CHANGING PATTERNS OF REPAIR IN THE CONVERSATIONS OF ONE APHASIC COUPLE: A COMPARISON OVER TIME

CLARE LAWSON

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the MSc in Speech and Language Sciences

2005

Department of Human Communication Science
University College London

Contents

Abstract

This project is part of a wider funded ERSC study 'Long Term Adaptation to Conversation by People with Aphasia and their Partners' (ESRC R000239306). This wider study aimed to investigate the process of adaptation to conversation by seven couples living with aphasia, using data collected at seven regular intervals post-CVA; 3 months, 4.5 months, 6 months, 12 months, 18 months, 24 months and 30 months. This present project used conversational data collected from one of these couples at 4.5 months and 18 months post-CVA.

This project will review current literature in the field of aphasia, focusing in particular on research concerning spontaneous recovery. The method of conversation analysis as a tool for investigating talk-in-interaction will be outlined and discussed. Relevant research using conversation analysis will be discussed, namely studies concerning turn-construction methods and repair. Then the application of conversation analysis to data from speakers with aphasia will be discussed, as will the issue of repair patterns in aphasia.

The analysis section will outline the changing patterns of repair that were found upon detailed analysis of the conversational data. The first pattern of repair concerns self-initiated other-repair and other-initiated repair, and the second pattern is form of self-initiated, same-turn repair.

Finally, a summary of the results shall be presented, and the implications of these results will be discussed. The limitations of this project and areas for future research shall be outlined.

Introduction

Aphasia

Acquired aphasia is a communication disorder that can affect the ability to use and understand spoken and written words and other symbolic activities. This is a chronic condition that can be the result of, commonly, a cerebrovascular accident (CVA), or less commonly, a head injury (Enderby and Emerson, 1996). A CVA, more commonly known as stroke, is an acute focal neurologic dysfunction of vascular origin caused by either intracerebral or subarachnoid hemorrhage, which lead to the infarction of brain tissue (Payne, with Minus, 1997).

The severity and pattern of deficits depends on many integrating factors, including size and anatomical locus of the lesion, and the type of stroke. Geschwind et al (1971) proposed that the site of the lesion correlates with the quality of spontaneous speech production, which lead to a classification system by syndromes (Sarno, 1980). One of these classifications, Wernicke's aphasia, is characterised by spontaneous, fluently articulated speech with a reduced content, paraphasias and neologisms, poor repetition and impaired comprehension, reading and writing (Payne, with Minus, 1997). Consequently, Wernicke's-type aphasia is also referred to as fluent aphasia due to the fluent nature of spontaneous output. One feature of fluent aphasia that is often mentioned in research is the impaired ability to monitor their speech and an unawareness of errors they produce (Butterworth, 1979). Conversational turn-taking behaviour has been argued to remain intact in aphasia (Schienberg & Holland, 1980, Ferguson, 1998), although excessively long turns have been reported in fluent aphasia with impaired ability to self-monitor (Edwards and Garman, 1989). More recently,

researchers (e.g. Laakso, 1997) have argued that speakers with fluent aphasia are not as deficient in self-monitoring skills as has been previously suggested.

Various changes occur in the initial stages following a given lesion, including raised cerebral spinal fluid pressure, vascular disruption and diaschisis. This initial depression of function is followed by a period of spontaneous recovery. Phenomena such as recovery from diaschisis, regenerative and collateral sprouting and long-term potentiation at a physiological level and redundancy, substitution and levels of representation at a structural level will interact to promote physiological repair and restitution (Powell, 1981). There is evidence that patient's with Wernicke's-type aphasia will recover function in various language components, including the information content of spontaneous speech and naming, although less recovery is seen in Wernicke's-type aphasia compared to Broca's-type aphasia (Kertesz, 1984).

It is generally accepted amongst researchers that various types of aphasia and language components recover differently and therefore some patients will have their primary period of recovery later than others (Kertesz & McCabe, 1977, Bruce, Howard and Gatehouse, 2000). The traditional consensus on the shape of the curve of the period of spontaneous recovery is maximal improvement occurs in the three months post-onset before flattening out and reaching a plateau between six and twelve months post-onset (Basso, 1992, Holland, Greenhouse, Fromm & Swindell, 1989, Kertesz & McCabe, 1977). However, some researchers argue that components of language function can continue to recover after the period of spontaneous recovery has ended, although there have been very few systematic studies of long-term

recovery of language function in aphasia (Penn, 1987, Bruce, Howard and Gatehouse, 2000).

The organisation and function of a patient's brain in the initial days after a CVA will differ from a few weeks and months post-onset, therefore the deficits observed and interventions required will also differ according to the patient's phase of spontaneous recovery (Keefe, 1995, Papathanasiou & Whurr, 2000). Researchers argue that speech and language therapy (SLT) intervention is most effective when coinciding with the period of spontaneous recovery (e.g. Kertesz & McCabe, 1977). There is evidence to suggest that patients with chronic aphasia can make therapeutic gains in improving functional communication and adapting their linguistic capacities to the demands of the conversational environment (Penn, 1987). Therefore, the long-term rehabilitation process will differ from the therapeutic approaches employed in the acute stages of recovery and will focus more on adaptation and compensation.

Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis (hereafter CA) is the term used to describe a form of method and analysis, developed within the analysis of common-sense reasoning and practical theorising in everyday activity (ten Have, 1999), used to investigate human interaction. In particular, it investigates 'talk-in-interaction', as talk is the primary medium through which social interaction takes place (Damico, Oelschlaeger and Simmons-Mackie, 1999). The original exponent of this approach was Harvey Sacks (1935-1975), who advocated the use of materials from naturally occurring occasions of everyday interaction in order to describe and explore the functions of any recurrent process during talk-in-interaction. CA originally focused on data obtained from non-

disordered speakers; more recently CA has been used to investigate data obtained from speakers with communication disorders.

The methodological approach to CA is summarized in the following four principles (Wilkinson, 1999):

1) *Analysis is participant-driven.* The data should be approached with as few preconceptions as possible. This contrasts with the more common 'analyst-driven' approach, when analysts approach the data with hypotheses about what the relevant investigative issues will be. The participants themselves provide evidence of their own interpretations of each other's talk through subsequent turns in conversation.

2) *Assumption that conversation is orderly.* All aspects of talk-in-interaction exhibit patterns of structurally organised turns. Turns require at least two participants; therefore the focus of CA is on the contributions made by all participants, not just on an individual.

3) *Importance of sequential context.* The type of turn produced by a participant is produced in response to, and shaped by, the previous utterance. This analytic concept has been termed the adjacency principle and shows how sequential turns can be anticipated and fulfilled in conversation.

4) *Wariness of quantification.* Analysts should display caution in analysing conversation phenomena out of their sequential context. Therefore quantitative analysis should be viewed in conjunction with analysis within sequential context.

Whilst it is important not to violate the assumption that analysis is participant-driven, analysis often begins with a systematic study of the construction of turns, pauses,

overlaps and distortions in turn-taking, then continues with looking for sequences, and culminates with noting any phenomena of repair.

Turn Construction

Talk is a collaborative and interactive process with participants switching between the talker and listener role to exchange messages on a real-time basis. This idea of exchanging messages between participants has been termed turn taking or turn construction. Turns are constructed out of four different sized unit of talk (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). These are referred to as 'turn-constructional units' (TCU), and these different sized units can all be constitute possibly completed turns, upon which completion, transition to the next speaker becomes relevant; in other words, a 'transition-relevent place' (TRP). It is important to note that turns are constructed one unit at a time so each unit is followed by a TRP at which the current turn may end (Nofsinger, 1991). The organisation of the TCU is referred to as 'grammar' which inhabits articulated talk-in-interaction rather than prototype sentences (Schegloff, 1996). The smallest TCU is constructed of a single lexical item (uh-huh can be considered a completed turn at talk). Other turns are constructed with a phrase that does not constitute a sentence, others are constructed with a clause that contains the necessary components to be classed a sentence but is not a stand-alone sentence, and finally other turns are constructed with a full sentence (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). One important feature of turn construction and the TCUs is that, from the beginning, they project aspects of their planned shape and type. This projection of the turn-type or turn-shape at turn-beginnings is critical for the organisation of turn-taking in conversation (Schegloff, 1987). Turn-beginnings are often where speakers will repeat or recyle part of their utterance. Whilst the recycling

of turn-beginnings is not uncommon in non-aphasic conversation (Schegloff, 1987) there is sparse literature on the abandoning of turn-beginnings in the field of aphasia or, it would appear, the field of CA and non-aphasic conversations.

Overlaps are simultaneous talk that arises from the normal operation of the conversational turn system (Nofsinger, 1991). Overlaps occur when more than one person talks at once in a conversation and is managed by participants in conversation by a set of practices that compose the overlap resolution device. These set of practices are a component of turn-taking organisation (Schegloff, 2000). Overlap can be a tactic for dominating a conversation or conversely for showing support for a speaker. Furthermore, there are some aspects of turn construction that provide resources for conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker, such as word searches and silences (Lerner, 1996).

Repair

Repair is the general technical term that is used to describe the process of fixing conversational problems, or in some cases non-problems, for example revising talk that appears to have no noticeable errors (Nofsinger 1991). The existence of repair mechanisms were described as being part of a model for the organisation of turn taking, in order to deal with turn-taking errors and violations (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). Therefore turn-taking and repair are integrally related.

Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks (1977) have distinguished between who initiates the repair, and drew a second distinction between who produces the actual repair. Self-initiation of repair is produced by the speaker of the trouble source, and other-

initiation of repair is produced by someone else other than the speaker of the trouble source. Therefore, self-initiated self-repair refers to a speaker of a trouble source initiating, and completing, repair on their own trouble source. Self-initiated other-repair refers to the speaker of the trouble source initiating repair, upon which another speaker contributes to resolve the trouble source. Conversely, other-initiated repair refers to one speaker marking a trouble source of another speaker as troublesome. Self-initiation and other-initiation of repair are distinct types but are not alternatives to each other. They deal with the same trouble types and are related, and this relatedness is organised. This organisation of repair in conversation favours self-initiated self-repair (Schegloff et al, 1977).

Furthermore, repairs are often completed within the turn in which the trouble-source occurred, and self-initiated same turn repairs are the most common form of repair (Schegloff, 1979). Whilst self-initiated repairs commonly occur within the same turn they were initiated, other-initiated repairs may be accomplished in multiple turns. As speakers' talk moves away from the problematic turn, it becomes increasingly difficult to design an effective repair (Nofsinger, 1991). Repair sequences have the potential to take over as the 'interactional business' of the normal interactional activity (Jefferson, 1987). Whilst repair is usually completed quickly and efficiently so that the resumption of the TCU can occur, repair can be an event that threatens face (Couper-Kuhlen, 1992).

As was mentioned earlier, turn-beginnings project the turn-type or turn-shape and the current turn projects some range of possibilities for the next turn (the sequential implicativeness of a turn). Turn beginnings are sequence-structurally important places

in conversation (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974), and as such are subject to multiple sources of overlap and vulnerable to trouble. Moreover, turn-beginnings in topic-initial turns very often have self-repair in them (Schegloff, 1979). The occurrence of repair can change the shape and composition of that sentence, and can have consequences for the sequential implicativeness of current or next turn (Schegloff, 1979). For example, an activity such as searching for a word can become a visible event (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986), which is self-initiated but leads to collaboration in order to resolve the trouble source. Therefore the form of the sentence in which the word search began, and the subsequent turns, have been affected by the occurrence of repair.

Conversation Analysis and Aphasia

The need for assessment of pragmatic communicative capacities in aphasia has been recognised (e.g. Davis & Wilcox, 1985) in order to identify contextual impairments that may require therapeutic intervention. However, there has historically been an absence of procedures using spontaneous speech as an analytical tool in aphasia both in the clinical and research setting (Sarno, 1980). Some researchers (e.g. Wilkinson, 1999) have suggested that analysing spontaneous talk poses unique difficulties due to random and ambiguous nature of naturally occurring talk. These difficulties increase with the presence of aphasia. Furthermore, it has been suggested that conversational procedures have poor reliability (Manochiopinig, Sheard and Reed, 1992).

To this effect, an investigation of the reliability of CA as an assessment tool was undertaken (Perkins, Crisp & Walshaw, 1999). This study compared quantitative and qualitative analyses of collaborative repair in dyadic conversations between eight

different people with aphasia and their relatives, recorded on four different occasions. Their findings included support for qualitative analysis of conversations as a tool for showing change over time and explaining the nature of change, and indicated reliability in this methodology.

Another study that supports CA as a tool for describing the nature of conversational potential and change in an individual with aphasia was by Goodwin (1995). This study details how a man with severe non-fluent aphasia at 13 years post-onset was able to sustain conversational competence through collaboration with co-participants, revealed through the use of CA. Wilkinson (1999) adds support to this argument by highlighting the possible advantage of the CA procedure to uncover patterns in aphasic talk which indicate the methods used and problems encountered by the participants of these conversations.

In recent times, aphasic literature has included many studies where CA has been applied to aphasic data, with greater emphasis on the collaborative nature of conversational interactions (Damico, Oelschlaeger & Simmons-Mackie, 1999; Simmons-Mackie & Kagan, 1999; Wilkinson, 1999; Beeke, Wilkinson & Maxim, 2001; Schegloff, 2003; Wilkinson, Beeke & Maxim, 2003). Furthermore, there has been many single case studies that have applied CA methodology to investigate how individuals or how one aphasic conversational dyad constructs turns at talk (Wilkinson *et al*, 1998; Booth & Perkins, 1999; Beeke, 2003; Beeke, Wilkinson & Maxim, 2003a; Beeke, Wilkinson & Maxim, 2003b).

Furthermore, the Booth and Perkins (1999) study was a single case study which employed CA methodology to look at change in the conversations of one aphasic

dyad, comparing pre-intervention and post-intervention, to evaluate the outcome of a therapeutic programme. This study illustrated the effective use of CA to inform therapy and to address specific issues for an individual with aphasia and their main conversational partners.

Another study that has used CA methodology to compare data across time is by Lock, Wilkinson and Bryan (2001). This study described how a period of couples-based intervention benefited both the partners and the people with aphasia, and highlighted the positive effects of working with partners as a therapy programme.

Whilst CA methodology has been applied to singe case studies, and has been used to show change across time, there are no studies in aphasia literature that have employed CA methodology to investigate how the conversational and interactional behaviours of aphasic couples change over time due to spontaneous recovery. There have been previous studies that have investigated change in chronic patients in relation to spontaneous recovery (e.g. Penn, 1987), but none that has specifically used CA as an investigative tool to highlight change attributable to spontaneous recovery. This present study aims to contribute to addressing this gap in the literature.

Aphasia and Repair

Repair has been extensively investigated both in aphasic and non-aphasic conversation. Repair organisation is a particularly salient device within aphasic interaction, as the very nature of aphasia has the potential to produce a variety of trouble sources that may impact on the progressivity of a conversation (Perkins, 2003). Within the field of aphasia, the focus of research has been on whether the repair mechanism in aphasia talk works to avoid frequent, sustained or irretrievable

communicative breakdowns, and how participants collaborate to manage repair in conversation (Lesser & Milroy, 1993). Previous studies have investigated repair in relation to the type of aphasia, fluent or non-fluent.

One such study is described by Laakso (1997). This study specifically looked at self-initiated repair in fluent aphasia. CA methodology was applied to 16 conversational dyads in order to investigate the extent fluent aphasics self-initiate repair after producing word forms, how self-initiated repair proceeds in the trouble-source turn and the interaction with conversational partners during self-initiated repair sequences. Another study (Wilkinson, 1995) used a single case analysis to gain insight into the impact of trouble source and repair in the interaction between an individual with non-fluent aphasia and his therapist.

Other studies have specifically looked at how participants collaborate to manage repair using the 'hint and guess' sequence (Lubinski, Duchan & Weitzner-Lin, 1980; Laasko & Klippi, 1999). These studies describe how the individual with aphasia will deal with aphasic problems, such as a word search or self-repairing a paraphasic error (the latter is particularly relevant to individuals with fluent aphasia), by providing a hint towards the target within their turn, which is followed by a guess by the co-participant in the following turn. This pattern continues over subsequent turns until the target is agreed.

However, there are few studies reported in the literature that specifically look at how repair is collaboratively managed with a single conversational dyad with aphasia, and how this management of repair changes over time as a result of spontaneous recovery.

One such study that goes part way to filling this gap in the literature is described by Wilkinson, Gower, Beeke & Maxim (in press). This study looked at changes in the turn-constructional methods employed by a man with an anomic-type fluent aphasia across time. By using CA to compare conversations at different time periods post-CVA, the study revealed qualitative differences in the way the aphasic speaker adapted his limited linguistic resources to the demands of the conversation in order to lessen the visibility of his impairment and reduce his identity as 'different'.

Another study (Gower, 2004) that is linked to the previously mentioned research, looked specifically at the changing repair mechanisms within the conversations of one aphasic couple at two points in time within the period of spontaneous recovery. This study found qualitative differences in the patterns of repair employed by the couple. The present study therefore aims to extend the work of Gower (2004) by applying CA methodology to investigate changing repair patterns in the conversation of one aphasic couple during the period of spontaneous recovery.

Methodology

This project is part of a wider ESRC-funded study entitled 'Long Term Adaptation to Conversation by People with Aphasia and their Partners' (ESRC R000239306). This wider study aimed to investigate the process of adaptation to conversation by seven couples living with aphasia, using data collected at seven regular intervals post-CVA; 3 months, 4.5 months, 6 months, 12 months, 18 months, 24 months and 30 months. This present project used conversational data collected from one of these couples at 4.5 months and 18 months post-CVA.

Subjects

The subjects in this present study were volunteers for the ESRC R000239306 study, who were recruited from the speech and language therapy (SLT) caseloads from hospitals within NHS trusts that have links to the Department of Human Communication Science at University College London.

Selection Criteria

The ESRC R000239306 study asked SLTs to refer clients who:

- Have had a single CVA within the previous three months and have no history of brain injury
- Have been judged stable enough by their medical staff to return home
- Have no previous history of speech and language problems
- Have no hearing loss which would significantly affect participation in conversation

- Have no history of cognitive disorders or mental illness
- Be monolingual English speakers
- Have a partner who they live with and who is willing to be involved in the data collection.

Couple Profile

Keith and Annie[1] were randomly selected to partake in this present study from the seven couples living with aphasia that met the selection criteria for the ERSC R000239306 study. Keith was 69 years old at the start of the data collection. He was previously employed as the managing director of a clinical waste disposal company. He suffered a left CVA 3.5 months prior and was classified as presenting with Wernicke's aphasia on the Western Aphasia Battery (Kertesz, 1992). There were meant to be seven data sets but unfortunately Keith died after the fifth data set collected at 18 months post-CVA. Annie, his wife, is his main everyday conversational partner.

Data Collection

Conversation analysis is the systematic analysis of talk-in-interaction, and as such requires access to the recordings of the talk produced in everyday situations (Hutchby and Woofit, 1998). For this present study, video recordings were used instead of audio recordings as, whilst conversation analysis was originally developed on the basis of audio recordings only, the use of video is advisable as it provides a wealth of contextual information (ten Have, 1999). Keith and Annie were familiarised with the video equipment and provided with written operating instructions by a researcher

from the wider ESRC project. They were instructed to record two typical conversations of approximately twenty minutes at home over a period of a week. In order to minimize the effects of the Observer's Paradox (Labov, 1970) and to obtain samples of naturalistic talk, Keith and Annie were encouraged to identify a regular time when they sit down together to chat, and asked to independently record the type of conversation they would normally have. All recordings for this present project were undertaken in their living room with Keith and Annie sat in armchairs. A total of 43 minutes and 30 seconds was collected at 4.5 months post-onset, and 19 minutes and 40 seconds at 18 months post-onset.

Whilst the recordings serve as the 'focal data' (ten Have, 1999), additional data was gathered in the form of interviews with Keith and Annie at each data collection interval. Keith's language function was assessed using the 'Western Aphasia Battery' (Kertesz, 1982) at the first data collection, and the 'Pyramids and Palm Trees Test' (Howard and Patterson, 1992) and subtests 47 and 53 from the 'Psycholinguistic Assessment of Language Processing in Aphasia' (Kay, Lesser and Coltheart, 1992) at each data collection.[2]

Transcription

It was decided to begin the data transcription at a topic initiation after approximately ten minutes of talk. This was to ensure that Keith and Annie had time to become accustomed to talking whilst the video was recording them. For this present project it

[1] All names and places have been changed to ensure confidentiality.
[2] For a summary of the results of formal language tests see appendix 1

was decided to transcribe a sample of a piece of continuous talk that represents normal interaction of roughly ten minutes duration. [3]

A total of 10 minutes 40 seconds was transcribed from the recordings made at 4.5months post-onset (hereafter Data Set 1). It begins at 8 minutes 37 seconds into the recording. A total of 11 minutes 54 seconds was transcribed from the recordings made at 18 months post-onset (hereafter Data Set 2). It begins 6 minutes and 30 seconds into the recording. Whilst comparing two data sets that differ in length is not ideal, it was felt that both data sets yielded examples that were representative of this couple's talk.

The two data sets were transcribed using the Jeffersonian Conversation Analysis Conventions[4] and Standard English orthography to capture verbal and non-verbal talk-in-interaction. The exception to this is when a broad phonetic transcription was employed to capture features of aphasic talk, such as neologisms and jargon.

[3] For full versions of the transcriptions see Appendices 3-4

Preliminary Analysis

One of the most distinctive features of CA methodology is that exemplars are used as the basis on which a generalizable description is built, as opposed to starting with a hypothesis to be tested using a large collection of data (Hutchby and Woofit, 1998). The process of analysing the data for this present project began with looking at the conversations in an unmotivated way (Sacks, 1984) in order to see what patterns emerge, and to see how these patterns compare over the two conversations.

A comparison of the results of the formal language tests at 4.5 months and 18 months post-CVA revealed some improvement in Keith's linguistic ability, although his performance on the spoken picture-naming test was better at 4.5 months. This overall improvement in his linguistic skills was to be expected as Keith was still in a period of spontaneous recovery. Therefore it was hypothesized that changes in his linguistic skills would impact on his conversational methods that would lead to qualitative differences between the conversations over time.

One interesting phenomena to emerge from preliminary analysis of the data were patterns of self-initiated other repair in data set 1. This is interesting as there are no patterns of this type of repair in data set 2. Conversely, preliminary analysis revealed no patterns of other-initiated repair in data set 1 whilst examples of this type of repair were noted in data set 2. Another notable feature of Keith's talk was a qualitative difference in his use of self-initiated repair formats. In data set 1 Keith uses re-doing

[4] For transcription symbols please see appendix 2

or replacing as a reparative method whereas in Data set 2 we see Keith projecting more to come within an utterance and then abandoning it altogether and starting again. In order to test the hypothesis that there will be differences between the two conversations over time, a thorough analysis of the differences in the types of repair patterns used by Keith and Annie was made.

Analysis

Comparison of the two data sets revealed that the conversation at eighteen months post onset differed from the earlier conversation. One way in which these differences were shown was in the patterns of repair between Keith and Annie. There are marked differences between the two data sets with respect to patterns self-initiated other-repair (hereafter SIOR) and other-initiated repair (hereafter OI repair), namely that there are three occurrences of SIOR in the first data set and none in the second data set. Conversely, there are no examples of OI repair in the first data set compared to 3 examples of OI repair in the second data set. There is also a qualitative difference in the way Keith makes use of a certain type of self-initiated repair, namely abandoning troubled TCUs. These findings were anticipated as anticipated as change in Keith's turn-constructional methods were to be expected during the period of spontaneous recovery (Wilkinson, Gower, Beeke & Maxim, in press; Gower, 2004).

Analysis of conversation at 4.5 months post-CVA

This section will first discuss three extracts from data set 1, which illustrate examples of SIOR. These extracts demonstrate how Keith initiates repair on particular sources of trouble, namely on the appearance of word-finding difficulties and on aphasic word forms. These examples highlight a difference compared to data set 2, where Keith does not initiate repair on similar trouble sources. Instead, he deals with sources of trouble within his turn using a specific form of self-initiated repair.

Other studies (e.g. Laakso, 1997; Laakso & Klippi, 1999) have noted that word-finding difficulties are almost universally a particular source of trouble experienced by individuals with aphasia, and consequently lead to reparative sequences in the

form of word-searches. Word-searches are characterized by pauses, non-lexical speech perturbations, repetitions or sound stretches, or can be made explicit through metalinguistic comments (Schegloff, 1979). In both aphasic and non-aphasic conversation, word searches are visible events that often initiate a sequence of collaborative repair between co-participants. These conversational event are usually referred to as self-initiated other repair in non-aphasic literature on conversation analysis (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977). This phenomena has been traditionally referred in aphasic literature as the 'hint and guess' sequence (Lubinski, Duchan and Weitzner-Lin, 1980; Laakso & Klippi, 1999). An example of a 'hint and guess' sequence initiated by Keith is shown in example 1, where he is talking about a recent bout of ill health:

Example 1:

	01	A	ye see ye <u>don</u>'t know whether you, you, (.) got
	02		a (.) <u>bug</u> or something.
	03	K	w- i dunno what it was.=i was <u>ter</u>rible though.
➔	04		(1.1) all that <u>ti</u>me until, (1.0) until i went: to,
➔	05		about, (0.8) n i went to er: about two o'clock. <u>no</u>,
➔	06	A	>that was about< (0.8) half past <u>three</u> when you
	07		went to sleep.
➔	08	K	Yeah: ⌈but, er,⌉
➔	09	A	⌊then ⌋ you slept solidly after⌈wards⌉
	10	K	⌊thats ⌋ right

Keith initiates a word search in line 04, initially characterized by a pause longer than one second. It has been suggested that there is an interactional 'metric' of approximately a one second pause, for which there is a 'standard maximum tolerance' (Jefferson, 1989). Therefore this pause could be considered to be a lengthy pause that signifies the initiation of a word-search by Keith, although it is only slightly longer than one second in duration. This initial pause is followed by subsequent pauses and the non-lexical speech pertubation 'er' in line 05 and the recycling of part of his utterance (Schegloff, 1987). These word search behaviours are followed by an explicit metalinguistic comment by Keith on his attempts at finding the target word in line 05 ('no.') The falling intonation indicates the end of the TCU and of his turn. Annie then provides a resolution to the search (line 06 'half past three').

The repair here is an example of SIOR. Annie is showing an awareness of the preference for self-initiated repair (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977) by not showing any lexical signs of trying to enter Keith's turn space until invited by the metalinguistic comment 'no' by Keith. Keith has provided a hint for the target word, and Annie is able to guess correctly in the next turn. Therefore this word search was treated collaboratively and resolved within the next turn, which differs from suggestions in the literature that the resolution of word finding problems in aphasic conversation is commonly extended over several speaking turns (Lesser & Milroy, 1993; Laakso & Klippi, 1999).

A second example of SIOR in data set 1 occurs when Keith produces an aphasic word form that is typical feature of fluent aphasia; a paraphasia:

Example 2:

	01	A	well⌈°that's good°⌉
	02	K	⌊i felt ⌋better already. an then i
	03		got <u>round,</u> an i got <u>round</u>, and, (.) had a new,
➔	04		(0.9) I come⌈an had a ⌉/ΣA:ϕ/,
➔	05	A	⌊I think?- ⌋
➔	06	K	a <u>new</u> /<u>ΣA:ϕ</u>/, was this word?
	07	A	a shower.
➔	08	K	shower? an I got all <u>that</u>, i had all <u>that</u>, an got all
	09		<u>there</u> an >put it <u>there</u> an i felt< <u>pretty</u> <u>good</u>.

This is another example of SIOR. Again, in this example, we see Keith producing a metalinguistic comment after a trouble source, which is a direct appeal to Annie for help to resolve the repair initiated by him (Line 09 'was this word?'). Interestingly, Annie comes into Keith's turn space at line 04, before the production of the paraphasia. This could be in response to the pause of almost one second attributable to Keith that precedes Annie's overlap in line 04, or could be due to the reduced amount of content in Keith's turn. However, Annie again acknowledges the preference for self-repair as she abruptly ends her turn in line 05 whilst Keith attempts to produce the target word in lines 04 and 06.

In the two examples previously mentioned, Annie offers a candidate resolution not with rising intonation in the form of a guess, but with falling intonation. The falling intonation employed by Annie does not allow Keith to accept or reject the resolution offered by her. It could be suggested that this inhibits Keith from performing the

preferential action of self-repair. In both examples, Keith responds to the resolution proffered by Annie with a contradiction (Example 1, line 08; Example 2, line 08). Annie comes into Keith's turn space in line 09 (Example 1), possibly because she thinks he has finished his turn with an acceptance of her resolution to the impairment (Line 08, 'yeah, but er,'). However, this entry into his turn space brings about the end to the reparative sequence. It could be suggested that, without this overlap by Annie, the repair sequence may have been lengthy and over many turns, which has been argued commonly occurs within aphasic conversation (Lesser & Milroy, 1993; Laakso & Klippi, 1999).

Oelschlaeger and Damico (2000) suggest that words offered by a co-participant in a declarative rather than a question format serves to complete the turn of the aphasic speaker and as such, assumes speakership. This is because, unlike the rising intonation of a guess, the declarative does not select the next speaker. In example 1 we see that this is indeed the case; Annie offered a resolution to the word search with a falling intonation, and then carried on with a subsequent turn that overlapped with Keith's prior turn. However, in example 2, Annie again offers a word in a declarative format, but does not continue speaking.

The next extract is another example of SIOR, which is a lengthy 'hint and guess' sequence:

Example 3:

	01	K	(6 syllables). there's two little
➔	02		/kA:?/- what's it called? (1.5) where you put all

	03		the things there.
➔	04	A	(1.0) where in the, (1.3)
	05	K	>in in< the things you bought yesterday
➔	06	A	(1.0) oh that ball thing.
	07	K	i don't know i⌈thought you'd- ⌉
	08	A	⌊its GONE AGAIN!⌋
	09	K	no i thought you told me, (.) me you gave me
➔	10		some erm (.) /ΩΘκσ≅μ/, >what is it you put in
	11		there?<
➔	12	A	(1.6) what on that f- food thing.
	13	K	no here! that you grew.(.)you mean some one here
	14		an some on here.
➔	15	A	oh I don't know what- (.) °what° (.)
	16		I have⌈n't got⌉
	17	K	⌊we ⌋yesterday.
➔	18	A	the sweet pea⌈s, (.) °ya⌉mean.°
	19	K	⌊yeah! ⌋
	20	A	ye⌈s. ⌉
	21	K	⌊yeah!⌋(.) where are they going.

In this example, Keith again makes an explicit metalinguistic comment regarding his production of an aphasic word form (line 02, 'what's it called?'). This word form may be an example of a neologism, but it is difficult to make this assumption in the absence of contextual information. In all three examples mentioned so far, Keith has shown awareness of his errors and word-finding problem by commenting on the

trouble-source or by directly appealing to Annie to provide resolution to the repair he has initiated. This concurs with the findings of Laakso (1997) that speakers with fluent aphasia are not as deficient in self-monitoring skills as previously thought.

After Keith has produced the error and metalinguistically commented on it, there is a pause of 1.5 seconds. This pause has been attributed to Keith, but it may be more appropriately placed on a separate line. The pause could signify an initiation of a word search, as discussed previously in relation to the standard maximum silence of once second (Jefferson, 1989). Alternatively, this pause could provide a TRP for Annie to commence her turn and respond to Keith's self-initiation of repair (Nofsinger, 1991).

Annie's first response to Keith's hint is to begin to ask a clarifying question (Line 04). This strategy, combined with the many pauses within Annie's turns, suggest that she is unsure of the target but is recognising that Keith requires collaborative input into the repair sequence. That Annie does not explicitly draw attention to her inability to understand the hints provided by Keith could be evidence for her displaying awareness of repair as a potential threat to face (Couper-Kuhlen, 1992). Annie mirrors Keith's use of the general meaning noun 'thing' (Lines 06, 12) which again could be a strategy employed by Annie to show equality in the repair sequence and to prevent Keith losing face.

Keith produces another aphasic word form, a neologism, in line 10. He shows recognition of his error in the subsequent TCU by asking Annie for clarification ('what is it you put in there?'). Interestingly, Annie does not respond to Keith's

production of a neologism with an attempt at the target word. Keith rejects Annie's attempts at guesses to resolve the word search, which prompts Annie to continue to participate in his search with an alternative guess strategy (Oeschlaeger & Damico, 2000). It could be suggested that Annie is attempting to terminate the word search before it is resolved in line 15 ('oh I don't know what-') with an utterance designed to reveal her inability to understand Keith's hints. A closing strategy is often used when several guesses have been rejected, and can be a method of moving the conversation forward (Oeschlaeger & Damico, 2000). However, Keith's next turn shows that he rejects her attempt to close the repair sequence by coming into her turn space and offering a further hint. This last hint is followed by a guess in the next turn, in the form of a question rather than a declarative, which is accepted by Keith (line 18).

These examples have shown that at this stage of recovery, there is a strong pattern of Keith self-initiating repair on his errors through the use of metalinguistic comments, which invite Annie to collaborate in, and ultimately resolve the repair sequence. Whilst there are three clear examples of this pattern of SIOR, there are no examples of OI repair. There are examples in data set 1 where Keith has produced an error and neither he nor Annie initiate repair. For example:

Example 4:

	01	K	=it does. (little that,) (.) but it's a bit /∝Σ≅/ its a bit
➔	02		/∝Σ≅/ <u>ve</u>ry /ΣA:d/. (.) for <u>us</u>.=
	03	A	=°yeah.°
	04		(1.0)

Keith produces a paraphasia in Line 02. Whilst it is not unusual for speakers with fluent aphasia to not initiate repair on trouble sources, indeed, it has been suggested that fluent aphasic speakers only initiate repair on about one third of their aphasic word forms (Laakso, 1997), it is noticeable that Annie does not initiate repair on this or any other error or trouble source in data set 1. Perkins (2003) argues that, where there are an above average number of trouble sources due to the presence of aphasia, one option for the co-participant is to allow them to pass in order to avoid potentially face-threatening repair work. However, the absence of collaborative work on his contributions can limit the ability of the aphasic speaker to contribute to the conversation.

By comparing the SIOR sequences from data set 1 with the repair sequences in data set 2, it is possible to see that there is a stark difference in the patterns of repair across the two data sets. In data set 2, there are three clear examples of OI repair from Annie, whilst there are no examples of SIOR. However, there are three examples of Keith abandoning an utterance that had initially projected more to come, when he encounters a word-finding difficulty. This abandoning of an utterance that contains a trouble source is a form of self-initiated, same-turn repair (Schegloff, 1979, which is the most common form of repair in non-aphasic conversation.

Analysis of conversation at 18 months post-CVA

In this section three examples of OI repair from data set 2 will be discussed and compared with the patterns of repair noted in data set 1. As discussed in the introduction, self-repair predominates over other-repair. Other-repair overwhelmingly produces self-corrections in non-aphasic conversation (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks,

1977). In the three examples of OI repair, we see that this type of repair pattern can lead to lengthy and complex repair sequences, which do not always yield self-repair from Keith.

As was discussed in the analysis of data set 1, co-participants in aphasic conversations have the option to not initiate repair work, to not address misunderstandings or failures of understandings (Perkins, 2003). It was argued that this was a strategy that Annie was employing in data set 1, as there were no examples of OI repair. In example 5, we see Annie initiating repair on a failure of understanding:

Example 5:

```
    01  K   b BACK to ordinary. ordinary things          new topic
➔   02      th er er as:: we are, (.) er going
➔   03      i er: i erm, (2.2) its ju that, (.)
    04      there's nothing, (1.0)s um i think
    05      im having too too too much.
    06      (1.8)
➔   07  A   too much what.
    08  K   e in his er::, (.) i think he's e oh
➔   09      START again. (1.0) he came along there
    10      an se h how's you erm, (.) er are you
    11      ⌈going (1.6) BETTER.    ⌉
    12      ⌊((holds hand out flat))⌋
➔   13  A   who is this talking.
    14      (1.4)
    15  K   his. ye- this morning!
    16  A   y'mean, (.)edith. the nurse.
```

The extract begins with Keith beginning a new topic in the topic-shift position (Schegloff, 1979). These classes of sentences often have self-repair in them. We see in this extract that Keith's initial turn is comprised of word-finding behaviours (lines 2, 3), characterised by pauses, non-lexical forms (e.g. 'er', 'erm') and stretches of the pronunciation of sounds (e.g. 'as::::'). As suggested by Schegloff (1979), Keith's first sentence in this topic-shift position does contain a form of self-repair, namely the abandoning of utterances. This will be discussed in greater detail later in this section.

Whilst the first sentence in a topic-shift position often contains self-initiated repair, the next-turn commonly involves the initiation of repair by another speaker (Schegloff, 1979). After a long pause of 1.8 seconds, Annie initiates repair by asking a question (line 07, 'too much what'). This initiation of repair by Annie is in stark contrast to the repair patterns described in the analysis of data set 1. The other-initiated repair is followed by an attempt by Keith to respond to the initiation of repair by clarifying his meaning, which leads to him making metalinguistic comment on his word-finding behaviours (line 09, 'start again'). Keith's uses this method of using expressions that make the word search explicit in both data sets. In this example, this metalinguistic phrase is also a form of self-initiated repair.

Following Keith's second attempt at making his meaning clear to Annie, she responds in Line 13 by initiating repair rather than offering a guess. This is interesting in comparison with repair sequences in data set 1, where we saw Annie responding to Keith's hint with a word search strategy, such as a guess, alternative guess, completion or closing strategy (Oeschlaeger & Damico, 2000).

If we compare example 5 with the next example, we see that sentences in the topic-shift position continue to yield trouble-sources and opportunities for self and other repair:

Example 6:

```
    01  K   thats fair enough that perfectly
    02      good. (1.0) ri::ght. (1.6) OH! in          new topic
    03      the in the:: er, (.) yesterday.
    04      when we went to the lun the er, (.) th
    05      the other day, (2.0) an we went to the
    06      to the er, (2.7) the various th erm,
➔   07  A   >wh well erm< are we talking about
➔   08      welsh (2 syllables)?(.) or meeting? or
    09      (2 syllables).
    10  K   YES! today
    11  A   today.=
    12  K   = we went in there,
    13  A   yes.
    14  K   an you said ⌈OH LOOK!     ⌉ (1.0) she've
    15                 ⌊((pointing))⌋
    16      b she's erm, (.) they've got erm,
    17      he's on- he's, (.) wh wh wh grown up
    18      there now that=
➔   19  A   = those beans?
➔   20      (1.0)
➔   21  A   no. ⌈°what⌉ are you ⌈talking⌉ about.°
    22  K       ⌊no! ⌋         ⌊today. ⌋
    23      we went along there. ↓/ρρρ:::::/ went
    24      into the, (.) to the nur::se,
```

```
25  A     yes,
26  K     an while we're coming back we said
27        look at look at that er, (.)in there t
28        erm place.before, (.) er being,(.)
29        (claringed).
30  A     cl cleaned?
31  K     exactly!=
32  A     = oh yes! the (sani[t's)], (.) garage.
33  K                         [ wh ]
34  A     well  tennant motors isnt it.
```

This example of an OI repair sequence is longer and more complex than example 5. This could be because, whereas in example 5 Annie does not attempt a guess at the target in order to resolve the repair, in example 6 Annie's initial repair initiation is immediately followed by a guess, a pause and alternative guess (Lines 7, 8). Repair is organised to prefer quick resolution in order to minimise disruption to the current interactional business. As aphasic trouble sources are often not resolved quickly, the participants in aphasic conversation must collaborate to complete repair as quickly as possible whilst taking the linguistic abilities of the aphasic speaker into account (Perkins, 2003). It could be tentatively suggested that the example of collaborative repair seen in example 5 was negotiated more successfully, via the use of clarification questions, to achieve a quicker resolution compared to example 6.

There is a second instance of other-initiated repair in lines 19 and 21. In line 19 Annie offers a guess with rising intonation, which invites Keith to speak in the next turn in order to accept or reject it. The TRP is marked by a pause on line 20, which is followed by Annie taking the next turn to initiate repair. Keith continues to offer hints

which leads to alternative guesses by Annie, until a guess is expected as the target (line 31). Therefore, in this example, Annie is using a combination of collaborative word search strategies, such as guess and alternative guess, and initiating repair in order to deal with Keith's word-finding difficulties. However, Keith is not a passive participant in this repair sequence. Again, we see Keith employing a form of self-initiated repair within the first sentence in the topic-shift position, namely the explicit abandoning of utterances that include a trouble-source.

The final example of OI repair occurs within the previous example:

Example 7:

```
   01   A     yes,
   02   K     an while we're coming back we said
   03         look at look at that er, (.)in there t
   04         erm place.before, (.) er being,(.)
   05         (claringed).
➔  06   A     cl cleaned?
   07   K     exactly!=
```

This extract shows the only example of other-initiated, other-repair to occur in either data set. Annie initiates repair on the paraphasia produced by Keith by offering a guess to the target form, which Keith accepts in the next turn (line 06). Whilst it is difficult to draw conclusions from only one example, it is interesting to note that Annie does not initiate repair on any of the paraphasia or neologisms produced by Keith in data set 1. Indeed, there were quantitatively more aphasic word forms produced in data set 1 compared to data set 2, which could have been expected to yield a greater frequency of other-initiated repair (Please refer to Appendices 3-4 for

the full transcripts of both data sets). Other-initiated repair is dispreferred in next turn, as there is a preference for keeping the next turn free. One method for adhering to this preference of conversation is by the self-initiation of repair by the speaker of the trouble-source in the current turn (Schegloff, 1979). Keith's instances of self-initiated same-turn repair will now be discussed in relation to examples from data set 1.

As mentioned in the discussion of examples 5 and 6, Keith employs a specific form of self-initiated same-turn repair when word-finding difficulties occur. This form of self-initiated repair will be referred to as abandoning in this present study. Abandoning involves the abandonment of the first, and possibly subsequent, word search and the initiation of an alternative TCU by the speaker of the trouble-source. Abandonings are often ordered as a series of abandoned word searches and the re-starting of new utterances. The following examples have been taken from data set 2 to show how this pattern exists within Keith and Annie's repair sequences. There are no examples of abandoning of utterances and re-starting of new ones in data set 1. The first example is a clear illustration of this phenomena:

Example 8:

```
   01   K     b BACK to ordinary. ordinary things          new topic
   02         th er er as:: we are, (.) er going
➔  03         i er: i erm, (2.2) its ju that, (.)
➔  04         there's nothing, (1.0)s um i think
   05         im having too too too much.
```

As was mentioned in an earlier discussion of this example, Keith's first sentences at the topic-shift position indicate word-finding difficulties, as is evident from the

pauses, non-lexical forms (e.g. 'er', 'erm') and stretches of the pronunciation of sounds (e.g. 'as::::'). Keith demonstrates an awareness of his word-finding difficulties via the abandoning of the TCU at line 03. After a long pause of 2.2 seconds, Keith starts again with a completely different utterance. This new utterance does not contain any of the same vocabulary as the previous utterance and is semantically different ('its ju that'). Keith then abandons this second word search in line 04 and repeats the same patter, namely starting a completely new sentence after abandoning the previous sentence and then pausing.

Another clear example of abandoning occurs in the next example:

Example 9:

```
01    K     = well >we can well we can< well SEE
02          what he comes up. (1.0) an h he got
```

Turn beginnings are an important initial resource for the projection of the turn-shape or turn-type (Schegloff, 1987). We can see in this example that Keith is projecting the shape of the initial turn from his turn-beginning. He then recycles the turn-beginning, before abandoning the utterance completely and starting again. Whilst the recycling of turn-beginnings is not uncommon in non-aphasic conversation (Schegloff, 1987) there is sparse literature on the abandoning of turn-beginnings in the field of aphasia or, it would appear, the field of CA and non-aphasic conversations.

The final example from data set 2 lends support to the robustness of this pattern of self-initiated same-turn repair occurring as a turn constructional method employed by Keith:

Example 10:

```
   01   K                                  [ well. thats ]
➔  02          how erm, as soon as he says, (.) lets
   03          see, (.)what you want
```

Turn-beginnings are vulnerable to impairment by overlap, and are often the site of identical repeats to deal with the overlap before carrying on with the projection turn-shape or turn-type (Schegloff, 1987). However, whilst this example does indeed contain an overlap at the beginning of Keith's turn, he opts to abandon the TCU rather than repeat it a carry on with the projected turn. We can see in line 02 that he was projecting more to come within the turn but then abandons it after 'erm'. Therefore, it could be suggested that the overlap initiated a trouble-source, which Keith repaired by abandoning and starting again. In both the example 9 and example 10, Keith was able to re-organise his turn within the same turn, which avoids a SIOR or OI repair sequence over multiple turns. He is able to maintain the interactional business of his turn.

These examples of abandoning by Keith have shown there is a pattern of self-initiated, same-turn repair employed by him in data set 2. In addition, the examples of OI repair contrast with the absence of OI repair in data set 1.

Summary and Discussion

This project, as part of a wider ESRC-funded study entitled 'Long Term Adaptation to Conversation by People with Aphasia and their Partners' (ESRC R000239306), has used conversational data collected from one of the couples participating in the wider project study (Keith and Annie) to investigate how patterns of repair within their conversations change over time.

Annie was trained to use a video recorder in order to capture representative examples of their normal interactions in their own home whilst on their own at regular intervals post-CVA suffered by Keith, at 3.5 months, 4.5 months, 6 months, 12 months and 18 months. It was intended to undertake 7 data collections but sadly Keith died after the data collection at 18 months. Data sets collected at 4.5 months and 18 months were analysed for this present study.

Formal language testing revealed a general improvement in Keith's linguistic abilities, although his performance on the spoken picture-naming test was better at 4.5 months. Following on from the hypothesis in current research which suggests that the duration of spontaneous recovery extends beyond the 6-month period post-onset as previously suggested, it was initially hypothesised that conversation analysis would reveal differences in conversational phenomena as the time post-onset of aphasia increases. In particular, this present study focused on patterns of repair in Keith and Annie's conversation. The first repair pattern under investigation was self-initiated, other-repair and other-initiated repair. The second pattern concerned a form of self-

initiated repair in which utterances containing a trouble-source are abandoned and completely restarted.

Changing repair patterns over time

A detailed analysis of data sets 1 and 2 have shown that there are differences in the repair patterns across the two data sets. The first finding was the presence of self-initiated, other-repair in data set 1, compared to the absence of this type of repair pattern in data set 2. Conversely, examples of other-initiated repair were noted and analysed in data set 2, but no examples of this type of repair were found in data set 1. Another difference between the two data sets exists in the absence of a specific form of self-initiated, same-turn repair in data set 1 compared to clear examples of this type of repair found in data set 2. This type of repair was referred to as abandoning by this present study. This finding is interesting as, not only does it strengthen support for the argument of changing repair patterns over time, there is scant mention of this type of repair in both aphasic and non-aphasic literature.

The hypothesis that the repair patterns would change over time was anticipated as an emerging body of research suggests that components of language function can continue to recover after the period of spontaneous recovery has ended, although there have been very few systematic studies of long-term recovery of language function in aphasia, (Bruce, Howard and Gatehouse, 2000). The results of this study can, in a small way, contribute to the argument that changes and adaptation to conversation can continue in chronic aphasia (Penn, 1987).

Another qualitative finding, which was similar across both data sets, was that the presence of self-initiated, self-repair in data set 1, and of self-initiated, same-turn repair in data set 2, supports the argument proposed by Laasko (1997) that fluent aphasic speakers are self-monitoring their errors to a greater extent than was originally thought.

The examples of self-initiated, same-turn repair show a quick resolution of a trouble-source. This type of repair also contributes to the forward progression of talk, which is preferable to repair sequences taking over as the interactional business (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977). That this form of repair occurs in data set 2 and is, by comparison, absent in data set 1, could tentatively suggest that Keith has developed a strategy for dealing with aspects of his aphasia, for example his word-finding difficulties. This repair strategy allows him to continue with his turn, albeit with a completely different TCU to the turn-beginning.

Therapeutic Implications

One important implication of this present study is the support it lends to the benefits of using CA methodology in order to detect change over time. Furthermore, the successful method of capturing naturally occurring conversations between aphasic couples, in the absence of researchers, has implications for functional assessment outside the clinic. Whilst it may not be practical to lend video-recorders to clients, if clients with aphasia already have access to such equipment, this form of assessment in a different, naturalistic setting will positively impact on an individualised and well-informed intervention programme.

Whilst the results of the formal language tests did not show a marked improvement; indeed, results of the spoken-picture naming test revealed a negative change, the results of the conversation analysis indicated a rather more dramatic and positive change in Keith's conversational abilities. CA's ability to highlight issues and competences that were not identified by formal language testing means a greater number of important issues can be tackled in intervention (Lesser & Perkins, 1999).

Limitations and areas for further research

One limitation of this present study is that it is a single case study, and therefore cannot be readily generalised to the wider population. However, it supports the previous work by Gower (2004) and Wilkinson, Gower, Beeke & Maxim (in press). Both these studies apply conversation analysis to case studies, and found change in turn-constructional methods over time. However, future research may wish to apply CA methodology to more conversational dyads, and to conversations between individuals with aphasia and different people (e.g therapist, friends, work colleagues etc.).

Another limitation is the absence of analysis of non-verbal behaviours, such as gesture, from this present study. Including such behaviours would have proven to be advantageous in analysis of collaborative repair, as gaze and gesture are often used by speakers to negotiate repair in conversation. Further research could include these behaviours when comparing repair patterns over time.

Word count: 8966

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my thanks and gratitude to Dr Ray Wilkinson for his supervision and guidance for this project and for showing patience in the face of ever-changing plans! I would also like to thank Suzanne Beeke for providing feedback on one of my transcriptions in Dr Wilkinson's absence. Thanks also go to the researchers from the wider ERSC project for collecting the data included in this project, and to Keith and Annie, for allowing their conversations to be used for analysis.

Thank you to my family for supporting me through the completion of this study, and to my Father for printing and binding my project. Above all, heartfelt thanks, gratitude and apologies to David Colebrook, for weathering the storm and keeping the fear out of his eyes.

References

Basso, A. (1992). Prognostic factors in aphasia. Aphasiology, 6. 337-348

Beeke, S. (2003). 'I suppose' as a resource for the construction of turns at talk in agrammatic aphasia. Clinical linguistics and phonetics, 17, 4-5, 291-298

Beeke, S., Wilkinson, R. & Maxim, J. (2001). Context as a resource for the construction of turns at talk in aphasia. Clinical linguistics and phonetics, 15, 1-2, 79-83.

Beeke, S., Wilkinson, R. & Maxim, J. (2003a). Exploring aphasic grammar 1: a single case analysis of conversation. Clinical linguistics and phonetics, 17, 81-107.

Beeke, S., Wilkinson, R. & Maxim, J. (2003b). Exploring aphasic grammar 2: do language testing and conversation tell a similar story? Clinical linguistics and phonetics, 17, 109-134.

Benson, D. & Geschwind, N. (1971). The aphasias and related disturbances. In H. B. Baker & L. H. Baker (Eds). Clinical Neurology. 1. New York: Harper & Row

Booth, S. & Perkins, L. (1999). The use of conversation analysis to guide individualized advice to carers and evaluate change in aphasia: a case study. Aphasiology, 13, 283-303

Bruce, C., Howard, D. & Gatehouse, C. (2000). Why should recovery be a cause for concern An investigation of an unusual pattern of recovery in a man with aphasia. Aphasiology, 14, 755-769.

Butterworth, B. (1979). Hesitation and the Production of verbal paraphasias and neologisms in jargon aphasia. Brain and Language, 8. 133-161.

Couper-Kuhlen, E. (1992). Contextualizing discourse: The prosody of interactive repair. In P. Auer & A. di Luzio (Eds.) The contextualization of language. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Damico, J. S., Oelshlaeger, M. & Simmons-Mackie, N. (1999). Qualitative methods in aphasia research: conversation analysis. Aphasiology, 13, 667-679

Davis, G. A., & Wilcox, J. (1985). Adult aphasia rehabilitation: Applied pragmatics. Windsor: NFER Nelson.

Edwards, S. & Garman, M. (1989). Case study of a fluent aphasic: the relation between linguistic assessment and therapeutic intervention. In Grunwell, P. & James, A. (Eds) The functional evaluation of language disorders. London: Croom Helm.

Enderby, P. & Emerson, J. (1996). Does speech and language therapy work? A review of the literature. London: Whurr

Ferguson, A. (1998). Conversational turn-taking and repair in fluent aphasia. Aphasiology, 12 (11), 1007-1031

Holland, A. L., Greenhouse, J. B. & Swindell, C. S. (1989). Predictors of Language Restitution following stroke: A multivariate analysis. Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 32. 232-238

Goodwin, C. (1995). Co-constructing meaning in conversations with an aphasic man. Research on Language and Social Interaction, 28, 233-260.

Gower, M. (2004). Changing repair sequences as the result of spontaneous recovery in the talk of one aphasic couple: a comparison across time. Unpublished MSc thesis.

Howard, D. & Patterson, K. (1992). The pyramids and palm trees test. Bury St Edmonds: Thames Valley Test Company

Hutchby, I. & Woofit, R. (1998). Conversation analysis: principles, practices and applications. Cambridge: Polity Press

Jefferson, G. (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. (Eds.) Talk and social organisation. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Jefferson, G. (1989). Preliminary notes on a possible metric which provides for a 'standard maximum' silence of approximately one second in conversation. In D Roger & P. Bull (Eds.) Conversation: An interdisciplinary perspective. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kay, J., Lesser, R. & Coltheart, M. (1992). Psycholinguistic assessment of language processing in aphasia. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Keefe, K. A. (1995). Applying basic neuroscience to aphasia therapy: what the animals are telling us. American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology. 4, 88-93.

Kertesz, A. (1982). Western Aphasia Battery. New York: Grune and Stratton.

Kertesz, A. (1984). Recovery from aphasia. In Rose, F. C. (Ed) Progress in Aphasiology. New York: Raven Press.

Kertesz, A. & McCabe, P. (1977). Recovery patterns and prognosis in aphasia. Brain, 100, 1-18

Laakso, Minna. (1997). Self-initiated repair by fluent aphasic speakers in conversation. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society

Laakso, M. & Klippi, A. (1999). A closer look at the 'hint and guess' sequences in aphasic conversation. Aphasiology, 13, 345-363.

Labov, W. (1970). The study of language in its social context. Studium Generale, 23, 30-87

Lerner, G., H. (1996). On the "Semi-permeable" character of grammatical units in conversation: conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff & S. A. Thompson (Eds) Interaction and Grammar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lesser, R. & Milroy, L. (1993). Linguistics and aphasia: psycholinguistic and pragmatic aspects of intervention. London: Longman.

Lock, S., Wilkinson, R. & Bryan, K. (2001). SPPARC (Supporting partners of people with aphasia in relationships and conversation): a resource pack. Bicester: Speechmark.

Lubinski, R., Duchan, J., & Weitzner-Lin, B. (1980). Analysis of breakdowns and repairs in aphasic adult communication. In R. Brookshire (Ed.) Clinical aphasiology conference proceedings. Minnesota: BRK.

Manochiopinig, S., Sheard, S., & Reed, V. (1992). Pragmatic assessment in adult aphasia: a clinical review. Aphasiology, 6. 519-533

Nofsinger, R., E. (1991). Everday Conversation. London: Sage.

Oelschlaeger, M., L. & Damico, J., S. (2000). Partnership in conversation: a study of word search strategies. Journal of Communication Disorders, 33, 205-225.

Papathanasiou, I. & Whurr, R. (2000). Recovery of function in aphasia. In I. Papathanasiou (Ed). Acquired neurogenic communication disorders: a clinical perspective. London: Whurr

Payne, J. C. with Minus, B.D. (1997). Cerebrovascular Accidents. In J. C. Payne (Ed). Adult neurogenic language disorders: assessment and treatment. London: Singular Publishing inc.

Penn, C. (1987). Compensation and language recovery in the chronic aphasia patient. Aphasiology, 1, 235-245.

Perkins, L. (2003). Negotiating repair in aphasic conversation: Interactional issues. In C. Goodwin (Ed.) Conversation and brain damage. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Powell, G. (1981). Brain Function Therapy. Hants: Gower

Sacks, H. (1984). Notes on methodology. In: J. Atkinson and J. Heritage (Eds.), Structures of social action: studies in conversation analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

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

Sarno, M. T. (1980). Analyzing aphasic behaviour. In M. T. Sarno and O. Hook (Eds). Aphasia: Assessment and Treatment. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

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

Schegloff, E., A. (1987). Recycled turn beginnings: a precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organisation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds). Talk and social organisation. Avon: Multilingual Matter Ltd.

Schegloff, E., A. (1996). Turn organization: one intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff & S. A. Thompson (Eds) Interaction and Grammar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E., A. (2000). Overlapping talk and the organisation of turn-taking for conversation. Language in Society, 29, 1-63.

Schegloff, E. A. (2003). Conversation analysis and communication disorders. In C. Goodwin (Ed.) Conversation and brain damage. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Schienberg, S., & Holland, A. (1980). Conversational turn-taking in Wernicke's aphasia. In R. Brookshire (Ed.), Clinical aphasiology conference proceedings. Minneapolis: BRK Publishers.

Simmons-Mackie, N., & Kagan, A. (1999). Communication strategies used by 'good' versus 'poor' speaking partners of individuals with aphasia. Aphasiology, 13. 9-11, 807-820.

ten Have, P. (1999). Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide. London: Sage

Wilkinson, R. (1995). Conversation analysis of an non-fluent aphasic person. In M. Pekins & S. Howard (Eds.) Case studies in clinical linguistics. London: Whurr.

Wilkinson, R. (1999). Introduction. Aphasiology, 13, 4/5 251-258.

Wilkinson, R. (1999). Sequentiality as a problem and resource for intersubjectivity in aphasic conversation: analysis and implications for therapy. Aphasiology, 13, 4/5, 327-343.

Wilkinson, R., Beeke, S., & Maxim, J. (2003). Adapting to conversation. In C. Goodwin (Ed.) Conversation and brain damage. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Wilkinson, R., Bryan, K., Lock, S., Bayley, K., Maxim, J., Bruce, C., Edumdson, A., & Moir, D. (1998). Therapy using conversation analysis: Helping couples to adapt to aphasia in conversation. International journal of language and communication disorders, 33, 144-149 (supplement).

Wilkinson, R., Gower, M., Beeke, S. & Maxim, J. (in press). Adapting to conversation as a language-impaired speaker: changes in aphasic turn construction over time.

Appendix 1

Summary of results from formal language assessments

Western Aphasia Battery

Conducted 3 months post-CVA. Classification = Wernicke's

Subtest	Score	Aphasia Quotient
Spontaneous speech:		16
Information content	8/10	
Fluency	8/10	
Comprehension:		6.1
Yes/no questions	54/60	
Auditory word recognition	43/60	
Sequential commands	25/80	
Repetition:	52/100	5.2
Naming:		3.6
Object naming	27/60	
Word fluency	0/20	
Sentence completion	5/10	
Responsive speech	4/10	
		Total: 61.8

	4.5 Months post-CVA	**18 Months post-CVA**
Pyramids and Palm Trees	20/26	21/26
PALPA 47 spoken word-picture matching	11/20	15/20
PALPA 53 spoken picture naming	15/20	12/20

Appendix 2

Transcription Symbols

The following symbols can either be found on the keyboard, or accessed as follows:- choose *insert* menu: choose *symbol* to access 'symbol' window. To access an IPA font enter *insert* menu, choose *symbol* to access the window, and then click on *font* arrow to select the IPA font of your choice.

⌈ ⌊ a large left-hand bracket links an ongoing utterance with an overlapping utterance or non-verbal action at the point where the overlap/simultaneous non-verbal action begins

⌉ ⌋ a large right-hand bracket marks where overlapping utterances/simultaneous non-verbal actions stop overlapping

```
eg.  01  PR  how have you been since I last saw⌈you⌉
     02  AM                                    ⌊not ⌋so⌈good          ⌉
                                                      ⌊((AM shakes head))⌋
```

= an equals sign marks where there is no interval between adjacent utterances

```
e.g. 01  DG  did he really say that?=
     02  FB  =yes
```

(.) a full stop in single brackets indicates an interval of tenth of a second or less in the stream of talk

oh: a colon indicates an extension of the sound or syllable it follows (more colons prolong the stretch)

. a full stop indicates a stopping fall in tone, *not necessarily the end of a sentence*

, a comma indicates a continuing intonation

? a question mark indicates a rising inflection, *not necessarily a question*

! an exclamation mark indicates an animated tone, *not necessarily an exclamation*

but- a single dash indicates a halting, abrupt cut off to a word or part of a word

↑↓ marked rising and falling shifts in intonation are indicated by upward and downward pointing arrows immediately *prior* to the rise or fall

<u>stress</u> underlining indicates emphasis

°no° degree signs indicate a passage of talk which is *quieter* than surrounding talk

TALK capital letters indicate talk delivered at a *louder volume* than surrounding talk

h,heh indcates discernable aspiration or laughter (the more hs the longer the
hah aspiration/laughter)

fu(h)n an h in single brackets marks discernable aspiration or laughter *within* a word in an utterance

°h discernable inhalation (the more hs the longer the inhalation)

>talk< lesser than/greater than signs indicate sections of an utterance delivered at a *greater speed* than the surrounding talk

⌈yes text in double brackets represents a gloss or description of some non-verbal
⌊((nods))aspect of the talk, and is linked to the relevant section of talk with large brackets (see above)

(1 syllable)
(dog) single brackets containing either a word, phrase, or syllable count (if utterance is very unclear) mark where target item(s) is/are in doubt

/δOδ/ transcribe paraphasias and jargon between slashes, using an IPA font. Check with your supervisor about which vowel transcription system to use.

------ a broken underline in *bold* indicates speaker's gaze is directed at listener (place on *separate line directly below* relevant talk). Only note eye gaze if (a) it seems particularly relevant/important to the interaction, or (b) you are particularly interested in analysing it.

e.g. 01 IB did you hear about John?
------
02 JM no (.) what?

→ an arrow in *column 2* alerts the reader as to which line contains the issue discussed in the analysis

Appendix 3

Clare Lawson

Keith and Annie conversation 1

transcript version [no. 4]

Subject with aphasia in conversation with Annie at home

sample date May 2003

transcribed sample length 10 Minutes 40 Second

counter times: start 00:08:37 stop 00:19:17

All initials, names and places are pseudonyms

column 1 2 3 4 5 6

counter time		line no.	speaker	talk	notes
hh:mm:ss					
00:08:37		001	K	but today,(1.0) what we /ΩεIμIN/ up today,	
		002		now.	
		003	A	w-w- (1.0) we're just- (.) aiming now for	
		004		dinner- (0.2) ton⌈ight ⌉	
		005	K	⌊ yeah⌋ but how we gonna eat it	
		006	A	we eat the way we always do in th-that-	
		007		⌈dining °room°⌉	
		008	K	⌊ yeah but⌋what we HAVing?	
		009	A	ye having, (.) devilled mushrooms, (.) to start	
		010		(0.2) then roast beef and yorkshire puddings (.)	
		011		and (.) er (.) s->purple sprouting broccoli<, and	
		012		(.) erm (1.0) >new potatoes<, (1.0) and the:n	
		013		strawberries and icecream if you want that	
		014		after⌈wards ⌉	
		015	K	⌊very good ⌋	
		016	K	very good.⌈ I'm going to look forward to⌉those	
		017	A	⌊ So that should be erm ⌋	
		018		(.)	
		019	A	a nice: -	
		020	K	very ↓good.	
		021	A	(.) sounds like a coo(h)kery pro(h)gr- hh	
		022		ye(h)know >whaddya⌈call it ⌉< ma(h)	
		023	K	⌊↓yeah⌋	
		024	A	MAsterchef	
0009:17		025	K	that's what we⌈wanted⌉for our, for our,	New Topic
		026	A	⌊°h yeah⌋	

	027	K	absolutely (bidding) >which was in<	
	028		⌈that room:⌉ today: . =	
	029		⌊ ((*points*)) ⌋	
	030	A	= yes =	
	031	K	= it is because it is (.) it is there >that you	
	032		↓go< n everything was per:fect⌈ today⌉	
	033	A	⌊ yes ⌋	
	034	K	n that's whats matter.er	
	035		what⌈matter⌉=⌈er ⌉= er	
	036	A	⌊yes ⌋ ⌊ yes⌋	
	037	K	(5 syllables) i- i- i-don't know whether (.) ever	
	038		wanted any more /tΩαIn/ =er= /τΣ/ /τΣ/ (1.0)	
	039		mining to mine (.) getting all sorts of things its	
	040		seems all on (.) lets forget about it	
	041	A	well that's it. i think its all you can do.	
	042	A	⌈you know ⌉	
	043	K	⌊ (4 syllables)⌋ ⌈ /jed/ or it needs ↑cold ⌉	
	044		⌊((*waves hands side to side*))⌋	
00:09:48	044		(.)	
	045	A	⌈that's °right° . ⌉	
	046	K	⌊ that's the truth.⌋ bit of this n, (0.9) bit of	
	047		⌈(odd)⌉	
	048	A	⌊ w- ⌋w- well we often have	
	049		⌈things hot and ⌉ cold. (.) erm,°h	
	050	K	⌊well i just i just did.⌋	
	051		(.)	
	052	K	that why i like it	
	053		(2.1)	
	054	A	ye see ye don't know whether you, you, (.) got	new topic
	055		a (.) bug or something.	
	056	K	w- i dunno what it was.=i was terrible though.	
	057		(1.1) all that time until, (1.0) until i went: to,	
	058		about, (0.8) n i went to er: about two o'clock. no,	
	059	A	>that was about< (0.8) half past three when you	
	060		went to sleep.	
	061	K	Yeah:⌈but, er,⌉	
	062	A	⌊then ⌋you slept solidly after⌈wards⌉	
00.10.18	063	K	⌊thats ⌋right	
	064		i felt different then.=i suddenly felt much, much	
	065		better. And then a MOment >/Ω≅δZ/ it was<	
	066		ALright. (.) and then ye gave me something to	
	067		eat. (1.3) very qui⌈ckly ⌉, (.) very sim. (.)	
	068	A	⌊yeah⌋	
	069	K	and i s::::Udenly the whole of all my	
	070		(2 syllables). OH. it was beautiful. (.) an an (.)	
	071		an there's two little plants. >an it is< little tiny	
	072		⌈things ⌉ their wall ,	
	073	A	⌊yeah but s- ⌋	
	074	A	yes	

	075	K	an they were tightened in an it was perfect. i	
	076		think oh yes .	
	077	A	well ⌈°that's good°⌉	
	078	K	⌊i felt ⌋better already. an then i	
00.10.48	079		got round, an i got round, and, (.) had a new,	
	080		(0.9) I come ⌈an had a ⌉/ΣA:ϕ/,	
	081	A	⌊I think?- ⌋	
	082	K	a new /ΣA:ϕ/, was this word?	
	083	A	a shower.	
	084	K	shower? an I got all that, i had all that, an got all	
	085		there an >put it there an i felt< pretty good.	
	086	A	yeah (0.6) but i think staying in bed is,	
	087		⌈(°Two syllables°)⌉	
	088	K	but i⌊ didn't ⌋wanna bring too much	
	089		Today, >°anyway°.< BE ALright today. and	
	090		/≅/ back tomorrow. i be back to normal ding	
	091		ding ding an I hope da >da da< ↑DA::=	
	092	A	=°that's ⌈it°. yes. and we'll (.) get some⌉	
	093	K	⌊ (six syllables) ⌋	
	094	A	exercises done to ⌈morrow. ⌉	
	095	K	⌊that's right,⌋	
	096	A	it was silly trying to do them ⌈today. ⌉	
	097	K	⌊WELL i⌋ didn't feel	
00.11.18	098		/d≅/ doing it /t≅/ /t≅/ too much (.) this is all very	
	099		good now. very, very, good. (0.8) an another	new topic
	100		thing i want to try, tomorrow, (0.9) is we hadn't	
	101		ANy, for all this time. (1.0) but i just would like	
	102		(2.0) have something (1.0) and we'll just have,	
	103		(0.6) you and i, (0.8) we'll have, (.)	
	104		erm-a-reasonable er: >thing< and we'll have,	
	105		>/w≅/-/w≅/-it will be< out of there, there,	
	106		er::⌈er ⌉(1.0) /t3:mIN/⌈(1.0)/w≅/⌉is that right	
	107	A	⌊yeah⌋ ⌊ yes er- ⌋	
00:11:48	108	A	no. /j≅/ /j≅/ you talking about the red wine we're	
	109		⌈having afterward⌉	
	110	K	⌊YEAH it'll be ⌋there. it'll be PER⌈fect.⌉	
	111	A	⌊I'll ⌋open it	
	112		in a⌈few minutes.⌉	
	113	K	⌊yeah. yeah. ⌋an then when we've got- got-	
	114		had that /tY≅T/. an then, (.) afterwards we can	
	115		always go on some ordinary, (.)⌈er- er- things.⌉	
	116	A	⌊that right. ⌋	
	117	K	/j≅/ not.	
	118	A	°tha⌈t's right°⌉	
	119	K	⌊but it ⌋may be just per:fect if it's	
	120		al⌈right ⌉	
	121	A	⌊yes. ⌋	
	122	K	i think that's per:⌈fect.⌉	

	123	A	⌊yes.⌋ well I'll sh- (.) I'll go an	
	124		select a bottle and, (0.7) you'll have to tell me if	
	125		it's the right one or n⌈ot. ⌉	
	126	K	⌊yeah⌋ that's °pretty pretty	
	127		good. that was what I want. °	
	128		(1.0)	
	129	K	⌈ch⌉eero, /b≤IN≅ β≤{Nγ≅/. bang bang bang,	
	130	A	⌊t- ⌋	
	131	K	⌈/g≅/⌉	
	132	A	⌊ts- ⌋°yeah.°	
00:12:18	133	K	so very good.	
	134		(2.7)	
	135	A	he's making hot water pastry.	new topic
	136	K	he's making exactly those things yes all very	
	137		good.	
	138	A	but ya have to work SO:: quickly with hot	
	139		water pastry.=	
	140	K	=well.	
	141		(2.6)	
	142	A	I mean last time I made em, (.) °h the pork pie	
	143		like that s we lived at co- at cli(h)fton?	
	144		(1.0)	
	145		we lived there in: erm. (0.7) seventy seven didn't	
	146		we.	
	147	K	yep, ⌈there you go?⌉	
	148	A	⌊so it's a ⌋very long time ago	
	149		(2.0)	
	150	A	I remember making it at school, (2.0) °/j≅ n≅/°	
00:12:48	151		mine turned out alright but some of them they	
	152		couldn't c(h)ut it.	
	153	K	°/≤≅?/°	
	154	A	it goes like lead,	
	155	K	that's very good. (1.0) perfect, look at that.	
	156	A	yeah	
	157		(0.4)	
	158	K	°/n≅/ i think° the whole thing was ve- very diff-	
	159		er- difficult. (.) to the end.	
	160	A	°mmm°	
	161		(0.5)	
	162	K	it is of course, (.) r- er-	
	163	A	°he's made all the holes°=	
	164	K	= yes we've got all of er /sYvι:/, (1.0) / sYvι:/, er	
	165		its /nΘ? σYvι:/. I mean. the right, (0.8) thing	
	166		we've gonna watch. but then, (.) for your erm,	
00:13:18	167		(1.0) things, when it's all ready, (.) by about six	
	168		o'clock, (0.9)	
	169	A	°yes. tha⌈t's right.⌉ ⌈that's right.⌉ we'll sit °	
	170	K	⌊today. ⌋well ⌊that'd be, ⌋ (1.0)	
	171	A	°⌈down ⌉°	

	172	K	⌊that'd be⌋ /m{γvIκι/, (.) /vIκι/. (.) one /μαI/	
	173		/ΩαIτ≅λ/. ⌈/Ω⌉≅?/	
	174	A	⌊°h ⌋	
	175	K	/Ω≅?:τ/ /ΩΘτ≅φo/.	
	176	A	wonderful.	
	177	K	yeah.	
	178	A	yes.	
	179	K	the right colour. yes ok, very good. ve:ry good.	
	180		(0.8) °get all this°, (1.0) look at it now its, (.) its	new topic
	181		coming to rain. look little⌈(tiles)⌉	
	182	A	⌊starts- ⌋	
	183	K	(pictorial) it'⌈s ⌉down there again.	
	184	A	⌊ah⌋	
	185		(2.1)	
00:13:48	186	A	it's more like April than May isn't it th⌈ough ⌉	
	187	K	⌊we::ll-⌋	
	188	A	°h but this is just what I need for those sweet	
	189		peas.=	
	190	K	=it does. (little that,) (.) but it's a bit /∝Σ≅/ its a bit	
	191		/∝Σ≅/ very /ΣA:d/. (.) for us.=	
	192	A	=°yeah.°	
	193		(1.0)	
	194	K	Buts noneof the other?(0.8)it's/ΩΘ⌈?σ/ ago⌉↑oh↓uh	
	195	A	⌊but ts-t⌋	
	196	A	⌈ts-⌉	
	197	K	⌊so ⌋said-(1.0)	
	198	A	yeah=	
	199	K	=cut it. (0.7) an then, p(h)⌈(2 syllables)⌉	
	200	A	⌊but ya ⌋see its,-	
	201		(.) ya know that pack's all opened up over there	new topic
	202		aswell. I feel, (.) er m- much more relieved now.	
	203		cos at- (.) the front garden, (.) will only take, (.) er	
	204		a morning t- (.) or an afternoon to dig, (0.7) cos	
00:14:18	205		althought its got a lots of weeds on it, (0.9) its	
	206		erm (.) very soft, (.) cos you've dug that	
	207		se⌈veral⌉times.	
	208	K	⌊mm ⌋(1.0) but that's that's alright now that,=	
	209	A	=°yeah°=	
	210	K	=it wasn't do what you want /∝Σ/ what what you	
	211		er: (1.0) what you er::: er read,	
	212	A	°tha⌈t's right° ⌉ yeah	
	213	K	⌊that perfect.⌋	
	214		but its (.) that's per⌈fect.⌉	
	215	A	⌊an ⌋then I'll get erm, (1.6)	
	216		i'll go out an see if the hanging basket are ready.	
	217	K	mmm.	
	218		(1.0)	

	219	K	(6 syllables). there's two little
	220		/kA:?/- what's it called? (1.5) where you put all
	221		the things there.
00:14:48	222	A	(1.0) where in the, (1.3)
	223	K	>in in< the things you bought yesterday
	224	A	(1.0) oh that ball thing.
	225	K	i don't know i ⌈thought you'd- ⌉
	226	A	⌊its GONE AGAIN!⌋
	227	K	no i thought you told me, (.) me you gave me
	228		some erm (.) /ΩΘκσ≅μ/, >what is it you put in
	229		there?<
	230	A	(1.6) what on that f- food thing.
	231	K	no here! that you grew.(.)you mean some one here
	232		an some on here.
	233	A	oh I don't know what- (.) °what° (.)
	234		I have⌈n't got⌉
	235	K	⌊we ⌋yesterday.
	236	A	the sweet pea⌈s, (.) °ya⌉mean.°
	237	K	⌊yeah! ⌋
	238	A	ye⌈s. ⌉
00:15:18	239	K	⌊yeah!⌋(.) where are they going.
	240	A	well, (.) one lots by the (.) swimming pool,=
	241	K	=well how deep are they.
	242	A	(1.0) well they've bout
	243	A	⌈(2 syllables) they're bout that big. ⌉
	244	K	⌊well there you are. that's pretty good.⌋ that's
	245	K	⌈what ⌉I'm saying. that's⌈alright.⌉
	246	A	⌊yeah.⌋ ⌊the ⌋roots are much
	247		bigger that the pla⌈nt itself.⌉
	248	K	⌊yeah ⌋but its about that far:s=
	249	A	=mmm,
	250	K	I was looking round there, (.) then it was all
	251		(/≅/),
	252	A	yeah=
	253	K	=but no bodies (seem tied it).
	254		⌈you couldn't⌉find⌈it ⌉
	255	A	⌊you went- ⌋(1.0)⌊did-⌋the alan titchmarsh ones
	256		by the (1.4) er swimming pool, (0.7) and the
	257		(astronaut) (0.4)dat we grew last year (0.5) are
	258		down the er⌈m, ⌉(1.3) ⌈°/s≅di/°⌉
	259	K	⌊mmm.⌋very good.⌊so they ⌋ARE
	260		growing then.
	261	A	they are growing but I⌈did ⌉n't think they were at
	262	K	⌊yeah!⌋
00:15:48	263	A	first.
	264		(2.0)
	265	K	very good.
	266	A	but those er geraniums aren't, (.) growing very
	267		much at all. h don't think I'm going to buy any

	268		more of that organic, (1.2) er, (.) compost	
	269		because, (.) last year we didn't, (.) we had a	
	270		problem, (1.0) with the beans didn't we. er (.)	
	271		°cos we⌈ were,-°⌉	
	272	K	⌊what ⌋ cha mean buy it.=	
	273	A	=WELL d- n- (.) its not good for seeds. (.) it	
	274		doesn't seem to be ve⌈ ry good for ⌉seeds.	
	275	K	⌊OH::: no- ⌋(04) no. (.)	
	276		⌈ya wanna get what you think you're gonna⌉ get, (.)	
	277	A	⌊ye- (.) know that CHEAP stuff that um- ⌋	
	278	K	DO IT. >(but if you keep on going I'd don't just)	
	279		chuck em< absolutely. (0.7) I just,- just,- (.)	
00:16:18	280	A	well tennants supplies them⌈ (as good)⌉	
	281	K	⌊just ⌋ throw	
	282		them away!=	
	283	A	= yeah	
	284	K	/δγ≡σ- δγY-/ don't even wanna ask!=	
	285	A	=yeah	
	286	K	useless. (.) no. ⌈get them ⌉ in properly they	
	287	A	⌊°that's right°⌋	
	288	K	know what they're doing.	
	289	K	(0.8) that's the thing to do.	
	290		(5.7)	
	291		((K waves arm))	new topic
	292		----------	
	293		(1.5)	
	294	A	yes. sorry. I was, (.) yes.	
	295	K	no your /ετ3:/ watching things=	
	296	A	= no I WASn't! it was ju⌈st I,- ⌉(0.9) ⌈no.⌉	
	297	K	⌊YOU⌋ARE! you⌊'re ⌋	
	298		f(ixed) in it.=	
	299	A	=NO. >er it was just< t, (0.8) ye /dçδν{/ often see	
	300		somebody making a pork pie an it just suddenly,-	
00:16:48	301	K	well what you watching it. turn it⌈ off⌉ then.	
	302	A	⌊no,⌋(.) no. I- I-	
	303		just, (.) thought for a second I wanted to just see	
	304		what he did⌈ next⌉so⌈ I ⌉ I won't⌈ (1.0) ⌉	
	305	K	⌊°oh.⌋(.)⌊right⌋ ⌊there you go°⌋	
	306	A	er: won't bother anymore.	
	307		(1.2)	
	308	A	but we are supposed to be natural. not, (.) just, (.)	
	309	K	i⌈know. ⌉(.) >but I mean,< (.) you're just always	
	310	A	⌊°yeah° ⌋	
	311	K	sittin in there.	
	312	A	now come off it I don't watch telev(h)ision	
	313		°that much°	
	314	K	(1.2) ((K raises eyebrows at A))	
	315	A	i have today because I've ha⌈d a ⌉day off. but	
	316	K	⌊oh. I see.⌋	

	317	A	i don't, (.) usually⌈do⌉i. i leave you in here with	
	318	K	⌊mm⌋	
	319	A	the time an,-	
	320	K	>ye- ye- the-<⌈trouble is ⌉ye- you get something	
	321	A	⌊(4 syllables)⌋	
	322	K	an then, (0.8) watch it °an- er° >listen.< an read an	
00:17:18	323		everything over there, >ye haven't got a< clue what	
	324		comes out of⌈here? ⌉	
	325	A	⌊°I know°⌋	
	326	K	not a word.- well why don ye say so. (.) turn it off.	
	327	A	because you're watching it,=	
	328	K	=oh. I see.⌈°right° ⌉	
	329	A	⌊more often that not.⌋	
	330	K	oh.	
	331	A	if you're not asleep.	
	332	K	(.) well yes a little yes.	
	333	A	you were having a good old doze this afternoon.=	new topic
	334	K	=well I felt like (I could also this), (.) this dreadful	
	335		things didn't i.	
	336	A	yes. but you've just gotta forget that⌈now. I ⌉	
	337	K	⌊mmm. right.⌋	
	338	A	mean (0.7) I think we're hyper sensitive that	
00:17:48	339		anything that's wrong now, (2.8) ya know we're	
	340		thinking⌈AHHHHH ⌉(.) ye know, (.)	
			⌊((vibrates hands by head))⌋	
	341		whats gong wrong now. w- with the everything	
	342		that's gone wrong before with you. this last two	
	343		years. (.) that we're (1.3) thinking its another	
	344		major event an it might just be an upset stomach?	
	345		(1.3)	
	346	K	w- I⌈don't⌉know what it is but its gone⌈now, ⌉	
	347	A	⌊or, ⌋ ⌊°yeah,°⌋	
	348	K	⌈I'm over⌉, an I'll (change,) (.) that's it good.	
	349	A	⌊that's it. ⌋	
	350	A	°yeah.°	
	351		(3.1)	
	352	A	when I spoke to jim this morning. (.) he was telling	new topic
	353		me that, (.) when edna had her first stroke , (1.0) he	
	354		didn't tell her she'd had a stroke, (0.5) she, (.)	
00:18:18	355		just thought she was suffering from ver⌈tigo.⌉	
	356	K	⌊who ⌋was this?	
	357	A	jim, (.) (bentham) was saying about edna.	
	358	K	oh!	
	359	A	an he- e- e- he said a long while afterwards he said	
	360		something about, (.) °h when you had your stroke,	
	361		(0.6) an she said, (.) WHEN did I have a stroke.	
	362		(1.8) >an he of course he said< I had to tell her	
	363		then. (0.7) he said, (1.4) I don't think she blacked	
	364		me eye, (.) I said w(h)as that when you walked with	

	365		a limp! /j3:/. (.) but he sounded very good this	
	366		morning it was not, (.) sometimes he sounds very	
00:18:48	367		weary. but he didn't t- today.	
	366		(2.9)	
	367	K	°mmm°	
	368	A	so anyway. tha- that's good.	
	369		(3.8)	
	370	A	°h °have we done enough?°	new topic
	371		----------	
	372	K	((nods and motions to camera with hand))	
	373		(2.7)	
	374	K	there⌈you go⌉, (.) look⌈all ⌉that.too much. (.)	
	375	A	⌊hhh ⌋ ⌊OH⌋	
	376	K	⌈TOO much.⌉	
	377	A	⌊yes:::::: tha⌋t's right.	
	378		(1.5)	
00:19:17	379	A	anyway. (1.2) off we go. (2.0) smile to the camera!	

to extend the table enter **table** menu and choose **insert rows**

Appendix 4

Clare Lawson

Keith and Annie conversation 5

transcript version [no.2]

subject with aphasia in conversation with Annie at home

18 Months post-CVA

transcribed sample length 11 mins 54 secs

counter times: start 6:30:43 stop 18:26:31

All initials, names and places are pseudonyms

column 1 2 3 4 5 6

counter time		line no.	speaker	talk	notes
hh:mm: ss					
6:30:43		1	A	when we first knew her she was so, (.) bubbly	
		2		°⌈ wasn't she, (.) yeah⌉°	
		3	k	⌊ she was. she was ⌋ wonderful person. to be, (.)	
		4		with, (.) and⌈she sh- (1.0) ⌉but she going but⌈now ⌉	
		5	A	⌊ yeah.. and i –i-⌋ ⌊°yeah°⌋	
		6	K	its all, (.) its all, (.) its all⌈down.⌉	
		7	A	⌊ i ⌋don't think she's	
		8		worried about her daughter getting married cos, (.) she	
		9		told me she was so thrilled that she'd-, °h she'd settled	
		10		down cos she'd been living in turkey.	
		12		(1.0)	
		13	K	°mmm°. ⌈yeah.⌉	
		14	A	⌊and ⌋erm,- she came back and	
		15		met s this fella who'd she'd know	
		16		from school days. (.) and she said	
		17		th≅ they th- such a perfect couple.	
		18		>an she said i couldn't-< °h if i'd	
		19		gone out and picked anybody i couldn't	
7:0:69		20		have picked anybody better.	
		21		(1.4)	
		22	A	°h so=	
		23	K	=oh well.	
		24		(1.4)	
		25	A	or whether it's cos she's gonna meet	
		26		her husband?	
		27		(1.7)	
		28	K	h have to see what she (drums) up.	
		29	A	yeah.	
		30	K	thats all i can say.	
		31		(1.2)	
		32	A	but it is a shame.	
		33		(1.1)	
		34	K	but- apart from that, (.) as our main	new topic

	35		s- main thing, (.) which has been
	36		round and round and round with me.
	37	A	°yeah°=
	38	K	=going on, (.) its s- SO much isn't it
	39		how long,(.)⌈how ⌉long would you say
	40	A	⌊°yeah.°⌋
	41	K	it was?
	42	A	its six weeks yes⌈terday. ⌉
	43	K	⌊ sixteen ⌋weeks!
	44	A	SIX. ⌈th-, ⌉yes.
7:30:88	45	K	⌊six weeks.⌋
	46	K	we',re bi- s- w- we're there. (1.2)
	47		an its its, (.) ya you feel
	48		exhausted.
	49	A	yeah ⌈°i know °yes,⌉
	50	K	⌊all is gonna ⌋thing up and do
	51		that >but still lets< lets look at it
	52		i always (think) as if he's getting
	53		BETTER. its its good now
	54	A	yes=
	55	K	=cos they're going that so, (.) if
	56		he's goes up fairly soon, (.) that's
	57		better and ss n thats fairly good. (.)
	58		an thats been done, (.) yesterday
	59		the last thing they did it was
	60		good, (.)an thats all perfectly ⌈one⌉
	61	A	⌊an ⌋
	62		isn't it a pity they didn't do that,
8:0:575	63		(.) properly the first time.
	64		(2.1)
	65	A	y'know when they came an ff (.)put the
	66		tank in (last Friday) why didn't they
	67		make, (.) nice an neat an tidy. °h they
	68		must've known it wouldn't except that.
	69		(1.0)
	70	K	OH! well (3 syllables)oh ye he said t
	71		to me, (.) today. (.) i said look i'm
	72		NOT what you-, (.) ive said i'm (.)
	73		i'm not gonna go(1.0)what you put down
	74		here, (.) and showed (down) it was (.)
	75		°h TERRible. (.) oh im >got nothin to
	76		do with it< i i dont like it myself.
8:30:23	77		(.) i couldn't get it. no. or
	78		something ⌈like ⌉that. y'know what i
	79	A	⌊°mmm° ⌋
	80	K	mean.
	81	A	yeah- it just seems so, (.) de- >i'm
	82		gonna murder this lamp< cos im, (.) new topic
	83		⌈looking round the corner at you.⌉
	84		⌊((moves lamp)) ⌋
	85		(1.1)
	86	K	oh.
	87		(2.0)
	88	K	⌈so- ⌉
	89	A	⌊ira,⌋ (.) does re(h,heh, h)reorganise
	90		the furniture doesn't ⌈she.⌉

```
          91   K                                 [ mmm.]
          92        (1.7)
          93   K    but anyway, (1.6) er, (1.1) well, (.)i   return to
          94        y'know. l l lets him, (.) i hope he      previous topic
          95        comes along and does and does it and
          96        we shall be wh-, (.) y'know=
          97   A    =°hhh (.) wh hopefully, (1.0) erm, (.)
9:0:24    98        once its all done, (.) the weather
          99        will improve an we'll be able to sit
          100       out again in the garden.
          101  K    tha[ts what       what                ]
          102  A       [cos we havent been able to sit out]
          103  K    [well its terrible horrible innit.   ]
          104  A    [at all this year.           °yeah° ]
          105  K    thats true.
          106       (.)
          107  A    so p'haps its er, (.) an ↓omen.
          108       (.)
          109  K    well >its its so<. °yes thats a fair
          110       (1 syllable)° ALREADY th the er, (.)
          111       th the er, (1.3) I IT GOES, (.) its
          112       STARTing to erm, (.) >didnt go< erm,
          113       (.) er it has been running to now
9:30:19   114       but now its its starting to close
          115       it down isnt it?=
          116  A    =yes.yep.
          117  K    each one. yes t already. (.) still.
          118       lets hope it looks good, (1.0) an
          119       i hope it is. thats wond[erful]
          120  A                            [well ]
          121       it cant l(h)ook h any worse than it
          122       l(h)ooks now=
          123  K    =no thats t[rue.]
          124  A               [or,] (.) really, (.)
          125       beforehand. be[cause,] (.)
          126  K                 [°yeah°]
          127  A    when the, (.) gazebo was up °h it was
          128       fine you couldnt see it but when, (.)
          129       this year >because we haven't had< the
          130       (.) °h the gazebo up at all its been
          131       [(1.8) very much   ](1.6)
          132       [(( waves fingers))]
          133       they're all,- that honeysuckle an
10:1:81   134       that, (1.2) erm buddleia, (.) lovely
          135       buddleia.
          136  K    mm hmm.
          137  A    an that other, (.)erm dogwood was it?
          138  K    mm [hmm            ]
          139  A       [(3 syllables).] ermmm, (1.) they
          140       were just beginning to really cover
          141       [that.          ]
          142       [((moves hand))]
          143       (1.1)
          144  A    weren't they.
          145  K    well its [all gone ]now an thats the
```

```
          146  A              ⌊screen it⌋
          147  K    end of it. still, (.)⌈le-⌉
          148  A                          ⌊°h  ⌋ (1.0)
          149       y'know we went, (.) this morning to
          150       get the bird seed, (.) erm, (.) °h that
          151       place where we had our, (.) erm (1.0)
          152       ⌈log horse made.          ⌉
          153       ⌊((makes cross with arms))⌋
          154       (1.0)
          155  K    yes?
          156  A    did y'see the lovely pieces of
10:30:96  157       screening they've got there?
          158       (1.4)
          159  K    of what.
          160  A    y' er >yeah th ma-< they make
          161       screening, (.) y'know like (laffs)
          162       n   n do some lovely
          163  K     yes
          164  A    ⌈shapes an things like ⌉that,
          165  K    ⌊oh sorry yes yes.     ⌋
          166  A    °h d- i i, (.) thought bout,(.) whether
          167       we ought to go an have a look see
          168       what they've got in there. (.) °h
          169       but one of them was lovely it was
          170       a little seat >(5 syllables) i thought
          171       i wouldnt mind that< heh heh
          172  K    well i'll have to have a ⌈look. ⌉
          173  A                            ⌊heh °h ⌋
          174       but >we can't very well say< (.) °h
          175       can we have one with a seat on! (1.0)
          176       can we.
          177  K    well i don't know! (.) err (.) i er i
11:0:84   178       i think with all that there, (.) to
          179       be, (1.0) all that time,
          180  A    mmm
          181  K    (2.1) well, (.)i i think it ought to
          182       be, (.) erm, (.) be very good today.
          183  A    °yeah-° ill tell you summit else that     new topic
          184       hasn't come is that quote from, (.)
          185       andrew's.
          186       (2.0)
          187  A    y'know. for the bumper.
          188       (1.2)
          189  K    well, (.) ⌈he,     ⌉(.)he hasn't sent it.
          190  A              ⌊°come.° ⌋
          191  A    >hasn't sent it i better give them a
          192       call later on.< ⌈ask them-⌉
          193  K                    ⌊yeah see ⌋ what they
          194       want to do=
          195  A    =erm, (.) ⌈i wonder⌉ if ⌈they ⌉have it
11:30:54  196  K              ⌊i HOPE  ⌋    ⌊ i   ⌋
          197       HOPE its easier um its easier to um,
          198       (.) do it ourselves.
          199  A    >all i know er not keen on us
          200       doin it um doing anything ourselves,<
          201       °h (.) they'll do it.
```

K its alot of money,
A yes but, (.) i mean if (.) erm,
K STILL [if he does thats even better]
A [if the insurance is going to]
K [still. thats why, (.) yes fair]
A [pay its alright isnt it? if not we'll]
K [enough but,] [ok]
A [leave it.]its [not] worth the
effot.=
K =right right ok. °that alright then°.
(2.0)
A or let ben have a go at it cos he
said he would.
K well thats, (.)well lets see what he
does first. (.) thats it.
12:1:40 A bu-, (.) y'said that the, (.)
insurance claim wouldn't never be
closed!
(2.3)
K oh i see. yes [well then,-]
A [so cos y'said] that
y'never know what, (.) °h while've
taken every, (.) possible step
we've can, (.) er y'never know what
might happen in the future. (.) an
we want to keep the claim open,
K yes.=
A = er in case of any, (.) further
developments.
K °h well lets see er wh what they wan to
do. °h er i, (.) i don know what he
wants to do. (.) if he thinks well.
12:30:17 (.) thats reasonable, (1.0) er then i
say well lets, (.) lets h have it!
(.)
A y[eah]
K [the]better it is the better it IS!=
A = well thats righ[t.] [yes.]
K [all] the [all] the
time!=
A =i do hope we get a tree, (.)
because,-
K well a little one.
A yes.
K n n not a great one. i mean y'want
smort- y'want [small,]
[((puts hand out flat))]
A yes one of these little [°ones°]
K [not one of]
these, (.) great big, (.) [(growers)]
A [no.]
but, erm, (.) i would like something
to drape up that, (1.0) plant by
erm (1.4) er (1.0) gladys's. like by
13:0:4 the side of the tank. >b'tween the

	257		gar-< °h the raised garden. (.) an the
	258		tank. i'd like a tree there.
	259		(1.9)
	260	K	well its up to them. (1.0) err
	261		what ⌈y'mean on our side⌉ or this side?
	262	A	⌊well. i i mean ⌋
	263		(1.3) on, (.) our side. (1.0) by the
	264		raised garden.=
	265	K	= well >we can well we can< well SEE
	266		what he comes up. (1.0) an h he got
	267		all those things an he showed it to us
	268		what he got, but now i wan to see what
	269		he'll sell us!
	270	A	yes im surprised they haven't sent us
	271		a copy of the the plan.
	272	K	well. (.) i hope its fairly soon, (.)
13:30:93	273		cos its er- wh we want it-
	274	A	well, er, Ian erm, rang him Monday
	275		morning and said look, (.) im
	276		desperate for it. an he said he'd get
	277		it in the post. °h bu cos Ian, was
	278		at (Lowerstof) yesterday he hadn't
	279		been, (.) into work, (.) an he s now
	280		hope its there when i get back
	281		today.
	282	K	oh. ⌈what you,-⌉
	283	A	⌊s- so i ⌋i might give him a ring
	284		another person or some(h)thing °hh erm,
	285		(.) to say to him. erm, (.) that
	286		we're pleased with the work now.(1.5)
	287		y'know w with, erm, (.) ⌈(5 syllables)⌉
	288	K	⌊ well. thats ⌋
14:1:48	289		how erm, as soon as he says, (.) lets
	290		see, (.)what you want
	291		to put up we'll come an listen to you
	292		thats perfect.
	293	A	°mmm ⌈yes°.⌉
	294	K	⌊do ⌋we expect (alright go on)
	295	A	thats right.
	296		(1.5)
	297	K	b BACK to ordinary. ordinary things new topic
	298		th er er as:: we are, (.) er going
	299		i er: i erm, (2.2) its ju that, (.)
	300		there's nothing, (1.0)s um i think
	301		im having too too too much.
	302		(1.8)
	303	A	too much what.
	304	K	e in his er::, (.) i think he's e oh
14:30:77	305		START again. (1.0) he came along there
	306		an se h how's you erm, (.) er are you
	307		⌈going (1.6) BETTER. ⌉
	308		⌊((holds hand out flat))⌋
	309	A	who is this talking.
	310		(1.4)
	311	K	his. ye- this morning!
	312	A	y'mean, (.)edith. the nurse.
	313	K	yes! >i thought you were saying is it

	314		ok <an y'said well it it has a, (.)
	315		it has a little bit but nothing
	316		nothing more. ⌈so ⌉its ⌈no⌉thing
	317	A	⌊no,-⌋ ⌊n ⌋
	318	K	happen⌈ing.⌉
	319	A	⌊i- ⌋ if you remember when i
	320		when he, (.) put you on those
	321		tablets he said they'd gradually
15:0:46	322		increase.
	323	K	oh ⌈i see. ⌉
	324	A	⌊he didn't⌋ want to bring it down
	325		too quickley.
	326	K	oh. p'haps he wants ⌈some more then.⌉
	327	A	⌊ so, (.) he ⌋
	328		>probably when he< sees you next week
	329		he'll take prob ⌈get ⌉you two tablets
	330	K	⌊mmm ⌋
	331	A	n,
	332	K	well he what he wants to do lets do
	333		it i say.
	334	A	°thats right er,°
	335	K	thats fair enough that perfectly
	336		good. (1.0) ri::ght. (1.6) OH! in new topic
	337		the in the:: er, (.) yesterday.
	338		when we went to the lun the er, (.) th
	339		the other day, (2.0) an we went to the
15:30:56	340		to the er, (2.7) the various th erm,
	341	A	>wh well erm< are we talking about
	342		welsh (2 syllables)?(.) or meeting? or
	343		(2 syllables).
	344	K	YES! today
	345	A	today.=
	346	K	= we went in there,
	347	A	yes.
	348	K	an you said ⌈OH LOOK! ⌉(1.0) she've
	349		⌊((pointing))⌋
	350		b she's erm, (.) they've got erm,
	351		he's on- he's, (.) wh wh wh grown up
	352		there now that=
	353	A	= those beans?
	354		(1.0)
	355	A	no. ⌈°what⌉ are you ⌈talking⌉ about.°
	356	K	⌊no! ⌋ ⌊today. ⌋
	357		we went along there. ↓/ρρρ:::::/ went
	358		into the, (.) to the nur::se,
	359	A	yes,
	360	K	an while we're coming back we said
16:1:52	361		look at look at that er, (.)in there t
	362		erm place.before, (.) er being,(.)
	363		(claringed).
	364	A	cl cleaned?
	365	K	exactly!=
	366	A	= oh yes! the (sani⌈t's)⌉, (.) garage.
	367	K	⌊ wh ⌋
	368	A	well tennant motors isnt it.
	369		(1.6)

	370	A	>bu its<, (.)tennant motors it was	
	371		where it all cleaned up. (1.0) is	
	372		that what you mean::.	
	373	K	no, [its where we-]	
	374	A	[there's the]erm [caravan people]	new topic
	375		[((pointint))]	
	376		going [up.]	
	377	K	[oh yes.]	
	378		(4.0)	
16:30:22	379	A	[ma]kes me laugh the way they put	
	380	K	[wh]	
	381	A	the landrover, (.) on the b(h)ack of	
	382		the c(h)ar heh by wh(h)ich [time]	
	383	K	[oh]back	
	384		on itself!	
	385	A	°yeah.°(.)well it saves abit of fuel	
	386		[doesn't] it.	
	387	K	[°mmm°]	
	388		(1.5)	
	389	K	NO! i was just noting we were going	return to
	390		in there, (.) to see him, (1.6)	previous topic
	391		tonight, (1.5)[an the]	
	392	A	[d' you]mean about the	
	393		house.=	
	394	K	=[yes! thats what (6 syllables)] its	
	395	A	[that the people have moved in]	
	396	K	beautiful an [new.] but d there's a	
	397	A	[yes.]	
	398	K	house on there, [an-]	
	399	A	[but] haven't they	
	400		got an awful entrance.	
	401		(.)	
	402	A	[y'know with those old people in the]	
	403	K	[well y'know its(4syllables) very]	
	404	A	[bungalows]	
17:1:21	405	K	[strange,](.)er things: AT ALL.=	
	406	A	=>mind you it looks better than<, (.)	
	407		d'you remember it was sat, (.)°h that	
	408		poor horse on there. all on his own.	
	409		(1.4)	
	410	A	on that [piece of land.]	
	411	K	[well that was awful.]	
	412	A	[with all those weeds an] an thistles,	
	413	K	[but anyway sh she]	
	414	K	well. it doesn't matter now because	
	415		tha tha thats their place.	
	416	A	mmm=	
	417	K	=but its a very strange thing is[nt it]	
	418	A	[mmm]	
	419	K	but it just n er,(.) goes up an up an	
	420		up an up an thats the end?	
	421	A	yes=	
	422	K	=an its horri[ble].there's nothing	
	423	A	[yes.]	
	424	K	to make you, (.) say well thats really	

```
          425        good, (.) to [listen to.     ]
          426   A                 [ i wouldn't be] very
          427        happy bout that having that s, (.)
          428        [like that. like that.    ]
17:31:88  429   K    [no.would you d- exactly!]then it
          430        [goes   ] shooop!
          431   A    [°yeah° ]
          432        but y'know you've [only got to ] have
          433   K                      [(3 syllables]
          434        a little slip.
          435        (.)
          436   A    an thats [it.]
          437   K             [oh ]it is!=
          438   A    =°yeah.°
          439   K    it goes like that an then,
          440   A    mmm
          441   K    shoosh=
          442   A    =an then when it rains here it could,
          443        (.) y'don't know how- (.) whether
          444        they've disturbed, (1.0) erm, (.)
          445        y'know roots systems an, (.)
          446        all [kinds of things.   ]
          447   K        [well i don't know.]
          448   A    but we(h)'ll all [(sl(h)ow down)     ]
          449   K                     [ but wh what's in ]
          450        the next one, (.) th thats in the end
          451        one. (1.0) who's the other one.i its
          452        going there wh er er::: who sits up
18:0:42   453        who has that °one there°.
          454   A    oh thats the garage!
          455        (2.8)
          456   A    that, (.) one next to it is the
          457        garage!
          458        (1.5)
          459   A    huge thing it is. >er i< i should say
          460        its probably as big as ours
          461        (1.5)
          462   K    °yeah. (1.0) ↓hmmm.°
          463        (.)
          464   A    per(h)haps its a gr(h)anny flat?
          465        (.)
          466   K    well i don know
          467   A    shut up granny or else we'll put you
          468        [in the     ]garage
          469   K    [°oh yeah.°]
          470   A    y(h)eah.
          471   K    ↓mmm
          472   A    anyway. i i should think now that
18:26:31  473        we've, (.) done quite a long time.
          474
```