

# Multiple Sayings as a Resource for Halting a Course of Action in Interaction: Evidence from Turkish Everyday Discourse

Derya Aydın<sup>1</sup>, Gülsüm Songül Ercan<sup>2</sup>

ORCID: <sup>1</sup>0000-0003-0706-8051, <sup>2</sup>0000-0002-5392-7008

<sup>1</sup>University of Turkish Aeronautical Association, İzmir Aviation Vocational School, Selçuk Campus, 35920, Selçuk, İzmir

<sup>2</sup>Dokuz Eylül University, Department of Linguistics, İzmir

<sup>1</sup>daydin@thk.edu.tr, <sup>2</sup>songul.ercan@deu.edu.tr

(Received 27 September 2023; Accepted 17 April 2024)

---

**ABSTRACT:** Self-repetition, which is defined as repeating one's own utterance, performs various functions in spoken discourse. This study investigates the use of "multiple sayings", a specific type of self-repetition which involves the speaker's repetition of some unit of talk in the same turn multiple times, under a single intonational contour. In everyday discourse different linguistic resources are used as multiple sayings performing different communicative functions. The study limits itself in two aspects: (i) the use of lexical multiple sayings such as "yes yes yes" and "wait wait wait"; (ii) their function of halting the prevailing course of action in talk-in interaction. Although repetitions have been investigated in Turkish in several studies, this specific form of repetition and this specific function remains to be explored. To this end, using Conversation Analysis as the method of analysis, the study aims to find out what multiple sayings are used in Turkish everyday discourse for halting a course of action and what courses of action they halt. The database of the study consists of the recordings of a 10-hour Turkish everyday discourse. The analysis of the data reveals that in line with the previous studies conducted in other languages, Turkish speakers use multiple sayings to stop an unwarranted course of action, which implicates the universality of this function.

**Keywords:** repetition, multiple sayings, conversation analysis, everyday discourse

## Etkileşim Sırasında Bir Konuşma Eylemini Sonlandırma Kaynağı Olarak Çoklu Yinelemeler: Türkçe Gündelik Söylemden Kanıtlar

**ÖZ:** Karşılıklı konuşma sırasında bir konuşucunun kendi sözcüsünü yinelemesi olarak açıklanan kendini yineleme, sözlü söylemde çeşitli işlevleri yerine

getirmektedir. Bu alıřmada, bir konuřma biriminin aynı sz sırasında tek bir ezgi konturu ile yinelenmesi biiminde gerekleřen zel bir kendini yineleme tr olan oklu yinelemelerin kullanımı incelenmektedir. Gndelik sylenme farklı dilsel kaynaklar oklu yinelemeler olarak kullanılmakta ve eřitli iletiřimsel iřlevleri yerine getirmektedir. alıřmanın kapsamı (i) “evet evet evet” ve “bekle bekle bekle” gibi tek szckl oklu yinelemeleri ve (ii) bunların etkileřimsel iřlevlerini inceleyecek biimde sınırlandırılmıřtır. Trkede yinelemeler eřitli alıřmalarda ele alınmıř olmakla birlikte oklu yinelemeler ve bir eylemi sonlandırma iřlevi henz incelenmemiřtir. Bu alıřmanın amacı, Karřılıklı Konuřma zmlemesi erevesinde Trke gndelik sylenme bir eylemi sonlandırmak iin kullanılan oklu yinelemelerin ve bu yinelemeler aracılıęıyla sonlandırılan eylemlerin belirlenmesidir. alıřmanın veritabanı 10 saatlik Trke gndelik konuřma kaydından elde edilen evriyazı metinleridir. Bulgularımız, Trke dil konuřucularının oklu yinelemeleri alanyazında farklı dillerde yapılan alıřmalara kořut biimde gereksiz bir konuřma eyleminin sonlandırılması amacıyla kullandığını ortaya koymakta ve sz edilen iřlevin evrensellięine iřaret etmektedir.

*Anahtar szckler:* yineleme, oklu yinelemeler, karřılıklı konuřma zmlemesi, gndelik sylenme

## 1 Introduction

Repetition is a basic operation that speakers of any language do in talk (Rossi, 2020). Considered as a universal phenomenon in conversation (Merritt, 1994), repetition is so pervasive in spoken discourse that it is present whenever people interact (Johnstone, 1994; Tannen, 2007). Everyday face-to-face conversation thrives, in particular, on repetition. Speakers routinely repeat their own words and phrases; in addition, they repeat the utterances of other speakers to fulfill various communicative functions (Norrick, 1987; Tannen, 2007; van Lancker Sidtis and Wolf, 2015). Due to the multiplicity of the functions it serves in conversation, repetition has been a fruitful area of research in linguistics.

Described as a spontaneous, pervasive and multifaceted phenomenon in talk, repetitions have been mainly categorized into various types according to the speaker who repeats (same speaker or other); the form it takes (exact or non-exact) and the time-lapse after the first saying (immediate, delayed or distant) which are also referred as the source, degree of fixity and temporality of the repeated items (Johnstone, 1994; Tannen, 2007; van Lancker Sidtis and Wolf, 2015).

There is a growing body of literature showing that repetitions in discourse can be of different kinds and have various cognitive, psychological, interactional, ritualistic, stylistic or didactic effects (Johnstone, 1994; Perrin, Deshaies and Paradis, 2003; Tannen, 2007; Bazzanella, 2011). More recent

research reveals that speakers use repetitions intentionally for various purposes such as *requesting confirmation of understanding; requesting clarification; giving discourse coherence; confirming; showing participatory listenership; showing alignment, engagement in listenership (continuer); agreement; giving the opportunity to understand an item* etc. (Fujimura-Wilson, 2007; Hsieh, 2009; Cappuzzo, 2015; van Lancker Sidtis and Wolf, 2015).

Studies on repetition in Turkish, however, are quite limited (Aydın, 2024; Ercan, Aydın ve Başaran, 2024). One prominent study was conducted by Tekdemir Yurtdaş (2010) in which she analyzed Turkish conversations among friends and revealed that self-repetitions were used mainly for *repair* in conversations, while other-repetitions were used for the functions of *acknowledgement, agreement, disagreement, rejection, request clarification/confirmation* and *humor*. In another study analyzing conversation among friends and family members, Tekdemir Yurtdaş (2012) found that self-repetitions were used for *repair initiations, emphasis, conversational floor management, jokes/humor* and *correction*; while other-repetitions were used for *repair initiation, displaying receptiveness, agreement, disagreement/rejection, joke sequences* and *question-answer sequences*. Obviously, whether self or other-repetition, repetitions, together with their various functions, are a part of everyday talk in Turkish.

In an attempt to identify and describe a systematic interactional practice in ordinary conversation characterized by the repetition of a word, phrase or sentence, Stivers (2004) introduced the term “multiple sayings” which have been described to involve a speaker repeating some unit of talk (a word, phrase or sentence) in the same turn, multiple times, under a single intonational contour. Stivers (2004) argues that speakers use multiple sayings with a specific function, i.e., “halting the course of action”. The same function has been previously observed in English, Catalan, Hebrew, Japanese, Korean, Lao, Russian, Spanish (Stivers, 2004), German (Golato and Fagyal, 2008), Mandarin Chinese (Zhou, 2022) French (Stivers, 2004; Persson, 2020) and Turkish (Aydın, 2024). Our study aims to investigate multiple sayings with the mentioned function and reveal the courses of action they halt.

Using the transcription of a 10-hour Turkish everyday discourse recording within the framework of Conversation Analysis, our study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. What multiple sayings are used by Turkish speakers in everyday discourse?
2. Are multiple sayings used as a resource for halting a course of action in Turkish everyday discourse?
3. What courses of actions are halted by multiple sayings?

Since the focus of our study is multiple sayings, background information has been provided in the following section.

## **2 Multiple Sayings**

Multiple sayings (Stivers, 2004) such as “no no no.” or “wait wait wait” are the multiple repetitions of a unit of talk by a speaker in the same turn and the same intonational contour. As the term “multiple sayings” depicts, these types of repetitions have specific features: (i) they involve a full unit of talk being said multiple times; (ii) they are uttered by the same speaker; (iii) they have similar segmental character; (iv) they occur immediately in succession; and (v) they are done under a single intonation contour (Stivers, 2004, p.261).

Based on these features, it can be argued that multiple sayings fall into the category of immediate, exact, self-repetitions. What distinguishes multiple sayings from immediate, exact, self-repetitions is their direct link to the prosody of the repeated item. Intonational contours provide speakers with an additional resource for managing turn transitions and multiple sayings are produced as a single turn constructional unit. For better understanding of the difference, we need to have a closer look at how a multiple saying of a single token (a lexical item) can be delivered. A stretch of talk can be delivered and transcribed as a single prosodic package brought to a single point of completion such as “okay okay okay”, where each item “okay” is part of a single intonation contour not coming to period intonation until the third saying of “okay”. Alternatively, it can be delivered and transcribed as involving multiple packages, each of which involves a type of final intonation point such as “Okay. Okay. Okay.” where each item “okay” comes to falling period intonation. This contour is suggested to be critical in terms of the prosody of the repeated items. The sound production of multiples is broadly described as beginning at a slightly higher pitch and being produced without a break in phonation and with a gradual and steady fall until they reach final intonation. This contour appears to be hearable from the outset of the multiple sayings. This study relies on an auditory analysis of the prosody of multiples arguing that this shape appears to be systematic, recurrent and recognizable to interactants. A precise description of the acoustic properties of this practice would be an investigation in its own right (Stivers, 2004, pp. 262-265).

A comparison of Example (1) and Example (2) should help to get a better understanding of the use of multiple sayings in everyday conversations:

- (1) 1 DOC: .h Use tha:t, an:' when you see thuh: thing-sw-  
 2 wi:pe it off. scrape it off [like that.]  
 3 MOM: -> [ Ri:ght. ] R[ight].  
 4 DOC: [Okay?  
 5 MOM: ->Right.  
 6 DOC: And the::n, uhm if you see like thuh redness,  
 7 like infected?, [then I'm gonna give you antibiotic=  
 8 MOM: [Right.  
 9 DOC: =ointment.  
 10 MOM: Okay:. Alright.

(Stivers, 2004, p. 263)

Example (1) shows a part of a conversation between a doctor and a child's mother involving the use of a dandruff shampoo on the child. The mother responds to doctor's instruction of wiping the child's body off as "Right. Right" in line 3 and as "Right" in line 5 with a function of acknowledgement. Each "Right." here also signals the completion of mother's turn constructional units. The tokens of "Right." in this excerpt is a discrete unit for the hearer (the doctor). Doctor's "Okay" in line 4 targets the transition space following the first "Right." in line 5. Similarly, doctor's turn in line 6 is placed following the mother's "Right." in line 5, which again shows that the mother's turn is complete. The example shows that, from the perspective of the hearer, a single token "Right." signals a turn completion unit and is perceived as discrete.

On the other hand, compare the usage of a similar token "Alright" when it is uttered and repeated under a single intonation contour for five times as in Example (2):

- (2) 1 BOB: Ah- Ah- I deferred on thee earlier thing? on thuh  
 2 projection [( of thuh- )]  
 3 TOM: -> [Alright >a'ri]ght=a'right=a'right=a'right<.=  
 4 OTH: =((gene[ral laughter))/(1.5)  
 5 BOB: [ (^Ooh.)  
 6 BOB: [I guess I won that one thou(h)gh=huh=huh=huh=°huh  
 7 huh°

(Stivers, 2004, p. 263)

In the excerpt, Bob and Tom have a teasing dispute over a problem. Unlike the repetition of "Right." In Example (2) above, the repetition "alright alright alright" comprises a turn constructional unit, involving full five repeats. Thus, this repetition is defined as a multiple saying which performs a single action of acknowledgement collectively, in contrast to the multiple discrete actions as in Example (1). The hearers also respond to this turn after the completion of the fifth token, thus treating this multiple saying as a single action.

Stivers (2004) argues that multiple sayings are not simply upgrades and/or intensifiers of a single token and in fact, they fulfill a different function. The practice of multiple sayings function to display that the prior speaker's course of action, typically the perseveration, is unwarranted and thus that course of action should be properly stopped as shown in the following example:

- (3) 1 DOC: Now you're::  
 2 (0.2)  
 3 MOM: Sawy:er.  
 4 (0.3)  
 5 DOC: Ye:[s. ]  
 6 MOM: [Ro]ber[t (Sawyer).]  
 7 DOC: -> [Yes yes ye]s yes:: yes::.  
 8 (0.4)  
 9 MOM: A very bad cough.=I had ta call the doctor . .  
 (Stivers, 2004, p. 266)

The extract is taken from a pediatric examination, which offers evidence that multiple saying performs a discrete action (function) from the original item. The token “Yes.” in line 5 is used to acknowledge information. However, the multiple saying of the same item as in line 7 (“Yes yes yes yes yes”) performs a quite different action, which does not necessarily mean a more intensified version of the first saying as widely reported in the literature. The action “Yes yes yes yes yes” displays that the provision of the child's full name by the mother is unnecessary and thus should be halted. Halting a course of action may further convey some degree of annoyance with the mother's persistence in offering unwarranted piece of information, which is not conveyed by a single item “Yes.” This finding reveals that the repeating is a communication practice in its own right.

Similarly, Golato and Fagyal (2008) showed in German data that a single “ja” (yes) is typically considered as an acknowledgement token, confirmation marker or continuer while “ja ja” signals that the prior utterance contains already known information and therefore the current action should be stopped. Therefore, a double “ja” cannot be considered as a more intense version of a single “ja”. Schegloff (1992) treated the token “no” used singly or multiple times as a repair initiator. Müller (1996) reported that the instances of French “oui oui oui” constituted a stronger recognition when compared to a single token of “oui” (cited by Stivers, 2004). Analyzing the use of multiple sayings of “yes” and “no” in French conversations, Persson (2020), too, revealed that “non non” (no no) and “ouais ouais” (yes yes) display that the speakers “have been over the subject at hand” and that the matter has been dealt with more than necessary. On the other hand, investigating the uses of the multiple saying “dui dui dui” (right right right) in Mandarin Chinese conversations, Zhou (2020) also showed that this multiple saying is not an upgrade of the single “dui”; it

indicates to the hearer that what the speaker articulated in the previous turn has been more than precisely articulated; mutual understanding has been reached and thus the talk can now be progressed to the next step. The present study contributes to the literature by exploring the use of multiple sayings with the function of halting a course of action and what courses of action they halt in Turkish everyday discourse.

### **3 Database and Method**

The data of the study consists of the transcriptions of a 10-hour audio recordings of Turkish everyday discourse examples. The transcriptions comprised of 24 conversations among a total of 49 participants between the ages of 26-35. The participants are all Turkish native speakers and were chosen among people who are friends, colleagues or partners, with no superior-subordinate relationship among them. All of the participants are at the least university graduates. The participants were informed that the recording would be used for academic purposes and their written consents was taken and ethics committee approval was obtained.

Conversation Analysis (CA) was adopted as the methodology. Viewing social interaction as systematic, orderly and practice-oriented, CA assumes that no detail of communication can be considered as random or arbitrary. Thus, it examines the recording of naturally-occurring data in order to uncover systemic practices by which social actions are achieved and to describe the social actions that a particular interactional practice aims to accomplish (Heritage and Atkinson, 1984; Schegloff, 1997). CA examines conversation within the scope of communication behaviors such as interrupting, repairs, topic change, and its structural features, which include adjacency pairs and sequences, which are the regular patterns that occur in conversation (Ercan, 2022). The tools of CA enable the researchers to uncover the dynamics of mundane conversations (Sert et al., 2015). Analyses conducted on naturally occurring data revealed that the participants of an interaction reciprocally build meaning using sequential organization tools such as sequence organization, turn taking and repair (Girgin et al., 2020). In our study, CA was used to discover a particular function of multiple sayings.

To identify multiple sayings in our database, the transcriptions of audio material were manually scanned by the researchers. The findings of the two researchers were crosschecked and an agreement was reached on controversial instances. The functions of these tokens were also determined separately by the two researchers. Finally, the opinion of a third researcher who is specialized in the field of linguistics was requested to verify our findings.

#### 4 Analysis and Discussion

Our study, as presented in the Introduction, aims to answer these questions: i) What multiple sayings are used in Turkish everyday discourse? ii) Are multiple sayings used in Turkish everyday discourse as a resource to halt a course of action? and iii) What courses of action do multiple sayings halt in Turkish everyday discourse? As stated earlier, multiple sayings are, in fact, a type of immediate, exact, self-repetition. In our database, we found 170 lexical, immediate, exact, self-repetitions, which were then separately transcribed by the authors to check whether they qualified for a multiple saying, based on the criteria explained in Section 2. Finally, only ten of them were categorized as multiple sayings, eight of which were found to be affirmatory responses. The most frequently used one, with five instances, is “aynen aynen”, which is a confirmation expression and can be translated into English as “exactly exactly”. We found two instances of “tamam tamam” (“right right”/ “okay okay”) and single instances of “tabi tabi” (of course of course), “gibi gibi” (like that like that) and “anladım anladım” (“I got it I got it”).

The first examples of multiple sayings from our database are presented in Example (4), which presents two multiple sayings in a row:

- (4) 1 A: Ne sordunuz writingde?  
(What did you ask in writing?)  
2 B: İkisinden birini.  
(One of the given two.)  
3 A: Topic neydi? Topicler ya da. Konular neydi?  
(What was the topic or topics?)  
4 B: Valla neydi ya. Bir advantages and disadvantages of  
managing your own business idi bir tanesi.  
(What were they? One of them was advantages and disadvantages of managing your  
own business.)  
5 A: Bunu ne bilecek de öğrenciler? Business manage etmeyi  
nerden bilsinler?  
(How can the students know that? How are they supposed to know how to manage a  
business?)  
6 B: Ama biz öğrenciyi B1+ seviyede mezun ediyoruz o yüzden  
yani deęiřti.  
(But our students graduate with a level of B+. That’s why e, it has changed.)  
7 A: Haa.  
(Oh.)  
8 B: Mezun olduęunda da bunu yazabilecek düzeye gelmeli.  
(They must be able to write this when they graduate.)  
9 A: Öğrencinin hayatına dair bir soru olmamıř gibi geldi bana  
da. Testing hazırladı deęil mi bu soruyu?  
(It seemed to me that the question does not relate to a student’s life. Testing office  
prepared this question, didn’t they?)  
10 B: Hıı  
(Uh huh.)  
11 A: Eleřtirdim řu anda ama.  
(I’m critical of this topic)  
12 B: Yani hayatı yani...



- (Their life, you mean...)
- 13 A: Öğrencinin kendi hayatına yakın bir şey olmadı.  
(The question does not relate to a student's life.)
- 14 B: Ama yani öğrencinin de biraz hazırbulunmuşluğunun var olduğunu kabul ediyoruz yani. Öğrenci üniversiteye gelmiş, üniversitede.  
(But we expect that the students have a certain degree of preparedness. They are university students.)
- 15 A: Manage business yani biraz bana şey geldi.  
(Managing a business seems a bit...)
- 16 B: Yani en azından yani hani kendim... Kendi işini. Yani restoran açacaksın mesela, ya da kuaför açacaksın. Bunu...Ne bileyim işte paranın yönetimi sende olacak falan diye yazan olmuş.  
(At least, they wrote... Their own business. For example you can open your restaurant or a hair dressers. Like you will be the one to manage your money.)
- 17 A: Her gün gitmene gerek yok. Erken kalkmana gerek yok.  
(You don't have to go to work everyday. You don't have to get up early.)
- 18 B: *Gibi gibi.*  
(Like that like that.)
- 19 A: Bu tür şeyler yazmışlardır.  
(They must have written things like this.)
- 20 B: *Aynen aynen.*  
(Exactly exactly.)
- 21 A: Sonra onları değerlendirdiniz.  
(Then you evaluated the papers.)
- 22 B: Sonra yedi kişiyi sözlü yaptık bitirdik sonra gittik bir de beşer kağıt da birebir öyle düştü bize.  
(Then we took seven students to an oral exam and then we were given five papers each.)
- 23 A: Hı hıı. Ya yine az düşmüş.  
(Uh huh. That isn't too many.)

The excerpt has been taken from a conversation between two English teachers. The interlocutors discuss about an exam and speculate on types of questions asked and the proficiency level expected from the students. Speaker A criticizes the topic given for the writing section of the exam. After 13 turns of criticism on the choice of the writing topic and speculation on the possible answers given by the students produced by Speaker A and reactions from Speaker B (lines 5-17), Speaker B gets tired of A's exhausting questions and comments and uses the first example of multiple saying "gibi gibi" (like that like that) in line 18, in an effort to halt the ongoing course of action at hand. However, Speaker A continues to talk about what the students might have written in the following turn. This action of perseveration on commenting on the writing topic is again interrupted by a second multiple saying produced by Speaker B, which is "aynen aynen (exactly exactly), in line 20 for the same reason. Realizing Speaker B's implication and taking up the use of multiple sayings as a signal to halt the ongoing course of action, Speaker A gives a new direction to the conversation by commenting "Then you evaluated the papers" thereby encouraging the conversation to progress into a new direction.

It should be made clear that speakers make use of multiple sayings for displaying themselves to be dealing with an entire course of action and not only the just prior unit of talk. A “larger course of action” means an action that involves multiple “stages” or “steps” (Stivers, 2004). As seen from Example (4), there is a 13-turn long course of action involving several stages of criticism brought forward by Speaker A and a defensive stance pursued by Speaker B.

Example (5) below involves triple use of “aynen” (exactly):

- (5) 1 A: Çocuğumu özledim bu arada. Bir haftayı geçti değil mi sana geleli Marley?  
(I missed my child by the way. It’s been more than a week since Marley came to you, right?)
- 2 B: Tabi canım. (.) Bir haftayı rahat geçti. Üç hafta olmadı mı hatta ya? [Sen ilk geldiğinde getirmedi mi Marley’yi bana?]  
(Of course it has. It’s definitely been more than a week. Hasn’t it been three weeks now? Didn’t you bring her the first time you came to my place?)
- 3 A: [Hayır be. Çarşamba günü galiba.] Ya Salı, ya Çarşamba.  
(No. It was Wednesday I guess. It must be Tuesday or Wednesday.)
- 4 B: Ya gene bir haftayı geçmiş işte. Neredeyse bir buçuk hafta.  
(Anyway it’s been more than a week. Almost one and a half weeks.)
- 5 A: *Aynen, aynen, aynen.* Şey, bak bi de şey olacak şimdi biliyorsun.  
(*Exactly exactly exactly.* Well, listen, you know it will be...)
- 6 B: Ayak ucuma geçti bi de artık yanımda yatmıyor.  
(She moved to the end of the bed by my feet. She no longer sleeps next to me.)
- 7 A: Aaa.  
(Woow)
- 8 B: Yanımda yatıyordu aslında. Çarptım mı ne oldu bilmiyorum gece fark etmeden. Yatmıyor artık yanımda, ayakucuma geçti.  
(She used to sleep next to me actually. I don’t know if I hit her at night unknowingly. She does not sleep next to me anymore, she moved to the end of the bed.)
- 9 A: Ama bak dediğim gibi, ayakucu. Hep orayı seviyor o. Yani seviyordu en azından, benimle öyle kalıyordu.  
(As I said, end of the bed. She always likes it there. At least, she used to like it there when she was staying with me.)

In the excerpt above, two friends are talking about when Speaker A’s cat Marley was taken to Speaker B’s place. Upon the question “It’s been more than a week since Marley came to you, right?” in Speaker A’s turn, both speakers begin to speculate on the approximate time of the cat’s date of arrival, which continues until the fourth turn. The multiple saying “Aynen aynen aynen” (“Exactly exactly exactly”) in line 5 appears on the fifth turn, ceasing the efforts put forward to remember the length of time during which the cat stays in her present location. This example qualifies for a multiple saying as it has been produced under a single intonational contour and has the function of halting an ongoing action, which is now deemed unnecessary by the speaker who

produces it. This multiple saying halts the action of detailing exactly when the cat was brought to Speaker B's house.

Example (6) below involves a single use of “aynen” (exactly) and a multiple use of “aynen aynen” (exactly exactly), which bears an additional significance in terms of showing the difference between the single and multiple use of the same linguistic resource:

- (6) 1 A: Biz çok sık konuşuyoruz. Annemle arkadaş gibiyiz, sesinden anlıyorum zaten. ...  
(We talk too often. We're like friends with my mum. I can understand from her voice...)
- 2 B: Ben şimdi sürekli şey oluyorum. İster istemez sürekli aklım hep onda.  
(I am always like... I can't help consistently thinking about her.)
- 3 A: Şimdi bir de berabersiniz. Gözün görüyor ya.  
(You live together now. You always see her.)
- 4 B: *Aynen.*  
(*Exactly.*)
- 5 A: Kardeşim çok yıprattı annemi. Ayrılıyorlardı...  
(My brother upset mum very much. They were about to get a divorce...)
- 6 B: Hımm.  
(I see.)
- 7 A: Bir süre sonra geri birleştiler ama o çok yıprattı kadıncağızı. Psikolojisi bozuldu.  
(They got back together after a while but that upset the poor woman a lot. She became depressed.)
- 8 B: Tabii.  
(Of course.)
- 9 A: Kardeşim inada bindirdi bazı şeyleri. Çocuk da var. Yani geçim söz konusu olunca...  
(And my brother had been stubborn lately. They have a kid. When it comes to sustaining a family...)
- 10 B: *Aynen aynen.*  
(*Exactly exactly.*)
- 11 A: Sıkıcı şeyler.  
(Boring things.)
- 12 B: Sen yedin mi bir şeyler?  
(Have you eaten anything?)

In Example (6) two close friends are talking about their family problems. This example presents a single saying and a multiple saying of “aynen”, which perform different functions. The first “aynen” produced by Speaker B in line 4 displays the conventional use of a confirmatory response, while the multiple saying of “aynen aynen” produced by the same speaker in line 10 indicates a willingness to stop the ongoing course of action, which is complaining about family problems. Speaker B's intention of halting the action at hand can be clearly seen from the last line in the excerpt “Have you eaten anything?” in line 12, which definitely stops previous action and opens up a new course of action.

We argue that although a single “aynen” (exactly) in Turkish everyday discourse is typically analyzed as an acknowledgment token or continuer, a multiple saying of this lexical item cannot simply be considered a more intense version of the same action and that it accomplishes a separate interactional goal. By uttering “aynen aynen” (exactly exactly), the speaker conveys that the previous speaker has provided an excessive amount of information, which was already known or deemed unnecessary and that hence the current action should be stopped.

Similarly, the excerpt below shows two multiple sayings consecutively used by the same speaker, displaying the speaker’s wish to stop the perseveration shown by the other speaker:

- (7) 1 A: Bizim toplantı Haldun Dormen’de olacakmış.  
(Our meeting will be held at Haldun Dormen.)
- 2 B: Çetin Hoca ya bize gelecek ya size gelecek. E ikisini de feda edemeyeceğine göre? O zaman acaba direkt sizi çıkartacak mı yukarı?  
(You say so. How will it be otherwise? Çetin teacher will come to us or to you. As he can’t sacrifice both? I wonder if he will directly take you upstairs.)
- 3 B: Yani belki toplantı yapar. Sonra bize geçebilir.  
(Maybe he will hold a meeting tomorrow. he might come to our rehearsal later.)
- 4 A: Evet.  
(Yes.)
- 5 B: Ama eğer kafasında öyle bir şey varsa, toplantı yapıp sonradan yukarı çıkalım da diyebilir..  
(But if he has such a plan, he might say let’s have a meeting first and then go upstairs after that...)
- 6 A: Evet  
(Yes.)
- 7 B: ...Belki de bahsetmez, gelecek haftalarda bahseder. Yani her ihtimal olabilir şu an.  
(...Maybe he won’t, he may say it in the coming weeks. Everything is possible right now.)
- 8 A: Ee *tabi tabi tabi*. Doğru. (.)  
(Err, *of course, of course, of course*. Right.)
- 9 B: ...Bilmiyorum ki yani siz bir talepte bulunabilirsiniz. Hocam provayı izleme şansımız var mı gibi..  
(...I don’t know, you can make an offer. Like “Can we watch the rehearsal?”...)
- 10 A: Evet. Heh  
(Yes.)
- 11 B: ... kendisi bahsederse, [eğer-]  
(...if the teacher talks about this himself, if...)
- 12 A: [*Aynen aynen*]  
(*Exactly, exactly.*)
- 13 B: Der mesela o zaman. Hani, hani bilmiyorum yani ben bu konularda çok çekingen davrandım hep bugüne kadar ama.  
(He says then, for example. You know, I don’t know I have always been shy about these matters.)
- 14 A: Yo ben hiç çekingen...  
(No, I’ve never been shy.)
- 15 B: Sen şeysin bana göre söylüyorsun yani.  
(You are more... I mean you can say anything.)

16 A: Evet.  
(Yes.)

The excerpt in Example (7) was taken from a discussion between two friends concerning the time of their acting rehearsal. The first multiple saying is “tabi tabi tabi” (of course of course of course) (line 8) and the second multiple saying is “aynen aynen” (exactly exactly) (line 12) which are both produced by Speaker A.

The first multiple saying has the function of halting the ongoing 12-turn debate on whether the drama teacher will join both rehearsals or has another idea. It is clear from the excerpt that the focus of the conversation evolves around the guesswork produced by Speaker B, who seems to be insistently talking about possibilities. Here, Speaker A uses the first multiple saying to halt the ongoing action of over speculating pursued by Speaker B, who further contemplates about the possible course of events. Actually, this effort of Speaker A fails as Speaker B continues to provide details about various possibilities on the future attitude of the teacher. Upon this insistence shown by Speaker B, Speaker A resorts to repetition one more time after only four turns, this time using the multiple saying “exactly exactly” in an effort to convey that the action of providing excessive amount of information about future possibilities is considered undesired and thus should be properly stopped.

It can be argued that this multiple saying of “tabi tabi tabi” (“of course of course of course”) (line 8) is perceived by the speaker as a three-item discrete unit judging from the following expression “Doğru” (“Right”) following it. This example also provides further evidence that the use of “tabi tabi tabi” does not fulfill the function of emphasis or confirmation as the single use of “tabi” does. The fact that the speaker resorts to a separate lexical item “Doğru” (“right”) to express confirmation underpins our finding that a single use of a lexical item can have a totally different function from that of a multiple saying.

Of the 10 multiple sayings identified in our database, six were presented in Examples (4-7). A summary of the identified multiple sayings and their functions are presented in Table (1).

*Table 1. Multiple sayings and their functions in our database*

No	Multiple sayings	Course of action halted by multiple sayings
1	gibi gibi (like that like that)	Commenting on the ongoing topic
2	aynen aynen (exactly exactly)	Commenting on the ongoing topic
3	aynen aynen aynen (exactly exactly exactly)	Detailing

4	aynen aynen (exactly exactly)	Complaining
5	tabi tabi tabi (of course of course of course)	Overspeculating
6	aynen aynen (exactly exactly)	Overspeculating
7	tamam tamam (okay okay)	Providing information on an already-known situation
8	aynen aynen (exactly exactly)	Providing information on an already-known situation
9	anladım anladım (I got it I got it)	Providing information on an already-known item
10	tamam tamam (okay okay)	Acknowledging criticism from other speakers

Table 1 shows that the most frequently halted course of action in Turkish daily discourse is “providing information on an already known situation”. We can infer that Turkish speakers tend to find hearing about the same topic on and on exhausting and therefore attempt to close it down. In sum, this section drew attention to the different functions of single sayings and multiple sayings in our database and illustrated that the multiple sayings accomplish similar functions with those reported in the literature.

## 5 Conclusion

Repetitions are widely used in talk-in-interaction to fulfil several communicative functions. The present study focused on a single type of repetition, namely multiple sayings, and a single type of function they serve, which is halting an ongoing course of action in Turkish everyday discourse data.

Our findings revealed that a single saying (such as “aynen” (exactly)) and a multiple saying (such as “aynen aynen aynen” (exactly exactly exactly)) of a lexical item can perform completely different interactional functions. While a single “aynen” generally displays acknowledgement or agreement, multiple saying of the same lexical item such as “aynen aynen aynen” has the function of stopping an unwarranted talk. Consistent with the literature, we found that multiple sayings cannot be only considered as upgrades or a more intense version of their single saying but in fact, they fulfill a different function. In this respect, our study contributes to both Turkish and foreign literature on multiple sayings.

The findings from our database revealed that Turkish conversationalists too use multiple sayings as an interactional resource to display that prior speaker’s

perseveration regarding the subject at hand is unnecessary and therefore should be stopped properly. We found they were used to halt the actions of commenting on a topic; detailing of an exact time of an instance; complaining about a matter; overspeculating about the future; providing information on an already-known item; acknowledging criticism from other speakers and providing information on an already-known situation, which is the most frequently halted course of action by Turkish speakers according to our data.

The fact that the most frequently halted course of action in Turkish daily discourse is “providing information on an already-known situation” suggests that Turkish speakers tend to find hearing about the same topic on and on again exhausting and attempt to close it down.

The fact that our study included only single-word (lexical) items is a limitation. Phrasal and sentential multiple sayings appear to be a fruitful area of research for future studies, which might unfold other courses of actions that are halted by multiple sayings in a larger database.

## References

- Aydın, D. (2024). *Türkçe gündelik söylemde yinelemeler ve işlevleri*. [Doktora tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.
- Bazzanella, C. (2011). Redundancy, repetition, and intensity in discourse. *Language Sciences*, 33(2), 243-254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2010.10.002>
- Cappuzzo, B. (2015). Allo-repetition in academic settings. Cooperation, understanding co-construction and knowledge negotiation in the medical section of the ELFA corpus. *ESP across Cultures*, 12, 33-54.
- Ercan, G. S. (2022). Karşılıklı konuşmanın özellikleri ve yapısı In B. Ranguelov, R. Efe, & U. Çelik (Eds.), *Academic researches and studies in sciences* (pp.189-195). St. Kliment Ohridski University Press.
- Ercan, G. S. Aydın, D. Başaran, Ö. (2024). Türkçe gündelik söylemde yinelemeler ve işlevleri. H. I. Güler, D. Sarısoy ve P. Turan (Edt.), *Dilbilimde güncel tartışmalar* (ss. 152-168). Dilbilim Derneği Yayınları.
- Fujimura-Wilson, K. (2007). Japanese exact repetitions involving talk among friends. *Discourse Studies*, 9(3),319-339. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445607076202>
- Girgin, U., Acar, Y., Akbaş, E., Yavuz, E., Altan, A. E., Boran, M., ..., & Moralı, G. (2020). Conversation analysis methodology: Validity, reliability, and ethical issues in data collection and analysis procedures. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 37(1), 381-402. <https://doi.org/10.16986/HUJE.2020063458>
- Golato, A., & Fagyal, Z. (2008). Comparing single and Double Sayings of the German response tokenjaand the role of Prosody: A conversation analytic perspective. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 41(3), 241-270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351810802237834>

- Heritage, J., & Atkinson, J. M. (1984). Structures of social action. *Contemporary studies in Conversation Analysis*, 1-16. Cambridge University Press.
- Hsieh, F. (2009). Repetition in social interaction: A case study on Mandarin conversations. *International Journal on Asian Language Processing*, 19(4), 153-168.
- Johnstone, B. (1994). *Repetition in discourse: Interdisciplinary perspectives. Volume 2. (Advances in discourse processes, 47-48.)* Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Merritt, M. (1994). Repetition in situated discourse-Exploring its forms and functions. In B. Johnstone (Ed.), *Repetition in discourse* (pp. 23-35). Ablex.
- Müller, F. E. (1996). Affiliating and disaffiliating with continuers: Prosodic aspects of reciprocity. In E. Couper-Kuhlen, & M. Selting (Eds.), *Prosody in Conversation* (pp. 131-176). Cambridge University Press.
- Norrick, N. R. (1987). Functions of repetition in conversation. *Text - Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 7(3), 245-264. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1987.7.3.245>
- Perrin, L., Deshaies, D., & Paradis, C. (2003). Pragmatic functions of local diaphonic repetitions in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(12), 1843-1860. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166\(03\)00117-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166(03)00117-6)
- Persson, R. (2020). Taking issue with a question while answering it: Prefatory particles and multiple sayings of polar response tokens in French. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 53(3), 380-403. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2020.1786977>
- Rossi, G. (2020). Other-repetition in conversation across languages: Bringing prosody into pragmatic typology. *Language in Society*, 49(4), 495-520. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047404520000251>
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(5), 1295-1345. <https://doi.org/10.1086/229903>
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes*, 23(3), 499-545. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01638539709545001>
- Sert, O., Balaman, U., Can Dařkın, N., Büyükgüzel, S. & Ergül, H. (2015). Konuşma çözümlemesi yöntemi. *Mersin Üniversitesi Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi*, 12 (2), 1-43.
- Stivers, A. (2004). “no no no” and other types of multiple sayings in social interaction. *Human Communication Research*, 30(2), 260-293. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2004.tb00733.x>
- Tannen, D. (2007). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tekdemir Yurtdaş, G. (2010). Sözce tekrarlarının kültürel anlamları. *Psikoloji Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 30(2010), 33-51.



- Tekdemir Yurtdaş, G. (2012). Repetitions in Turkish: talk among friends. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-13.2.1855>
- Van Lancker Sidsis, D., & Wolf, R. (2015). Pragmatic verbal repetition: Review and application of a new method of quantification. *Text & Talk*, 35(2), 263–287. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2014-0037>
- Zhou, X. (2022). Acknowledging coparticipant's contribution to one's interactional goal: The multiple saying Dui Dui Dui in Mandarin Chinese conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 200, 98–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.08.005>