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**Abstract**

This paper investigates how self-repairs with the editing term *well* are stance acts based on the speaker’s self-monitoring. It mainly analyzes conversational narratives under the theories of stance (Du Bois 2007) and dialogic syntax (Du Bois 2014) on the one hand, and speech monitoring and repair (Levelt 1983) on the other. The analyses show that self-repair with *well* is not simple error correction, but a shift of subjective evaluation. *Well* particularly marks the repair of facts, factual relations, or order, to signal and manage the meta-stance relation between the speaker’s upcoming stance and prior stance. The discussion highlights the dialogic nature of the monologic, self-contained part of the speech involving self-initiated self-repair, with its being responsive to self-monitoring voice. In consequence, the paper confirms the stance-managing function of the discourse marker *well* as a meta-stance marker (Sakita 2013a).
1. Introduction

Linguistic repair is the process in which a speaker recognizes a speech error and corrects it, often accompanied by an editing term and some sort of disfluency. It is classified into four types according to who initiates the repair process and who carries out the correction (self-initiated self-repair, other-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, and other-initiated other-repair), among which Schegloff et al. (1977) identify self-initiated self-repair as the most preferred, or most prevalent, in spontaneous conversation. In repairing errors, editing terms, or “editing expressions” (Hockett 1967), whether lexical or non-lexical (well, I mean, rather, you know, no, sorry, oh, or filled pauses such as uh, uhm, er, etc.), are very frequently used (Erman 1987). In an experimental setting where participants had to describe simple networks, Levelt (1983) found that 62% of all repairs were accompanied by editing expressions, which are functional in that “they apparently differ in the semantic and/or pragmatic function they perform” (p.71). They signal the type of repair, elaboration, or qualification the speaker is about to present (Clark 1996, 2002).

In a series of investigations, I have uncovered the core function of the discourse marker well as a stance marker in conversational interaction in general (Sakita 2013a), as well as in the distinctive contexts of quoted speech (Sakita 2013b), conversational concession (Sakita 2013c), and oral narrative (Sakita 2017). The marker has been acknowledged for its frequent occurrence in these contexts (e.g., Schiffrin 1987; Norrick 2001; Schourup 2001; Müller 2005). Besides these, the marker is also frequently used for self-repair (Svartvik 1980; Schiffrin 1987; Müller 2005; Sakita 2017). This paper explores how self-repair using the editing term well in spontaneous speech is a stance act closely linked to the speaker’s self-monitoring, based on the fact that the speaker takes an evaluative stance by monitoring and assessing the
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preceding part of her/his speech. It is hypothesized that, in the use of *well* as an editing expression in self-repair, the speaker bases the repair not on error recognition per se, but rather on monitoring the need for stance alteration.

As an analytical framework, the paper examines self-repair with regard to stance (Du Bois 2007) and resonance, which is a core notion of dialogic syntax (Du Bois 2014), an innovative theory in recent pursuit of the interface of discourse and cognition based on dialogicality (Bakhtin 1981). It is assumed that the seemingly self-contained part of speech involving self-initiated self-repair is actually dialogic in nature, being responsive to the self-monitoring voice equivalent to the hearer’s potential questions and comments that could have arisen in the context. In these terms, the paper approaches long-standing research on self-repair (e.g., Schegloff et al. 1977; Levelt 1983, 1989; Schegloff 2000; Spilker et al. 2000; Nooteboom 2010) by analyzing its occurrence from the perspective of stance (Du Bois 2007), resonance, and accompanying editing terms.

In Section 2, I will briefly review the mechanisms of self-repair and self-monitoring and their relevance to the dialogic syntactic approach. In Section 3, I will review past studies on the role of *well* as a discourse marker and a stance marker. In Section 4, I will examine instances of self-repair with the editing term *well* using a discourse analytic approach with the key notions of stance, resonance, and dialogicality. Examples are analyzed in diagraphs that highlight structural mapping relations across utterances. Section 5 will summarize the findings and conclude the discussion.

### 2. Self-repair and self-monitoring

Self-repairs are “self-initiated corrections of one’s own speech” (Pillai 2006: 114; see also Schegloff et al. 1977; Postma 2000). Levelt (1983, 1989) developed a theory to explain how speech is monitored and repaired, suggesting that speakers monitor their own speech just as they monitor other people’s
speech (Levelt 1983; Levelt et al. 1999). Speech production originates in the conceptualizer, where an idea or message of an intended utterance is generated. The preverbal message then proceeds to the formulator and is turned into a linguistic structure, which is finally passed on to the articulator. The message is monitored as internal speech (pre-articulatory editing) or overt speech (post-articulatory editing).

Levelt (1983) lists three major phases of self-repair: (i) monitoring and interrupting speech; (ii) hesitating and pausing often with editing expressions or filled pauses; and (iii) repairing the speech. He also proposes two functions of the monitor: matching and creating instructions for adjustment. The monitor first compares parsed aspects of inner or overt speech with the intended message and with the criteria of production. If any mismatch is sensed in the “intentional and contextual appropriateness, agreement of intended and delivered message, and linguistic correctness,” then the monitor sends instructions for adjustment. Some foci in monitoring and repairing are: (i) different-information-repairs regarding the content, the topic choice, or the ordering of messages; (ii) appropriateness-repairs concerning whether an idea is expressed properly, clearly, unambiguously, cohesively; and (iii) error-repairs for accidental errors, including lexical, syntactic, and phonetic errors (Levelt 1983: 51–52).

Levelt (1983) points out the similar structural echoing relation between the original utterance and the repair proper, between members of a coordinate construction, and between questions and answers.¹ The speaker making a repair transfers the structural features from the original utterance to the next, just as in a conjunction and in question-answering. This transfer establishes structural relations, enhancing speech fluency and discourse coherence. In light of that, I would argue for the relevance of analyzing self-repairs with regard to the notion of resonance, which maps structural relations between present and prior utterances. Resonance is a central notion of dialogic syntax (Sakita 2006; Du Bois 2014), which is founded upon the concept of dialogicality.
Self-repair and self-monitoring with the editing term well in narrative in view of stance (Bakhtin 1981). Since self-repairing primarily involves the speaker as her/his own listener in the monitoring process, the concept of dialogicality applies to it in its fundamental operation. Furthermore, the structure of self-repair is generally characterized to have four segmented parts: (i) the original utterance that contains the trouble spot (reparandum), (ii) the interruption point, (iii) the editing phase including an editing term, and (iv) the repair that contains the alteration (reparans) (Levelt 1983: 45). With the interruption point and the editing phase in between, the original utterance and the repair are commonly set in structural transfer, which is pertinently examined in view of parallelism on the analytical ground of the diagraph in dialogic syntax (Du Bois 2014).

Clark (1996: 273) points out that each editing term in self-repair is used for a different type of trouble or repair. The editing expressions no, or rather, I mean, that is characterize the speaker’s current trouble and its relation to the repair: no characterizes the preceding segment as incorrect; or rather compares it with another expression to be offered. On the other hand, the editing expressions well, oh, ah, aha, let me see comment on the source of the speaker’s trouble (James 1972, 1973; Schourup 1985; Heritage 1984) and reveal their current thought about their upcoming remark. You know is used for appropriateness repair (Clark and Gerrig 1990). Each editing term may derive its features from its function as a discourse marker.

### 3. Well as a stance discourse marker

Well has been commonly noted as a discourse marker with various pragmatic functions (e.g., Lakoff 1973; Svartvik 1980; Carlson 1984; Schourup 1985, 2001; Schiffrin 1987; Bolinger 1989; Fraser 1990; Jucker 1993; Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen 2003; de Klerk 2005; Wu and Wang 2008). Its core function is that of a meta-stance marker to negotiate stance divergence between the preceding and upcoming utterances (Sakita 2013a). Du Bois (2007) defines stance as the social act of simultaneously evaluating objects,
positioning subjects (self and others), and aligning with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field. When speakers take a stance, they need to pay attention to stance relations, and the meta-stance operator *well* manages stance divergence and shift, as shown in Example (1) from Sakita (2013a: 90). Here, two speakers make divergent evaluations of a topic (harassing a woman at a club).²

(1) JAMIE; @

   Probably,
   .. [something’ll land in your mouth].

PETE;   [Well,
   it sounds like there you wouldn’t be] though. (SBC002)

Jamie gives a negative evaluation (you would be punched), while Pete gives an optimistic one (you would not be punched). With *well*, the second speaker marks his divergent stance from that of the prior speaker.

This primary function of *well* has been verified in conversational interaction in general in two contextual categories: at stance divergence between utterances, and at stance shifts embedded in a topic shift. It is also applicable in particular contexts that tend to be prominent loci for the frequent occurrence of *well*, allowing for its distinctive behavior. Those particular contexts include the introduction of quoted speech (e.g., James 1983; Schiffrin 1987; Jucker 1993; Schourup 2001; Müller 2005; Sakita 2013b), concessive moves (Sakita 2013c), and oral narrative (Norrick 2001; González 2004; Sakita 2017). Besides, numerous studies have pointed out that the discourse marker *well* frequently occurs with self-repair (Svartvik 1980; Schiffrin 1987; Biber et al. 1999; Carter and MacCarthy 2006). It is thus the focus of this study to examine in what sense the *well* used in self-repair might be stance-related.
4. The editing term *well* for stanced speech repair

*Well* often accompanies self-correction as a self-repair marker (e.g., Svartvik 1980; Schiffrin 1987; Ran 2003; Müller 2005). Among different types of self-repair, the ones accompanied by the editing term *well* have a certain feature that derives from the nature of the discourse marker *well*—that is, the core function of managing stance divergence and shift as a meta-stance marker and the various pragmatic effects derived from this core. What is characteristic for self-correction initiated by *well* in narrative is that the narrator tends to make some sort of correction in terms of shift of subjective evaluation of the facts, order, or relations of the narrated events. While the typical self-correction in interactional contexts is often associated with such conditions as disfluency, hesitation, planning, and delaying effect, *well* in the present study appears more confined to its stance-managing function as an editing term, rather than mitigating the speaker’s stumbling on a spontaneous speech error.

4.1 Data

Previous studies of speech errors most often involved either task-oriented elicited speech or naturally occurring talk-in-interaction. This study primarily looked at narrative as naturally occurring speech. The data were taken from the oral English narratives in the Charlotte Narrative and Conversation Collection. It contained both interactional (interviewed or conversational) and monologic narratives for which listeners were present. Interactional narratives involve varying degrees of turn-taking, from highly dialogical to extended sequences of monologic discourse with occasional interruptions from the listeners. In the narrative data, among 272 occurrences of the discourse marker *well*, there were 31 instances of it being used as an editing term for self-repair. In addition, this study examined self-repairs in talk-in-interaction to see if the common pattern observed in narrative is seen in
general conversational contexts as well.

4.2 Self-repair mirroring speaker subjectivity

As Gubrium and Holstein (1998: 170) note, a narrator is always engaged in self-reflexivity, as she or he constantly “monitors, manages, modifies, and revises the emergent story” as the author of the narrative. In a narrative, when the narrator recollects a past event, she or he takes a certain stance toward the event, evaluates it, and forms a mental image of it before reporting it. The narrator’s monitoring self, positioned at the meta-narrative level, takes another stance in the next moment in evaluating the same event. In the constant updates of the image, the narrator occasionally notices some discrepancy from the image recreated a moment ago. The narrator immediately corrects, alters, or modifies the former report. It is this overt correction of evaluation of information concerning facts, order, or relation that is notable for self-repair in narrative, rather than the correction of word choice or pronunciation. In Examples (2) and (3) of self-correction initiated by well, the narrators reevaluate the events and, immediately upon detecting an occasion for repair, replace the information with contrasting or contradicting information.

In (2), the narrator talks about what she learned from her grandparents.

(2) they also gave me some advice about life, such as, do unto others as you would have them do unto you, and one very famous thing that, well maybe not famous thing I do remember is my grandmother saying to me is when one door is closed another one always opens [quotation marks missing in original].

(LGAN0649)

She evaluates the quote that her grandmother told her as one very famous thing but then immediately reevaluates it as maybe not famous thing. Although the phrase originated in the Bible and has been quoted by either
Alexander Graham Bell or Helen Keller, being “famous” is a relative and subjective concept. Depending on how someone construes it, the evaluation may be altered. She first evaluates it as famous, but then reevaluates it as not famous by taking another viewpoint or stance that she/he believes is fairer. To bridge the two consecutive but incompatible evaluations, she uses *well* to signal the divergence.

Errors are also a subjective matter, often based on the viewer’s stance. Ohlsson (2011: 208-210) claims that errors arise subjectively as conflicts between what the actor believes ought to be true and what she or he perceives to be the case. In this subjective view, errors are defined with regard to some internal criterion, “for actions are neither correct nor incorrect themselves” (Postma 2000: 101). A certain remark is made from one stance, while from another stance it may not be valid and calls for some correction or adjustment. In (2), the divergent evaluations and the stance negotiation in the monitoring self manifest as self-repair in the course of the narrative. *Well* marks the self-repair as a matter of stance shift rather than a mere mistake, and in using it, the narrator preserves her face through the self-correction as a reliable narrator employing a self-monitoring conscience.

Similarly, Example (3) is a self-repair with *well* bridging totally opposite evaluations.

(3) And nobody cares! And then you could walk down Navy Pier and it must be a little bit like San Francisco only they don’t have, *well*, they do have people down there making money, but they’re mostly drawing people and stuff like that. It is beyond cool! And nobody but, you know, people say they’re indifferent or whatever, but not really, it’s just that it’s a whole different [pause] lifestyle! (LGCH0108)

To evaluate Navy Pier, the original remark gives a denial (*they don’t have*), which is immediately reversed in the second remark (*they do have*), but the
first remark is not uttered due to a slip of the tongue or a simple misconception. The narrator explains that in Navy Pier there are not people making money for the sake of profit as in San Francisco, but there still are people making money as a result of artistic activities. Evaluated from one stance, people there are certainly making money, but from another stance they are not working for the money as a primary purpose. Self-monitoring is a kind of introspection. The narrator’s move of reconsidering the remark and reversing the stance is triggered by the self-reflexive, monitoring self (the background for which will be discussed in detail later in 4.6).

4. 3 Rational self-repair with explanation
Self-repair often accompanies rational explanation of the reversal as a matter of stance divergence.4

(4) It was a Christmas Eve ( ) in there ( ) warm and we sat on these benches and it was completely dark. And, well, it was starting to get dark ’cause they, they did, did it right at dark. And these women, women in these, um, long black skirts and aprons came out with these giant baskets filled with these sweetened buns, (LGLA0171)

In (4), the narrator evaluates a past Christmas event and first remembers that they were sitting on the benches in complete darkness. Immediately afterwards, she reevaluates the same event by seeing it with more accuracy in light of the progressive order of the events. Her updated evaluation of the site situation is that it was not after dark, but just starting to get dark when they were sitting there on the benches. Diagraph (5) makes clear the mapping and differential between the utterances of the same speaker in the sequence.5
The narrator starts describing the site situation in the format *it was ... dark.* She takes divergent stances in terms of how dark it was. On first thought, this is verbalized in the evaluative statement *it was completely dark.* On second thought, her stance diverges to be more precise about the progressive order of the Christmas event: *it was starting to get dark* when they started the preliminary services of bread and music (line 2), so the candlelight service was performed *right at dark* (line 3). The third line is the narrator’s supplement of an evidential in the form of reasoning for the self-repair (*’cause they, they did, did it right at dark*), which increases the reliability or legitimacy of her revised evaluation. This is notably observed with the editing term *well* in narrative. The narrator monitors the factual and relational verity self-reflexively. She marks her own stance shift with *well,* presents the revised information, and provides the rationale for the revision. The repair in this case is not due to a mere speech error with disfluency and hesitations; if it were a mere error at the speech production level, there would be no need to give a legitimate reason for restatement. It is a restatement of the content, especially when a speaker reconsiders, recaptures, or reevaluates the content of her/his own remark in a spontaneous second thought.

So, the editing term *well* tends to signal a stance shift in which the narrator clarifies something or adds accuracy, often accompanying additional information or explanation. In (6), in starting to talk about how she met her husband, AP recalls the situation at that time.6

(6) KB: Did you meet him at the church or // just in Harrisburg? //

AP:  // Yeah, he, he went to church. // And, uh, one reason I guess he-, the reason I married him *’cause he* [pause], *well* I, I went to church
monthly and he wasn’t going that much, but he tried to follow me.

KB: Hm-hmm.

AP: You know, he // had-. //</p>

KB: // Uh-hmm. //</p>

AP: -To go to church, and he told everybody if I don’t follow her to church I’m not going to get to marry her. (LGJO0502)

The correction with well at the point he [pause], well I, I went to church (underlined) is not merely a slip of the tongue, but conceptual and highly self-reflexive, shown unfolded in the mapping in Diagraph (7).  

(7)

1 yeah, he, he went to church.
2 I guess he- +
3 ’cause he [pause] +
4 well I, I went to church monthly
5 and he wasn’t going that much ,
6 but he tried to follow me .
7 you know, he had to go to church , +

AP evaluates KB’s question on whether she met her husband at the church. With the instant, straightforward approval yeah, she initially affirms it, including the situational relation (he, he went to church), but she then reevaluates the statement in hesitation and proceeds to edit it. First, she attempts to position her husband as the subject of “going to church” and the following explanation, but cannot fully confirm his taking a subjective role in going to church (I guess he-; ’cause he [pause]) in lines 2 and 3, and finally decides to position herself as the subject instead (line 4). She reevaluates the situation so that it is not he, but she herself who was going to church with a specification of regularity (monthly), and in contrast negatively evaluates his
frequency (*he wasn’t going that much*) in line 5. She then reveals that he was actually simply trying to follow her there. The stance shift that she effects using her meta-level consciousness is marked by *well*. As a matter of fact, his going to church is not completely incorrect information considering his physical attendance, but to evaluate his attending church from a functional point of view, he did not go to church primarily for religious reasons, whereas she herself attended church regularly as a pious follower. Depending on the stance from which the event is evaluated, the evaluative meaning fluctuates and the narrator as a monitoring self ponders these points. This suggests that the statement in the narrative presented just a moment ago by the speaker was made from a prior stance, but now the speaker wants to shift her stance, and when seen from this current stance, the fact can be evaluated in a different way, leading to restatement. To justify the stance shift and restatement, the narrator adds background information, which in the case of (6) includes the last remark (*he told everybody if I don’t follow her to church I’m not going to get to marry her*).

In these examples, *well* is not a simple mitigator or marker of error-correction, but signals divergence from the speaker’s own preceding stance. These self-repairs are triggered by the self-monitoring consciousness and subjective evaluation.

4.4 **Self-repair adding acceptability**

Even when a remark is not absolutely incorrect, and thus not in need of repairing, the speaker may feel uncertain of its validity as it stands. The speaker can make a repair just by rephrasing a segment or adding an explanation. In (8), KB repairs the remark *you were free to-* by repeating the phrase *you were free* with additional information and explanation.

(8) PJ:  And we would always down there [*sic*] and mama never would say anything.
KB: Hmm. That’s good, you were free to, well it was a different time then too. You were free. It was safe-

PJ: It was safe yeah.

KB: -To do anything.

AP: It was safe.

PJ: Yeah, it was safe. // Because I was talking to-. // (LGJO0502)

Initially, KB’s remark you were free to- does not seem quite right to herself, so she truncates it and repairs it by providing a background context (it was a different time then too) and adding specific conditional meaning (it was safe to do anything). KB’s evaluation of PJ’s experience (the children were at the movie theater and their mother was not saying anything about it) as a good thing (that’s good) is not fully justified by KB’s stance pertaining to freedom itself, but it is by the stance with reference to freedom on the basis of safety. At the stance shift from simple freedom to freedom based on safety, KB instantly receives agreement from interlocutors PJ (it was safe yeah; yeah, it was safe) and AP (it was safe). In this case, the editing term well suggests stance shifts; it does not fully repair the prior remark, but it signals the shift to a more appropriate stance from which to accept the prior remark.

4.5 Editing term no or well

No characterizes the preceding segment as incorrect (Clark 1996: 273), so it could be a reasonable editing term for denial of the prior utterance in self-repair. There is a clear difference between the editing terms no and well. Example (9) includes both of these markers.

(9) And that is my sister and she was born in 1985. She just had her 16th birthday last Saturday. And she is quite active. She plays field hockey in the spring, no in the fall. Um, she swims during the winter and plays soccer during the spring. So she’s definitely got the athletic gene out of
the two of us. The next square says “253-6068” and that has been my phone number my entire life. Well, obviously until I moved away from home, but um, when I was living with my parents that’s always been my phone number and that is, um, that is the phone number my parents still have. (LGWA0165)

Using no as an editing term in the first occurrence of self-repair, the initial statement in the spring is outright incorrect and is replaced by in the fall. There is no fluctuation of judgment involved here. On the other hand, the second occurrence of self-repair that accompanies the editing term well suggests that my entire life is not an absolute mistake. It is reevaluated from another stance and revised into the segment until I moved away from home, with the stance-adverbial obviously being added to emphasize epistemic stance in terms of factuality and truth. Legitimate information is then added to support the co-occurrence of the two divergent stances (when I was living with my parents that’s always been my phone number and that is ... the phone number my parents still have) as a rationale for the repair. The narrator’s parents have had the phone number 253-6068 her whole life, but she herself is not living with them currently, so it is not her own number anymore. Depending on the speaker’s stance in evaluating the phone number, whether in a broad or strict sense, the prior segment is either acceptable or needs to be corrected. While the editing term no is used for the repair of incorrect information, well is used for revision on second thought with an alternate stance that the speaker decides is more appropriate in the current context.

4.6 Dialogic nature of monologue: Self-monitoring and self-repair

Why second thought? The speaker utters something but, detecting a discrepancy of information or a contradiction, the monitoring self questions the validity of the remark in light of the situational context. It is as if the speaker anticipates the listener’s reaction by monitoring her own speech. In
dialogic interaction, this is commonly seen as other-initiated self-repair, as in (10).

(10) Ken: Is Al here today?
Dan: Yeah.
Roger: He is? hh eh heh
Dan: *Well* he was. (Schegloff et al. 1977: 364)

Following Dan’s remark *yeah*, Roger questions its validity, and Dan is led to reevaluate the fact. Al *was* there when Dan saw him today, but on second thought, he realizes that he is not sure whether Al *is* still there. By shifting his stance to evaluate the presence of Al “today” in a more strict sense, Dan corrects the remark with the editing term *well*. In Diagraph (11), the dialogic differential (Du Bois 2014) foregrounds the point at issue.\(^8\)

(11) 1 Ken: Al {is} here today ?
  2 Dan: yeah .
  3 Roger: he is ?
  4 Dan: *well* he *was* . +

Spread out in the diagraph, Dan’s *yeah* without thinking deeply (line 2) reveals that he is responding roughly to *Al, here, and today*. On the other hand, Roger focuses on *is* (line 3). By noticing Roger’s stance toward the shared stance object (the presence of Al today), Dan shifts to Roger’s stance to reevaluate Al’s presence today in line 4. The range of the *be*-verb *is* cannot be approved when strictly considering the situation, calling for the repair of *is* to *was*. The dialogic differential reflects the stance differential (Du Bois 2007) at its foundation. According to the stance shift in evaluating Al’s presence in the temporal framework “today,” the dialogic differential is highlighted
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between *he is* and *he was* in the syntagmatic framework shared by these short utterances. Simultaneously, Dan’s switching from *yeah* on first thought to *well* on second thought denotes the upcoming stance divergence.

Similarly, the speaker in the self-initiated self-repair in (9) above presupposes the listener’s reaction, illustrated as *your entire life?* in Diagraph (12). Thus, the speaker reevaluates the time span of the phone number being hers, and assesses if the phrase *my entire life* exactly covers the time span. *Well* bridges the first and the second thought, with the latter being true from a more strict standpoint.

(12)
1 that has been my phone number  my entire life .
2 (your entire life ?)
3 well, obviously until I moved away from home ,

In this sense, *well* particularly points to the dialogicality of monologues. The discourse marker *well* as used in talk-in-interaction has been known as a response marker, interaction marker, and stance marker, so it can readily assume these dialogic features even in monologues. A repair with *well* in monologues responds to an inner-speech question posed by the speaker’s self-monitoring, just like a response to a listener’s clarification question or challenge in dialogic interaction.

A common feature of the use of the editing term *well*, whether in self-initiated or other-initiated self-repair, is that the error judgment is a matter of stance-taking, and *well* bridges the two divergent stances, managing their relation. The initial remark may not be “incorrect,” but the stance object can be evaluated from a different stance in which it is more appropriately or accurately presented. An explanation may often be added as a rationale for the initial remark that has been altered, or a reason or information supporting its alteration may be added.
Recall (3), which is repeated below as (13). It is a monologic narrative, but it suggests the dialogic nature of second-thought self-repair on the basis of self-monitoring.

(13) And nobody cares! And then you could walk down Navy Pier and it must be a little bit like San Francisco only they don’t have, well, they do have people down there making money, but they’re mostly drawing people and stuff like that. It is beyond cool! And nobody but, you know, people say they’re indifferent or whatever, but not really, it’s just that it’s a whole different [pause] lifestyle! (LGCH0108) (=3)

The correction is done almost like in the concessive pattern [X well X’ but Y] in interactional settings (Sakita 2013c), but in this case X is covertly provided by the monitoring self. The concessive pattern [X well X’ but Y] is one of the prevalent variations of the basic concessive pattern in conversation, involving a three-part interactional sequence [XX’Y] (Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson 2000), as in Example (15).

(14) X: A; Makes some point  
X’: B; Acknowledges the validity of this point  
Y: B; Goes on to claim the validity of a potentially contrasting point

(15) X: Joanne; He’s got iron, with his multiples.  
well Lenore; Well,  
X’: I have iron too,  
but but  
Y: some of it isn’t absorbable. (SBC0015) (Sakita 2013c: 66)

Along this line, suppose the narrator’s monitoring self in (13) questioned the validity of the claim that they don’t have people making money in Navy Pier,
Chicago. In Diagraph (16), the bracketed part X (they do) denotes the monitoring voice’s contribution (line 2).

(16)

1 only they do n’t have ,
X: 2 (they do)
well 3 well ,
X’: 4 they do have people down there making money ,
but 5 but
Y: 6 they’re mostly drawing people ...

In the concessive move X’, the narrator shifts stance to acknowledge the view that they do have people down there making money (just as in San Francisco), and then makes her own point in Y, which leads to the conclusion that it’s a whole different ... lifestyle (in these two places). In Diagraph (16), resonance between the preceding remark (line 1) and its correction (line 4) foregrounds the dialogic differential, which is achieved with minimal self-correction. The dialogic differential highlights the conceding move in this case.

4. 7 Alteration of specification

Well often signals shifts in the fluctuations between varied construals of a state of affairs. In (17), by adding the main clause I thought in the repair, the speaker adds modality that makes subjectivity explicit.

(17) AP: I would talk to me and just, any little thing. The main thing was the houses.
KB: // Uh-huh. //
AP: // They was-, // I didn’t want a, well I thought I didn’t want to live close-.
KB: // Yeah. //
AP: // -You know, // ’cause the houses were, you know-.  
KB: On top of each other. // [Laughs] // (LGJO0502)

AP starts her remark (I didn’t want a), but chooses to add a main clause with a cognitive matrix verb (I thought) that specifies the mode of cognitive activity—thinking. Well in this case signals the shift to the more precise clarity about the speaker’s subjectivity. In self-repair, the speaker AP chooses to make clear that what she mentions is her subjective evaluation. Similar cases of self-repair are often observed with the editing term well in conversation, too.

(18) ... (Hx) And I told —
    ... Well I think I told you this. (SBC0011)

(19) And I told her exactly —
    ... well,
    i t- I simply told her what,
    (H) what I: know ... to have happ- — (SBC0010)

In these examples, the initial remarks that are repaired are not incorrect. Between I didn’t want to … and I thought I didn’t want to …, there appears not much difference in terms of truth value: both are the speaker’s thought, regardless of whether the speaker makes this explicit. However, the added I thought acknowledges that what follows is the speaker’s subjective evaluation. When choosing to evaluate the speech event in a more strict sense, the editing term well with its stance-managing function signals repair on the basis of a speaker’s stance shift.
5. Conclusion

This paper has examined how self-repair with the use of the editing term well is a stance act based on the speaker’s self-monitoring. Self-repair with well reflects the narrator’s self-reflexivity in monitoring and revising the emergent story. Well prefices the repair of facts, factual relations, or order, signaling and managing the meta-stance relation between the upcoming stance and the prior stance. This paper has focused on narrative data, but the study also looked at talk-in-interaction, suggesting its applicability in general speech contexts, which shall be further verified in the future.

Levelt (1983: 41) claims that “the editing term plus the first word of the repair proper almost always contain sufficient information” to indicate “how the repair should be related to the original utterance. Speakers almost never produce misleading information in this respect.” This paper has shown that the defining trait of self-repair with the editing term well is that the speaker has, in self-monitoring, assessed their prior remark not as incorrect in a strict sense, but that more feasible or accurate facts or factual relations may be presented from a divergent stance. Furthermore, when the prior remark’s validity is somewhat questionable, well signals a shift to a stance that is more appropriate for accepting the remark. It may also denote clarifying something or adding accuracy to the prior remark. Self-repair with well is not simple error correction, but a shift in the speaker’s subjective evaluation of the original reported events/facts. The speaker often adds some rational explanations for this type of repair. Furthermore, self-repair with well demonstrates the dialogic nature of monologues through the use of well in responding to inner-speech questions posed by the speaker’s own monitoring self, just as it would be used to respond to a listener’s question or challenge.

In conclusion, well in the context of self-repair is a stance-managing editing term. This supports the core function of the discourse marker well as a meta-
stance marker, which I have shown in previous research: in conversational interaction in general (Sakita 2013a), as well as in the distinctive contexts of quoted speech (Sakita 2013b), conversational concession (Sakita 2013c), and oral narrative (Sakita 2017). Stance is inherent in the nature of human communication (Du Bois 2007). In a dialogic context, speakers are attentive to other speakers’ stances, whereas in a monologic context, they pay similar reasonable attention to their own prior stances. Speakers constantly attend to stance and stance relations, negotiating them in language use.

Notes

1 This is especially true of error-repairs, which resemble the original utterance with minimal changes. Appropriateness-repairs are often realized as fresh starts with additional messages (Levelt 1983: 97).

2 The following transcription symbols and conventions are used in the conversational examples taken from the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English (Du Bois 2010).

— truncated intonation unit
wor— truncated/cut-off word
.  final intonation
,  continuing intonation
… long pause
.. short pause
(H) inhalation
(Hx) exhalation
:  lag
@ laugh pulse
JILL; speakers

The examples from this corpus have identifiers starting with (SBC).

3 The Charlotte Narrative and Conversation Collection: New South Voices: J. Murrey Atkins Library, University of North Carolina at Charlotte. The examples from this collection have identifiers starting with (LG).

4 The empty parentheses ( ) indicate uncertain or unclear words.
The narrative examples are mostly presented following the style of the original data collection. The diagraphs for the narrative examples are mostly displayed by sentential or clausal units. For the detailed logic behind the diagraph, see Du Bois (2014).

The double obliques // indicate overlapping speech.

In the diagraph, the plus sign at the end of a line denotes some omissions between the current and previous lines.

In the diagraph, the curly bracketed element { } is removed from its original position.
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要約
本論文は、話し言葉の自己修復に伴う様々な編集標識（editing term）の中で、特にwellを伴う自己修復が話者の自己モニタリングに基づくスタンス行為であることを示した。修復及びモニタリングに関する理論（Levelt 1983）と、スタンス（Du Bois 2007）と対話統語論（Du Bois 2014）の理論に基づいて、会話における語りに焦点を当てて分析を行った。その結果、wellを伴う自己修復は単に「誤り」を「訂正」するためになされるのではなく、事象に対する話者の主観的評価を推移させ別スタンスから言及する形に修正するためになされることが明らかになった。特に、話者自身の先行スタンスと後続スタンスとの間のメタレベルにおける関係を調整・表明する際に編集標識wellが生起し、発話対象に関する事実関係や順序等に関する自己修復がなされる。また、本論文の分析を通して、自己開始による自己修復という、発話中の一見自己完結な独話部分が自己モニターに基づいて対話的性質を示すことが明らかになった。
さらに、本論文では談話標識wellの中心的機能を、会話一般、引用、議論、語り等の個々の文脈で一連の調査を進める中で明らかになってきた、メタスタンス標識としてのスタンス調整機能（Sakita 2013a、2013b、2013c、2017）を、自己修復の文脈においても確認することができた。従って、日常のあらゆる場面での言語運用におけるスタンスの肝要な役割がさらに解明された。