

# Code-switched repair initiation: The case of Swedish *eller* in L2 English test interaction



Lina Nyroos<sup>a</sup>, Erica Sandlund<sup>b</sup>, Pia Sundqvist<sup>b,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Scandinavian Languages, Uppsala University, Sweden

<sup>b</sup> Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Karlstad University, Sweden

Received 12 April 2017; received in revised form 23 August 2017; accepted 23 August 2017

Available online 9 September 2017

## Abstract

Despite a long-standing interest in repair practices, much is yet to be learned about participants' selections of components of the repair operation, and their systematic variation across contexts and languages (Hayashi et al., 2013b; Kitzinger, 2013). The present paper targets the initiation of self-repair through examination of a particular discursive object, the Swedish conjunction *eller* ('or'), located in repair-prefacing position in a corpus of 79 second language (L2) oral proficiency tests. In the corpus, *eller* is systematically produced in Swedish, while surrounding talk is produced in the target language, English. As such, the repair initiations are *code-switched* (e.g., Auer, 1998b). Building on the recent work on *or*-prefaced repair initiations in English (Lerner and Kitzinger, 2015), we examine the role of *eller*-initiated repair (EIR), i.e., repair prefaced by *eller*, in the context of paired L2 tests. We also contrast EIRs with *or*-prefaced repair initiations in the same dataset. Findings indicate that EIRs serve to display trouble awareness, which may relate to necessary revisions of both form and content of the talk in English. The 'other-languageness' (Gafaranga, 2000) of the momentary code-switch amplifies test-takers' attention to what needs to be replaced or revised, and indicates to co-participants that self-repair is underway. The practice helps push forward turn transition and pre-empts conclusions about the speaker's stance or linguistic competence, which may be particularly relevant in a language testing context.

© 2017 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

**Keywords:** Code-switching; Conversation analysis; Repair preface; Self-initiated repair; L2 English; Test interaction

The fact that continuous negotiation of shared understanding of ongoing talk is key to all human interaction is perhaps never as visible as in the organization of repair. Interactants do "take challenges to intersubjectivity (...) seriously" (Hayashi et al., 2013a, p. 21), and work contentiously to reinstate a shared view in cases where hearing, producing, or understanding turns at talk temporarily derail such a shared understanding. However, the practice of repair has a wide range of applications beyond evident error correction. As the extensive conversation analytic (CA) literature on repair demonstrates, repair is an organizational practice that may be employed in order to perform a variety of actions, such as modifying an utterance underway, deleting something already said in favor of a substitute, or presenting alternative versions of some event (Hayashi et al., 2013b; Schegloff, 2013; Schegloff et al., 1977). As Kitzinger (2013, p. 256) suggests, particular repair types may be approached in terms of the reparative and interactional actions they contribute to performing, respectively. Similarly, work on conversational repair may emphasize either the technical aspects of repair within and across languages, or the repair operations that speakers perform (Schegloff, 2013). Several recent studies have emphasized that despite the long-standing interest in repair among conversation analysts, there is still much more to

\* Corresponding author at: Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Karlstad University, SE-651 88 Karlstad, Sweden.  
E-mail address: [pia.sundqvist@kau.se](mailto:pia.sundqvist@kau.se) (P. Sundqvist).

learn “about the organization of repair, the range of practices that are constitutive of it, and the ways in which specific deployments of these forms can be consequential for current and subsequent actions” (Hayashi et al., 2013a, p. 30), and “about the ways in which it may be adapted for use in different institutional contexts” (Kitzinger, 2013, p. 255). Also, as noted by Drew et al. (2013) on the interactional implications of self-repair, one challenge is to establish the ‘why’s’ of their occurrence in particular turns, as researchers may hesitate to offer explanations that “border on speculating about cognitive processing, including attributing to speakers some intentionality in changing the design of their turn” (p. 75). The repair procedure consists of segments, together comprising a chain of lexical or non-lexical items that make up the repair operation.<sup>1</sup> The initiation slot, or the repair preface slot, may be occupied by lexical items such as *well*, *no*, *actually*, *sorry*, *I mean* and *or* (Jackson and Jones, 2013; Kitzinger, 2013; Lerner and Kitzinger, 2015). In their recent study of *or* as a repair preface, Lerner and Kitzinger (2015) note that “*or*-prefacing indicates that the trouble-source formulation is not being discarded altogether, thereby mitigating the reparative character of the repair operation” (p.77).

In the present paper, we wish to contribute to the growing body of research on practices of conversational repair as it is employed in an institutional context with its own unique constraints on talk, and to our understanding of self-initiated self-repair (Schegloff et al., 1977). We target specifically the *initiation* of self-repair through examination of one particular repair preface found in the data, consisting of a large corpus of second language (L2) paired oral proficiency tests (two students/test-takers talking to each other). To clarify, we investigate a repair initiator systematically produced in a different language than surrounding talk, namely, the Swedish conjunction *eller* (English *or*) in repair-initiating position in a turn otherwise produced in the target language, English. Thus, *eller* is chosen as the focus of study (i.e., its discourse function in the context of L2 English oral proficiency tests). As such, the repair initiations are *code-switched* (e.g., Auer, 1998b; Gafaranga, 2000; Wei, 2005). Additionally, Swedish *eller* is contrasted with English *or* in the same corpus, to see how participants in this dataset used the two conjunctions. In sum, our study sets out to extend recent work on repair initiation (e.g., Lerner and Kitzinger, 2015), while also contributing to conversation analytic work on participants’ meaningful code alternations (cf. Gafaranga, 2000).

Gumperz (1982, 1991) proposed the idea that contextualization of language relies on aspects of linguistic behavior functioning as *contextualization cues*; a signal to recipients as to which aspects of the context are made relevant. Such cues can, in a wide sense, consist of “all the form-related means by which participants contextualize language” (Auer, 1992, p. 24), such as prosody, paralinguistic signs (e.g., tempo, tone, pauses, hesitation, and overlaps), code choice, and choice of lexical form and formulaic expressions (Gumperz, 1991, p. 231). A momentary shift from one medium (language) to another language can represent such a contextualization cue, signaling to co-participants a contrast to prior talk, indicating “that something new is going to come” (Auer, 1992, p. 33). However, an instance of code-switching, while orderly and meaningful to interactants, does not carry a particular referential meaning on its own if taken out of its local context (cf. Auer, 1992, p. 30). By inspecting and attempting to understand the local relevance of such shifts to participants, we can also unearth some inferential frameworks at play, and “minimize the imposition of our own interpretative codes upon the innocent, unsuspecting data” (Alvarez-Cáccamo, 1998, p. 43).

Interactional studies of code-switching among bilinguals, learners, and second language speakers have aimed to answer the underlying “why that, in that language, right now”-question (Üstünel and Seedhouse, 2005, p. 310) with regard to code-switching and sequential development. However, as Gafaranga (2000) has argued, concepts of ‘language’ and ‘code’ may be problematic in discovering participants’ own orientations to language choice as an orderly activity, and proposes the term *medium* of bilingual conversations (i.e., the “scheme of interpretation speakers themselves orient to while talking”, which in turn may be bilingual, see p. 329) in identifying what language is switched ‘to’ or ‘from’. Gafaranga (2000) examines repair practices in bilingual conversations and demonstrates how participants treat *medium repair* versus *other-language repair*. He argues that while speakers often explicitly name “the language about to be deviated to”, the “other-languageness” of the other type of repair often goes unnoticed (p. 348). As such, the study of language alternation in the shape of individual instances of code-switching is not just an analyst’s problem, but a participants’ concern requiring the uncovering of the methods by which participants orient to their own ‘languages’ or ‘codes’ in interaction.

Studies of conversational code-switching has indeed confirmed that the switching of languages in certain interactional slots is “programmatically relevant” to the interaction at hand (Wei, 2005, p. 375), for example, as a device for displaying alignment or misalignment with a teacher’s pedagogical focus (Üstünel and Seedhouse, 2005) or for shifting between on-task and off-task talk in L2 oral proficiency tests (Sandlund and Sundqvist, 2013a). The present study faced the challenging task not only of capturing the repair initiation mechanism of the conjunction *eller/or*, but also of identifying the role of the language switch as a contextualization cue (Gumperz, 1982, 1991) in these operations. Furthermore, the context for these repair prefaces also makes them relevant for in-depth examination: What kinds of orientations to the institutional context of language testing are displayed in the selection of a repair preface produced in a different language than the remainder of the turn?

<sup>1</sup> Cf. ‘initiation’ and ‘outcome’, Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 365.

With an eye toward the kind of repair operations performed by means of the *eller*-initiated repair (EIR) preface, we begin with a first look at the phenomenon of interest, illustrated in three fragments from the dataset. The particle *eller* (Eng. *or*) is marked in bold:<sup>2</sup>

(a) [530123182]

1 Sam /.../ from your job if youe (.) are a  
 2 ma:n but (0.3) I think woman should be,  
 3 (0.2) <>**eller**< women should be (1.8)  
 4 more accepted of people because  
 5 (1.0) I think they're (0.8) they  
 6 are (1.5) exactly the same

(b) [521522052]

1 May he's works in the church?=  
 2 Deb =yes and he helps=e:h °very > **eller**<°  
 3 (.) very many (0.2) people¿  
 4 May yes,

(c) [311321062]

1 Elsa do you look<sup>3</sup> (.) \*a-\* at teevee? (.)  
 2 <**elle**=ho:w (0.5) how much time you  
 3 spent, (0.8) >spend watching teevee<¿

In fragments (a) and (b), *eller* is produced mid-turn, postponing a syntactical completion of the current turn. In contrast, fragment (c) shows how *eller* can initiate immediate modification of some element produced in previous turn constructional unit. In all three fragments, features that indicate possible trouble are present, such as hesitation, pauses, and jump-starts.<sup>3</sup> In both (a) and (c), as well as in many of the following examples, *eller* is produced in a very rapid pace, in which the ending of the word is clearly affected. As seen here as well as in other transcripts, the word is heavily contracted so that either the second 'e' or the final 'r' is lost. There is also a difference in terms of the connection between the trouble-source and the trouble solution in the fragments above. In (a), the turn alone offers enough clues to the initiation of a repair operation, as the singular *woman* is swapped for the grammatically correct plural *women*. Conversely, in example (c), the question in line 1 is re-formulated in lines 2–3. In order to understand this particular repair practice from an emic perspective, some knowledge about the particular institutional orientations of participants is necessary. Before we present the data corpus used, we turn briefly to the institutional context: L2 oral proficiency testing.

## 1. Interaction and L2 oral proficiency testing

Like any form of institutional talk, L2 oral proficiency tests pose particular constraints on the interaction (He and Young, 1998; Sandlund et al., 2016b). The main goal of such tests is to generate assessable output from candidates, which entails particular participant roles as 'test-takers' and 'examiners'. Test-takers are then assessed on how proficiently they accomplish various tasks in an L2 (so-called task-based oral language assessment, cf. Kasper, 2013, p. 259). Although the particulars of such oral tasks vary, understandings, initiations, and completions of the tasks-at-hand constitute sequential slots where institutional characteristics of L2 oral testing talk may be displayed (cf., e.g., Kasper, 2013; Sandlund and Sundqvist, 2011, 2013b).

<sup>2</sup> For the purpose of illustration, bold type is used for *or* and *eller* throughout.

<sup>3</sup> *Jump-starts* are characterized by "a start to the following talk that sounds earlier than it is" (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013), and it is used to describe the delivery of a TCU-component. The *jump-start* differs from the *rush-through* as the latter defines a specific way in which speakers can tie two turns together by rushing through a possible transition relevance place by increasing the pace of the talk and leave no "momentary silence" (Schegloff, 1998, p. 241). Jefferson (2004, p. 29) states that the jump-start, or 'left push', is often found in the self-repair, confirming our findings, and can be heard as "a compressed onset of the utterance or utterance-part in question".

The vast majority of studies of interaction in L2 oral proficiency tests have been conducted on tests that are known as *oral proficiency interviews* (OPIs). The OPI is a standardized test format that involves a native speaker examiner and a test-taker (Seedhouse, 2013; van Lier, 1989), and a great deal of research on interaction in L2 proficiency tests has been conducted with OPIs as data (see, e.g., Ross and Kasper, 2013; Seedhouse and Egbert, 2006; Young and He, 1998). Well-known OPIs include, for example, the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), and the Cambridge ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) Examinations, including the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) (see Sandlund et al., 2016b, for a recent overview). OPIs have, however, been criticized for unfairly reflecting candidates' conversational skills (e.g., Brown, 2003; Kasper and Ross, 2007), and it has been argued that the specific interactional competence that students can demonstrate in scripted, standardized OPIs with an interviewer relates to their "socially constructed knowledge of what it means to interact with an LPI [Language Proficiency Interview] interviewer" and the "rhetorical script" of the interview being enacted (van Compernelle, 2011, p. 132). Similarly, Seedhouse (2013) demonstrated that interaction in an OPI (specifically, the IELTS) is characterized by interactional asymmetry, an "extremely high degree of pre-allocation of turns by comparison to other institutional contexts", an organization of repair that "differs significantly from that described as operating in L2 classroom interaction", and a lack of "requirement to achieve intersubjectivity" (p. 211). These studies and others have raised an awareness among test constructors and researchers that the OPI perhaps only partly reflects a learner's L2 interactional skills and proficiency. As a result, the so-called *paired* format, where test-takers interact with a peer instead of with a native speaker examiner, have grown in popularity (Ducasse and Brown, 2009; Nitta and Nakatsuhara, 2014). Studies of the paired format have indicated that it allows for a greater variety of contributions from test-takers, and that they resemble everyday conversations to a greater extent as compared to OPIs (Brooks, 2009; Hüttner, 2014). Paired, and also small group tests, have become increasingly common in testing L2 proficiency and interactional competence, and research has identified the flexibility of the peer-driven format along with the increased opportunities for negotiating meaning as beneficial (e.g., Gan et al., 2009), but also pointed to the problems associated with individual assessment of a joint product (May, 2011; Sandlund and Sundqvist, 2011). Paired/group tests are also considered more symmetric as both/all participants are expected to initiate and contribute to topics in an equal manner, whereas OPIs reserve the right to ask questions and introduce new tasks and topics to the interviewer (Seedhouse, 2013).

Studies of interaction in L2 testing contexts have also taken a specific interest in the organization of repair. For example, Egbert (1998), in a comparison of repair formats of everyday conversations and L2 OPIs, demonstrated that repair formats differed significantly between casual English and German conversations on the one hand, and the OPIs on the other. Students used repair formats inferred from the interviewer's instructions prior to the test, from textbooks, or from "repair strategies transferred from the students' first language" (p. 165). Similarly, Seedhouse (2013), who compared L2 classroom interaction with OPIs, noted that examiners are instructed not to (and do not generally) initiate repair on candidates' turns even when they are incomprehensible, as the goal of OPIs is not to achieve intersubjectivity, but to assess L2 production. As regards assessment, Seedhouse and Egbert (2006) observed that successful candidates had very few repairs in their talk. However, as paired tests are generally less standardized than OPIs, there is no reason to assume that such repair patterns would also apply to paired peer tests. Therefore, studies of repair in paired L2 tests make an important contribution to our understanding of the institutional particulars of a different test format.

## 2. Data

Underlying the present study is a corpus of 79 paired L2 English oral proficiency tests for Swedish 9th graders (recording length varied between 8 and 15 min), collected as part of a dissertation project (Sundqvist, 2009). Data were collected on two different test occasions: one was a classroom-based test ("TV life", 41 recordings), whereas the other occasion was the mandatory national test of English in 2007 ("The world around us", 38 recordings).<sup>4</sup> All 79 tests were audio-recorded, and a portion of the test corpus from "TV life" was also recorded on video. All tests were in the paired format, and participants were 9th grade students (ages 15–16) and their English teacher ("The world around us") or the researcher ("TV life"). Both tests had the same setup, as the classroom-based "TV life" testing condition used test materials from a previous national test. Since the authentic national test was a high-stakes test for participants, video was not allowed for ethical reasons, and not all video-recordings from "TV life" were suitable for analysis because of camera angles and quality. As a consequence, embodied action was only available for analysis for parts of the data used in his study, and a decision was made to mainly work with the audio recordings to allow for the same methodological treatment and comparison between instances of *eller*. The oral tests were recorded with the written consent of test-takers, their guardians, and teachers.

The tests examined consist of a warm-up section followed by one or two discussion sections. In our dataset, test-takers were first instructed to talk about their TV habits (classroom-based) or their home environment (national test). The discussion sections involve topic cards, consisting of either statements (e.g., *Smoking should not be allowed*) or questions

<sup>4</sup> Freely available at [http://nafs.gu.se/digitalAssets/1356/1356787\\_theworldaroundus.pdf](http://nafs.gu.se/digitalAssets/1356/1356787_theworldaroundus.pdf).

(e.g., *How can men and women be more equal?*). In both tests, test-takers were instructed to offer viewpoints, ask each other questions, and provide examples. Instructions also state that students should speak English at all times, and that the teacher should remain in the background of the interaction.

Data were transcribed according to CA conventions (Jefferson, 2004; see also Hepburn and Bolden, 2013, who elaborate on Jefferson's conventions). All 79 recordings were manually searched for instances of *eller* produced in Swedish. Instances in which *eller* was the only word produced in Swedish in a stretch of talk produced in English were included in the collection. No differences in the frequency or use of *eller* between the two test occasions were found.

Since all data was collected in one region of Sweden, dialectal aspects were present, hearable in first language talk as well as in, for example, intonation patterns in L2 talk, which on occasion presented a challenge for transcription. All such decisions have been carefully balanced in order to stay true to the data as well as to CA transcription conventions (Atkinson and Heritage, 1984; Hepburn and Bolden, 2013; Jefferson, 2004). As our study aims to depict the use of *eller* in an otherwise all-English local context, our transcription decisions have been motivated by a strive to depict the production of turns containing *eller* as close to the recorded data as possible. This means that when *eller* was produced in a contracted or cut-off manner, this was represented in transcripts. We have also made an effort to capture intonation patterns and tempo in minute detail, following Hepburn and Bolden's (2013) summary of conventions for representing, for example, jump-started turns, i.e., "a start to the following talk that sounds earlier than it is, and it seems to be produced by an over-loud first syllable" (Schegloff, 2005, p. 473).

Semantically as well as functionally, the Swedish conjunction *eller* corresponds to English *or*. In order to link the grammatical equivalence of these conjunctions to the interactional work accomplished in turns where *eller* occurs as the only Swedish lexical item, a sub-study on the deployment of *or* within the corpus was also conducted. The analysis of *eller*, compared to *or* in the dataset, aimed to shed light on the particular interactional function of the language switch in initiating repairs. As such, the study broadens recent work on *eller* in initiations of repair (cf. Lerner and Kitzinger, 2015) in an institutional context where orientations to participants' first language (L1) and L2, respectively, can be assumed to be procedurally relevant.

### 3. Analysis

The analytic segments of the present study are presented in this section, which is divided into two analytic parts. Before demonstrating the uniqueness of *eller*-initiated repair (EIR) in the next section, we begin with findings from our comparative investigation of test-takers' uses of *or*. When describing a specific phenomenon in interaction, such as a specific repair initiator, it is important to consider possible comparable loci of interaction, in order to define the specifics of the investigated item (cf. Schegloff, 1993).

#### 3.1. When code-switching does not occur

As expected, *or* was a frequent item in the test corpus. This observation is significant for a basic reason: It dismisses any explanation of the occurrence of Swedish *eller* as a result of unsuccessful retrieval of the English conjunction. While *or* was often located in non-repair contexts doing basic work of coordinating two corresponding elements in a phrase (cf. Blakemore, 2007; Lerner and Kitzinger, 2015), our comparative analysis of *or* versus *eller* was delimited to interactional work relevant to repair, which will be exemplified below. While our analysis of *eller* as a repair preface focuses on self-initiated self-repair, *or*-prefaced repairs were also located in repair sequences initiated by others, such as in (1a) below, where Belle and Sandy are discussing their TV habits. One of the conversation prompts for this test included various *wh*-questions that the test-takers could ask each other about their TV habits, such as when they watch TV, which shows they like, et cetera. In (1a) below, Belle has initiated repair in the form of a *so*-prefaced upshot regarding Sandy's evening TV habits:

(1a) [330423152]

1 Belle eh: like=eh: (.) so you watch tv  
 2 in the evening only,  
 3 Sandy eh: yeah.=or when I come home after  
 4 school,

The principle of preference for agreement influences the shape and format of the second pair part in an adjacency pair (e.g., Pomerantz, 1984). In (1a), the question in lines 1–2 is grammatically and syntactically built to project a yes-answer (Raymond, 2003), which is what Sandy begins her response with in line 3. However, "yeah" is immediately followed by "or" and a modification of the initially agreeing response. The modification ("when I come home after school") might be understood as either an alternative, or as a modification. What *or* does here is that it frames an expansion of the turn while still retaining a link to

prior talk. As [Lerner and Kitzinger \(2015\)](#) state, *or* has the potential to introduce a repair solution without discarding the trouble-source altogether. As such, Belle's other-initiated repair leads to an agreeing response from Sandy, which then immediately seems to require modification of her initial claim. In (1b), a different type of modification is exemplified:

(1b) [540224052]

1 Lisa ehm: yeah my parents are divorced so I  
 1 live in two different places,  
 2 Lisa and, (.) with my mom I just moved  
 3 to (.) °uppsala° >or< (.) yeah >it  
 4 was a couple of months ago< but (.)  
 5 it feels n(h)ew hh .hh

In (1b), Lisa is describing where she lives, which is an initial task in the test. In line 4, she accounts for a recent move to Uppsala, when she adds “or yeah it was a couple of months ago but”. Here, it seems that Lisa's modification is an effort to “establish a ‘relevant description’” (cf. [Drew, 2003](#), p. 919) that is more true to the factual circumstances, even though “it feels” like it was recently she moved. Both (1a) and (1b) demonstrate how *or* might be used in order to shift trajectory, or to modify a response toward a more apt description.

Our second repair-relevant or deployment illustrates how *or* can be used to initiate a more specific shift, which is relevant to our subsequent account of *eller*. In (2), Deb is about to explain a type of TV show that she dislikes. The description Deb appears to have trouble retrieving seems to indicate that ‘documentaries’ is the type of TV program she does not enjoy, but she first produces “for rea:l” before *or* initiates a word search (lines 3–4):

(2) [321522052]

1 Deb I like this (0.5) Hhh (.) english (.) that  
 2 episo- I don't °kno-° I don't like this=eh:  
 3 for rea:l or >what do you call it< (.)  
 4 ffak(h)ta(hh)f hh?  
 5 May f.hja:f=  
 6 Deb =programs (.) it's pretty boring

In line 2, Deb is attempting to formulate her stance on shows dealing with ‘real’ or ‘factual’ matters. In lines 2 and 3, she indicates trouble retrieving the searched-for item, prefacing the word search display question (a rapidly produced >what do you call it<) with *or*. Her *or*-prefaced search display makes public that “for real” was not an accurate description, but one which requires some modification and/or specification, and that she has trouble retrieving. Such a forward-oriented repair initiation, i.e., when “the trouble source is yet to be produced, such as when a speaker is searching for a word” ([Greer, 2013](#), p. 100) is characteristic of learners' word searches, and attempts to resolve such searches may involve the invitation of co-participants. Deb's translation request is hearable as an invitation to participate in the search, but May does not immediately offer a solution. Instead, Deb offers a candidate descriptor of the TV show type, “fakta” in Swedish (Eng. *facts*), using rising intonation on “fakta”, which makes the suggestion hearable as a candidate descriptor (cf. [Koshik and Seo, 2012](#), p. 167). The potential delicacy of switching over to Swedish is indicated in its production through a smile voice. May produces an agreeing response (line 5, notable also using a Swedish-sounding response particle rather than an agreeing “yes” or the like), thus displaying to Deb her understanding, regardless of the incomplete candidate description in line 4. Deb adds the word “programs” in line 6, which complements her earlier description of ‘fact programs’, and adds an assessment (“it's pretty boring”) to finalize her topical talk on her TV preferences.

In (2) above, *or* functions as a marker that initiates an activity shift from producing descriptions and assessments about a topic (TV habits) to a search in progress and a shift in footing (cf. [Goffman, 1986 \[1974\]](#), p. 21). Up until this point, Deb has been struggling to explain what kind of TV program she dislikes, but with the *or* she is shifting to a meta-commentary mode or an invitation to participate, as her translation request “what do you call it” explicitly comments on language use. The *or*, consequently, invokes a different footing since the meta-commentary shifts focus from content to form, and also displays to her co-participant that she has not yet identified the searched-for descriptor, but returns to the original activity of describing and assessing as soon as shared understanding has been displayed. *Or* indicates that there is some trouble in prior talk, specifically in the description “rea:l”, and initiates a problem-solving activity in which a co-participant may become involved, and thus shifts the word search from a solitary action to a possibly joint accomplishment.

This brief overview of the students' use of *or* in the test interaction illustrates that *or* is used in primarily two repair-relevant local contexts. The use of *or* in our data seems to initiate a modification and/or development of something in prior talk – except for in example (2), where possible alternatives (cf. Lerner and Kitzinger, 2015) are indicated in the open display of a word search (the translation request) – although all three excerpts illustrate *or* in the initiation of some kind of shift in the ongoing talk. In the remaining analysis, we turn to the initiation of repair using *eller* prefacing in order to demonstrate the systematic deployment of a code-switched coordinating conjunction as opposed its available English equivalent.

#### 4. *Eller*-initiated repairs

In this section, we investigate the use of the Swedish conjunction *eller*, and how it initiates and organizes repair operations.

##### 4.1. Editing segments in the turn-so-far: replacing transparent trouble sources

As described by Lerner and Kitzinger (2015, p. 66), *or* may be used as a repair-initiator that casts the repair solution as an alternative rather than a rejection of the trouble source. In our data, English *or* was not found to primarily initiate repairs in this way; instead, the code-switched Swedish conjunction *eller* operates in a similar fashion. In fragments (3)–(13) below, *eller*-initiated repairs are examined in detail, starting with EIRs that introduce trouble solutions that *replace* a segment of the turn in progress. According to Schegloff (2013, p. 43), “replacings (...) refer to a speaker's substituting for a wholly or partially articulated element of a TCU-in-progress (...) while retaining the sense that ‘this is the same utterance’”. In (3), Sam is talking about gender inequality when she initiates repair with an *eller* preface:

(3) [530123182]

1 Sam /.../ from your job if youe (.) are a  
 2 ma:n but (0.3) I think woman should be,  
 3 (0.2) >e11r< women should be (1.8)  
 4 more accepted of people because  
 5 (1.0) I think they're (0.8) they  
 6 are (1.5) exactly the same

In line 2, “I think woman should be” projects a statement regarding women before the turn is halted and a repair operation is initiated. After a brief pause, the EIR is *jump-started*, which means that *eller* is produced with an “over-loud first syllable” which gives the impression of the turn component being produced “earlier than it is” (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013, p. 64; Schegloff, 2005, p. 473). In addition, *eller* is contracted as it initiates the repair operation, produced at a fast pace. The repair preface *eller* is immediately followed by the repair solution, the grammatically correct form “women”, which in turn is post-framed by the recycled verb phrase (“should be”). The formula “[replaced item] + [recycled item]” makes the trouble-source (“woman”) transparent as it repeats a part of the turn, simultaneously highlighting the deletion of the replaced item. This sequence illustrates how the EIR performs a replacing operation, while retaining the impression of a coherent utterance. The EIR softens the rewind of the turn to a passed point in time and marks the speaker's orientation toward modifying an item already produced in favor of a more apt formulation. In sum, the EIR highlights functions as a meta-commentary when parts of a turn are replaced by a more accurate phrasing.

In (4), a similar organization, but with a verb being substituted, is in place:

(4) [521212021]

1 Bill a: I live in a hou:se a bige:h (.) brown  
 2 hou:se, (0.4) it's a: (1.9) lumber (.)  
 3 house,  
 4 (1.6)  
 5 Bill and e:h,  
 6 (1.7)  
 7 Bill it have (0.8) °>e11e it has<° (0.9) seven  
 8 roo:ms I think,  
 9 (2.7)

Here, Bill is embarking on a description of his house as part of the test warm-up. In line 7, referring to the house as “it”, he uses the plural form “have”. After the grammatically inaccurate “have”, a pause halts the production before the EIR frames the repair “*eller* it has”, produced at a fast pace and with a slightly softer volume. As in excerpt (3), the grammatical error is replaced but the trajectory remains intact. *Eller*, then, pre-empts other-initiated repair since it both occupies space in the turn in close connection to the repairable and signals the speaker’s orientation toward the need for refining some already articulated item and for providing a solution.

However, in (5) and (6) below, the connection between the trouble-source and the repair solution is slightly different:

(5) [521212021]

```
1 Alice  ane:h
2         (3.0)
3 Alice  it's wood aroun=>elle< forest
4         aroun (.) an: , (1.6) *eh:*
5         (4.9)
```

The technology of the repairs in examples (3)–(4) above follows a similar pattern: EIRs initiate a replacing operation in which a lexical item is swapped for a more grammatically correct item. However, in example (5), “wood” is not inaccurate, but the speaker treats this item as in need of substitution. In terms of its production, *eller* is contracted and produced rapidly in a rushed manner, but not jump-started as in excerpt (3). The production format contributes to the sense of *eller* as a conversational practice rather than a word carrying a specific meaning. The EIR seems to function as a device with which the speaker signals an eagerness to hold on to the turn, while managing the trouble-at-hand without disruptions. The format, in combination with the code-switch, signals ‘a wish to go first’, and that co-participants should refrain from initiating repair.

In (6), Bella adds an additional component, “y’know”, that also highlight the meta-commentary function of *eller*:

(6) [521012152]

```
1 Bella  m:: well I live in a (0.3) cabin an
2         (0.4)
3 Bella  >el1r y'know<, u:h house I
4         m(h)ean¿ hh .hh
5 Bella  e:h (0.2) in the middle of nowhere¿=up
6         in the forest¿
7         (1.0)
```

In line 1, Bella initially describes her home as a “cabin”, although with some displayed hesitation prior to producing the lexical item. In line 3, her previous turn becomes subject to repair as she offers “house” as a preferable solution. In addition to *eller*, the speaker adds the epistemic markers “y’know” and “I mean”, and with the interspersed laughter in line 4, the repair becomes a meta-commentary to her prior deployment of “cabin” as not only an erroneous description, but also an amusing one. Here, “*eller*” + “you know” are also produced very rapidly, further emphasizing a desire to keep away co-participant intrusion in order to amend the turn-so-far. As such, the epistemic markers serve to buy the speaker time.

As Schegloff et al. (1977) state, ‘correction’ is a specific type of repair which implies that something is faulty. However, in extracts (3)–(6), speakers employ self-correction repairs by means of replacing operations, indicating a preference for not only linguistic accuracy, but precision in terms of word choice (cf. Heritage, 1997, p. 235). In this first section, we have examined sequences in which test-takers employ EIRs in order to replace and correct actual as well as perceived grammatical or lexical errors. EIRs contribute to holding the floor, and to forestalling co-participants’ intervention. Through *eller*, the current speaker signals awareness that the interaction has reached a point where other-initiated repair may be expected, even though it is treated as undesired. In sum, extracts (3)–(6) show transparent repairables, and the operations are, despite pauses and other trouble markers, designed so that they minimize the hitch that the repair procedure involves.



## 5. Trouble underway: search on display

There are, however, many instances in our data where the repairables are not as evident as in the fragments examined above, as in excerpt (7):

(7) [530713161]  
 1 (0.9)  
 2 Al it's has been a lot of smokers >in the  
 3 room< and you can smell, (0.8) >elle<  
 4 (0.3) smell the smoke. .hhh  
 5 (1.7)  
 6 Al cause its- doesn't smell so good?

In line 2, Al is developing an account on the test topic card “Smoking should not be allowed” with a focus on smoke lingering in a room. In line 3, he embarks on a formulation of lingering smoke, “and you can smell,” which is produced with a ‘fade out’ intonation, projecting a continuation which is pushed forward in the turn because of the pause of 0.8 seconds. The pause indicates that Al is having trouble with the progression of the turn, and it is in this segment of the turn that *eller* is produced. *Eller* is followed by a brief pause before he repeats the verb “smell” and continues with an object syntactically necessary to semantically close the turn. The production format indicates that Al is trying out a suitable formulation, without finding a proper substitute.

In Schegloff's (2013, p. 49) examples of the repair operation *searching*, the speaker explicitly marks that a search is in progress, as in the following example:

04 Stn: → Bullocks? ya mean that one *right u:m (1.1) tch! (.)*  
 05 → *right by thee: u:m (.) whazit the Plaza? theater::=*  
 06 Joy: =Uh huh,

In this borrowed excerpt, Stan searches for the name of the hotel and makes the search explicit by “whazit the Plaza? theatre::=”. However, in example (7), the search procedure is not as extended, and the search is not articulated in the same way. A further difference is that an explicit search could possibly open up for other-initiated repair, whereas *eller*, due to its cataphoric quality, postpones interference with the solution as it signals that the speaker has embarked on a ‘rewind-and-swap’ procedure which projects an upcoming alternative.

The same format, ‘*eller* + [repetition of articulated segment(s) of the turn]’, occurs in examples (8)–(9):

(8) [321522052]  
 1 May he's works in the church?=  
 2 Deb =yes and he helps=e:h °very > eller<°  
 3 (.) very many (0.2) people?  
 4 May yes,

(9) [311421012]  
 1 Eve .pt .hh much=e:h extre:me spo:rts?  
 2 (0.6)  
 3 Eve eh: and not so many (0.7) >eller<,  
 4 (hh) °not so many° .hhh e::h (0.7)  
 5 <HORses on tee:vee>?  
 6 (0.4)

*Eller* occurs in a local environment where indications of trouble (hesitations, pauses) mark that something is problematic. Similar to (7), examples (8) and (9) illustrate how the segments produced before *eller* are recycled without any substitution being introduced. The elements that are repeated in the turns grammatically project syntactical objects:

you can smell [object], he helps very [object], not so many [object], and the recycling indicates that the current speaker is stuck.

As noted earlier, *eller* as a repair preface is marked in terms of its delivery characteristics. In fragments (7)–(9), *eller* is produced rapidly and/or in contracted form, which, if not used to introduce a solution to arisen problems, marks that something is not running smoothly. Semantically, the turn is in progress, but pace-wise, the search procedures lower the tempo, which makes it possible for other participants to either embark on a new turn, or to interfere with the turn in progress. To initiate repair is one way of indicating that a potential problem is about to be taken care of, and to pre-frame the repair with a rapidly produced *eller* might be a way to even more forcefully pre-empt interference from other speakers. It is worth mentioning that the task is to keep the conversation going and elaborate on the topic. Therefore, it may be of particular importance for test-takers to keep on talking despite hitches in order to complete the tasks to be assessed.

## 6. Pro forma: readjusting the action in tune with the task at hand

Not surprisingly, test instructions play an important role in the interactions examined. At the beginning of each test, teachers read the instructions out loud, and test-takers are also presented with a printed copy. As mentioned, the tests begin with a ‘warm up’ section that includes pre-set questions (to ask fellow test-takers) that are printed on the instruction sheet. Extracts (10) and (11) both illustrate test-takers importing material from the warm-up materials into the conversation:

(10) [311321062]

```
1           (1.0)
2   Elsa   do you look (.) *a-* at teevee? (.)
3           <elle=ho:w (0.5) how much time you
4           spent, (0.8) >spend watching teevee<?
```

In the video, test-takers Elsa and Frida both display a strong visual orientation toward their instruction sheets. Prior to line 1, Elsa has asked Frida one of the pre-set questions to which Frida has responded briefly. After a pause (line 1) Elsa poses a new question, still visually orientated toward her test material. As soon as she has come to a possible turn transition at the end of line 2, she jump-starts a new turn-construction unit, initiated with *eller*. The repair operation (lines 3–4) replaces the yes/no-question in line 2 with a different question that is identical to the one on the instruction sheet (“how much time you spend watching TV”, one of several question from a list).<sup>5</sup> When redesigning the question in line with what is written on the paper in her hands, Elsa highlights her orientation toward the pre-set questions and treats them as not only topic suggestions, but rather as recommended interactional contributions (cf. Mikkola and Lehtinen, 2014; Sandlund and Sundqvist, 2011). The written questions are meant to aid the students, but looking at line 2 in the transcript, Elsa seems capable of producing a relevant question on the topic. Elsa’s EIR is therefore not dealing with the question in line 2 as a trouble-source similar to the ones we have seen in examples (3)–(9). Instead, the EIR readjusts the entire action by *overwriting* the question in line 2 with a new one in lines 3–4 (cf. the repair operation *aborting* in Schegloff, 2013, p. 52). The overwrite, in contrast to the replacing operations (examples 3–6) and the word searches (examples 7–9), does not create a sense of the ongoing utterance being semantically or syntactically altered. Rather, the operation not only initiates a restart, but it creates the notion of a *resetting* of the interaction. This is further stressed by jump-started *eller* operation.

Extract (11) is collected from the discussion section of the test. The instructions for this part of the test are more explicit, with six points that explain the expected procedure (bold in original):

- 
1. **pick** one of the cards
  2. **read** the statement **aloud**
  3. say if you **agree or disagree**
  4. try to **explain why** you agree or disagree
  5. **give examples** to show what you mean
  6. **ask your friends** what they think and why
- 

Points two and three express particular constraints on the interaction, which becomes evident in example (11). In lines 2–3, Frank has picked up a topic card reading “What can we learn from history?”, and halts his production of a commentary midway:

<sup>5</sup> The test can be found at [http://www.nafs.gu.se/digitalAssets/1194/1194196\\_tv\\_life.pdf](http://www.nafs.gu.se/digitalAssets/1194/1194196_tv_life.pdf).

(11) [531313201]

1 (0.9)  
 2 Frank: we can learn, (0.2) hh >elle<=what  
 3 can we learn, from history? .HHH  
 4 (0.9)  
 5 Frank: u::h (.) I think (.) that eh:  
 6 (4.0)  
 7 you can learn from our mistakes  
 8 in history and our revolution, (.)  
 9 and things?  
 10 (2.0)

As stated in the instructions, the test-taker who reads the question aloud should also offer a first response. This setup constitutes a formal constraint on the interaction that contrasts with ordinary conversation (which, ironically, is what the students are instructed to produce). Information-seeking questions, or questions aiming to initiate a discussion, are rarely answered by the questioner in ordinary conversation (for studies on questions as social actions, see, e.g., [Hayano, 2013](#); [Pomerantz, 1988](#)). However, in this particular setting, participants need to pay attention to instructions regulating not only topic but also conversational practices. In line 2, excerpt 11, Frank embarks on a content response to the topic card question. This action violates the setup that prescribes the student to start by reading the question, and as seen in the example, the student has to perform a repair operation in order to abide by the instructions. As in (10), the action initiated with *eller* shows the speaker's orientation toward the instructions and the specifics of the testing context. This focus leads the speaker to readjust the action so that it becomes in tune with the expected action, as projected by the test material. In contrast to (10), the EIR is not jump-started, possibly because the EIR is produced mid-turn and not at a potential TRP. However, the EIR is contracted and latched while attending to a trouble-source. Again, the production offers evidence that *eller* as a repair preface works as a conversational practice rather than as merely a lexical item carrying meaning.

## 7. Recalibrating assessments

In the excerpts examined so far, lexical items have been replaced (3–6), speakers have searched for alternative formulations (7–10) or readjusting their actions so as to fit the instructions (10–11). In our final category, two examples illustrate how EIRs introduce a different type of modification. In (12), Fred (lines 1–2 + 5) talks about the fact that men and women can carry out the same type of work while receiving unequal pay. In overlap in line 6, Bella elaborates on the topic:

(12) [521012152]

1 Fred they have the same job=eh: but  
 2 the:y,  
 3 (.)  
 4 Bella >yeah well,<=  
 5 Fred =don't get the mo- [as much money,]  
 6 Bella [the government] I  
 7 think have always discussed that  
 8 bud(h) >I don't I don't< think it  
 9 helps,<eller it helps but (hh)  
 10 (0.6)  
 11 not all the way,

Fred has talked about the subject in rather factual terms, while Bella introduces the government's involvement on the matter. Her assessment is hearable as critique toward the government on a political issue, as she (in lines

8–9) explicitly states that this is her opinion (“I think”), and what the government has done (“discussed that”) is not good enough (“I don’t think it helps”). Direct expressions of opinions, in particular regarding possibly delicate matters, are quite rare in the dataset. However, in line 9, Bella jump-starts an EIR at a possible transition relevance place (TRP), which introduces a modification and reformulation of her opinion. This reformulation does not overwrite or replace what has been said; instead, the repair treats the repairable as something in need of slight adjustment. More specifically, the EIR downgrades the speaker’s standpoint, as it deletes the negation and adds a positive aspect with modification; thereby nuancing the stance taken through a recalibration of the assessment.

A similar recalibration takes place in (13):

(13) [330423152]

1 Ann e:h  
 2 (0.6)  
 3 Ann if (1.2) if=e:h (.) (there’s) happened an  
 4 accident¿  
 5 (0.5)  
 6 in some place.  
 7 (0.5)  
 8 like=e:h (0.3) world trade center,  
 9 Teacher m:m=  
 10 Ann =or some.  
 11 (0.5)  
 12 Ann =the::(n), .thh hhh  
 13 ((loud breathing during 1.9 seconds))  
 14 Ann there was (.) u:h  
 15 (0.7)  
 16 Ann fmHHHUH .hh thenu:hɛ (.) it’s good.  
 17 (0.4)  
 18 Ann >eller<, (0.5) °it’s=u:h° more  
 19 >interesting<¿  
 20 (2.1)  
 21 Teacher ‘ka:y?

The topic card that Ann draws before the transcript begins reads “I think news programs are boring”. She moves on to exemplifying occasions when she disagrees with the statement, such as when major accidents have happened. Her talk in lines 12, 14, and 16 displays hesitations and pauses, and is finalized with an assessment of news programs on such occasions (“then it’s good”). In line 18, the EIR is produced rapidly, and the solution carries features of a word search procedure (pause, hesitation), indicating that the EIR marks the speaker’s wish to go first, as well as the speaker’s orientation toward a potential trouble-source.

The repair is followed by a new assessment that is designed in the same way as the first one (‘it’s [X]’). In light of how the assessments relate to the potential delicacy of the topic, it is likely that the speaker finds “good” to be inappropriate in relation to her example of 9/11. “Interesting” is less subjective and does not reflect a positive or a negative evaluation of the assessed object in the obvious way that “good” does. Just like in (14), the modification nuances the stance-taking, thus reducing the stake for the speaker.

Examples (12) and (13) demonstrate how the EIR is used to modify the speaker’s stance, and this particular deployment shows similarities with the examples described by [Lerner and Kitzinger \(2015\)](#). The material following upon the EIR can be viewed as modifications of the repairables that reduce the speaker’s stakes (cf. [Edwards, 2006](#)). In terms of lexical choices, the English *or* could have been used instead of the Swedish *eller* – still maintaining the same lexical meaning. However, since the Swedish *eller* is being used, it does something more than the English *or*, which more

strongly would have projected a following alternative.<sup>6</sup> In sum, *eller* marks the speaker's concern for fixing something treated as a trouble-source, hence making it a conversational practice with meta-commentary features.

## 8. Conclusion

In this paper, we have examined a specific discourse marker, the Swedish conjunction *eller*, as it is deployed in the initiation of repair in a corpus of L2 English oral proficiency tests. We have demonstrated that repair initiated with an *eller*-preface contributes to the realization of a variety of repair operations ranging from the replacement of grammatically incorrect items to the modification of a displayed stance. A recurrent feature of the *eller*-initiated repairs (EIRs) is their meta-commentary function, displaying the speaker's alertness to a (potential) trouble and desire to attend to such trouble through self-repair. As such, the language shift into Swedish (which is not the medium language of the ongoing interaction), works as a contextualization cue (Auer, 1992; Gumperz, 1982) signaling to co-participants that something new is underway – an “other-languageness” cue (Gafaranga, 2000, p. 336) that is absent from the repair-initiating actions deploying *or* in the corpus. Signaling a new interpretative scheme by momentarily switching to Swedish allows the test-taker to move beyond projecting a specific upcoming alternative and to highlight trouble, while never explicitly commenting on the shift itself, yet cueing co-participants to await a solution of some kind.

Another contextualization cue is the production of the EIRs. Production-wise, the EIR is frequently produced in a rapid or jump-started manner, which shows co-participants that the current speaker is eager to hold the floor. As noted by others (e.g., Hayashi et al., 2013a; Schegloff et al., 1977), the preference for self-correction is strong in social interaction, and test-takers' temporary switch to an L1 shared by all participants puts on display this underlying structural preference. We argue that the selection of a non-target language repair initiator, along with its characteristics of vocal production in this particular context, *highlights and amplifies* to co-participants the speaker's attention to a trouble-source and its self-initiated solution, and pre-empts any premature rescue actions from co-participants.

A common folk belief, and one that we have encountered in workshops with English teachers in Sweden (Sandlund et al., 2016a), is the idea that code-switching of single particles like *eller* is the result of some kind of subconscious language transfer, which is to be treated as more or less accidental and as something learners do when they are under pressure to produce talk. Relying on extensive CA work on code-switching and our own analysis, we naturally strongly disagree with such a belief, but the often rushed production of *eller* in initiating self-repair in a language testing context does resonate with a meta-commentary function, or perhaps even a very brief moment of self-directed talk. Taking the concepts of self-talk and ‘private speech’ (e.g., Goffman, 1981, p. 116; Vygotsky, 1987), Steinbach Kohler and Thorne (2011) show how self-directed talk in language learning contexts is treated “as a resource for, or obstacle to, task management and mutual alignment” and how “self-directed talk can act as a publicly available resource for maintaining intersubjectivity through its display of task- and group-relevant problem-solving procedures (p.71). They also describe self-talk as a means for “opening a space for working out a problem at one's own pace” (p. 67). Just as the production format of the EIR may be marked by a jump-start or other marked prosodic features, self-talk is described to carry features such as change of volume, altered prosody and repetitions. It seems that self-talk opens the possibility for co-participants to leave the self-talk producer disattended, just as the EIR seem to accommodate space for the speaker to execute the repair practice without co-participants' involvement. Some support for this idea is found in the contrastive analysis of *or*-initiated repairs in the dataset – especially where what follows the *or* is an invitation to participate – a request for help with translation (excerpt 2). With *eller*, co-participants are not invited to the repair solution, but rather, cautioned to await self-repair. It is possible that the EIR represents a brief moment of self-directed talk, where the repairer is partly doing the initiation or noticing of the trouble source for themselves before proceeding with a repair for recipients, but at this stage, such a claim would have to remain tentative. Further research along these lines should be based on video data to allow for a closer analysis of, for example, averted gaze and other embodied characteristics of self-directed talk, but for now, we must leave any such claims to be pursued further.

It could be argued that test-takers' eagerness to resolve the trouble on their own gives us a fleeting look at how two participant-relevant institutional contexts intersect. First, the language learning classroom, where teachers' offers of solutions to L2 troubles may be expected (see, e.g., Sert, 2015), and second, language testing talk, where test-takers'

<sup>6</sup> A connection that may come to mind to readers is the possible equivalence between both *eller* and *or*-initiated repairs, and a construction like *or rather* in initiating repair (see, e.g., <http://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/or-rather> for corpus-based examples, as suggested by one of our reviewers). Some of our fragments indeed show some functional similarities with this slightly more formal way of initiating self-repair using a “double preface” (Lerner and Kitzinger, 2015, p. 74). However, the English *or rather* has a Swedish equivalent (*eller snarare*), and we believe that these constructions (in both languages) convey a higher degree of explicitness. English *or rather*, just as its Swedish translation, does to a greater extent than *or/eller* indicate that the repair involves a replacement of X in favor of Y. *Eller/or* allows for the speaker to introduce an alternative in a more subtle manner without assessing the repairable and the replacing item as clearly. Further research could examine whether a double preface (*eller snarare*) can be seen as contracted to *eller* in certain cases of code-switched repair initiations, or whether these practices are distinctly different, which is what our analyses so far have demonstrated.

orientations may be displayed in terms of increased willingness to show what they know and to resolve problems independently. As such, EIRs may be viewed as one component of test-takers' orientations to doing-being competent test-takers.

In their paper on *or*-initiated repairs in English, Lerner and Kitzinger (2015) argue that the *or* preface “reaches back into the TCU to connect the troubles source and repair solution in a particular way” (p. 77), one that does not completely reject the trouble-source formulation. In our data, many of the EIRs seem to do the opposite, where the repairs initiated by *eller*, both in terms of design and production format, completely replace or overwrite the trouble-source. Most of these are related to lexical or grammatical errors, and the need for replacing them in their entirety seems very reasonable in a language testing context.

However, instances where assessments produced are mitigated or refined after an *eller* preface seem more closely associated with the role of *or* in the Lerner and Kitzinger (2015) study. In these sequences in our dataset, a displayed stance is reformulated. Englebretson (2007, p. 6) describes stance-taking as an action reflecting personal morale, attitudes, beliefs, and evaluations. Such an action is relevant to our analyses in cases where test-takers modify statements that could be perceived as morally challengeable. In these cases, our findings bring to mind Drew's work on the “quite implicit repair practices” (2003, p. 937) in which interactants engage in order to arrive at precision of claims and descriptions, such as to avoid misunderstandings due to expressed exaggerations (cf. also Jackson and Jones, 2013). Test-takers must not only orient to the correctness of their target language output, but also orient to the content of their talk via a socio-moral compass, where particular descriptions may need revision in order to accurately depict opinions and stances.

This study has shed light upon the initiation of repair in a particular institutional context in which orientations to target language (English) accuracy is essential to success, but where the fact that all participants also share knowledge of Swedish, makes possible a temporary language switch without compromising intersubjectivity (cf. Auer, 1998a). As such, we have shown that the code-switching of the equivalent of *or* is systematic and meaningful to participants in that the initiation of repair through a one-shot lexical language switch highlights and amplifies both the presence of a trouble-source and the self-repair operation in progress. In sum, we argue that more studies of code-switching and repair initiation across languages and conversational contexts are needed, as such studies extend our understanding of both the interactional and technical dimensions of the organization of repair.

## Acknowledgments

This study was supported by a grant from the Swedish Research Council [2012-4129]. We are much indebted to the two anonymous reviewers for their insightful and valuable comments on an earlier version of this paper.

## References

- Alvarez-Cáccamo, C., 1998. From 'switching code' to 'code-switching'. Towards a reconceptualization of communicative codes. In: Auer, P. (Ed.), *Code-switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity*. Routledge, New York, NY, pp. 29–48.
- Atkinson, J.M., Heritage, J. (Eds.), 1984. *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Auer, P., 1992. Introduction: John Gumperz' approach to contextualization. In: Auer, P., DiLuzio, A. (Eds.), *The Contextualization of Language*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 1–37.
- Auer, P., 1998a. Bilingual conversation revisited. In: Auer, P. (Ed.), *Code-switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity*. Routledge, London, pp. 1–24.
- Auer, P. (Ed.), 1998b. *Code-switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity*. Routledge, London.
- Blakemore, D., 2007. “Or”-parentheticals, “that is”-parentheticals and the pragmatics of reformulation. *J. Linguist.* 43 (2), 311–339.
- Brooks, L., 2009. Interacting in pairs in a test of oral proficiency: co-constructing a better performance. *Lang. Test.* 26 (3), 341–366. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265532209104666>
- Brown, A., 2003. Interviewer variation and the co-construction of speaking proficiency. *Lang. Test.* 20 (1), 1–25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/0265532203lt242oa>
- Drew, P., 2003. Precision and exaggeration in interaction. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 68 (6), 917–938.
- Drew, P., Walker, T., Ogden, R., 2013. Self-repair and action construction. In: Hayashi, M., Raymond, G., Sidnell, J. (Eds.), *Conversational Repair in Human Understanding*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 71–94.
- Ducasse, A.M., Brown, A., 2009. Assessing paired orals: Raters' orientation to interaction. *Lang. Test.* 26 (3), 423–443.
- Edwards, D., 2006. Managing subjectivity in talk. In: Hepburn, A., Wiggins, S. (Eds.), *Discursive Research in Practice: New Approaches to Psychology and Interaction*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 31–49.
- Egbert, M., 1998. Miscommunication in language proficiency interviews of first-year German students: a comparison with natural conversation. In: Young, R., He, A.W. (Eds.), *Talking and Testing. Discourse Approaches to the Assessment of Oral Proficiency*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 147–169.
- Englebretson, R., 2007. *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Gafaranga, J., 2000. Medium repair vs. other-language repair: telling the medium of a bilingual conversation. *Int. J. Bilingual.* 4 (3), 327–350.
- Gan, Z., Davison, C., Hamp-Lyons, L., 2009. Topic negotiation in peer group oral assessment situations: a conversation analytic approach. *Appl. Linguist.* 30 (3), 315–344.

- Goffman, E., 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Goffman, E., 1986 [1974]. *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Northeastern University Press, Boston.
- Greer, T., 2013. Word search sequences in bilingual interaction: code switching and embodied orientation toward shifting participant constellations. *J. Pragmat.* 57, 100–117.
- Gumperz, J., 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Gumperz, J., 1991. Contextualization and understanding. In: Duranti, A., Goodwin, C. (Eds.), *Rethinking Context*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 229–252.
- Hayano, K., 2013. Question design in conversation. In: Sidnell, J., Stivers, T. (Eds.), *Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 395–414.
- Hayashi, M., Raymond, G., Sidnell, J., 2013. Conversational repair and human understanding: an introduction. In: Hayashi, M., Raymond, G., Sidnell, J. (Eds.), *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 1–40.
- Hayashi, M., Raymond, G., Sidnell, J. (Eds.), 2013b. *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- He, A.W., Young, R., 1998. Language proficiency interviews: a discourse approach. In: Young, R., He, A.W. (Eds.), *Talking and Testing: Discourse Approaches to the Assessment of Oral Proficiency*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 1–24.
- Hepburn, A., Bolden, G.B., 2013. The conversation analytic approach to data collection. In: Sidnell, J., Stiver, T. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Blackwell Publishing, Chichester, pp. 57–76.
- Heritage, J., 1997. Conversation analysis and institutional talk: analyzing data. In: Silverman, D. (Ed.), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*. Sage, London, pp. 161–182.
- Hüttner, J., 2014. Agreeing to disagree: 'doing disagreement' in assessed oral L2 interactions. *Classroom Discourse* 5 (2), 194–215.
- Jackson, C., Jones, D., 2013. Well they had a couple of bats to be truthful: well-prefaced, self-initiated repairs in managing relevant accuracy in interaction. *J. Pragmat.* 47 (1), 28–40.
- Jefferson, G., 2004. Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In: Lerner, G.H. (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*. John Benjamins Publishing, Amsterdam, pp. 13–31.
- Kasper, G., 2013. Managing task uptake in oral proficiency interviews. In: Ross, S.J., Kasper, G. (Eds.), *Assessing Second Language Pragmatics*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, pp. 258–287.
- Kasper, G., Ross, S.J., 2007. Multiple questions in oral proficiency interviews. *J. Pragmat.* 39 (11), 2045–2070. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.07.011>
- Kitzinger, C., 2013. Repair. In: Sidnell, J., Stivers, T. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 229–256.
- Koshik, I., Seo, M.-S., 2012. Word (and other) Search Sequences Initiated by Language Learners. *Text Talk* 32 (2), 167–189.
- Lerner, G., Kitzinger, C., 2015. Or-prefacing in the organization of self-initiating repair. *Res. Lang. Soc. Interact.* 48 (1), 58–78.
- May, L., 2011. Interactional competence in a paired speaking test: features salient to raters. *Lang. Assess. Q.* 8 (2), 127–145. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/154303.2011.565845>
- Mikkola, P., Lehtinen, E., 2014. Initiating activity shifts through use of appraisal forms as material objects during performance appraisal interviews. In: Nevile, M., Haddington, P., Heinemann, T., Rauniomaa, M. (Eds.), *Interacting With Objects: Language, Materiality, and Social Activity*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 57–78.
- Nitta, R., Nakatsuhara, F., 2014. A multifaceted approach to investigating pre-task planning effects on paired oral test performance. *Lang. Test* 31 (2), 147–175. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265532213514401>
- Pomerantz, A., 1984. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In: Atkinson, J.M., Heritage, J. (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 57–101.
- Pomerantz, A., 1988. Offering a candidate answer: an information seeking strategy. *Commun. Monogr.* 55 (4), 360–373.
- Raymond, G., 2003. Grammar and social organization: yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *Am. Soc. Rev.* 68 (6), 939–967.
- Ross, S.J., Kasper, G. (Eds.), 2013. *Assessing Second Language Pragmatics*. Basingstoke, Bristol.
- Sandlund, E., Sundqvist, P., 2011. Managing task-related trouble in L2 oral proficiency tests: contrasting interaction data and rater assessment. *Novitas-ROYAL* 5 (1), 91–120.
- Sandlund, E., Sundqvist, P., 2013a. Codeswitching as a task management resource in EFL speaking tests: testwiseness, resistance, and task Instructions. Paper presented at the AAAL conference, 16–19 March, Dallas, TX.
- Sandlund, E., Sundqvist, P., 2013b. Diverging task orientations in L2 oral proficiency tests – a conversation analytic approach to participant understandings of pre-set discussion tasks. *Nord. J. Mod. Lang. Methodol.* 2 (1), 1–21.
- Sandlund, E., Sundqvist, P., Nyroos, L., 2016a. Research-based professional development workshops for EFL teachers: focus on oral test interaction and assessment. *Nord. J. Mod. Lang. Methodol.* 4 (1), 24–48.
- Sandlund, E., Sundqvist, P., Nyroos, L., 2016b. Testing L2 talk: a review of empirical studies on second language oral proficiency testing. *Lang. Linguist. Compass* 10 (1), 14–29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12174/epdf>
- Schegloff, E.A., 1993. Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation. *Res. Lang. Soc. Interact.* 26 (1), 99–128.
- Schegloff, E.A., 1998. Reflections on studying prosody in talk-in-interaction. *Lang. Speech* 41 (3–4), 235–263.
- Schegloff, E.A., 2005. On intergrity in inquiry... of the investigated, not the investigator. *Lang. Speech* 41 (3–4), 235–263.
- Schegloff, E.A., 2013. Ten operations in self-initiated, same-turn repair. In: Hayashi, M., Raymond, G., Sidnell, J. (Eds.), *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 41–70.
- Schegloff, E.A., Jefferson, G., Sacks, H., 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53 (1–2), 361–382.
- Seedhouse, P., 2013. Oral proficiency interviews as varieties of interaction. In: Ross, S.J., Kasper, G. (Eds.), *Assessing Second Language Pragmatics*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, pp. 199–219.
- Seedhouse, P., Egbert, M., 2006. The interactional organisation of the IELTS speaking test. *IELTS Res. Rep.* 6, 161–206 Retrieved from [http://www.ielts.org/pdf/Vol6\\_Report6.pdf](http://www.ielts.org/pdf/Vol6_Report6.pdf)
- Sert, O., 2015. *Social Interaction and L2 Classroom Discourse*. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Steinbach Kohler, F., Thorne, S.L., 2011. The social life of self-directed talk: a sequential phenomenon? In: Hall, J.K., Hellerman, J., Pekarek Doehler, S. (Eds.), *L2 Interactional Competence and Development*. Multilingual Matters, Bristol, pp. 66–92.

- Sundqvist, P., 2009. *Extramural English matters: out-of-school English and its impact on Swedish ninth graders' oral proficiency and vocabulary* (Diss.). Karlstad University, Karlstad.
- Üstünel, E., Seedhouse, P., 2005. Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus. *Int. J. Appl. Linguist.* 15 (3), 302–325. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2005.00093.x>
- van Comperolle, R.A., 2011. Responding to questions and L2 learner interactional competence during language proficiency interviews: a microanalytic study with pedagogical implications. In: Hall, J.K., Helleman, J., Pekarek Doehler, S. (Eds.), *L2 Interactional Competence and Development*. Multilingual Matters, Bristol, pp. 117–144.
- van Lier, L., 1989. Reeling, writhing, drawling, stretching, and fainting in coils: oral proficiency interviews as conversation. *TESOL Q.* 23 (3), 489–508.
- Vygotsky, L.S., 1987. In: Reiber, R.W., Carton, A.S. (Eds.), *The Collected Works of L.S. Vygotsky (Vol. 1). Problems of General Psychology*. Plenum Press, New York, NY.
- Wei, L., 2005. "How can you tell?": towards a common sense explanation of conversational code-switching. *J. Pragmat.* 37 (3), 375–389. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2004.10.008>
- Young, R., He, A.W. (Eds.), 1998. *Talking and Testing: Discourse Approaches to the Assessment of Oral Proficiency*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

**Lina Nyroos** holds a Ph.D. degree from the Department of Scandinavian Languages at Uppsala University, Sweden. Her dissertation (2012) focused on institutional traits in interaction in two different settings: group tutoring sessions at university level, and performance appraisal interviews in organizations, using conversation analysis. She was a researcher in a four-year project on second language speaking tests (Swedish Research Council Reg. no. 2012-4129), and she is currently the Director of Studies at the Department of Scandinavian Languages, Uppsala University.

**Erica Sandlund** is Associate Professor of English Linguistics. Her doctoral dissertation (2004) was a conversation analytic exploration of displays of affect in social interaction. Specializing in conversation analysis in institutional settings, she has studied performance appraisal interviews, classroom interaction, teachers' assessment meetings, and second language speaking tests. She has led a project on second language speaking tests (Swedish Research Council Reg. no. 2012-4129), and is currently doing research on the multilingual English classroom (Swedish Research Council Reg. no. 2016-03469). She is part of an interdisciplinary research group on subject-specific education.

**Pia Sundqvist** is Associate Professor of English Linguistics. Sundqvist's research interests stem from her experience as a teacher in secondary/upper secondary school. Her dissertation on extramural English was pioneering work in that it took a close look at the relation between informal English and two aspects of L2 proficiency: oral proficiency and vocabulary. She has continued doing research on extramural English, focusing on the role of gaming, and on the assessment of L2 oral proficiency. Sundqvist is the author of 'Extramural English in Teaching and Learning: From Theory and Research to Practice' (with Sylvén, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016). She is currently doing research on the multilingual English classroom (Swedish Research Council Reg. no. 2016-03469).