

**“Do You Know What That Word Means?” Repair for Native and Non-native Speakers
in the Talk Show *Ellen***

Claudia A.M. Fronen (6698867)

Faculty of Humanities, Utrecht University

TLMV14323 Thesis ICC

Supervisor: Dr. Ashley Micklos

Second reader: Dr. Trent Hagar

April 26, 2021

Word count: 10956 words

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my sincerest thanks to my first supervisor, Dr. Ashley Micklos, for guiding me through the thesis writing process and providing me with helpful feedback.

Any correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Claudia A.M.

Fronen c.a.m.fronen@students.uu.nl.

Table of Contents

Abstract	5
1. Introduction	6
2. Theoretical Framework	9
2.1 An Overview of the Characteristics of Talk Shows	9
2.1.1 <i>Semi-institutionalized discourse in talk shows</i>	9
2.2 Conversation Analysis	11
2.3 Resolving Problems in Speech through Repair	12
2.3.1 <i>Initiation of Repair</i>	13
2.3.2 <i>Solving of Repair</i>	15
2.3.3 <i>The Subtypes of Repair</i>	16
2.4 Native and Non-native Speakers	16
2.4.1 <i>Asymmetries Between NS and NNS</i>	17
2.4.2 <i>Identities in Conversation</i>	18
3. Methodology	20
3.1 Data	20
4. Results	23
4.1 Self-Initiated Self-Repair	23
4.1.1 <i>Non-Native Speakers</i>	23
4.1.2 <i>Native speakers</i>	26
4.1.3 <i>Discussion</i>	29
4.2 Self-Initiated Other-Repair	31
4.2.1 <i>Non-native Speakers</i>	31
4.2.2 <i>Native Speakers</i>	31
4.2.3 <i>Discussion</i>	32
4.3 Other-Initiated Self-Repair	33
4.3.1 <i>Non-native Speakers</i>	33
4.3.2 <i>Native Speakers</i>	34
4.3.3 <i>OISR for Ellen by NNS</i>	34
4.3.4 <i>Discussion</i>	37
4.4 Other-Initiated Other-Repair	39
4.4.1 <i>Non-native Speakers</i>	39
4.4.2 <i>OIOR for Ellen by NNS</i>	41
4.4.3 <i>Native speakers</i>	41
4.4.4 <i>Discussion</i>	44
5. Conclusion	46
5.1 Self-Initiated Repair	46
5.2 Other-Initiation of Repair	47
5.3 Hierarchy of Power	48
5.4 Limitations and Further Research	49
Bibliography	51

Corpus Bibliography	54
Appendices.....	57
Appendix 1: Glossary for transcription symbols of Jefferson (2004)	57
Appendix 2: Coding scheme.....	58
Appendix 3: Full transcripts of data	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Abstract

Conversational repair, a resource used to manage troubles in speaking, hearing or understanding, has been extensively researched in both conversational and institutionalized contexts. Talk shows are viewed as semi-institutionalized interaction, as features of both discourse types appear. Moreover, both native and non-native speakers are frequently part of interactions in this discourse type. This research explores the features of this semi-institutionalized interaction with regards to repair and the differences that may occur between native and non-native speakers. Furthermore, this research examines the influence of power, which exists within the context of a talk show as well as between speakers with asymmetrical language capabilities. In these asymmetrical power relations, identities as expert and novice may be assumed (Dings, 2012). Additionally, these power relations also exist by the nature of talk shows, as the show host is generally in control (Ilie, 2001). This study investigates 30 clips of repair occurring for native and non-native speakers in the talk show *Ellen* and uses Conversation Analysis to analyze the turn-taking sequence. The analysis shows that talk shows follow trends in repair of both institutional and conversational discourse, exemplifying its semi-institutional nature. Moreover, the analysis shows that repair is used to bring forward the identities of expert and novice, and to highlight the asymmetrical relations between show host and interviewee, as well as between native and non-native speakers. The latter is demonstrated by native speakers reassuring non-native speakers that their repair was unnecessary. Moreover, native speakers assumed their role as expert as they did not accept repair initiated by a non-native speaker, who has the underlying identity of novice. The talk show host assumes her position of power by deciding when the topic shift occurs, regardless of the interviewee's understanding of the conversation. These power relations strengthen the semi-institutional discourse of talk shows.

Keywords: Conversation Analysis, repair, native/non-native interaction, semi-institutional discourse, talk shows, asymmetries, power relations

1. Introduction

Miscommunication in speech frequently occurs in all types of contexts. The concept of miscommunication refers to any problem that might arise in interaction, due to trouble with speaking, hearing, or understanding (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). Consider the following excerpt, in which miscommunication occurs between a native speaker of English (Ellen) and a non-native speaker of English (Sofia).

[Excerpt 1: Sofia Vergara and Ellen Play ‘Stuff Your Granny Panties’]

- (1) Ellen: All right. We have 45 seconds to stuff as many balls in here as we can.
(2) The person who has the least amount of balls left wins- le- least |
(3) amount that’s left in there.
(4) Sofia: → Least?
(5) Ellen: L- Do you know what that word means?

The above excerpt is derived from a talk show this study focuses on. Talk shows are an interesting media product, as Davis & Mares (1998) describe how talk shows affect perceptions of reality, claiming they can “make the abnormal seem normal” for issues presented frequently (p. 84). Furthermore, Woo & Dominick (2003) have discovered that talk shows influence the perceptions of incoming international students and their attitudes towards human relationships in their host country. However, talk shows can also be thought of as an ongoing talk-oriented process. Talk shows contain distinguishing features compared to casual conversation and institutional interaction, and therefore can be viewed as semi-institutional regarding, for example, discursive configuration and goals, participant role assignment, role switching, talk and topic control (Ilie, 2001).

Power relations are intertwined in conversations. In the excerpt, Ellen acts as the show host while Sofia is the participant in the show, and Ellen is explaining the rules of a game they are about to play. As illustrated by Ellen explaining the rules in lines 1 until 3, the show host is meant to have control by deciding the topics and asking questions, however the show guests are also permitted to ask questions and make non-elicited comments with which they are able to challenge the asymmetrical power relations. Subsequently, the relations

between hosts and guests are constructed and reconstructed creating new, unpredictable, and occasionally provoking forms of interaction (Ilie, 2001). Similarly, power relations exist between Ellen and Sofia as native (NS) and non-native speakers (NNS) of English respectively, which may cause identities of expert and novice to be assumed in conversation (Dings, 2012). Nowadays interactions and encounters are becoming increasingly multilingual as goods, people, services, and information transfer faster and more often as a result of technology in a globalized world (García, Flores & Chu, 2011). Bilingualism is becoming more common, which is also apparent in the fact that increasingly guests appearing in talk shows are NNS, as in the excerpt shown.

As people with different linguistic repertoires are increasingly coming into contact with each other, it is inevitable that confusion or mistakes in speech will arise, as exemplified in the extract above. Repair is used as a resource in everyday conversation and can be defined as a mechanism used to manage troubles in speaking, hearing, or understanding (Schegloff et al., 1977), regardless of linguistic ability. Repair consists of two parts: first, the initiation of repair; and second, the “solution” or the repair itself. Two major types of repair exist: namely self-repair in which speakers repair their own speech and other-repair in which speaker’s conversation partners repair their speech. Likewise, the initiation of repair can come from the self or the other. In the excerpt, Sofia initiates repair of Ellen’s speech in line 4, indicating she has trouble understanding the rules. Instead of Ellen providing a clarification (and thus, a repair solution), she points out their asymmetrical linguistic repertoire by asking Sofia if she “knows what that word means” (line 5). This study looks into this sequencing of repair and if this differs from conversations between speakers with similar linguistic abilities (NS).

Scholars have researched the occurrence of repair in different contexts, for example in classroom situations (Liebscher & Dailey-O’Cain, 2003) and in intercultural settings (Bolden, 2012). However, repair in semi-structured contexts, such as talk shows, has not extensively

been researched. On the other hand, it has been shown that talk shows influence the perceptions of those watching as argued by Woo & Dominick (2003), which includes attitudes towards language use, including for example, the use of repair. Therefore, this study focuses on how repair is constructed in talk shows and noting if differences exist between NS and NNS, and if miscommunication is discussed and resolved in similar ways. This is further examined by looking at asymmetrical relations, both in power and language. This results in the following main research question: **How is repair constructed by the speakers in conversations in the talk show *Ellen*?**

The following sub-questions are formulated to aid in answering the main question:

1. How is self-initiated repair constructed for native and non-native speakers of English?
2. How is other-initiated repair constructed for native and non-native speakers of English?
3. How does the hierarchy of power influence repair and vice versa?

There are noticeable differences in repair between NS and NNS on a talk show which are influenced by asymmetry in language and power, causing the repair to follow different preferences compared to conversational and institutionalized discourse and therefore bringing forward the semi-institutional nature of talk shows.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 An Overview of the Characteristics of Talk Shows

Talk shows have developed as “a public extension of the private sphere of casual conversation, thus bridging the gap between the public conditions of the media and the private conditions of the consumers” (Ilie, 2001, p. 215). Scholars have identified five major criteria that help distinguish between various talk show formats (Ilie, 2006, p. 490):

1. Discussion topics (such as entertainment (*The Tonight Show*) or social issues (*Oprah*))
2. Categories of participants (in terms of social and popularity status, such as celebrities in *Jimmy Kimmel Live!* or civilians in *Geraldo Rivera*)
3. Broadcasting time (early morning (*Ricki Lake*), daytime (*Oprah*), late night (*David Letterman*))
4. Organizational and interactional frameworks (the stage of the host and the seating of the audience, for example the host sitting behind a desk (*Jimmy Kimmel Live!*) or both guest and host sitting on a couch together (*Oprah*))
5. Ethical considerations (exploitative (*Jerry Springer*) and non-exploitative (*Kilroy*)).

Previous research of talk shows consists of discourse and/or conversation analytical approaches to investigate the interaction of participants in, for example, turn-taking (Gregori-Signes, 2000), co-constructing stories and identity roles (Calsamiglia, Cots & Lorda, 1995), and question-response argumentation (Ilie, 1999).

2.1.1 *Semi-institutionalized discourse in talk shows*

The term “discourse” refers to language use which is seen as a piece of text, an occurrence of discursive practice, and an occurrence of social practice (Fairclough, 1998). Talk shows consist of several discourse types at the same time, mainly information and entertainment, interviews, and casual conversation. The combination between discursive and

linguistic features shape talk shows as a “broadcaster-controlled, host-monitored, participant-shaped, and audience-evaluated speech event” (Ilie, 2006, p. 490). Talk shows can be characterized as semi-institutional, as they contain features of both conversational and institutional discourse types.

Institutional interaction is characterized by involving “at least one participant who represents a formal organization of some kind” (Drew & Heritage, 1992, p. 3). In other words, one participant is oriented towards some core task, goal or identity affiliated with the institution (Drew & Heritage 1992). Within research into institutional talk, turn design is an important feature which can be divided into two distinct phenomena. First, the turn is designed to perform an activity as the selection of this activity can orient towards institutionalized talk. Second, the activity is accomplished through verbal construction, as detailed features of talk can show institutionalized features. Basic conversational organizations such as repair and topic shift are used in institutional settings to manage role-specific activities (Drew & Heritage, 1992).

Talk shows utilize features of institutional discourse, most notably through audience-oriented events which emphasize engagement within the boundaries of institutional conditions, including situational restraints framed into talk-related restrictions, such as time and turn-taking limitations, as well as discursive constraints indicated in talk-framing patterns, such as recurrent breaks and predetermined topic schedules. As Drew & Heritage (1992) note, institutional encounters are predominantly organized into a standard order, whereas conversational ones, with the exception of opening and closing stages, are not. Similar to conversational discourse, talk shows display features such as lower topic control and equal speaking rights (Ilie, 1999; Ilie, 2001). This creates semi-institutionalized aspects such as “less predictable topic and subtopic shifts, interruptions, unprompted participant

interventions, audience-oriented repetitions and audience-oriented questions” (Ilie, 2006, p. 490).

Furthermore, talk shows demonstrate specific features concerning the discursive organization of talk, the roles of participants regarding questions, and the sequence of adjacency pairs and turns (Ilie, 2006). In institutional discourse, turns are regulated by assigned roles such as questioners or respondents causing two-slot adjacency pairs (Drew & Heritage, 1992). However, the sequencing of these pairs in talk shows is not as rigorous as they are less predictable and norm-regulated but contain a wider range of questioning patterns, as the process of questioning is sometimes interrupted by evaluations of answers or comments by the host or the participants (Ilie, 1999; Ilie, 2001). Even though the question-answer process seems to predominate, overlap is regularly encountered (Gregori-Signes, 2000). In conversations, transitions from one turn to another generally occur without overlap or gaps, and repair mechanisms are in place in the occurrence of error. However, the turn system of talk shows differs due to its semi-institutional nature. This turn-taking process, as well as overlaps and repair mechanisms are analyzed through Conversation Analysis.

2.2 Conversation Analysis

Conversation Analysis (CA) examines the structure and social organization of speech within conversational interaction (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990). In CA, sentences are never regarded as isolated and self-contained, but rather as forms of action located within specific contexts and produced with attention to these contexts. Interactional sequence is examined as a central point of CA. A sequence is defined as a course of action that is implemented through talk and can contain elaborate many-turn courses. However, it is considered that they consist of rudimentary adjacency pairs, for example question-answer, greeting-greeting, and offer-acceptance, which entails the rule that a current action (a “first-pair part”) demands the production of a reciprocal action (“second-pair part”) (p. 107, Levinson, 2012). A first-pair

part builds an expectation of the action the next turn ought to perform. Therefore, this first-pair part contains projective power over the pair, but can be interpreted differently through, for example, silences. The actions in the second-pair part are highly constrained because of this power, but options are available (Levinson, 2012; Schegloff et al., 1977). As Levinson (2012) states, preference organization aids recognition: “usually any turn that is not designed to comply with the expectation of the first-pair part comes with an immediate delay, warning particles (*well, uh*), indirection, mitigation, excuses or other marking of deviation from the preferred alternate action” (p. 108). Insertion sequences such as requests for clarification are always available, as well as counters that may reverse the trajectory (Levinson, 2012). These adjacency pairs highlight the importance of turn-taking analysis in CA. Turn-taking exists of three components: a specification of generic turn-constructive units that arranges places for possible turn-transition; speaker-selection techniques; and a rule set that demands options for action at points of possible turn-transition (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). Moreover, in CA repair organization is seen as one of the fundamental organizations of interaction (Schegloff et al., 1977), and therefore repair is one of the main features explored by CA.

2.3 Resolving Problems in Speech through Repair

Issues between speaker and hearer inevitably arise within everyday talk, and these problems in speaking, hearing, or understanding are resolved using the conversational mechanism of repair. Schegloff et al. (1977) identified two components of repair: first, the repair initiation which indicates there is trouble to be repaired; second, the repair solution, which is the success or failure of the attempt to repair. The term trouble source refers to the fragment of the turn the participants treat as problematic (Schegloff et al., 1977). Repair is occasionally found where there is no hearable error, mistake, or fault. Simultaneously, hearable errors or mistakes do not automatically yield the occurrence of repair (Schegloff et al., 1977). Additionally, Schegloff et al. (1977) distinguish two major types of the initiation

and solution of repair: self and other. After initiation, the ongoing course of action is suspended until the trouble source is dealt with.

2.3.1 *Initiation of Repair*

Schegloff et al. (1977) identify three main positions for self-initiated repair: in the same turn as the trouble source; second, in the transition space of that turn; and last, the third turn to the turn of the trouble source. Table 1 shows these main types of positions with examples, the arrows indicating repair.

Table 1: Examples of positions of self-initiated repair

Position of self-initiated repair	Examples
Same turn as trouble source	Naomi: —→ But c'd we- c'd I stay u:p? (0.2) Naomi: once we get // ho:me, Marty: For a few minutes.
Transition space of trouble source turn	L: An' 'on bud all of the doors 'n things were taped up = L: —→ = I mean y'know they put up y'know that kinda paper 'r stuff, L: —→ the brown paper.
Third turn to the turn of the trouble source	Hannah: And he's going to make his own pointings. Bea: Mm hm, Hannah: —→ And- or I mean his own frames.

p. 365, Schegloff et al., (1977).

For other-initiated repair one main position is identified: the turn subsequent to the turn of the trouble source. Furthermore, self- and other-initiation differ in the techniques used. In self-initiation a variety of “non lexical speech perturbations, e.g., cut offs, sound stretches, uh's etc.,” are used “to signal the possibility of repair-initiation immediately following” (Schegloff et al. 1977, p. 367). In turn, other-initiations use a variety of turn-constructive devices to signal repair initiation. One of these is known as an “open” form of repair initiation as they “leave ‘open’ what is the repairable trouble which the speaker is having with the prior turn” (Drew, 1997, p. 72), for example *huh* and *what?*. Other devices are shown in Table 2 with examples (Schegloff et al., 1977).

Table 2: Example of indicators of other-initiated repair

Turn-constructural device for other-initiated repair	Example
<i>Huh, What?</i>	<p>D: Wul did'e ever get married 'r anything? C: —→ Hu:h? D: Did jee ever get married? C: I have // no idea.</p> <p>A: Have you ever tried a clinic? B: —→ What? A: Have you ever tried a clinic?</p>
<i>Who, where, when</i>	<p>B: Oh Sibbie's sistuh hadda ba:by bo:way A: —→ Who? B: Sibbie's sister.</p> <p>J: Tsk there's Mako:(hh) C: —→ Where, J: There,</p> <p>S: That's all. But you know what happened that night we went to camp. Forget it. She wouldn't behave for anything. A: —→ W-when? S: When we went to camp.</p>
Partial repeat of the trouble-source turn, plus a question word	<p>Sue: And when we first moved up there, it was terrible sleeping because all these semis were going by at night. ((short silence)) Bob: —→ All the what? Sue: Semis.</p> <p>Bea: Was last night the first time you met Missiz Kelly? (1.0) Marge: —→ Met whom? Bea: Missiz Kelly,</p> <p>B: No I went to a shower. A: —→ To a where? B: I went to a shower.</p>
Partial repeat of the trouble source turn	<p>A: Well Monday, lemme think. Monday, Wednesday, an' Fridays I'm home by one ten. B: —→ One ten? A: Two o'clock. My class ends one ten.</p>
<i>You mean</i> plus a possible understanding of the prior turn	<p>A: Why did I turn out this way. B: —→ You mean homosexual? A: Yes.</p>

p. 367 & 368, Schegloff et al., (1977).

A speaker might initiate correction before the disturbance becomes apparent to others (Norrick, 1991). Moreover, Schegloff et al. (1977) state that when the recipient understands the turn well enough to correct it, they should produce a sequentially appropriate next turn instead of initiating a corrective sequence. In other words, only misunderstanding or uncertainty should lead to other-initiation. Since speakers themselves know their own intended speech, they are naturally held responsible for clearing up any trouble in conversation (Norrick, 1991). In interactions between equals, other-initiation in second position seldom serves as a query: it assumes competence of the speaker and requests correction. However, two environments are suggested by Schegloff et al. (1977) in which other correction can occur without constraints: telling a story in conversation where a second speaker becomes co-teller; second, in interaction between adults and children. Moreover, it is also possible for a hearer to let “the unknown or unclear action, word or utterance ‘pass’ on the (common-sense) assumption that it will either become clear or redundant as talk progresses” (Firth, 1996, p. 243). This is known as the *let it pass* concept.

2.3.2 Solving of Repair

Secondly, self-repair and other-repair are identified, where self-repair entails that speakers repair their own speech and other-repair entails the speakers’ conversation partner repairs their speech. As Schegloff et al. (1977) note, “the organization of repair provides centrally for self-correction, which can be arrived at by the alternative routes of self-initiation and other-initiation – routes which are themselves so organized as to favor self-initiated self-repair” (p. 377). The ordering of actions begins with self-correction, then other-initiation of repair using a guess at the meaning or a request for clarification, and last other-correction. Other-repair is usually modulated in form (for example, using *you mean X?*) which may be influenced by uncertainty or may take the form of a joke. Repair is sometimes preceded or followed by reluctance markers such as *I mean, you know, kinda* etc. (Schegloff et al., 1977).

2.3.3 The Subtypes of Repair

These divisions create four subtypes of repair: first, self-initiated self-repair (SISR) where the speaker both initiates and resolves the repair which usually occurs in the same turn; second, self-initiated other-repair (SIOR) where the speaker initiates repair, but the solution is provided by a recipient; third, other-initiated self-repair (OISR) where a recipient initiates the repair, and the speaker of the trouble source resolves it; and last, other-initiated other-repair (OIOR), where a recipient both initiates and resolves the repair (Bolden, 2012).

Although SISR is most common in mundane discourse, OISR has been found to predominate in classroom interaction. Liebscher & Dailey-O’Cain (2003) found that teachers and students used repair as a classroom resource differently. These differences are exploited to manifest the respective classroom roles and therefore reinforce the respective roles as instructor and learner which includes a hierarchy of power in these relations. Power is not seen as a fixed quantity but is produced through interaction with others (Cummins, 2009). Power relations exist between the talk show host and the interviewee, as the show host is generally viewed as having control in asking questions (Ilie, 2001). Similarly, power relations exist because of asymmetries between native speakers (NS) and non-native speakers (NNS) of English.

2.4 Native and Non-native Speakers

In this research the concepts of NS and NNS are used. The concept of a NS has been challenged frequently, noting problems of identifying exactly who is a NS (Ballmer, 1981; Davies, 1991; Muni, 2013). Nonetheless, it is a widely used notion in Applied Linguistics (Hackert, 2012), and in this study the term NS is used to denote people who speak English as their first language. Muni (2013) argues that the concept of NS is located within frameworks of power, which are influenced by ideologies or beliefs of language users’ legitimacy. Furthermore, Myhill (2003) notes that the ideology of the NS is involved with an ideology of

authenticity of language use, functioning in complex ways with identities and implying a hierarchical arrangement of speakers and their language affiliations.

2.4.1 Asymmetries Between NS and NNS

Generally, social interaction and communication demand a definable amount of shared knowledge. However, characteristically of all communication, disparities in knowledge exist that affect the structural context of interactions, possibly causing problems (Günthner & Luckmann, 1995). Communicative genres are described by Günthner & Luckmann (1995) as “historically and culturally specific, fixed solutions to recurrent communicative problems” (p. 6) that guide the expectations of interactants on what is to be said in predefined situations. For example, when two different cultural repertoires have the same communicative genre in common (such as a jocular story) they may differ in the employment of the particular genre.

Shared knowledge is a minimal condition for any communication; however, asymmetry exists both in general knowledge made relevant through interaction, as well as specific communicative knowledge. Moreover, it is necessary that participants have some awareness of the existing disparities, a knowledge that also tends to be asymmetrical (Günthner & Luckmann, 1995). Additionally, Günthner & Luckmann (1995) note that between people of different cultures, both asymmetries are more pronounced: “the participants know far less well how to modify correctly the general principle of the reciprocity of perspectives which underlies the assumption of shared knowledge” (p. 9). The amount of knowledge shared with the recipient can be overestimated or underrated, the latter giving the impression of “talking down” (p. 10, Günthner & Luckmann, 1995). These asymmetries can occur on three different levels identified by Günthner & Luckmann (1995): the internal structure (e.g., prosodic features); the situative level (e.g., turn-taking); and the external structure (e.g., the types of actors and their relationship). Intercultural differences in

turn-taking rules and conventions might cause misunderstandings to arise. Moreover, a difference in the types of actors in interactions and the relationship between actors influence the asymmetries. Day, Chenoweth, Chun, and Luppescu (1984) speculate that on-record correction by NS of NNS was frequent because the speakers knew each other well, and therefore corrections appeared as a favor instead of a face threat or imposition. These NS did not interrupt NNS mid-turn but waited for transition points. A NS must be able to assess the language level of a NNS to provide helpful correction, which is challenging without regular interaction between speakers (Norrick, 1991).

As Norrick (1991) describes, “a perceived asymmetry in responsibility for correctness and ability to achieve it overrides the usual organization of corrections” (p. 63). In conversations with NNS there may be less preference for SISR as other-correction might be more accepted because of the possible asymmetry. However, it is important to note that other-correction can be used as a power move in contexts defined by animosity. Correction can be offered and received in “either a spirit of solidarity or power” (Norrick, 1991, p. 76).

2.4.2 Identities in Conversation

When speakers orient to the perceived asymmetries between language capabilities, they bring forward the ideological construction of a NS as legitimate and a NNS as less legitimate, making these constructions relevant to the unfolding of the interaction (Park, 2007). Moreover, speakers may assume identities of expert and novice in conversation. Dings (2012) notes that if an asymmetry in background knowledge or language capability is observed, “the more competent speaker may adopt a somewhat pedagogical stance and perform other corrections with few or no mitigating moves, a stance that is accepted by both interactants as a way to help the less-competent speaker reach higher levels of competence” (p. 1504). Thus, other-correction is more accepted between adults and children, as it is used as a vehicle for socialization to deal with those that are still learning (Norrick, 1991). This

can also apply to conversations between NS and NNS. Similarly, Ikeda (2007) investigated language brokering as “teaching” whereby a NS steps in to explain, translate, or paraphrase a possible problematic utterance by one speaker for the benefit of another. In interactions with three (or more) interlocutors, it is possible for participants to act in coalition during repair sequences, as a third person in conversational repair can act as a language or culture broker. It is possible that they enlist others, such as a compatriot or a more linguistically proficient speaker, in resolving problems (Mori, 2003). Bolden (2012) argues that “when a recipient of some problematic talk initiates repair on it, she may enlist a third person into the role of a broker by addressing the repair initiation to them [...] alternatively, a third person may volunteer (or self-select; Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974) to provide a repair solution” (p. 104). When considering previous research on repair in conversations between speakers of unequal competence, it is noteworthy that in some studies NNS make their identities as novices noticeable when needed in their initiation of repair processes (Kurhila, 2001; Hosoda 2006), where in another study NNS expressed frustration when being continuously positioned as novices (Wilkinson, 2002).

In this study, the semi-institutional nature of talk shows is examined with regards to the organization of repair. Additionally, the existing two-fold power relations between show host/interviewee and NS/NNS are investigated through the use of repair. In these power relations the possible asymmetries between speakers are taken into consideration.

3. Methodology

The data for this research consisted of video and audio recordings of the talk show *The Ellen Show*, one of the most viewed and top-rated daytime talk shows in the US (Persaud, 2021). Ellen DeGeneres, the host, has won various awards for her work (Emmys, n.d.). Considering the typology of talk shows (Ilie, 2006), *The Ellen Show* can be defined as a non-exploitative daytime talk show mainly focused on entertainment, inviting celebrity guests or viral sensations on the show to talk about their personal lives and their work, and play a variety of games with them. Usually, both Ellen and her guest sit in chairs (or a sofa when there are multiple guests) across from each other, facing the camera and the audience seated behind the camera.

All recordings were recent, meaning they take place between 2015 and 2020, to provide an accurate corpus of modern-day interactions in this talk show. The data consisted of parts of conversations with different guests in which repair occurred, composed of NS and NNS. In this research, the native language of the NNS is not considered as the distinction is purely made between NS and NNS.

3.1 Data

In total, 30 clips containing repair have been analyzed and transcribed. These clips were found on YouTube, a separate bibliography for the data is included. 15 clips for NNS and 15 clips for NS were examined. In Table 3, a list of the speakers and their native languages is shown. The last column shows the number of clips this speaker appears in.

Table 3: Speakers in the data and their native language

Name	Native language	Number of clips
Sofia Vergara	Spanish	5
Salma Hayek	Spanish	1
Penelope Cruz	Spanish	2
Ricky Martin	Spanish	2
Cardi B	Spanish	1
Heidi Klum	German	2
Nikkie de Jager	Dutch	1
Ellen DeGeneres	English	30
Reese Witherspoon	English	1
Jennifer Lawrence	English	1
Lily Tomlin	English	2
Jane Fonda	English	2
Timothée Chalamet	English	2
Armie Hammer	English	1
Mark Wahlberg	English	1
Ryan Reynolds	English	1
Julie Bowen	English	1
Ed O'Neill	English	3
Eric Stonestreet	English	1
Kim Kardashian	English	1
Billie Eilish	English	2

These conversations were transcribed following a system developed by Gail Jefferson which is regularly used in CA. By using these symbols, overlap in turn-taking is highlighted as well as pauses, plosiveness, and prolongation of sounds (Jefferson, 2004). The symbols that have been used in the transcripts can be found in Appendix 1. The detailed transcript was then analyzed, using a coding scheme to identify the initiation and solution of repair. This coding scheme can be found in Appendix 2. These were further categorized following the categories of repair, specifically self-initiated vs other-initiated and self-repaired or other-

repaired while the turn-taking sequence was considered. The coded transcripts divided into these categories can be found in Appendix 3. In the analysis the turn in which the initiation and solving takes place was also analyzed. This has been analyzed for NS and NNS, which was compared and contrasted.

4. Results

The results are divided into different categories, following the four types of repair. The subcategories consist of NS and NNS. Each category ends with a discussion where the results are further analyzed with the theoretical framework.

In Table 4, an overview of the instances of repair and their categorization can be seen for both NS and NNS. SISR is mostly found in the data. However, NS appear to perform repair more frequently than NNS, especially SISR and OIOR. Self-initiated repair for Ellen was not considered in this research, however other-initiated repair for Ellen was only found in conversations with NNS. These results are further discussed in the subsequent categories.

Table 4: Overview of repair found in the data

	SISR	SIOR	OISR	OIOR
NS	33	1	2	6
NNS	20	1	2	3
ELLEN AND NS	-	-	-	-
ELLEN AND NNS	-	-	3	1

4.1 Self-Initiated Self-Repair

In sections 4.1 and 4.2, the occurrence of repair is indicated in the excerpts with an arrow. Other notes on the repair can be found in the text.

4.1.1 *Non-Native Speakers*

SISR in the Same Turn as the Trouble Source. Self-initiation of repair occurs more frequently compared to other-initiation. Self-initiated repair often occurs in the same turn as the trouble source, as is illustrated in the excerpts below.

[Excerpt 2: Ricky Martin Talks His Tush]

- (1) Ricky: But to be honest, it's an amazing series. Brilliantly written. Uh:,
 (2) dramatic. Uh:, My first scenes uh:: that I shot was when I actually
 (3) → found- find his body. Uh::, but I am really happy to be part of this,
 (4) because (h) even though so many years went by, we are still dealing
 (5) → with a lot of things- that uh as- you know as a member of the LGBT
 (6) community, that (.) we're still dealing with things we dealt in the
 (7) nineties.
 (8) Ellen: Yeah.

[Excerpt 3: Sofia Vergara on Her Fairy Tale Wedding]

- (1) Ellen: Look how beautiful that is!
 (2) Sofia: → Yeah. (0.4) It was like a dre:- like a fairytale.

In excerpt 2, Ricky is talking about his new series. Repair occurs in line (3), where he corrects “found” immediately to “find.” Furthermore, Ricky repairs his speech a second time in line (5), he hesitates and employs “uh” as well as “you know” as markers of repair. Ricky repeats part of the sentence of line (4) and (5) “we are still dealing with a lot of things” in line (6), after he has repaired his speech. Both cases of repair show a cut off, as in “found” (line 3) and “things” (line 5).

In excerpt 3, Sofia is discussing her wedding, and in line (2) she corrects herself. She prolongs the last vowel in the word she cut off in line (2) “like a dre:-“ which she replaces with “like a fairytale”. She repeats the phrase instead of just the word she repairs, including “like a” in the repair as well.

SISR in the Third Turn to the Trouble Source. Moreover, self-initiated repair can occur in the third turn to the turn of the trouble source. This has been found twice in the data, only for NNS, illustrated in the excerpts below. In both cases, Ellen comments on the trouble source but does not acknowledge any problems with it.

[Excerpt 4: Ricky Martin Visits Ellen to Talk About Helping Puerto Rico]

- (1) Ricky: (h) You’re terrible. You’re terrible. Well, once in a while, you know,
 (2) you get a little bit (0.4) [voyeuristic.
 (3) Ellen: [Once in a while-, no, you got to- (0.3)
 (4) whoever’s laying [on the ground-]
 (5) Ricky: → [exhibitionistic,] I’m sorry, [yeah] exhibitionist, a
 (6) little bit. It’s the opposite.
 (7) Ellen: [yeah (h)]
 (8) Yes that’s alright. [We-]
 (9) Ricky: [But,] I mean, if you have Instagram [...]

In excerpt 4, Ricky and Ellen are discussing Ricky’s Instagram while showing pictures. In this excerpt a lot of overlap occurs, noticeably more than in other conversations. In line (2) he employs a short silence before describing himself getting “voyeuristic”. Ellen

overlaps with Ricky after this silence, as they both try to fill the pause in the conversation at the same time. Ellen struggles to get her sentence together in lines (3) and (4). Ricky corrects his earlier statement in line (5) as he overlaps with Ellen providing the word he meant to say previously. He then apologizes for using the wrong word, to which Ellen replies “that’s alright” (line 8).

[Excerpt 5: Sofia Vergara on her ‘Modern Family’ Husband]

- (1) Sofia: I love-, I love going to work.
 (2) Ellen: Yeah, I bet Ed (.) [loves] going to work. I saw a picture of Ed.
 (3) Sofia: [Yeah]
 (4) (h) That was a scene actually.
 (5) Ellen: Was it?
 (6) Sofia: → It was a-, a scene. No, not a sin, like a uh d-, like a sin from the devil,
 (7) no, (h) (3.6) You’re making m-, my English bad.
 (8) Ellen: Oh (1.2) I’m making your English bad.
 (9) Sofia: → Yes (h) you. (h) (0.3) I meant that was uh (.) a scene (0.3)
 (10) Ellen: We knew what you meant. We all were with you.
 (11) Sofia: Ah okay. (h)
 (12) Ellen: (h) (2.5) So it was a sin, and what else?

The next excerpt shows Sofia correcting her speech while a picture is shown of Sofia and her co-star and on-screen husband.

Sofia states that the picture was taken for a scene (line 4), which due to her accent she pronounces similarly to “a sin” as she tries to explain in lines (6) until (9). She even blames Ellen for “making her English look bad” (line 7), however, Ellen notes that she knew what she meant all along and states the repair was not necessary in line (10). Ellen then spins the repair into a joke in line (12).

Commenting on Repair by a NS. Occasionally, Ellen, the recipient, will comment on the repair, confirm it or provide an alternate repair solution. This only occurs in conversations with NNS, as illustrated by the previous two excerpts. Excerpts 6 and 7 show Ellen commenting on the SISR, sometimes providing a different response than intended.

[Excerpt 6: Penelope Cruz on ‘American Crime Story’ and Snapping Ricky Martin’s Bare Bum]

- (3) Penelope: You feel much more responsibility. Yeah. When Ryan called me, I::-,
 (4) → because I love everything that Ryan does, I think he’s so [talented].
 (5) Ellen: [brilliant,
 (6) yeah]

[Excerpt 7: Cardi B liked Being a Stripper]

- (3) Cardi: I did the transition because I started getting a lot of money. And (0.3)
 (4) → the money (0.2) I co-, I made I used it for invest-, to invest in my
 (5) dream.
 (6) Ellen: In yourself.
 (7) Cardi: Yes, in my dream.

Penelope and Ellen are talking about a new series by Ryan Murphy, who Penelope is referring to in excerpt 6. Penelope initiates repair in lines (3) and (4), as she prolongs “I” in line (3) before repairing her sentence. Ellen then overlaps with her using the adjective “brilliant” where Penelope ends her sentence with “talented”, a similar adjective.

Cardi and Ellen are discussing Cardi’s transition from stripper to rapper in excerpt 7, and Cardi states that she invested the money in her dream in line (3) until (5), in which repair takes place in line (4). Ellen then comments on this, trying to confirm the point Cardi is trying to make, however, Cardi reinstates her statement in line (7).

4.1.2 *Native speakers*

SISR in Same Turn as Trouble Source. Interestingly, self-initiated repair is found more for NS than NNS. When looking at the position of self-initiated repair, similar to NNS, it generally occurs in the same turn as the trouble source, as presented in excerpt 8 and 9.

[Excerpt 8: Lily Tomlin Explains Why She Turned Down Coming Out on Time Magazine]

- (6) Lily: → Anyway uh-, no they did. They- uh, Pat Kingsley called me, who was
 (7) my publicist. Oh God, do I love her. Uh:, she told me that Time would
 (8) → give me the cover (0.2) if I would come out. (0.3) I don’t- it was a hard
 (9) decision to make.
 (10) Ellen: Yeah.
 (11) Lily: → And uh (.) and so I-, I fell down on the side of (0.3) probably-, after
 (12) what you went through, probably good sense.
 (13) Ellen: Mm-hmm (h)

In excerpt 8, Lily is explaining how she turned down an offer by Time Magazine to come out on the cover, which she refers to as “they” in line (6). Lily initiates repair in line (6), correcting “they” to the name of her publicist. Here she employs “uh” as a marker of repair. Later on, in line (8), Lily initiates repair again after she cuts off at “I don’t-“. Here, she does not use the marker “uh”, however in the next turn she initiates repair again and uses “uh” as well as pauses to indicate the repair.

The following excerpt follows a similar pattern where SISR occurs in the same turn as the trouble source and is immediately solved. Julie and Ellen are discussing the hobbies of Julie’s children.

[Excerpt 9: How to Survive Sofia Vergara’s Wedding]

(7) Ellen: You make them (0.1) break dance?

(8) Julie: → I have-, well, they have [a lot of-

(9) Ellen: [Do they have interest in it at all?

(10) Julie: They have interest in destroying things, and s-, and there they are. And they just destroy things.

Before this excerpt, Julie states that she makes her children break dance as a hobby. Ellen then asks Julie a question in line (7). Julie formulates an answer in line (8) but hesitates after she makes a mistake in her speech which she immediately repairs in the same turn. Ellen then overlaps in the following sentence, cutting Julie off.

SISR in Transition Space of Trouble Source. Self-initiation in the transition space of the trouble source turn occurs once in a conversation with a NS, shown in excerpt 10. Ellen interrupts the speaker again but cuts off when she noticed that he began to speak.

[Excerpt 10: Mark Wahlberg’s Wife Thought Kim & Kanye Were Coming Over for Dinner]

(5) Ellen: Do you have that for them?

(6) Mark: She’s turned the whole playroom-, the boys aren’t even allowed in

(7) there anymore. She’s made jumps out of boxes, broomsticks, whatever

(8) she can use. (0.5)

(9) → [Hockey] net got- the soccer net got destroyed, turned into uh jumping

(10) boards.

(11) Ellen: [You uh-] You have money. Buy the jumps that I’m talking about.

This excerpt shows Ellen and Mark discussing Mark's daughter's love for horse-riding. Ellen asks Mark about the jumps his daughter has, and Mark explains how the playroom is furnished in lines (6) until (10). A silence occurs in line (8), where normally turn transition would occur. Both Ellen and Mark try to fill this pause (line 9 and line 11) as they overlap in their speech. Ellen then cuts off, letting Mark finish his sentence. He then repairs his speech in line (9). The pause in this line indicates that this could be the transition space of the turn, and both speakers try to fill the silence at the same time.

Hesitations in Repair. Hesitations appear more frequently in conversations with NS than those with NNS. In the data, three instances are found for NNS (e.g., excerpt 2), where eight instances of hesitation included in repair are identified for NS. One instance of the word *well* as a hesitation is found in excerpt 9 line (8). However, in almost all cases, the phrase “uh” is used, as can be seen in excerpt 8 line (6) and (11) and in the excerpts below.

[Excerpt 11: This ‘Modern Family’ Star Knew the Show Would Last for a Decade]

- (1) Ellen: What do you remember, Eric?
 (2) Eric: Well, I remember thinking wow I'm (.) potentially gonna be friends
 (3) with Al Bundy which was really, really cool. (h)
 (1.4)
 (4) And, you know, (0.2), a-, after the, (0.2) after Ed- Ed saw the pilot, I
 (5) think before any of us did because (0.8) he's Ed. And uh, I got an un-,
 (6) → un-, uh call on my phone uh: that was unavailable, and I answered and
 (7) I had friends in the car and I said hello and he's like Eric. (0.6). Ed
 (8) O'Neill. (0.2) Like, hey Ed how are you? He's like, listen, (0.4) if this
 (9) show doesn't go on for 10 years, I don't know what the hell I'm doing
 (10) in this business.

In excerpt 11, Ellen is discussing the start of the hit show *Modern Family* with the cast and addresses a question to Eric. He answers Ellen's question first with a joke, and then starts telling a story about how Ed called him to say how he believes the show is going to be successful for a long time. Eric initiates repair in line (5) and (6) as he struggles to formulate his sentence by stuttering and using “uh”, ultimately providing self-repair in line (6).

[Excerpt 12: Timothée Chalamet Managed to Keep His Love for ‘The Office’ Hidden from Steve Carell]

- (1) Ellen: Because you’re trying to be supportive, trying to be there. And then at
 (2) some point, you have to (.) [have] tough love.
 (3) Timothée: [Yeah] Yeah and dr-, yeah, exactly, and
 (4) → uh draw a line. And-, and there is no-, (0.2) people-, there’s-, there’s
 (5) uh (0.2) there’s no exact formula on how to beat this kinda thing. And
 (6) (0.2) it’s devastating as a family member, as a parent, to (.) you know,
 (7) see-, see a loved one spin out.

In excerpt 12 Timothée and Ellen are discussing his new film. In line (3) Timothée is struggling to form his sentence, as some cut-offs and restarts of his sentence appear. This continues into line (4) where he corrects himself after saying “there is no- people-“, which is the trouble source of the sentence, where he meant to say “there’s no exact formula on how to beat this kinda thing” in line (5) providing the repair solution. In this repair he employs “uh” and uses pauses as he tries to formulate what he meant to say.

4.1.3 Discussion

The data shows that SISR was found most frequently, which is in line with the notion by Schegloff et al. (1977) that repair is organized to provide for self-correction. Talk show discourse seems to follow conversational discourse types regarding the overwhelming preference for SISR. Drew & Heritage (1992) argue that in institutional discourse turns are regulated by assigned roles, creating two-slot adjacency pairs. The semi-institutional aspect of talk show discourse becomes apparent as sometimes the question-answer sequence does appear (e.g., excerpt 9, 10, 11), however from the excerpts in 4.1 it is evident that these pairs are not the standard as most excerpts follow a different pattern when the speaker is explaining a story, rather than answering a specific question.

In excerpt 4, the trouble source is identified in line (2), to which the recipient, Ellen, does not pay attention in line (3). Then, in line (5) the initial speaker, Ricky, initiates repair. It could be argued that Ellen employs the let it pass principle, letting the unclear action pass and assuming it redundant for the ongoing interaction (Firth, 1996). After Ricky repairs his speech, Ellen goes on to reassure Ricky that it was “alright” (line 8).

SISR in the same turn as the trouble source follows a similar pattern for both NS and NNS, though comments on the repair only appear in the data for NNS. This can be seen for example in excerpt 5 where it is explicitly mentioned in line (10) that Ellen thought the repair was not necessary. This points towards an asymmetry between the NS and NNS, as the NS reassures the NNS that the mistake was insignificant for the conversation. The NS assumes power as Ellen assumes the identity of expert by deciding the repair was not necessary to follow the conversation. The identities of a NS as an expert and a NNS as a novice (Dings, 2012) are further exemplified as Sofia states that Ellen is “making her English bad” (excerpt 5, line 7), suggesting her identity as novice is being emphasized. In other instances, Ellen does reassure the NS by using “yeah” (excerpt 8, line 10) or “mm-hm” (excerpt 8, line 13) but it cannot be confirmed if this concerns the repair or the content of the conversation.

Additionally, it is interesting to note silences in the excerpts that show SISR. In conversations with both NS and NNS, silences in the conversation are allowed for a speaker to think about a word when repairing the sentence, shown in excerpt 4 line (2), excerpt 5 line (7) and (9), excerpt 8 line (8) and (11), and excerpt 10 line (8). There appears to be a similarity between NS and NNS, as both are granted these pauses in some cases, while sometimes the other speaker intervenes without a pause, as is seen in excerpt 6 line (4) and (5) and excerpt 9 line (8) and (9). These two excerpts show a similar pattern for NS and NNS, where Ellen overlaps with the speaker during a turn where a trouble source can be identified. The possible asymmetry in turn-taking and overlap in speech (Günthner & Luckmann, 1995) does not come to the foreground, as this is handled similarly between equal speakers as well as speakers with possible asymmetrical competences.

SISR occurs more frequently for NS compared to NNS, possibly because NNS do not notice or acknowledge every mistake that is made in their speech. Similarly, hesitations occur more frequently with NS. Generally, SISR indicates similar patterns in terms of turn-taking

and the lack of effect on turn-taking for both NS and NNS, implying that asymmetries are not in the foreground in SISR. However, in conversations with NNS the repair is occasionally acknowledged and seen as unnecessary for the understanding of the other speaker, where the identities as expert (NS) and novice (NNS) are highlighted.

4.2 Self-Initiated Other-Repair

4.2.1 *Non-native Speakers*

SIOR is only found in two instances, once for both NS and NNS. Excerpt 13 shows repair being initiated by a NNS, which is then solved by a NS who is also a guest on the show. Reese (NS) and Sofia (NNS) are sitting together on a couch across from Ellen, as they discuss their competition during filming about who would bring more cake.

[Excerpt 13: Reese Witherspoon, Sofia Vergara and Ellen]

- (15) Sofia: Yeah, because I went another level. I found the best baker in New
 (16) Orleans, and of course, I would sometimes make her do stuff for the
 (17) → gue-, for the, with the guests?
 (18) Reese: The crew.
 (19) Sofia: The (.) crew. (h) And it was amazing. I think I won the competition.

In this excerpt, Ellen is listening to Reese and Sofia. In line (17) Sofia initiates repair. She repeats part of her sentence when she is confused about her wording while facing Reese. Reese provides the repair in line (18), which Sofia repeats in line (19) confirming that Reese's repair was correct.

4.2.2 *Native Speakers*

One instance of SIOR is found in the data of NS, following a similar pattern as excerpt 13, however the repair is initiated even more explicitly. Jennifer is trying to describe her alter ego in excerpt 14.

[Excerpt 14: Jennifer Lawrence Explains Her Drunk Alter Ego 'Gail']

- (4) Jennifer: →Uh it was just like on masculine- like, aggr-, what is it- what are those
 (5) people called, [adrenaline junkie?
 (6) Ellen: adrena[line junkies?
 (7) Jennifer: Yeah, and I'm like, I'm normally like pretty cautious.

Jennifer is looking for a word in line (4) and (5), and explicitly initiates repair by asking “what are those people called”. Ellen then provides the correct repair in line (6), and Jennifer overlaps as she repeats the corrected phrase, confirming the repair.

4.2.3 Discussion

In both excerpts, the speaker initiates repair by commenting on the trouble source, as can be seen in excerpt 13 line (17), where the speaker repeats the trouble source to seek help, and excerpt 14 line (4) and (5) where the speaker explicitly asks for help. Both speakers repeat the repair provided by the other speaker, as can be seen in excerpt 13 line (19) and excerpt 14 line (5). In the latter case, overlap occurs between the two speakers as the initial speaker realizes what word she was thinking of.

In excerpt 13, it becomes clear that the NNS and the NS know each other well since they are conversing about a movie they have shot together. Therefore, it can be argued that Reese’s other-correction, without the use of any hesitations or reluctance markers shows that there is no threat of face (Day, et al., 1984). Therefore, it appears the help is offered as a favor (Day et al., 1984). This could also explain why the NS does not interrupt the NNS but waits until the transition point, which is also found by Day et al. (1984). Noteworthy is the fact that there are three interlocutors in excerpt 13, causing the participants, Sofia and Reese, to act in coalition during the repair sequence. Sofia enlists Reese as a language broker (Bolden, 2012), as she is a NS and they know each other well. Sofia repeats the trouble source, initiating repair while looking towards Reese. Reese then volunteers and provides the repair solution for Sofia. Sofia and Reese are already telling a story together, and therefore, logically, Reese steps in to provide the repair for Sofia which is accepted without any reluctance. As described in Norrick (1991), in interactions between equals like two NS in excerpt 14, the other-correction in second position amounts to the request for correction by

the speaker, as can be seen in line (4) and (5). Therefore, the other-correction is accepted without reluctance markers here as well.

4.3 Other-Initiated Self-Repair

In other-initiated repair, the trouble source, initiation, and solving of repair occurs in different lines and by different people. Therefore, in sections 4.3 and 4.4 the excerpts will include the location of the trouble source (TS), the repair initiator (RI), and the repair solution (RS). In case of multiple initiations or solutions, these will be numbered.

4.3.1 *Non-native Speakers*

OISR has been found twice for NNS, illustrated in the following two excerpts. First, in excerpt 15, Salma and Ellen are sitting across from each other on chairs and are talking about Salma's daughter.

[Excerpt 15: Salma Hayek's Dog Loves Cake!]

- | | | | |
|-----|----|--------|--|
| (1) | | Ellen: | So she's- what is she into? |
| (2) | TS | Salma: | Oh, she's into the slime craze. |
| (3) | RI | Ellen: | I don't know what that means. |
| (4) | RS | Salma: | It's like a- very- (0.3) humongous booger. Soft booger, that th- |
| (5) | | | they make, and they play with it, and they make it with glitter |
| (6) | | | and colors, and she's obsessed. [...] |

When Ellen asks what Salma's daughter is into in line (1), Salma responds with a term that is unfamiliar to Ellen. She simply states "I don't know what that means" in line (3), initiating repair because of misunderstanding. Salma then goes on to explain and provide clarification in lines (4) until (6), after which she continues her story.

Second, in excerpt 16 Sofia has to guess which man is wearing her newly released perfume.

[Excerpt 16: Ellen's Favorite Funny Ladies: Sofia Vergara]

- | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|--------|--|
| (1) | TS | Sofia: | Yeah, this one. I take this one. |
| (2) | RI | Ellen: | Yeah? (1.8) You take him? |
| (3) | RS | Sofia: | No, I mean, I-, I-, I choose this one. |
| (4) | RI ₂ | Ellen: | Okay. (0.5) You choose him? |
| (5) | RS ₂ | Sofia: | Yeah, this one. Didn't you say the one with the perfume? |
| (6) | | Ellen: | Yeah. (h) |

In excerpt 16, Sofia states in line (1) she identified the man with her perfume. Ellen then partially repeats the trouble-source turn in line (2): “you take him?”. Sofia then repairs her speech in line (3), changing her statement to “I choose this one”. Ellen initiates repair again by repeating the trouble-source turn again in line (4). Sofia then replies saying “yeah” and countering with a question, challenging Ellen’s initiations of repair. Ellen then accepts the repair solution in line (6) which is followed by a laugh, showing the jocular intention of Ellen in her initiation of repair.

4.3.2 Native Speakers

Excerpt 17 shows the one occurrence of OISR for NS as Lily is talking about how Time Magazine asked her to come out on the cover.

[Excerpt 17: Lily Tomlin Explains Why She Turned Down Coming Out on Time Magazine]

- | | | | |
|-----|----|--------|--|
| (1) | TS | Lily: | I just want to warn all of you. Be careful with those Macs. (h)
(4.6) |
| (2) | RI | Ellen: | (h) Macs? |
| (3) | RS | Lily: | The Mac. You know, a Macintosh. (h) Isn’t that what they were |
| (4) | | | in those days? |
| (5) | | Ellen: | Yeah (h) |

Prior to the excerpt, Lily is jokingly talking about how Time magazine would monitor her, which is why she says “Be careful with those Macs” in line (1). After a long pause, Ellen initiates repair by repeating the trouble source in line (2). Lily then explains what she meant, stating that “Macs” is an abbreviation for “Macintosh” which can be seen in line (3). Lily then asks for confirmation which Ellen provides by saying “Yeah” in line (5).

4.3.3 OISR for Ellen by NNS

OISR occurred for Ellen in three conversations, only with NNS. In these excerpts, NNS initiated repair, which was then solved by Ellen. First, in excerpt 18, Ellen and Sofia are talking about the second-year anniversary of Sofia’s marriage.

[Excerpt 18: Ellen Teaches Sofia Vergara an English Word of the Day]

- (1) TS Ellen: You're supposed to do something like uh:: you're supposed to-
 (2) yeah, cotton
 (3) RI Sofia: Cotton what?
 (4) RS Ellen: Anything cotton
 (0.2)
 (5) RI₂ Sofia: But (h) what do I do (h) with the [cotton?
 (6) RS₂ Ellen: [I- you know what I did
 (7) for our second year? Um- uh- Portia and I- we do- we do the
 (8) thing every, and um, from the second year it was cotton and
 (9) uh:: this is how much I love her because I hate cotton balls but
 (10) I made uh:: I glued cotton balls and I made the number two on
 (11) a canvas and framed it and uh- two out of cotton balls, because
 (12) (.) it was cotton, so that's what I did. You can do anything
 (13) stupid, it's not uh- [don't
 (14) RI₃ Sofia: [But for what? (0.3) To present it to him?
 (15) Ellen: Well (0.2) no don't steal my idea, you're not gonna do that.
 (16) Sofia: (h) No I'm not going to do that number two in cotton (h) (2.3)
 (17) [(inaudible)] Where is this thing now?
 (18) Ellen: [Listen] All I'm saying- I'm say[ing is-
 (19) Sofia: [do you still have it?

In excerpt 18, Ellen makes a statement in line (1) which is not understood by Sofia, as becomes apparent as she initiates repair in line (3) saying “cotton what?” using a partial repeat of the trouble-source combined with the question word what. Ellen then tries to repair her speech in line (4), but it is clear Sofia does not follow as she initiates repair again in line (5). Ellen then tries to clarify by using an example in lines (6) until (13). However, in line (14) it appears that Sofia still does not understand what the intention is, as she initiates repair again, but the topic shifts without a repair solution being provided.

The next excerpt shows a second instance of OISR initiated by a NNS for Ellen as she is explaining the rules of a game.

[Excerpt 19: Sofia Vergara and Ellen Play ‘Stuff Your Granny Panties’]

- | | | | |
|------|-----------------|--------|---|
| (1) | | Ellen: | All right. We have 45 seconds to stuff as many balls in here as |
| (2) | TS | | we can. The person who has the least amount of balls left wins- |
| (3) | | | le- least amount that’s left in there. |
| (4) | RI | Sofia: | Least? |
| (5) | | Ellen: | L- Do you know what that word means? |
| (6) | RI ₂ | Sofia: | Yea, but least inside of me? |
| (7) | RS | Ellen: | No, least- uh- I know. It’s worded weird. The- the person who |
| (8) | | | has the least left in [there] (0.5) [wins. |
| (9) | | Sofia: | [Uh-uh.] [OK. |
| (10) | RS ₂ | Ellen: | So you want most of them in here. |
| (11) | | Sofia: | OK. |
| (12) | | Ellen: | Ready? |
| (13) | RI ₃ | Sofia: | In your side of the pants? |
| (14) | | Ellen: | 45 seconds, go! |

Ellen struggles with explaining the rules in lines (2) and (3), as she already rephrases to provide clarification. Sofia then initiates repair and repeats part of the trouble source turn in line (4) saying “least?”, to which Ellen replies if she even understands the word in line (5), not providing a clear solution. Sofia rephrases her initiation by providing a possible understanding of the trouble source turn in line (6). Ellen then admits repair was necessary because “it was worded weird” in line (7), to which she provides clarification in lines (7) and (8) and again in line (10). Sofia provides confirmation in lines (9) and (11), however she still does not fully understand the rules because she requests clarification in line (13), which Ellen ignores as she starts the game (line 14).

The last example of OISR can be found in excerpt 20, where a NNS provides repair which is not accepted by Ellen. Ellen and Nikkie are talking about Nikkie being blackmailed into coming out as transgender.

[Excerpt 20: Influential YouTuber Nikkie de Jager Sits Down With Ellen]

- | | | | |
|-----|----|---------|---|
| (1) | | Ellen: | If you wouldn’t have been uh (.) blackmailed, do you think you |
| (2) | TS | | would’ve come out and if so, w- uh (0.3) [was] that important |
| (3) | | | to you, or-? |
| (4) | RI | Nikkie: | [When?] |
| (5) | | | I always wanted to come out with it, but it is such a delicate |
| (6) | | | (0.6) thing, that- how do you find the timing? There is never the |
| (7) | | | perfect timing. [...] |

Ellen asks Nikkie a question in lines (1) until (3), but there are some hesitations, cut-offs and pauses as Ellen forms her question. During a short pause in Ellen's sentence, Nikkie tries to initiate repair in line (4) providing a possible understanding of the trouble source turn. However, Ellen does not accept this repair as she repairs her sentence herself in line (2) as they overlap. Nikkie then continues to answer the question from line (5) onwards.

4.3.4 Discussion

In the data, OISR occurs twice for NNS and once for NS. In one case with a NNS, Ellen asks for clarification because she does not understand the topic of the conversation, which is also evident in the occurrence of OISR with a NS. However, the second case of OISR for NNS appears to have a different cause. In excerpt 16, the intention behind Sofia's speech seems clear, as she is supposed to guess which man is wearing her perfume. Ellen jokingly initiates repair for Sofia even though she probably understands the meaning of Sofia's speech. Schegloff et al., (1977) state that other-initiated repair should only come from misunderstanding or uncertainty, which is not the case. Here, asymmetry between speakers becomes apparent, as Sofia uses the wrong phrase but within the context of the conversation it is obvious what she means. Ellen, as the NS, assumes the role of expert and takes a pedagogical stance, initiating repair for Sofia to solve and provide the correct phrase, which Sofia does in line (3). Ellen initiates repair a second time, almost mockingly, causing Sofia to ask for clarification. Ellen follows Dings (2012) here, as she adopts a pedagogical stance and performs corrections with no mitigating moves forcing the NNS to repair her speech. Furthermore, Ellen's position of power as talk show host comes forward in this excerpt, as she decides when the segment moves on (Ilie, 2001).

Moreover, asymmetry between NNS and NS is apparent when NNS initiate repair for Ellen, which is not found in conversations with NS. Ellen does not accept the initiation of repair by NNS and assumes her role as expert in providing her own solution (Dings, 2012). In

excerpt 19, Ellen first mocks the NNS for not understanding, asking if she “understands the word” in line (5). Ellen points out that there is an asymmetry by implying the NNS would not know the meaning of a word, emphasizing the NNS as a novice speaker (Dings, 2012). However, later Ellen herself states it was “worded weird” (line 7) and acknowledges that repair was necessary. But when the NNS asks for clarification again Ellen ignores her, and enables her power as host (Ilie, 2001) by deciding the game is going to start.

In excerpt 18 Ellen does not provide a clear enough clarification to solve the repair, as the NNS still does not understand the topic of conversation. Interestingly, the topic shift occurs by the NNS, who, after attempting to initiate repair three times without gaining clear clarification, decides to ask a different question. This points towards the influence of conversational discourse in talk shows, as there are more equal speaking rights in talk shows compared to institutional encounters (Ilie, 1999; Ilie, 2001).

In excerpts where NNS initiate repair or where Ellen initiates repair for NNS, Ellen’s position of power is evident. First, she assumes the role of expert by initiating repair in cases when it is clear what is meant (excerpt 16) and by not accepting the repair provided by a NNS (excerpt 20). Then, in cases where the NNS requests clarification, Ellen does not provide enough clarification for the NNS to understand what is meant. Ellen then decides to move on, showing her power as show host to decide when there is either a topic shift or continuation of a game.

4.4 Other-Initiated Other-Repair

4.4.1. *Non-native Speakers*

There are three instances of OIOR for NNS found in the data. All excerpts follow a slightly different pattern. In excerpt 21, Ellen and Cardi B are discussing Cardi's cravings as she is pregnant.

[Excerpt 21: Cardi B Knows What She's Naming Her First Child]

- | | | |
|-----|--------|--|
| (1) | Ellen: | First of all, I should offer you- I know you- you're probably |
| (2) | | having cravings. What are you craving? |
| (3) | Cardi: | Uh it really depends. You know:. Like sometimes I-, (0.2) it |
| (4) | | really depends like, this whole week I've been eating ice cream, |
| (5) | | ice cream, ice cream. |
| (6) | Ellen: | Mm-hmm |
| (7) | TS | Cardi: Then like, (.) I like everything like lemonish |
| (8) | RI | Ellen: Mm-hmm. Lemish. Lemonish. |
| (9) | Cardi: | Yeah, lemonish. |

Cardi states that she sometimes likes "everything like lemonish" in line (7). Ellen initiates repair in line (8) saying "lemish" which she then corrects back to "lemonish". Cardi then affirms her previous statement by repeating the phrase "lemonish" emphasizing she had it right.

[Excerpt 22: Heidi Klum Doesn't Feel Too Old to Model]

- | | | |
|-----|--------|---|
| (1) | Ellen: | And-, and-, and now- God you've got so much going on. |
| (2) | | America's Top-, uh-, (0.3) next top Model, and then [you've |
| (3) | | got— |
| (4) | Heidi: | [I'm |
| (5) | TS | starting in two weeks, America's [uh:: (.) |
| (6) | RI | Ellen: [Got Talent. |
| (7) | Heidi: | Got Talent. |
| (8) | Ellen: | Yeah. So, so everyone is coming back? |
| (9) | Heidi: | Everyone is back together. I'm so excited. |

In excerpt 21, Heidi and Ellen are discussing Heidi's upcoming projects and her busy schedule. Ellen struggles to correctly state the program Heidi is working on in line (2), where hesitations and pauses are evident. Then Heidi adds to the list by providing another program she is working on, but she struggles to come up with the name in line (4), prolonging a hesitation. Ellen then overlaps with Heidi providing the name in line (5) which Heidi repeats in confirmation in line (6).

The next excerpt follows a different pattern compared to the previous two. In excerpt 23 Ellen and Sofia are playing a game as tWitch, the game host, is asking questions to both of them.

[Excerpt 23: 5 Second Rule with Sofia Vergara – Extended!]

- (6) Ellen: Time's up.
 (7) Sofia: Your:- shut up. Your: uh: tricep, your: quadricep, and your
 (8) TS sauce.
 (0.6)
 (9) RI tWitch: Sauce?
 (10) RS Sofia: The sauce is a muscle that is very understated. People don't
 (11) really think about it when they have back pain. But it goes from
 (12) down here, and [it goes] through your
 (13) RS₂ Ellen: [s:- sciatic]
 (14) RS₃ Sofia: No, it's called the sauce. The sciatic is a nerve.
 (15) RI₂ Ellen: And this is a sauce?
 (16) Sofia: The sciatic nerve.
 (17) RI₃ Ellen: All right, so what is the [sauce?
 (18) RS₄ Sofia: [the sauce goes from here, like down to
 (19) your [leg, and attaches] all the way back here.
 (20) RI₄ Ellen: [Is it called the sauce?]
 (21) RS₅ tWitch: Yeah, and uh also the [psoas.
 (22) Sofia: [Sauce.
 (23) Ellen: Psoas.
 (24) tWitch: Yep, yep. All right, I was following you, though- (0.5) it's the
 (25) sauce.
 (26) Sofia: You knew what I was talking about.
 (27) Ellen: Psoas
 (28) tWitch: Work out your sauce.
 (29) Sofia: What did I said wrong?
 (1.8)
 (30) Ellen: Nothing at all. Okay.

Sofia is naming three muscles as part of the game and pronounces a muscle as “sauce” in line (8). tWitch then initiates repair in line (9), repeating the trouble source. Sofia then explains what she means in line (10) until (12) where Ellen overlaps by trying to provide the right word in line (13). Sofia then emphasizes her previous statement in line (14) and again in line (16). Ellen asks for clarification and initiates repair again in line (17). Sofia provides an explanation of what the muscle is in lines (18) and (19). Halfway through her sentence, Ellen overlaps with Sofia asking for clarification again in line (20). tWitch then provides the repair by presenting the right pronunciation “psoas” in line (21). Sofia remains

with her phrase “sauce” in line (22) after which Ellen repeats the solution in line (23). Sofia states that they knew what she was talking about (line 26) and asking what she said wrong (line 29).

4.4.2 *OIOR for Ellen by NNS*

OIOR is found once in a conversation between Ellen and a NNS, in the same clip as the previous excerpt. Excerpt 24 precedes the previous excerpt.

[Excerpt 24: 5 Second Rule with Sofia Vergara – Extended!]

- | | | | |
|-----|----|---------|-------------------------------------|
| (1) | TS | tWitch: | Sofia, name three muscles.
(1.7) |
| (2) | RI | Sofia: | Like, the mussels? |
| (3) | | tWitch: | Mm-hmm. |
| (4) | RS | Ellen: | No, [no, on the body |
| (5) | | tWitch: | [no, on- |
| (6) | | Ellen: | Time’s up. |

Sofia does not understand the question and asks for clarification in line (2) following a pause after tWitch asks the question. The repair is provided by the third speaker, Ellen, in line (4). She overlaps with tWitch as they both try to provide the repair at the same time.

4.4.3 *Native speakers*

OIOR was found much more frequently for NS compared to NNS. There are two cases where another speaker, not Ellen, provides repair for a NS. In excerpt 24 this is done by a NNS, in excerpt 25 this is done by another NS. Excerpt 25 is from a clip of which an excerpt has been used before in paragraph 4.2.1 (excerpt 13), where SIOR was performed for a NNS by a NS, Reese Witherspoon. In excerpt 25, they are still discussing their competition of bringing sweets to the set. Here, OIOR appears for a NS, which is completed by a NNS.

[Excerpt 25: Reese Witherspoon, Sofia Vergara and Ellen]

- | | | | |
|------|----|--------|---|
| (5) | | Reese: | Well, we kind of, like had a little bit of competition about like |
| (6) | TS | | who would bring more cake to [the set.] |
| (7) | RS | Sofia: | [Yeah], [like bitter sweets. |
| (8) | | Reese: | [She, like- |
| (9) | | | Yeah, cause I always, whenever I’m in movies I bring treats |
| (10) | | | and she brings treats (...) |

In line (6) Reese mentions that the competition is about who brings more “cake” to the set. In line (7) Sofia overlaps with Reese after which she corrects her by saying “like bitter sweets”. Reese overlaps with Sofia when she is saying this, as can be seen in line (8).

Reese then continues her story after this.

[Excerpt 26: This ‘Modern Family’ Star Knew the Show Would Last For a Decade]

- | | | |
|------|-----------------------|---|
| (1) | Ellen: | And Ed, [what’d you think? |
| (2) | Ed: | [Well the first time- the first time that I met (1.2) |
| (3) | | everybody was at the table read. You know, we have these |
| (4) | TS | table reads. And uh- (0.4) |
| (5) | RS Eric: | The reads— |
| (6) | Ed: | The reads. |
| (7) | RS ₂ Eric: | --at a table. |
| (8) | Ed: | At a table. So we’re reading the (.) pilot, we’re reading the |
| (9) | | script. (.) And so I sat down, and I looked- and I looked around. |
| (10) | | And I waved, and I thought, I don’t know anybody here. (0.2) I |
| (11) | | don’t know anybody. |

In excerpt 26, Ellen is with the cast of the hit show *Modern Family*, who are all sitting across from her. In this excerpt, Ellen asks Ed a question about what he thought of the pilot of the show in line (1), and Ed responds in lines (2) and (3) with some hesitations and cut-offs. He repeats part of a sentence in line (3) “everybody was at the table read. You know, we have these table reads”. He then hesitates after which a pause follows, and Eric, another cast member, fills up the pause by once again emphasizing what Ed already meant to say before. Eric says “The reads” in line (4) which is repeated by Ed in line (5), and Eric continues to say “at a table” in line (6), which is then again repeated by Ed in line (7). After this, Ed continues his story of what he thought of the script.

In the next three excerpts Ellen performs OIOR for NS in her show. First, in excerpt 27, Ed and Ellen are playing a game in which Ed needs to guess which celebrity is shown on a picture.

[Excerpt 27: Ed O’Neill Tries to ID Ryan Gosling, Chris Hemsworth and More in a Game of ‘Who’s This?’]

- (1) Ellen: Yeah (h) (0.4) Joaquin Phoenix
 (2) Ed: Joaquin Phoenix. And her name is—
 (3) Ellen: [Ree-
 (4) Ed: [uh Oscar [winner.
 (5) Ellen: [Reese
 (6) TS Ed: Reve Witherst-, Witherspoon.
 (7) RI Ellen: Not Reve.
 (8) Ed: Witherspoon.
 (9) RS Ellen: Reese Witherspoon.
 (10) Ed: Witherspoon. Thank you, [thank you.
 (11) Ellen: [All right, all right.

Ed is struggling to get the name of the actress right, and Ellen is hinting towards her first name in lines (3) and (5). Ed repeats her first name wrong in line (6) and does not correct himself from this mistake. Ellen initiates repair in line (7), stating that Ed got her name wrong. She then provides the repair solution by stating her full name in line (9). Ed responds by only repeating her last name, which he already got right in line (6).

In excerpt 28, Ellen and Ed are discussing the time Ed met Billie Eilish on the Ellen show on an earlier visit.

[Excerpt 28: Leonardo DiCaprio and Ed O’Neill Spent Father’s Day Together]

- (1) Ellen: But then, Billie Eilish was on last time you were here, so you
 (2) got to meet Billie Eilish.
 (3) Ed: Yes.
 (4) Ellen: Yeah.
 (5) Ed: And I-, I texted my daughter and I said it was Billie (0.2)
 (6) Eyelash.
 (7) Ellen: Mhm.
 (8) TS Ed: And, you know, but she was- (.) she knew.
 (9) RS Ellen: She knew who you meant?
 (10) Ed: Yeah, and then later, you know, we went to The Greek.

Ed explains he got her name wrong when texting his daughter in line (5), and continues to say, “She was-, she knew” in line (8), cutting-off his sentence. Ellen then initiates repair and guesses what he meant by saying “She knew who you meant?” in line (9), after which Ed accepts the repair in line (10) by saying “Yeah” and he continues his story.

The last excerpt takes place during a game that Lily, Jane, and Ellen are playing. Lily and Jane need to answer the question shown on the screen.

[Excerpt 29: Lily Tomlin & Jane Fond Prove Why They ‘D.G.A.F.’]

- | | | | |
|------|----|--------|--|
| (1) | | Ellen: | So I’m going to hit a button and uh random questions will |
| (2) | | | [pop up] and you have to both answer honestly (.) with the first |
| (3) | | | thing that comes to mind, all right? |
| (4) | | Lily: | [Oh my God] |
| | | | (3.6) |
| (5) | TS | Lily: | Your best [celebrity- |
| (6) | RS | Ellen: | [Your first celebrity crush. |
| (7) | | Lily: | Oh. |
| (8) | | Jane: | Tony Curtis. |
| (9) | | Ellen: | OK. |
| (10) | | Lily: | Dorothy Malone. |
| (11) | | Ellen: | OK. |

During the pause after line (4) the phrase “Your first celebrity crush was…” appears on the screen. Lily then proceeds to read this aloud but confuses “first” with “best”. Ellen then overlaps with Lily in line (6) correcting her to the right phrase. Lily says “Oh” in line (7) after which Jane immediately answers the question in line (8). The turns here follow quickly, without pauses and without any overlap.

4.4.4 Discussion

Interestingly, OIOR appears more frequently in conversations with NS compared to conversations with NNS. However, the occurrence of this repair is due to different causes for both groups. As can be seen in paragraph 4.2.1, OIOR for NNS acts as a correcting move in conversation, as Ellen tries to correct Cardi in excerpt 21. Cardi repeats the phrase she used before to emphasize she got the word right in the first place and the repair was not necessary, attempting to take away power from Ellen. In excerpt 22, Heidi struggles to come up with the name of the show and Ellen solves this by providing it. Repair occurs as a favor here (Day, et al., 1984). In excerpt 23, Sofia pronounces a word wrong, after which confusion arises and a NS ultimately provides the repair. OIOR occurs here to solve a misunderstanding.

When comparing this to NS, it is evident that in excerpt 26 Eric provides repair in a jokingly, almost mocking manner, as Ed struggles to explain a simple phrase as “the table

reads". Excerpt 25 contains three interlocutors (as is in paragraph 4.2.3), and here Sofia provides repair to a NS and acts in coalition with Reese. Sofia self-selects as a broker (Bolden, 2012) and initiates repair. Sofia assumes the role of co-teller of the story which is why the repair is accepted without constraints as is suggested by Schegloff et al. (1977). Similarly, in excerpt 23, one of the three interlocutors provides repair after self-selecting as a language broker, as tWitch is a NS of English providing the repair solution for a NNS (Bolden, 2012). In excerpts 27 and 29 OIOR occurs in order to solve misunderstanding regarding a game that is being played. Ellen shows her power as show host here, as repair for a NS occurs with no constraints as she is in control of asking questions in the show (Ilie, 2001). Last, in excerpt 28, Ellen provides OIOR to solve a misunderstanding as Ed cut off his sentence in the turn before.

For both NS and NNS, OIOR occurs without any constraints. It is accepted in almost all cases, except when Ellen tries to correct Cardi in excerpt 21. Here, Ellen tries to correct Cardi but then corrects herself back to the original phrase which is then repeated by Cardi. It can be argued that Ellen is trying to bring forward the construction of the NS being legitimate (Park, 2007) but failing in this process, and Cardi regains her power by repeating the word she got right in the first place.

It seems from the data that OIOR is not seen as constrained as in mundane conversation, therefore following a more institutionalized discourse. It can be argued that the speakers in these excerpts know each other well, so in most cases, corrections may appear as a favor instead of a face threat as is discussed in Day, et al. (1984).

5. Conclusion

This research aimed to answer the main question: *How is repair constructed by the speakers in conversations in the talk show Ellen?* The analysis shows that although there are similarities in the construction of repair between NS and NNS, there are differences as well that highlight the asymmetries. It appeared the semi-institutionalized nature of talk shows results in a specific organization of preference for repair, which has similarities and differences with both conversational and institutionalized discourse. Both self-initiation and other-initiation display different constructions for NS and NNS and most importantly, repair is used to highlight the asymmetrical language abilities of the interlocutors. Moreover, the third sub-question regarding power highlights the influence of the hierarchy of power in a talk show, which is exemplified by the power relations that exist between NS and NNS.

5.1 Self-Initiated Repair

SISR occurred most frequently of all categories for both NS and NNS. This is in line with earlier literature which shows that SISR is most common in mundane conversations, suggesting talk show discourse follows the preference of repair similar to everyday conversations.

Hesitations in SISR appeared more frequently in conversations with NS compared to NNS. In fact, SISR appeared more in conversations with NS than those with NNS. This is possibly due to the fact that NNS do not notice or acknowledge every mistake that is made in their speech. Another possibility is that this is due to perceived asymmetries in language capabilities. Perceived asymmetries in language capabilities between NS and NNS were found in different parts of the data, where a NS is seen as legitimate and provides responsibility for correctness which overrides the usual organization (Norricks, 1991). Additionally, NS often comment on the SISR of NNS, which is not found vice versa. The NS reassures them that the mistake was insignificant for conversation. One instance shows the

NS letting the trouble source “pass” (Firth, 1997) and later comments that the repair was not necessary. The NS regularly comes forward as an expert, making a judgment of the conversation and the effect of the trouble source. Another example shows the NNS clearly stating her identity as a novice, as she complains that the NS is “making her English bad” (excerpt 5, line 7). Therefore, the identity of a NS as expert and a NNS as novice as identified by Dings (2012) are brought forward through the process of repair.

5.2 Other-Initiation of Repair

As mentioned, repair in talk shows appears to follow a similar preference to everyday conversations considering self-initiated repair, but it does appear that other correction is not as constrained in talk show discourse, which follows a trend in literature found for institutionalized discourse.

Perceived asymmetry of language capabilities also becomes apparent in other-initiated repair. Regularly, the NS assumes the role of expert in conversation, by initiating repair when the context provides clear indication of what the other means (excerpt 16), and by her unwillingness to accept repair initiated by a NNS. Ellen never accepted or commented on it, dismissing the repair-initiation. In one case, Ellen even goes as far as mocking the NNS for not understanding what she means, while later admitting the phrase was “worded weird” (excerpt 19, line 7). Ellen explicitly puts the NNS forward as less legitimate (Park, 2007) and underlines the identities of expert and novice (Dings, 2012).

Mocking also appears as a possible cause for OIOR, where a NS struggling to form a sentence is mocked by another NS. Other causes for OIOR that were found were co-telling of a story and repair as a favor when struggling to come up with a word, but most frequently OIOR was caused by misunderstanding. As Schegloff et al., (1977) note, other-initiation should only stem from misunderstanding or uncertainty. However, in one instance repair is

initiated by another speaker when the meaning is already clear, so here it can be argued that this initiation of repair is done to mock the NNS.

Many similarities between NS and NNS were found in the data. It is seen that pauses in repair are granted equally for NS and NNS, and overlap occurs in both groups as well. In almost all cases, both NS and NNS accept OIOR, something that is usually more constrained. This could be explained by the fact that the host and guests probably know each other well, and therefore the face threat of other-repair is not as apparent, which is in line with the findings of Day, et al. (1984). Since regular interaction between the speakers is apparent as they know each other well, it can be argued that the NS can accurately assess the language level of the NNS and therefore provide helpful correction when necessary (Norrick, 1991). This could explain why other-initiated repair is mostly accepted. However, it seems using repair in a humorous way to highlight the asymmetries is done often by the NS.

5.3 Hierarchy of Power

The data clearly shows Ellen in a position of power. This power works in two ways: first her position as show host, deciding when a topic shift occurs or when the segment continues, and second in her position as NS in conversations with NNS. Sometimes, these two positions of power are combined, as one excerpt shows the NNS still asking for clarification because she does not understand the rules of a game but Ellen starting the game regardless (excerpt 19). Additionally, Ellen does not accept repair initiated by NNS, and the data shows no instances of a NS initiating repair for Ellen.

The asymmetries between speakers are evident across all types of repair. Most explicitly, this is seen in the fact that NS comment on the repair of NNS, assuring them that they understood the conversation. On the other hand, the NS also exemplifies the asymmetry in language humorously, by, for example, initiating repair when the intention is clear. It could be argued that in this, the NS adopts a pedagogical stance by forcing the NNS to provide the

right phrase, even when the trouble source did not provide misunderstanding. However, this jocular repair also occurs in conversations with speakers with equal language repertoires. Implicitly, the NS demonstrates the asymmetries by not accepting the repair provided by a NNS, ignoring the initiation completely or by not providing enough clarification for the NNS to understand.

In summary, the data points towards an asymmetrical division of power, which is brought to the foreground by the show host and NS. The show host is in control, as she asks questions and decides when the topic shifts. However, the semi-institutionalized context provides an environment where the interviewee has the opportunity to shift topics or ask questions. Furthermore, the identities of NS as expert and NNS as novice are brought forward across the different types of repair and by all speakers. However, the repair usually occurs without constraints or reluctance, implying that both speakers accept the repair (when it occurs) which could be explained by the fact that the speakers often know each other well and therefore have a clear understanding of their language capabilities. Only the NS did not accept repair initiated by a NNS, which again exemplifies the perceived asymmetries.

5.4 Limitations and Further Research

This study aimed to provide insight into the organization of conversational repair in a semi-institutionalized context as a talk show. Many studies have focused on repair in institutionalized contexts as well as conversational discourse, but a gap existed in research in this particular discourse type. The data has provided answers; however, the research has limitations. First, it is important to note that a qualitative research method was used in this research, and Dörnyei (2007) notes that researcher bias in interpretation can occur. This could be minimized in future research by cross-checking the results by different researchers. Moreover, this study purely focused on the distinction between native and non-native speakers, where the native language (and culture) of the NNS was not taken into

consideration. Therefore, further research could look into specific interactions with NNS where the background is taken into consideration, as well as the language proficiency of these NNS. Last, this research focused on one talk show, and further research could extend talk show categories.

Bibliography

- Ballmer, T. (1981). A typology of native speaker. In Florian Coulmas (Ed.), *Festschrift for native speaker*, 51 – 67. The Hague: Mouton.
- Bolden, G. (2012). Across languages and cultures: Brokering problems of understanding in conversational repair. *Language in Society*, 41(1), 97 – 121. DOI: 10.1017/s0047404511000923
- Calsamiglia H., Cots, J. & Lorda, C. (1995). Communicative strategies and socio-cultural identities in talk shows. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 5(3), 325 - 339.
- Cummins, J. (2009). Pedagogies of choice: challenging coercive relations of power in classrooms and communities. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(3), 261 – 271. DOI: 10.1080/13670050903003751
- Davis, S., & Mares, M.-L. (1998). Effects of talk show viewing on adolescents. *Journal of Communication*, 48(3), 69–86.
- Davies, A. (1991). *The native speaker in applied linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Day, R. R., Chenoweth, A., Chun, A. E., & Luppescu, S. (1984). Corrective feedback in native-nonnative discourse. *Language Learning*, 34(1), 19 – 45.
- Dings, A. (2012). Native speaker/nonnative speaker interaction and orientation to novice/expert identity. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(1), 1503 – 1518.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press.
- Drew, P. (1997). ‘Open’ class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28, 69 – 101.

- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing Talk at Work: An Introduction. In P. Drew, & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at Work. Interaction in Institutional Settings* (pp. 3-65). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Emmys. (n.d.). *Ellen DeGeneres*. Retrieved February 12, 2021 from <https://www.emmys.com/bios/ellen-degeneres>
- Fairclough, N. (1998). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 237 – 259.
- García, O., Flores, N., & Chu, H. (2011). Extending Bilingualism in U.S. Secondary Education: New Variations. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 5(1), 1 – 18.
- Gregori-Signes, C. (2000). The tabloid talk show as a quasi-conversational type of face-to-face interaction. *Journal of pragmatics*, 10(2), 195 – 213.
- Goodwin, C. & Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation Analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 19(1), 283 – 307. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.an.19.100190.001435
- Günthner, S., & Luckmann, T. (2001). Asymmetries of Knowledge in Intercultural Communication: The Relevance of Cultural Repertoires of Communicative Genres. *Pragmatics and Beyond New Series*, 81, 55 – 86.
- Hackert, S. (2012). *The Emergence of the English Native Speaker*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Hosoda, Y. (2006). Repair and relevance of differential language expertise in second language conversations. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(1), 25 – 50.
- Ikeda, T. (2007). *Facilitating participation: Communicative practices in interaction between native and nonnative speakers of Japanese*. Austin: University of Texas.

- Ilie, C. (1999). 'Question-response argumentation in talk shows.' *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(8), pp. 975 – 999.
- Ilie, C. (2001). Semi-institutional discourse: The case of talk shows. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(1), 209 – 254.
- Ilie, C. (2006). Talk Shows. *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*. 12(1), pp. 489 – 494.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols. *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 13-31.
- Kurhila, S. (2001). Correction in talk between native and nonnative speaker. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(1), 1083 – 1110.
- Liebscher, G. & Dailey-O’Cain, J. D. (2003). Conversational Repair as a Role-Defining Mechanism in Classroom Interaction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87, 375 – 390.
- Mori, J. (2003). The construction of interculturality: a study of initial encounters between Japanese and American students. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 36, 143 – 184.
- Muni, V. T. (2013). Le locuteur natif et son idealization: Un demi-siecle de critiques. *Histoire épistémologie langag*, 35(2), 5 – 15.
- Myhill, J. (2003). The native speaker, identity, and the authenticity hierarchy. *Language Sciences*, 25(1), 77 – 97.
- Norrick, N. R. (1991). On the Organization of Corrective Exchanges in Conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 16(1), 59 – 83.
- Park, J. (2007). Co-construction of nonnative speaker identity in cross-cultural interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(3), 339 – 360.
- Persaud, C. (2021). *The Most Popular Daytime Talk Shows Ranked, According to IMDb*. Screenrant. Retrieved February 12, 2021 from <https://screenrant.com/most-popular-daytime-talk-shows-ranked-imdb-ellen-degeneres-view-wendy-williams-dr-phil-oz/>

- Rossler, P., & Brosius, H. (2001). Do talk shows cultivate adolescents' views of the world? A prolonged-exposure experiment. *Journal of Communication*, 51(1), 143-163.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696 – 735.
- Schegloff, E.A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference of self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53, 361 – 382.
- Wilkinson, S. (2002). The omnipresent classroom during summer study abroad: American students in conversation with their French hosts. *Modern Language Journal*, 86, 157 – 173.
- Woo, H., & Dominick, J. R. (2003). Acculturation, Cultivation and Daytime TV Talk Shows. *J&MC Quarterly*, 80(1), 109 – 127.

Corpus Bibliography

- TheEllenShow. (2017, Nov 21). *Ellen Teaches Sofia Vergara an English Word of the Day*. [Video]. YouTube. https://youtu.be/-4sU_AhRPY0
- TheEllenShow. (2015, Dec 3). *5 Second Rule with Sofia Vergara – Extended!* [Video]. YouTube. https://youtu.be/-4sU_AhRPY0
- TheEllenShow. (2017, Nov 21). *Sofia Vergara and Ellen Play ‘Stuff Your Granny Panties’* [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/utt5KbDzLMw>
- TheEllenShow. (2017, Apr 26). *Salma Hayek’s Dog Loves Cake!* [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/Pq7V4bWxSG4>
- TheEllenShow. (2019, Jun 18). *Penelope Cruz Never Wants to See Javier Bardem’s Pablo Esobar Look Again*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/xBM7EMPkstM>
- TheEllenShow. (2018, Jan 16). *Penelope Cruz on ‘American Crime Story’ and snapping Ricky Martin’s Bare Bum*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/13HoDhv8YEs>
- TheEllenShow. (2018, Jan 2). *Ricky Martin Talks His Tush*. [Video]. YouTube. https://youtu.be/WY_186QcMmA
- TheEllenShow. (2017, Sep 28). *Ricky Martin Visits Ellen to Talk About Helping Puerto Rico*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/br6SYA4SmT0>

- TheEllenShow. (2015, Apr 14). *Reese Witherspoon, Sofia Vergara and Ellen*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/zRc1SdC8Geo>
- TheEllenShow. (2015, Jun 11). *Ellen's Favorite Funny Ladies: Sofia Vergara*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/4WUINBs2PCA>
- TheEllenShow. (2015, Dec 3). *Sofia Vergara on Her Fairy Tale Wedding*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/QO2t1llzbZY>
- TheEllenShow. (2018, Mar 2). *Jennifer Lawrence Explains Her Drunk Alter Ego 'Gail'*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/mctn16hLzhg>
- TheEllenShow. (2019, Jan 15). *Lily Tomlin Explains Why She Turned Down Coming Out on Time Magazine*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/QjmApP4i8ZM>
- TheEllenShow. (2019, Jan 11). *Timothée Chalamet Managed to Keep His Love for 'The Office' Hidden from Steve Carell*. [Video]. YouTube. https://youtu.be/4GkXQ_c26NI
- TheEllenShow. (2017, Nov 29). *Armie Hammer and Timothée Chalamet Talk Passionate First Rehearsal*. [Video]. YouTube. https://youtu.be/F0rXPrnC_Ps
- TheEllenShow. (2020, Jan 20). *Mark Wahlberg's Wife Thought Kim & Kanye were Coming Over for Dinner*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/Pw2mPDUTRdY>
- TheEllenShow. (2018, Dec 4). *Ryan Reynolds Had Had Enough of 'Frozen'*. [Video]. YouTube. https://youtu.be/G2r_IIG_mfA
- TheEllenShow. (2018, Feb 8). *How to Survive Sofia Vergara's Wedding*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/laYZNbxk3AA>
- TheEllenShow. (2018, Sep 25). *This 'Modern Family' Star Knew the Show Would Last for a Decade*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/d5vwydREFH8>
- TheEllenShow. (2019, Apr 1). *Ed O'Neill Tries to ID Ryan Gosling, Chris Hemsworth, and More in a Game of 'Who's This?'*. [Video] YouTube. <https://youtu.be/Rn9T0vTzaR4>
- TheEllenShow. (2020, Mar 9). *Leonardo DiCaprio and Ed O'Neill Spent Father's Day Together*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/CSMVU7b06Ew>
- TheEllenShow. (2018, Apr 19). *Cardi B Liked Being a Stripper*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/nryVIPyKWBY>
- TheEllenShow. (2018, Apr 19). *Cardi B Knows What She's Naming her First Child*. [Video]. YouTube. https://youtu.be/7Z7xbelZI_Y
- TheEllenShow. (2017, Nov 15). *Kim Kardashian Plays '5 Second Rule'*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/tETQaX2pIiE>

TheEllenShow. (2019, Jan 15). *Lily Tomlin & Jane Fond Prove Why They 'D.G.A.F.'*. [Video]. YouTube. https://youtu.be/ZNzHpZu_7bw

TheEllenShow. (2019, Apr 3). *Billie Eilish Gets Candid About Tourette Syndrome*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/k4vRFodAqWo>

TheEllenShow. (2019, Jan 2). *Heidi Klum Still Believes in Love and Marriage*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/rhuHkxSbrGc>

TheEllenShow. (2020, Jan 22). *Influential YouTuber Nikkie de Jager Sits Down with Ellen*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/V1PABydQ668>

TheEllenShow. (2018, Feb 26). *Heidi Klum Doesn't Feel Too Old to Model*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/Cwgks9JXLYs>

TheEllenShow. (2015, Dec 6). *Sofia Vergara on her 'Modern Family' husband*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/NBFbkrxUKnk>

Appendices

Appendix 1: Glossary for transcription symbols of Jefferson (2004)

- [*A left bracket* indicates the point of overlap onset.
-] *A right bracket* indicates the point at which two overlapping utterances end, if they end simultaneously, or at the point at which one of them ends in the course of the other. It also is used to parse out segments of overlapping utterances.
- (0.0) *Numbers in parentheses* indicate elapsed time by tenths of seconds.
- (.) *A dot in parentheses* indicates a brief interval (\pm a tenth of a second) within or between utterances.
- :: *Colons* indicate prolongation of the immediately prior sound. The longer the colon row, the longer the prolongation.
- *A dash* indicates a cut-off.
- (h) *Parenthesized 'h'* indicates plosiveness. This can be associated with laughter, crying, breathlessness, etc.

Appendix 2: Coding scheme

What?	How?
Self-initiation	Marked green
Self-repair	Red font
Other-initiation	Marked blue
Other-repair	Purple font