A.1: Okay, what do you feel [laughter] is contributing most to air pollution?
B.2: Cars [breathing] [laughter].
A.3: Cars you think so?
B.4: Yeah, I really do, I, because I’m from California originally,
A.5: Uh-huh.
B.6: and so I saw the beginning, I feel I saw the beginning of air pollution in the fifties, and I think then it was basically from, from automobiles, I really do. And it just kept getting worse and worse and worse and worse and now it’s just terrible. Factories don’t help.
A.7: Yeah, I, I would have figured that some of the factories may be contributing as much as, as, uh, automobiles.
B.8: But, we have so much traffic now, so many cars. You know they’re trying to fix it, uh, with all this emission control and everything.
A.9: Uh-huh.
B.10: But, then I still see cars going down the road with all this smoke pouring out of the back end of them.
A.11: Uh-huh.
B.12: And that infuriates me. I always want to tell them, you know, don’t you know what you’re doing to our air? And I don’t understand how they can get their, uh, how they can get their car inspected and get away with that.
A.13: Well, if you only have to get your car in, inspected once a year you can just have it fixed real quick right before the inspection.
A conversation about privacy

A.1: Well, the first thing for me is I wonder, I see a couple of different ways of talking about what privacy is, um, if privacy is something that disturbs your private state, I mean an invasion of privacy is something that disturbs your private state, that’s one thing, and if privacy is something that comes into your private state and extracts information from it, in other words, finds something out about you that’s another. And the first kind of invasion of, the first type of privacy seemed invaded to me, and very much everyday in this country, but in the second time, at least overtly, uh, where someone comes in and, uh, finds out information about you that should be private, uh, does not seem, uh, um, obviously, everyday.

B.2: I, I think I agree with that. I think in a good example on the typical thing that happens, uh, when the phone rang and it’s T I calling, my immediate reaction is that it’s some sort of strange phone message and then I realize, oh, no, this is something I solicited,

A.3: That’s right [laughter].
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Levlt's (1983) biconditional

Well-formedness rule for repairs (WFR) A repair $\langle \alpha \gamma \rangle$ is well-formed if and only if there is a string $\beta$ such that the string $\langle \alpha \beta \text{and}^* \gamma \rangle$ is well-formed, where $\beta$ is a completion of the constituent directly dominating the last element of $\alpha$.

Example:

```
α
```

```
and the first kind of invasion of int.point γ
```

```
first type of privacy seemed invaded to me
```

$\beta \equiv \text{privacy}$
Like Category Constraint

Repair’s wellformedness $\leftrightarrow$ wellformedness of conjunction

which usually requires Like Categories

$$XP \rightarrow XP \text{ Conj} \ XP$$

(Chomsky 1957, page 36)
McKelvie’s abort feature

Metarule takes in rules such as:

\[ A \rightarrow B C \]

to yield new rules:

\[ A \text{ [abort} = Q\text{]} \rightarrow B C \text{ [abort} = Q\text{]} \]

\( Q \) a variable in \{true, false\}
McKelvie’s disfluency schema disf(3)

\[ X \rightarrow X[\text{abort} = \text{true}] \overset{\text{reparandum}}{\text{ED}} \overset{\text{interregnum}}{\text{(AFF)}} X \]

Editing term ED and optional discourse marker AFF may coordinate an unfinished X-phrase with a finished X-phrase. Syntactic categories X must match.
disf(3) example
Like vs. Unlike Coordination: corpus frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>way</th>
<th>frequency of unlike coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speech repair</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Is repair like conjunction, only more permissive?
2 × 2 design

LIKE

same different

WAY conj a. b.
repair c. d

a. He wants to go to the movies and \[PP to the mini-golf course.\]
b. He wants to go to the movies and \[\text{gerund} \text{ mini-golfing.}\]
c. He wants to go to the movies, I mean, to the mini-golf course.
d. He wants to go to the movies, I mean, mini-golfing.
Magnitude estimation of linguistic acceptability

For instance, **John hopes that Mary to go** is a pretty poor English sentence. It probably deserves a low naturalness rating. If I considered the item below it, **John goes to the store with Mary**, to be about five times as natural as the reference, I would enter numbers as in the above picture. Do not linger more than about ten seconds on each rating, and keep in mind that in everyday conversation, people sometimes hesitate in ways that are natural. Try to rate what you read according to its naturalness in real talk.
Magnitude estimation of linguistic acceptability

Reference: He would have been, I mean, going to the store with Mary.
Rating: 4

Item: He would have been, I mean, he would have been going to the store with Mary.
Rating: 7

Participants use their own scale.
Like Category Constraint Active, but Weaker in Speech Repair

\[ F_1(1, 86) = 8.94, p < 0.005 \]
\[ F_2(1, 19) = 0.6512, n.s. \]