

Opening Up CA – An Interactional Linguist’s View on ICCA-14¹

Uwe-A. Küttner

1. Introduction

Following the much-lauded conferences at Copenhagen in 2002, Helsinki in 2006, and Mannheim in 2010, the 4th installment of the *International Conference on Conversation Analysis* (ICCA-14) was the first of its kind to not take place in continental Europe. With that, the ICCA-14 moved to the home university of Conversation Analysis (CA): The University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). It was there, some 50 years ago, in Fall 1964, that a young and aspiring sociology professor named Harvey Sacks gave his first *Lectures on Conversation* (now published as Sacks 1995a & b). Ten years later, at the very same university,

[...] the famous Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) turn-taking paper was submitted to *Language* by the simple procedure of walking the manuscript over from Haines Hall to the directly adjacent Campbell Hall, where William Bright (the then-editor of *Language*) had his office. (Heritage 2014:1)

In this inspiring, and sometimes humbling, environment, 520 participants from all over the world gathered for four days, from June 26th-29th, 2014, in order to further advance the conversation analytic endeavor. First and foremost, there were four plenary talks, held by such distinguished CA researchers as *John Heritage* (UCLA), *Anita Pomerantz* (SUNY, Albany), and *Douglas Maynard* (University of Wisconsin-Madison), as well as the renowned anthropologist *Stephen C. Levinson*, from the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics (MPI) in Nijmegen. Besides the plenaries, roughly 400 papers were presented in 9 parallel sessions, covering a vast array of topics.

Given this setup of the conference, the present report can, of course, merely proffer a restricted, and necessarily selective, overview of the events at ICCA-14. Since my original home is in the CA-informed discipline of interactional linguistics (cf. Couper-Kuhlen/Selting 2001; Lindström 2009; Barth-Weingarten 2008), I decided to give this report a designedly (interactional) linguistic hue, especially with regard to weighting the plenaries and selecting the panels for review. Besides this, the report is intended to capture current research trends and issues in CA as a field, as well as documenting some of the accompanying professional events. The former will be addressed throughout the report of the plenaries and the panels (sections 3 and 4, respectively), whereas the latter will be addressed in the next section. The report will close by taking note of the personal (and ultimately subjective) impression which has been eponymous for this report: An observably growing openness towards the interdisciplinary coalescence of CA with other approaches, or towards *Opening Up CA*, as it were.

¹ Due to editorial constraints in space, several points had to be cut from this report. This includes a number of issues that were raised during the discussions of the reviewed presentations, as well as some of my own reflections on these issues. The interested reader is invited to send an e-mail to ukuettne@uni-potsdam.de for an extended version of this report. I thank Dagmar Barth-Weingarten, Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, Arnulf Deppermann, John Heritage, as well as Maxi Kupetz for valuable comments and feedback on earlier versions of this report (or parts thereof). All remaining errors are, of course, my own.

2. Accompanying Events at ICCA-14

Besides premiering on non-European soil, the ICCA-14 was also the first of its kind to be hosted by an independent association: *The International Society for Conversation Analysis* (ISCA).² As such, ISCA held its general assembly on the third day of the conference. Not only did the ISCA board report on their activities during the first four years since the founding of ISCA,³ but they also held an award ceremony to honor several scholars from the field for their achievements (see the box to the right). Moreover, Loughborough was announced as the hosting site for the 5th ICCA in 2018. Before the official beginning of the conference, there were pre-conference workshops, held by some of the leading scholars in the field. These workshops were highly praised by their attendees, graduate students and professors alike, for their hands-on seminar like character (see report in this volume). The general ICCA-14 program also provided young academics with ample opportunities to engage in direct exchanges with more experienced researchers, e.g., in a graduate student workshop on *Professionalization in CA*, as well as during the catered professor-student lunches on the first day of the conference.

A final treat at the ICCA-14 was an exhibition called *Order at all points – The work of Harvey Sacks*. This exhibition, which was installed to celebrate the 50th anniversary of Sacks' first *Lectures on Conversation*, comprised a number of artifacts and documents from his legacy, such as early recording devices, graded student assignments from Gail Jefferson and Judy Davidson, correspondences with other scholars, some first handwritten observations on turn-taking, the reviewers' comments on the first submission of the turn-taking paper, and much more. Even a fragment from a video of Sacks talking at a CA seminar was shown. The exhibition notes said that the exposed items were taken from only two of the over 150 boxes of material that compose Sacks' legacy. However, the few bits and pieces shown at the exhibition alone were impressive and humbling to anyone who saw them. The allure of the exhibition was so intense that, after only one day, rumor had it that it may be turned into a traveling exhibition, with next possible stops in Loughborough and Helsinki.

ICCA-14 Award Winners:

Chase Raymond & Anne White
Best Graduate Student Paper Award

Federico Rossano
Best Dissertation Award

Galina Bolden
Best Research Article Award

Christian Heath
Best Book Award

Emanuel A. Schegloff
Lifetime Achievement Award

² See their website at <http://isca.clubexpress.com/> for further information.

³ In the course of this reporting, it was announced that *Emanuel Schegloff* would make available all his lectures and associated materials online at the ISCA website for registered members.

3. The Plenaries

3.1. John Heritage: Turn-Initial Position and One of Its Occupants – The Case of *Well*

The very first plenary of the conference was held by *John Heritage* (UCLA). After a brief introduction from Paul Drew, Heritage stated his main objective: to come up with the highest level of generalization about the function(s) of turn-initial *well*, i.e. to search for underlying regularities in its pragmatic use, which still have an "empirical bite".

Heritage began by re-addressing the programmatic relevance of studying conversational objects in turn-initial position (cf. Heritage 2013). In his view, turn-initial objects neither play any direct role in sentence construction, nor do they contribute to the semantic content of a TCU. Instead, they contribute to positioning what follows as an action in relation to the actions that preceded it. Among others, this is taken to be true of conjunctions, address terms, response cries, and semantically 'bleached' lexical items like *well*. This relational positioning operates on the basis of the preference for *progressivity* in talk-in-interaction, any disruption of which is potentially meaningful (cf. Schegloff 2007:15). As evidence for his claim that turn-initial objects are designed to work on the relation between adjacent units only, Heritage invoked their dispensability in recycles (cf. Schegloff 1987, 2004). In this view, turn-initial position is a crucial place at the intersection of turn and sequence, where recipients evidence their analyses of prior turns and likely trajectories of talk to come are projected. Unmarked movements to next turns then display congruent understandings, expectations and the fulfillment of projections set up by a prior, whereas marked movements to next turns (i.e. those that disrupt progressivity between adjacent units with turn-initial objects) involve cancellations of some of the understandings, expectations and projections set up by the preceding turn.

Like turn-initial *oh*, turn-initial *well* can occur in a variety of sequential positions (1st/initiating position [e.g., following pre-sequences, cf. Kim 2013], 2nd/responsive position, 3rd/recepting position). The problem with *well* as a turn-initial object is, however, that unlike *oh*, which has a relatively stable semantic core (the 'change-of-state' meaning discussed in Heritage 1984, 1998, 2002) that can be particularized in various sequential positions and action-type sequences, the different uses of *well* do not seem to rely on such a common semantic core. This is reflected in the abundance of empirical and theoretical studies that posit different functions of *well* (*inter alia* Schiffrin 1987, Schourupp 2001, Jucker 1993, Pomerantz 1984, Schegloff/Lerner 2009, Kim 2013). Interestingly, when re-emphasizing the distinctness of his own characterization of *well*, Heritage explicitly referred to it as a "minimalist attempt in establishing the most general sense possible for *well*" (something he referred to as its "pragmantics").⁴

Heritage's account began with the observation that unlike *oh*, *well* is forward looking and operates on the level of action rather than stance; its general sense being "an alert that the coming action will depart from, or diverge from, what might otherwise have been aimed for, or expected, as the next action". Two main

⁴ As somebody with a background in linguistics, I could not help hearing a slight resonance of Chomsky's *Minimalist Program* (1995) in this formulation.

variants of this use can be identified: In 2nd position, turn-initial *well* indexes an upcoming move that goes against the constraints set up by the action in first position, whereas in other positions it marks a change in topic or perspective. The 2nd-positioned uses can typically be accounted for as follows:

- The dispreference account (Pomerantz 1984) captures cases of turn-initial *well* preceding responses to polar interrogatives that implement dispreferred responses (e.g., rejections or declinations of invitations or offers). Accordingly, it marks a departure from the preferential constraints set up by the first action. This is also true for responses to polar interrogatives that move against the polarity projected by the question.
- The non-straightforwardness account (Schegloff/Lerner 2009) captures cases of turn-initial *well* that precede responses to *wh*-questions. Here, *well* alerts the questioner that the response will not directly and/or straightforwardly address the question.
- The turn-taking account states that *well* projects turns that contain multiple TCUs. As such, it interlocks with the previous two accounts, because non-straightforward responses typically require more than one TCU, and dispreferred responses are typically expanded.

Following an illustration of each account, Heritage presented the results of a quantitative analysis that underpinned them numerically. However, in virtually every category, some of the cases fell through the categorization of the 'quantitative net'. This point remained unaddressed and became the target of some debate in the subsequent discussion, which invoked CA's unique strength to be able to account for precisely those cases that are not captured quantitatively.

The second part of Heritage's presentation was dedicated to uses of turn-initial *well* in other than second position, where they mark a change in topic or perspective (see also Jucker 1993, Schiffrin 1987, Schourupp 2001). In a preliminary disclaimer, Heritage admitted that accounts of these uses are inevitably somewhat more 'mushy' than those of turn-initial *wells* in second position. Roughly 30% of them were accountable for in terms of unilateral topic shifts or topic closures/attritions, occasionally co-occurring with conversational closures. The marking of a 'departure from an interactional sequence or line' was taken as the core aspect of turn-initial *well* in those positions from which the following other pragmatic uses are derivable:

- *My side-My side shifts*, in which a second my side-telling (Pomerantz 1980) is connected to a first via a possible mutual topical connection. The connecting element initiating the shift is typically preceded by *well*. It also contains elements of one-upmanship or 'epistemic juggling', as *Heritage* called it.
- *Epistemic pushbacks*, in which disagreements on rights to knowledge can be *well*-prefaced (e.g. *Does the name X ring a bell to you? – Well I should say so*).
- *Transformative answers* to questions (cf. Stivers/Hayashi 2010).

These last two points increasingly link the other-positioned uses back to the 2nd-positioned uses and the dispreference or the non-straightforwardness account, respectively. Thus, Heritage provided the audience with a pragmatic continuum of

turn-initial *well* uses ranging from clear dispreference- and non-straightforwardness-marking in 2nd position to marking topic- and perspective-changes in other than second positions. All of these uses constitute a prospective alert to a departure or divergence from (the constraints set up by) the preceding action.

In the end, Heritage proffered a possible explanation for the connections in this continuum. In his view, *well* must have diversified from its lexical use as an adverb to become a turn-initial object. As evidence for the general possibility of this developmental path, he provided cross-linguistic evidence; comparable adverbs in other languages such as *bien*, *bueno*, or *gut* have arguably taken the same path. Heritage suggested that this diversification may have started from the use of these lexemes to affirm or accept some state of affairs (as a sequence-closing third, as it were). In these sequential positions, adverbs like *well* would have projected sequence closure and a subsequent move to a next action. Occasionally, these next actions may have been disagreements (cf. Pomerantz 1984). Heritage provided Shakespeare quotes to illustrate these 'historical' uses and argued that the semantic bleaching of the content of *well* happened in precisely these environments. This, in turn, he suggests led *well* to become dedicated to the pragmatic uses we can observe today (cf. Jucker 1997).

To most (interactional) linguists, Heritage's account was intriguingly reminiscent of linguistic research on grammaticalization (or perhaps pragmaticalization or lexicalization, depending on one's theoretical commitment) of discourse markers (cf., e.g., Hopper/Traugott 1993; Günthner 1999a, 1999b, 2005; Brinton/Traugott 2005). While the appropriateness of (using) Shakespeare quotes to provide evidence for the possibility of this developmental path remains arguable, it shows Heritage's sensitivity to the evolved nature of interactional (and linguistic) practices, and a readiness to engage in interdisciplinary approaches to these issues. In sum, Heritage succeeded in providing an integrative account of the pragmatically rather distinct uses of turn-initial *well* which had been identified in previous studies. This integrative account was held together by a theoretical claim about the historical evolution of this interactional practice.

3.2. Anita Pomerantz: Responses That Counter Background Assumptions of Requests for Information and Assessments

On the second day of the conference, a conversation analyst from the first generation held her plenary: *Anita Pomerantz*. She began her talk about responses that counter or challenge presuppositions of requests for information and assessments by introducing her data, which came from a project on native–non-native speaker interaction. After this, she immediately moved to clarifying the notion of presupposition/assumption/presumption she was about to use throughout her talk. Following Levinson (1983:168), she used a broad understanding of these terms, in which the

[...] ordinary language notion of presupposition [is used] to describe any kind of background assumption against which an action, theory, expression or utterance makes sense or is rational.

Her general claim was that recipients of requests for information (and assessments) use their knowledge of and/or inferences about the information seeker's

purpose-for-asking in determining just what information to provide (i.e. what *kind* of information, how much information, at which level of detail etc., cf. also Pomerantz 1988). Pomerantz thus argued that this recipient-orientation to the overarching interactional project that a speaker may be seen to pursue with his/her request for information (cf. Levinson 2013) is a general feature of responses to queries.⁵ In an attempt to find out on what grounds recipients infer the purpose of a query by reference to its interactional context, Pomerantz then focused on several ways in which recipients may provide responses with which they counter background assumptions that may have informed the questioner's purpose-for-asking.

- A response may take issue with the presupposed exhaustiveness of the options presented in an alternative question, i.e. with its background assumption to binariness or complementarity. In Pomerantz's example, a speaker asked a co-participant *Does your wife stay at home or does she have a job?* in an attempt to find out whether the recipient's wife has enough time to prepare healthy meals or not. The respondent challenged the presupposed exhaustiveness of the two states by stating that his wife was a graduate student, and that they therefore occasionally, but not always, managed to prepare healthy food. The fact that this challenge was related to the food preparation issue suggests that the response was produced by reference to the inferred purpose of the question, rather than simply to provide the sought for information. Responding to the inferred purpose-of-the-question, then, necessitated the respondent's challenging of a background assumption which seems to have informed the query. Pomerantz referred to this type of challenge as 'Not A or B'.
- Especially, *yes-/no-interrogatives* (YNIs) can embody rather strong background assumptions. Type-conforming responses to such YNIs usually endorse their implicit background assumptions (cf. Raymond 2003). For example, in the context of discussing air pollution, a question such as *Did you wear the mask?* may be seen to display the background assumption that the masks are worn as protective devices against inhaling polluted air. This presupposed motive may then be challenged by the respondent (e.g., by stating that one wore the mask, while at the same time claiming that they are worn as protective devices against trans-national sandstorms), which again suggests that the recipient of the query is responding by reference to the inferred purpose-for-asking the question, rather than simply providing the requested information. Pomerantz referred to this type of challenge as 'Yes, but not for *that* reason'.
- Finally, a respondent may claim that the preconditions for a query are not met, e.g., by disclaiming knowledge of the requested information or access to an assessable. In its strongest form, such a claim provides for, or legitimizes, an absence of the requested report (information or assessment), whereas claiming that a precondition has only partially been met may provide for an epistemi-

⁵ She built this argument by reference to Sacks' (1995a) lectures on the correction-invitation device (Lecture 3, Fall 1964 - Spring 1965:21-25) and on questions (Lecture 7, Fall 1964 -Spring 1965:49-56), in which he makes the observation that answerers can construct an answer "by reference to the project of the question" (ibid.:56), i.e. their inferences as to what the questioner is after with the question.

cally mitigated report. If such a claim appears to be implausible to participants, it usually earns a response pursuit from the asker of the query.

Pomerantz' concluding remarks highlighted the analytic importance of investigating interactants' reasoning, which may, occasionally, inform their conduct. One way to do this is by considering the larger sequential environment and/or interactional projects or histories that form the backdrop of an inquiry. She also stressed that recipients of requests for information and assessments first and foremost deal with the pragmatic import of these requests, but that, in the course of that, they may deal with undesirable inferences. One major domain of future inquiry could then focus on when purposes-for-asking are responded to, inferred, explicated, masked, and so on.

3.3. Douglas Maynard: 'End of Life' Conversations and the Interaction Order in Cancer Clinics

A treatment of this plenary can be found in Groß (this volume), whose focus is on medical/doctor-patient-interaction topics.

3.4. Stephen C. Levinson: The Social Life of Milliseconds – New Perspectives on Timing and Projection in Turn-Taking

The last plenary, held by *Stephen Levinson*, took a cornerstone of CA as its basis, namely the organization of turn-taking (cf. Sacks/Schegloff/Jefferson 1974), and offered new perspectives on it from experimental psycholinguistic research. One of the central puzzles for psycholinguists is that turn-transition is very fast and usually happens with minimal gap (roughly 200 ms) or overlap, while speech encoding is rather slow. This suggests that action recognition and speech production planning have to happen long before (i.e. in overlap with) the actual utterance to which a next speaker will be responding is finished. In the first part of his plenary, Levinson provided insights from experimental and cognitive studies as to how early these processes may happen by summarizing the work that was presented in the MPI panels (see section 4.1.).

The results of this work suggest that action recognition (of responses) may begin from 200 ms after the beginning of the response, i.e. after the first word of the response. This, in turn, confirms Schegloff's (1987, 1996) and Heritage's (2013) claims about the importance of turn-beginnings for the projection of what action an unfolding turn may implement. Whether such early action ascription can also be maintained for initiating actions, which operate under fewer sequential constraints than responses, remains an open question at present. Moreover, the results suggest that speech production planning/utterance formulation has to start approximately in the middle of the turn that a speaker will be responding to (and this still has to be followed by physical preparations to speak, such as breathing).

Levinson's talk highlighted the extensive co-ordination of cognitive and psychophysical activities a next speaker has to engage in while the other is still talking. All of these activities necessitate that speakers begin to plan their talk as early-as-possible. However, Levinson also drew attention to the fact that this may mean that a speaker has to inhibit the launching of a response in cases of turn-ex-

tensions. This raises the question as to how and when next speakers recognize upcoming TRPs in order to launch their talk accordingly. Based on experimental findings, Levinson claimed that prosodic cues are highly relevant in projecting turn-completion, but he also stressed the importance of taking more than just pitch into account. In sum then, while the linguistic encoding of an utterance proceeds early, its delivery may be held back, if necessary, until crucial turn-final cues trigger the launching of a next utterance. Levinson argued that the turn-taking system needs these late signals, and that the findings proffer a partial resolution between the opportunity model advocated by Sacks/Schegloff/Jefferson (1974) and the signaling model advocated by Duncan and colleagues (e.g. Duncan 1972).

In the second part of his plenary, Levinson took the results of these findings to raise questions about the origin of the turn-taking system as we know it. One common view is the emergent view, which looks at the turn-taking system as the best solution to a recurrent set of problems. For example, the assumption that sequentiality and the turn-distribution rule of 'one party at a time' are motivated by responsiveness and channel constraints is part of such a view. Levinson countered this by stating that a) participants constantly process for understanding and production simultaneously (and have been shown to understand each other even in overlap), and that b), if turn-taking were governed by such an action-response logic, there would be permanent overlap, since their results suggest that action recognition and response planning happen very early.

Another view is the evolutionary view, which holds that some aspects of human social interaction are based on species-specific adaptations, which are not open to a great deal of cultural diversification. The fact that the turn-taking system seems to be such a universal, one-size-fits-all organization (despite the fact that languages and language structures are very diverse) may be taken to support such an evolutionary explanation. Moreover, there is ontogenetic evidence for the evolutionary view, in that turn-taking with its typical properties of gap minimization and overlap is observable in pre-linguistic proto-conversation. According to Levinson, the "kicking in" of (the complexity of) language merely slows down the system. Implying the Platonian aphorism that ontogeny parallels phylogeny, Levinson also made reference to observable vocal turn-taking in primates, whose vocalizations are, however, constrained by their limited control over their breathing activities. In an evolutionary perspective then, gaining the control of breathing should have enabled speech and vocal turn-taking. The origin of vocal turn-taking may then be dated back to some 800,000 years or so. According to Levinson, the turn-taking system as we know it is not explainable in purely functional terms, and there are many signs of its partial independence of and priority to language. These observations, however, do not diminish the relevance of its social-functional purpose. Levinson closed with the reflection that "[w]hile CA successfully uncovered this bedrock of human social interaction, it may have sources deeper than the current social arrangements".

Levinson's talk sparked a lively discussion. Some of the questions concerned the ecological validity of the experimental findings as such, calling the strong emphasis on linguistic structure (rather than on action) in the experiments into question. Other questions raised issues for future research, such as online adaptations of syntactic and action trajectories (e.g. pivots, repair) and/or the production of

multi-unit turns. It was also suggested to integrate turn-allocational practices with this turn-constructive account.

4. Panels

4.1. The MPI Panels (Heretics, Hybrids, and Converts: Experimental and Comparative Methods in Conversation Analysis Part 1 & 2)

Tying in with Levinson's plenary, this subsection reports on a two-part panel which was organized by members of the Max-Planck-Institute for Psycholinguistics in Nijmegen. All of the studies in this panel used experimental, comparative, or quantitative methods, while drawing on CA-findings and assumptions in setting up the specific research questions and designs. Moreover, many studies rested on classic speech production findings concerning latency between speech planning and speech production. According to these findings, the production of a one-word-utterance takes 600+ (up to 1200) ms⁶ from conception to speech, the production of a simple clause even takes 1500+ ms. All four presentations in the first part of the panel dealt with matters of projectability and/or such simultaneous cognitive and other embodied preparations for speech production.

Torreira, Bögels & Levinson, for example, looked at breathing behavior in Dutch dyadic face-to-face interactions. Besides video- and audio-recordings of these interactions, participants were equipped with "respiratory inductance plethysmography systems, a non-invasive breathing monitoring system which measures deflection of the torso involved in breathing" (Torreira et al. Abstract). These devices can also measure the volume of the breathing (i.e. the amount of air intake and outlet). They then focused on question-answer sequences and annotated the answerer's inbreaths after the beginning of syntactically or intonationally marked questions. In a quantitative analysis, they found that only roughly half of the answers were preceded by inbreaths, whereas the remainder were typically done on ongoing exhalations. Moreover, answers that were preceded by an inbreath were typically longer than those that were not preceded by an inbreath. (However, inbreath-*depth* did not correlate significantly with speech-length.) With respect to their timing, especially those inbreaths that preceded long answers clustered closely around the end of questions, i.e. answerers' timing of their inbreaths was found to be sensitive to the questions' end. Given that breathing-in itself requires a preparatory time of 140-320 ms, these findings are taken to provide respiratory evidence of interlocutors' projective orientation to TRPs. In other words, answerers' breathing patterns suggest that they start planning the launching of their speech in overlap with the question they will respond to.

Bögels, Magyari & Levinson focused on the cognitive processes underlying turn-taking by measuring brain activation with EEG technology in a Dutch quiz-paradigm setting. They tested two kinds of questions, some with early recognizability of the requested information (e.g., "Which character, *who is also called 007*, took part in the famous movies?") and some with late recognizability

⁶ This minimum of 600 ms can be divided up along the following lines: 175-200 ms for conceptual preparations, 75 ms for retrieval of the lemma, 80 ms for the retrieval of the phonological form, ~ 100 ms for syllabification and 145 ms for the phonetic encoding before articulation starts (cf. Indefrey/Levelt 2004; Indefrey 2011).

of the requested information (e.g., "Which character from the famous movies *is also called 007?*"). It was shown that this had an impact on response times as well as brain activation times (in both conditions brain activity increased when the critical information was provided). Localization of the brain signals' origins yielded the left temporal lobe and the left inferior frontal gyrus as sources. Both of these are brain areas that have been found to relate to language production. The measured brain activities also suggested that, in cases of longer or extended questions, a response may have been prepared, but motor-articulation was inhibited until cues for turn-transition were reached. The standard 200 ms gap between a prior and a next turn would then be the result of a latency in launching the motor-articulation. In sum, the findings were taken to suggest that respondents start to plan their responses as early as possible (and possibly already mid-way through an ongoing questioning turn).

Gísladóttir, Chwilla & Levinson's talk, entitled *Neuropragmatics and Conversation*, addressed the time course of cognitive processes involved in action ascription. More specifically, they focused on a simple assertion of possession (e.g., *I have a credit card*), which was underspecified for the action it implements (i.e. there were no syntactic or prosodic action cues available), and manipulated its sequential context, so as to investigate the effect of sequential organization on action ascription and its cognitive correlates. For example, in response to a question (e.g., *How do you want to pay for this?*), the response would implement an answer, whereas in response to an offer or a proposal (e.g., *I could lend you some money.*), the response would implement a declination or a rejection, and in response to a noticing of an absence (e.g., *I forgot my wallet.*), the response would implement a pre-offer. The experimental design was thus based on CA findings about sequence organization (cf. Schegloff 2007) and its role in action ascription (cf. Levinson 2013). They then used EEGs to measure brain activities (more specifically they looked at event-related potentials and conducted time-frequency analyses) during reception of the response (*I have a credit card*). Despite the fact that the final compound lexeme carried the main propositional content, it was found that in highly constrained contexts, such as the SPP slot in an adjacency pair (e.g., the rejection of a proposal/declination of an offer), brain activity related to action recognition begins as early as 400 ms after the first word, i.e. around the predicate. In other, more open contexts (e.g., the pre-offer), late brain activity was observable, which suggests that in these cases the entire utterance is needed to enable action recognition. It was suggested that participants generally increase their anticipatory attention before the start of the target utterance. For the more constrained SPP slots of adjacency pairs, it was suggested that, since a proposal makes acceptance/declination relevant next, by the time the *have* is reached, a conversationalist can tell that a prototypical acceptance is not underway, which in turn allows for the early action ascription. This suggests that (the timing of) action recognition is highly context sensitive, strongly depending on the sequential environment of an utterance (and the constraints/relevancies set up before).⁷ While the attempt to integrate action ascription into existing psycholinguistic models was approved of by the audience, it was suggested that these models (and future experimental studies of action ascription) should take more strongly into account

⁷ Additionally, it was shown that pre-offers in the *I have*-format were more easily recognizable than pre-offers in other formats, i.e. that turn-design *does* matter for action recognition.

that the sequential context activates subsets of *possibly relevant* and *possibly hearable* items in a given context, rather than just *any possible item* (cf. Schegloff 2006).

The final talk of the first part of the panel by *Barthel* reported work-in-progress that was dedicated to the role of syntactic as opposed to other cues in enabling the projectability of TRPs following German list-constructions. To investigate this, he used a complex experimental and dialogical setup in which participants (a confederate and an experimental subject) had to produce and complete the other's list with additional information, which was exclusively accessible to one of the two parties. Besides the verbal behavior, additional eye-tracking data were recorded. Moreover, (partly) controlled manipulations of the syntactic formatting of the confederate's talk, allowing early and late recognizability,⁸ were used to test their impact on turn-transition times. Barthel's data showed no effects of the different syntactic structures on the projectability of TRPs and turn-transition times, however. Accordingly, future research will address the importance of lexical cues (e.g. the presence or absence of *and* before the final item) and pitch cues in list completions (cf. Selting 2007) in a comparable experimental setup.

In sum, the first part of the panel provided ample experimental underpinnings for the existence of cognitive (and other embodied) analogues of the hitherto merely assumed "close relationship between understanding and responding[, suggesting that t]he distinction between (utterance) production and comprehension is not as radical, as has traditionally been assumed in models of senders (speakers, actors) and receivers (listeners)" (Linell 2009:357).

The second part of the panel began with *Kendrick/Brown/Dingemans/Floyd/Gipper/Hayano et al.*'s investigation of sequence structures, and more specifically sequence expansions, across a linguistically and geographically diverse sample of 12 languages. This study serves to address the repeated critique of CA for having developed its sequence-structural analyses largely on the basis of English alone.⁹ Based on Schegloff's (2007) work on sequence organization, the sample was examined for the possible universality of adjacency pair structures, as well as the three major types of sequence expansions (pre-, insert-, and post-expansions) and its minor sub-types (generic vs. specific pre-expansion, post-first vs. pre-second insert expansion, and minimal vs. non-minimal post-expansion). Adjacency pair structures as well as all three major types of expansions are attestable in all languages. Most of the languages even have all of the minor subtypes. Three modifications to this general finding should be mentioned, though:

- Specific pre-expansions have not yet been attested in Cha'palaa (Ecuador). Cha'palaa is considered a language embedded into a very straightforward culture, in which requests can be done with imperative forms. This may obviate the need for pre-requests. However, it was suggested in the discussion that

⁸ German syntax allows for several syntactic constructions, some of which enable relatively early projectability of TRPs, whereas others provide for relatively late projectability. Again others are ambiguous as to their early or late projection of an upcoming TRP. These structures were systematically tested against each other.

⁹ Apparently, some psychologists speak of WEIRD people, that is, people from Western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic societies, on which much research has focused in CA so far (cf. Henrich/Heine/Norenzayan 2010). The issue then is that CA's findings "may not generalize beyond this niche of outliers to the species as a whole" (cf. Kendrick et al.:abstract).

other actions may do the job of specific pre-expansions (e.g., complimenting the possessor on the object to be 'requested' before requesting it). Moreover, this fact does not explain the absence of other specific pre-expansions, such as pre-tellings.

- While post-first insert expansions are easy to find (due to the fact that they are repair initiations, which makes them liable to be universal structures), pre-second inserts represent the most difficult sequence type to find in the data. They seem to be generally rare in terms of frequency, and even more so in some languages (e.g., Tzeltal) than in others.
- With respect to non-minimal post expansion, there was the most diversity in the sample. In some languages, there appear to be culture-specific post-expanding action-sequences, such as a proliferation of repetitional response receipts in Tzeltal.

Besides these minor variations across the sample, the sequence structures identified by CA appear to be translinguistic and transcultural phenomena. Kendrick et al. concluded that they provide a shared interactional infrastructure that transcends cultural and linguistic (perhaps even species-specific, cf. Rossano 2013) boundaries. Unlike Levinson, who seems to have shown some inclination towards, or a preference for, an evolutionary model of the development of the turn-taking system, Kendrick et al. argued in favor of an emergent model to account for the universality of sequence structures. According to them, the basicness of adjacency pair structuring and its suitability for dealing with basic social tasks and contingencies (such as securing mutual attention, avoiding misalignments, etc.) accounts for its universality.

Following this, *Roberts* and *Levinson* presented a cultural evolutionary model of how the timing of turn-taking in conversation and its concomitant effects of simultaneous processing and planning (see the first part of the panel) impose constraints on the possible information structure of utterances. For example, there should be a general reluctance to placing crucial information (taken to typically reside in the predicate) in the "crunch zone" of a turn, i.e. during a phase of simultaneous planning and comprehension. Moreover, the location of crucial information in A's turn is taken to have a knock-on effect on the word order in B's responsive turn, so as to optimise the available planning time (what they called the "principle of symmetry"). In the long run, this is taken to bias languages towards having particular word-order structures. The model they built on these turn-taking constraints predicts SOV (with turn-final particles used as buffers in the "crunch zone") as the most frequent word order, before SVO and VSO, with results close to distributional facts.

Subsequently, *Holler & Kendrick* presented insights from a corpus-based study of gaze behavior, as recorded with new 1st-person eye-tracking systems, and the organization of turn-taking in triadic conversations. Besides high-quality audio recordings and objective (i.e. displaced) video recordings from frontal and lateral perspectives, the 1st-person eye-tracking systems enabled an analysis of each participant's view at any moment in the interaction. With this data at hand, *Holler & Kendrick* annotated and analyzed participants' gaze-behavior at and around turn-transitions within 281 question-answer sequences. Among others, they found that answerers were gazing at the questioner in roughly 90% of the cases. This was

typically followed by a brief gaze aversion, close to the TRPs of the questions, and a subsequent gaze return to the questioner at 60 ms after TRPs. Since eye movements are planned 200 ms prior to their observable occurrence, this suggests that the eye movements for the gaze returns must have been planned 140 ms prior to the TRP. A similar observation was made with respect to unaddressed recipients, who shifted their gaze from the questioner to the answerer in 46% of the cases. On average, this gaze shift occurred 150 ms after the TRP, which suggests that it must have been planned some 50 ms before the TRP. According to Holler & Kendrick, these findings suggest that TRPs are core elements to the organization of talk-in-interaction, and that eye movements can provide a window onto the cognitive processing of turns. Moreover, they reveal first-hand evidence for the fine-grained co-ordination of participants' gaze conduct in multi-party conversation at a micro level (see also Goodwin 1981). The fact that also unaddressed recipients seem to orient to TRPs suggests the existence of an intrinsic motivation for listening (for TRPs) built into the turn-taking system.

The final presentation in the panel, given by *de Vos & Torreira*, considered the timing of turn-taking in signed conversations of Sign Language of the Netherlands more closely. Analytically, signed conversations have the advantage that all articulators are 'in the open', as it were. Interestingly, this leads to an initial observability of large amounts of overlapping manual activity. However, *de Vos & Torreira* argued that this overlapping manual activity cannot warrantably be characterized as 'overlap'. Upon closer inspection, the strokes of the participants' bodily-visual conduct form smooth turn transitions across turns at talk. Late gestural holds and retractions are used to further smoothe out these transitions, but are not treated as overlapping talk by the participants. If this is taken into analytic consideration, the amount of (stroke-to-stroke) overlap decreases to a point that is roughly equivalent in frequency to verb-final languages like Japanese. This suggests that overlap is equally orderly in signed conversations, and that an analysis of turn-taking in signed languages requires analytic sensitivity to participants' treatment of the phonetic constituents of their signs.

In overall, the MPI panels offered impressive insights into possible future directions of CA-informed cognitive, experimental, theoretical, or quantitative work. While, from a rigid CA perspective, one could always question the ecological validity of the presented findings, the way in which these studies embrace interactional and dialogical premises and findings (cf. Linell 2009) and combine them with other methods to address hitherto 'unaddressable' questions is, in my view, interesting and promising at the same time. Besides this general interest, as the eye-tracking study from Holler & Kendrick showed, there are endeavors to make this kind of work ecologically more valid. It seems reasonable to assume that this will succeed, and that trans- and interdisciplinary studies like the aforementioned will proliferate significantly with the development of technologies that make it possible to take these analyses out into more natural interactional settings.

4.2. Issues and Challenges in the Study of Action Formation

Ever since the work of Curl (2006), Interactional Linguists as well as Conversation Analysts interested in the study of action formation (i.e. how actions are designed to be recognizable in and through linguistic and other practices of conduct)

were attracted by the idea of the existence of lexico-syntactic constructions that are specifically dedicated to implementing particular (kinds of) social actions in certain sequential positions, so-called "Social Action Formats" (cf. Fox 2007:305; see also Curl/Drew 2008; Craven/Potter 2010). Work on such formats has frequently centered around the two notions 'entitlement' and 'contingency'. The present two-part¹⁰ panel sought to integrate these notions with recent work on epistemics (cf. Heritage 2012a, b) and deontics (cf. Stevanovic/Peräkylä 2012) in talk-in-interaction.

Stevanovic, Peräkylä & Ruusuvuori framed the panel with their programmatic paper on what they take to be three basic orders in the organization of interaction: knowledge, emotion, and power (see also Stevanovic/Peräkylä 2014). They claimed that these three orders are potentially relevant for all interactional contributions, albeit to different degrees, depending on the specific social action being implemented. In their talk, they reviewed the ontogenetic foundations for these three orders, namely:

- an innate capacity for imitation that turns into primitive reciprocity later on (the foundation for the emotional order),
- the infant's ability to build up expectations from experiencing repeated (and repeatable) courses-of-action and the concomitant development of accountability (the foundation for the deontic order),
- and the capacity to create joint attention or focus, while acknowledging that people may have different perspectives or positions on it, i.e. the construal of self and alterity, which necessitates the incessant construction of a 'shared world' or *intersubjectivity*, as it were (the foundation of the epistemic order).

Moreover, they argued that the dual status of these orders as interactional constructs, but at the same time as resources in and for any interaction, is mirrored in the analytic distinction between *affective*, *deontic*, and *epistemic* status vs. stance. In their conclusion, they called for future investigations of the weighting and the precise role of these different orders in particular activities, as well as their impact on action formation and recognition.

Rossi then presented his findings on the Italian request system. Analogous to Curl/Drew (2008), he raised the following questions: When do speakers of Italian use which request form? What are the sources of entitlement or the specific contingencies involved that shape the choice of different request forms? And, since 15% of the requests in his data were done non-verbally, when do requesters actually need language to implement requests? In response to these questions, he proffered a complex request system, making use of the following four variables:

- Is the object of the request available or not (object availability)?
- Does the request extend the requestee's line of action or does it depart from it?
- If it departs from the requestee's line of action, is the requested action or object delicate or trouble-free?

¹⁰ Only the first part of the panel will be reviewed here.

- And if the request extends the requestee's line of action, is the requested activity projectable or not (projectability)?

Using these four variables, Rossi can, for example, account for the use of the Italian equivalents of *Can you (do) X?* vs. *Will you (do) X?* The explanation makes reference to the fact that they are both requests for available objects, in both cases the request departs from the requestee's line of action, but the former presents the requested action/object as trouble-free (high entitlement, low contingency), whereas the latter presents it as delicate (low entitlement, high contingency). Non-verbal requests are then possible whenever the requested object is available in the immediate environment, the request extends the requestee's line of action, and the requested activity is somewhat projectable from its context.

Another illustration of the context-sensitivity of formatting practices was provided by *Shaw* with respect to advice-giving in interactions between mothers and their young adult daughters. Quite generally, *Shaw* distinguished between explicit, more constraining forms of advice (e.g., with imperatives or formats such as *You need to (do) X*) and implicit, less constraining forms of advice (e.g., interrogatives such as *Have you tried X?*, my-side-tellings (Pomerantz 1980), informings), which project alternatives to simple acceptances/rejections as responses (e.g., acknowledgments, assessments). She was able to show that unmitigated, explicit forms of advice are typically used in the context of strong problem-orientation on the prospective advice-recipient's side, while the advice-giver is strongly aligned with the advice-recipient's perspective on the problem. By contrast, implicit, more tentative forms of advice are used in cases of disalignment about the problematic nature of an issue, i.e. a no-problem orientation by the prospective advice-recipient that contrasts with the advice-giver's problem-orientation. In other words, the formatting of advice-giving is somewhat opportunistic, which shows the value in soliciting the advice-recipient's perspective first. This finding is consistent with *Jefferson/Lee's* (1981) observation that advice-givings in informal interactions are more likely to be accepted when they are solicited or made relevant rather than volunteered. Moreover, it suggests that different sorts of entitlement may be relevant to advice-giving: relational entitlement and local(ly warranted) entitlement. According to *Shaw*, these findings add further complexity to preference organization in that advice-giving is not straightforwardly a preferred or dispreferred action. Instead, its preferential status seems to depend on participants' affiliation or disaffiliation in assessing an issue as problematic or unproblematic.

The final presentation in this part of the panel was given by *Potter & Hepburn*. They focused on *shame-implicative interrogatives* during family-dinner conversations with young children. They defined *shame-implicative interrogatives* as [K+]-questions (i.e. known-answer questions), where the answer admits morally bad conduct, and their recipient is the party producing said bad conduct. They argued that these questions shift agency to their recipients, thereby pressing the recipients to confess that their conduct is morally flawed. Since the recipients in their data were exclusively little children, *Potter & Hepburn* raised the question whether these interrogatives can be thought of as an interactional practice for producing morally favorable conduct beyond the momentary contingencies of the setting, i.e. as a socialization device, by means of which cultural norms and values are 're-inscribed' into members of a society.

4.3. Phonetics and the Management of Talk-in-Interaction: Methods, Challenges, Findings

This panel consisted of presentations that addressed phonetic issues in talk-in-interaction in a CA-informed manner (sometimes referred to as *Phonetics for Conversation*). While this approach can itself be considered interdisciplinary, *Ogden* presented a work-in-progress report of a collaborative study between Interactional Linguists and musicians which pushes interdisciplinarity even further. Since both speech and music use sounds to convey complex meanings, the main focus of this joint project lies with the question whether the same processes may be seen to underpin alignment in spoken and musical interactions. In particular, their joint research project focuses on the role of rhythm and timing in coordinating activities within these contexts of combined social and musical interactions, while at the same time accepting the challenges posed by including multi-modal aspects of interaction. *Ogden* first reviewed the methodological and technological desiderata arising out of such a holistic approach. It necessitates high-end recording technologies for acquiring useful data (e.g., separate channels for each speaker, recordings at a good sampling rate to cover the full frequency range, multiple video-cameras from various angles, etc.), as well as a consideration of possible 'noise-generating activities' (e.g., creating a food tasting task may generate many assessment sequences, but it also features a lot of chewing noises; so a food-smelling task may be more advisable). He then presented their recording setup and the task-based design of the data acquisition, in which participants were given five minutes for discussing how they got there, ten minutes for non-musical play, another ten minutes for musical improvisation on percussion instruments, which required the coordination of rhythmicity, and a subsequent ten minutes for 'everyday conversation' about a shared event, public or private.

Ogden then reported on an investigation of moments in which peaks of phonetic behavior (e.g., intonation peaks) corresponded in time with peaks of physical behavior (e.g., strokes of a gesture, eyebrow flashes). Following *Loehr* (2007), he called these moments of bodily-visual and phonetic co-ordination *pikes* and looked at their rhythmicity across question-answer sequences. The preliminary results were broadly consistent with earlier findings on timing and rhythmicity across turns-at-talk (*Auer et al.* 1999; *Couper-Kuhlen* 1993, 2009). By integrating bodily-visual with verbal behavior in the notion of *pikes*, this suggests that earlier claims about rhythmicity and preference organization are extendable to the multi-modal domain. *Ogden* closed with the observation that these patterns become much more complex, however, when spoken and musical turns are concurrently produced.

In the second talk of the panel, *Gareth Walker* presented work on phonetic variability in simultaneous productions. The phenomenon can be characterized as follows: Two speakers make a non-competitive, fluent (i.e. free from perturbations or hitches), simultaneous, lexico-syntactically identical, and possibly complete contribution to an ongoing interaction (e.g., a simultaneous response to a question). According to *Walker*, this phenomenon is distinct from other sorts of overlap,¹¹ and it should provide a rich site for studying phonetic variation, due to

¹¹ In the subsequent discussion, awareness was raised of the fact that (at least in English and German), this phenomenon has culturally sedimented and ritualized practices for dealing with its

the fact that two speakers produce the same words in the exact same sequential environment, but with possibly different phonetic designs. Of course, studying this phenomenon requires stereo recordings as well, since separating out overlapping speech from mono-recordings is impossible.

Walker's collection consisted of 35 instances, out of which he focused on those cases in which conditionally relevant next actions were simultaneously produced (there are other subtypes of the phenomenon). He was able to identify a cline of acoustic similarity between the individual productions, reaching from cases which show precisely matched productions (roughly the same duration, pitch contours, pitch spans, and places of location in the speaker's range, with a mean lag in acoustic landmarks of only 20 ms), via productions with slight variations in timing (e.g., bigger lags, or different durations) but with similar pitch characteristics, to simultaneous productions which additionally showed phonetic variation with respect to the pitch contours and ranges employed. One major question these different degrees of variability raise, but which remains unanswered at present, is how one can possibly account for this variability in a systematic way? It appears to be impossible to do this by reference to the sequential environment of the productions, since this is essentially the same for both.

Phonetic variability, albeit in children's speech, was also the topic of *Howard's* presentation. Her data consisted of mother-child interactions in free play with children between 1;11 and 3;0. Combining sequential and phonetic analyses, she showed how mothers occasionally engage in 'phonetic repair' sequences. These sequences are dedicated to other-initiating repair on a child's phonetic production of a word (e.g., an animal label) and aimed at eliciting a phonetic realization from the child that is more approximate to the target. Her results showed that children of that age may repair various phonetic parameters, such as volume, stress, phonotactics, articulations of individual sounds, etc. Moreover, she observed some sequential constraints. First, whenever a child proffered phonetic realizations as repair solutions which were further away from the target ("negative variability"), the mother would never take more than three attempts to reverse this variability. Secondly, the children hardly ever engaged in same-turn self-repair, which suggests that the adult preference for self-correction (Schegloff et al. 1977) is not in operation with respect to phonetic productions at this age. Finally, this last point is also reflected in the distinct kinds of sequences that emerge when a child's production is unintelligible for the mother. Instead of initiating repair on the child's production, or awaiting a self-initiated self-repair from the child, the mother produced candidate hearings based on phonetic approximations of the unintelligible item. The sequential production of these candidates is actively pursued by the child. The distinctiveness of their sequential trajectories suggests that 'unintelligibility repair' is different from the (m)other-initiated 'phonetic repair'. These findings are highly relevant for theories of speech development, in that they highlight the interactional basis of learning a language and learning to speak it 'properly'. Interestingly, this phenomenon is more common in the first half of the child's third year and tails off over the course of the year as the child starts producing longer utterances, which may not offer as easy an entry point for the repair as the earlier single word utterances.

occurrence (e.g., in German, one practice consists of the mutual hooking in of the respective speakers' pinky fingers, which are then pulled apart, while each of them can make a wish).

The last presentation in this panel was given by *Traci Walker*. It began with an illustration of two sequentially discriminable kinds of other-repetitions. In what she calls non-completion implicative other-repetitions (NCIs), a next speaker (often only partially) repeats what the prior has just said before beginning a new TCU, i.e. the repeater continues with a new (different) action after the repeat. By contrast, with completion-implicative other-repetitions (CIs), the repeater proffers a partial repetition of the prior speaker's talk, thereby *framing* the unrepeatable remainder of the partially repeated turn as the trouble source. In other words, this kind of other-repetition initiates repair on the preceding turn and invites or implicates a (collaborative) completion of the partial other-repetition from the speaker of the original saying.

Walker drew attention to the fact that turn-internal measurements of their phonetic properties were inconclusive in yielding systematic differences between the two types. While some parameters did not differ at all between the two types of other-repetitions, those that did show differences were not uniquely attributable to the activities being done. For example, in CIs the final words typically had a lower mean pitch than the rest of the turn, but this could equally well be the result of the normal pitch-declination that can be observed towards the end of a turn, rather than a marked prosodic design feature. While some design features seemed to be at least partially exclusive (e.g., the NCIs were produced at lower volume than the surrounding talk/as 'mullover repetitions' and with non-rising intonation contours, whereas roughly half of the CIs showed intonation contours rising-to-mid), Walker did not go as far as to call these regularities distinctive. She closed with the suggestion that, perhaps, rather than looking for distinctive and measurable phonetic properties turn-internally, it might be wise to see how these repetitions are produced relative to the surrounding talk (the repeater's talk or the other party's talk). This suggestion builds on the assumption that NCIs may be somewhat set off from the surrounding talk, because the speaker is going to do something else afterwards, whereas CIs may mirror preceding talk so as to elicit a completion as a sort of repair. In essence, this suggestion resonates well with a recent growing tendency towards studying prosody dialogically, rather than individually for single utterances or TCUs (cf. Ogden 2006; Couper-Kuhlen, in press; Plug, in press).

Like the other panels reviewed in this report, this panel showed an increased openness towards making interdisciplinary connections, be it with musical studies or studies in speech development and speech pathology, and forwarding new approaches with respect to phonetic issues in talk-in-interaction, such as dialogical or multi-modal approaches.

4.4. Beyond My Own (Interactional Linguistic) Nose

In their talk called *Absent Apologies*, *Drew & Hepburn* focused on the sequential organization and turn-constructive formatting of apologies in conversation. They then considered occasions in which one party treats another party's talk as having admitted culpability by providing an absolution, even though the alleged 'offender' did not necessarily admit a transgression in the preceding talk, let alone deliver an apology. Such a treatment suggests the absolutioner's understanding that an apology would have been due and implicitly treats it as absent. This ana-

lytic procedure enables analysts to uncover participants' orientation to something that has never actually reached the interactional surface, nor been explicitly pursued, *as absent*.

Other talks were dedicated to methodological issues in CA. *Gardner & Mushin*, for example, focused on the issue of which criteria must be met to warrantably characterize a turn as implementing a 'factual informing'. Their presentation raised a number of important questions for studies in action formation, such as: How does one analytically determine that a turn is primarily dedicated to passing on information, if all turns inform in some way or another? Are there specific turn-design features of informing turns? How can one analytically determine participants' territories of knowledge in order to locate them on the knowing-not-knowing continuum? How should 'informings' be labelled? There are arguably a number of labels available for the family of informing-type turns, such as informings, assertions, tellings, claims, announcements, reports, descriptions, etc. Perhaps, as they suggested, this multitude of terms is a direct reflection of the weak conceptual underpinnings of what constitutes an informing turn.

A similar problem was addressed *in absentio* by *Bilmes*, who problematized the labelling of actions with vernacular terms that is typical of CA and Speech Act Theory. Drawing on the differences between requests for action and requests for permission, he illustrated that broad, vernacular action category labels are by no means unproblematic. According to him, one major problem lies in the pre-selectedness of vernacular labels by the analyst's language. For example, German seems to have (at least) two equivalents for the English label *request*, namely *Bitte* and *Aufforderung*. In a way then, different languages may partition certain action domains differently in the vernacular (a kind of 'linguistic relativity'), and this may in turn constrain what an analyst can find. Another issue is the contextual embeddedness of social actions, which makes it possible for certain 'speech acts' to be mutable and multi-layered, even for participants. Occasionally then, not even a consideration of participants' treatment of a target utterance can clarify these kinds of analytic ambiguity. The danger of making more fine-grained analytic distinctions is, however, a possibly infinite proliferation of action categories that may eventually fail to have an empirical basis. Still, for *Bilmes* the vernacular is not fine-grained enough, and he suggests that CA should rethink, or at least problematize, the way it handles its action labels.

Chase Raymond & Anne White presented their award-winning (see section 2) paper on *Time Reference in the Service of Social Action*. In it, they drew a systematic distinction between time references that use socio-culturally shared constructs to parse time (absolute time references, ATRs) and time references that indexically use events (and frequently persons connected to those events) to parse time (event-related time references, ETRs). Time references from the ATR set can be further distinguished into counted (those that relate the temporal distance to the moment of speaking, e.g., "in four years") and uncounted ones (those that do not relate the temporal distance to the moment of speaking, e.g., "March 30th"). Time references from the ETR set can be differently framed, depending on the speaker's kind of access to the event that the time reference is set in relation to (A-framed, B-framed, AB-framed, O-framed). With this systematics at hand, *Raymond & White* showed that combined time reference forms are comparable to the use of alternative recognitionals for doing reference to persons (cf. *Stivers*

2007), in so far as the clumping together of multiple time reference forms provides speakers with different affordances in the service of the action the time reference occurs with (see also Linell 2009 on 'affordances'). For example, when, in July 2010, President Obama promised to withdraw American troops from Afghanistan, he used a combination of counted and an uncounted time reference forms from the ATR set by saying *July 31st, next year*. Raymond & White argued that this afforded him the opportunity to index commitment to this promise through the provision of a precise date, while at the same time camouflaging the undesirable hearing of the fact that this date was actually still *more* than one year away. Furthermore, they observed two general 'principles' constraining the use of certain time reference forms. First, the 'use of too much clock-time' for time references is constrained by its social perception as 'unnecessarily stringent', and second, the use of A-framed ETRs is constrained by a social dispreference for too much self-attentiveness (or perhaps narcissism). Still, their argument implies that the historical development of time reckoning systems (e.g., the development of referability to clock-time) provides for the interactional resources and affordances members of a culture have at their disposal to reference time in service of the actions they implement.

Last, but not least, there was *Lerner's* talk, which impressively linked CA theorizing about the orderliness of social conduct to a phenomenon that seems to be disorderly by its very nature. His talk began with the observation that very young children do not seem to have any procedure dedicated to initiating a social encounter with another person. However, object use and object acquisition seem to figure crucially in toddlers' first social encounters with others. Lerner's theorizing about this issue was connected to the 'trivial' observation that toddlers recurrently seem to wander around aimlessly and that many such diversions result in object acquisition. This state of perpetual motion arguably allows for, and maximizes the likelihood, of coincidental encounters with objects, which in turn may provide for social encounters. Lerner spoke of this as "interactional serendipity", the "faculty of making a fortunate discovery by accident that results in interaction with others". But how can one account for this in terms of an orderly activity? To do this, Lerner proposed a maxim which he takes to operate in toddler-life, namely 'Take what you see'. Indeed, his data were full of cases in which toddlers would shift their attention from whatever they were just doing or holding on to, to what had just entered their sight, followed by the initiation of a move towards the newly sighted object in order to acquire it. (Occasionally, on their way to the just espied object, toddlers would even be distracted by yet another object that entered their vision on the move, which would then cause a subsequent redirection of their motion towards the latter.)

This maxim provides for the aforementioned "interactional serendipity" and may lead to what Lerner called a "nascent social encounter", one that was not the projectable outcome or result of the ongoing course of action, and that was not the result of any systematic procedure designed to initiate the said encounter. It is an incidental affordance of an otherwise ongoing course of action. Such serendipitous diversions may be self-occasioned (e.g., when the toddler drops an object and follows its course to regain possession of it) or other-occasioned (e.g., when others move objects into their focus of attention). Therefore, how a child comes to notice any next new object is central to understanding what orders their social ac-

tions, and thereby possibly provides for the social interactions they can engage in. Lerner suggested that the entire process may be referred to as *sensory-motor sociability*: an account of how toddler's near-perpetual motion and the importance of object use in their lives provides incidental affordances that can lead to social encounters without the toddlers having to engage in opening these encounters.

Of course, the centrality of notions such as 'serendipity' and 'accidental diversions' begs the question of where precisely the socially produced orderliness of this conduct begins. In attempts at answering this question, one will ultimately and inevitably have to come to terms with the status of the maxim he postulated. Is it a socially organized (and perhaps 'socialized') maxim like the maxims Sacks postulated with regard to membership categorization (Sacks 1972) or the categorization of events in the 'ordinary device' (Sacks 1984)? Is it a (psychological?) disposition? Or is it something entirely different? Whatever may at some point turn out to be the answer to this fundamental question, Lerner's impressively deep theorizing about the social orderliness of seemingly chaotic and random conduct, which began with a simple observational noticing, vividly illustrated how extremely powerful CA's procedures can be.

5. Concluding Remarks

There is a growing openness within the CA community towards trans- and interdisciplinary approaches. Apart from multimodal studies increasingly becoming standard, I could roughly identify the following strands of trans- and interdisciplinary work (some more well established than others already):

- studies that use CA findings and assumptions as their premises and try to complement them with experimental methods as well as to integrate them with cognitive or psycholinguistic models of language use (especially the first part of the MPI panel, as well as Levinson's plenary stand as a good example of this),
- studies that try to combine methods from the biological sciences (e.g., measuring psychophysiological effects in responses to storytellings) with interaction analysis (cf. Peräkylä et al.'s talk; see also Voutilainen et al. 2014),
- studies that test CA findings quantitatively and cross-linguistically (Kendrick et al.'s work on the universality of sequence structures is illustrative in this respect; moreover Sidnell & Enfield's talk about collateral effects in responsive actions can stand as an example, cf. also Sidnell/Enfield 2012),
- and studies that use interactionist micro-analysis to address questions that are traditionally located in disciplines other than sociology, such as social, developmental, or general psychology (e.g., Potter & Hepburn, Stevanovic, Peräkylä & Ruusuvuori), speech development and speech pathology (e.g., Howard), and phonetics, or linguistics more generally (e.g., G. Walker, T. Walker, R. Ogden, G. Rossi).

Some scholars also opened possibilities for future interdisciplinary work. *Donald Carroll*, for instance, mused about the possible relevance of frequency effects and collocational patterns for the study of action formation. His suggestion was that

this could be a possible arena in which CA could be combined with corpus linguistics in the future.

It seems then that, at ICCA-14, a further step forward has been made towards *Opening Up CA*, as it were, in precisely this way. While the initial steps of such an endeavor are always the most cumbersome, they have, for the most part, been welcome and openly received at ICCA-14. In this light, it will be interesting to see which next steps will follow. Where will these developments lead us and CA as a discipline? What other new directions will be taken in the future? Alone the prospect of receiving answers to these questions should foster anticipation of ICCA-18 in Loughborough.

6. References

- Auer, Peter / Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth / Müller, Frank (1999): *Language in Time – The Rhythm and Tempo of Spoken Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar (2008): *Interactional Linguistics*. In: Antos, Gerd / Ventola, Eija (eds.) in cooperation with Weber, Thilo, *Handbooks of Applied Linguistics*. Vol 2: *Handbook of Interpersonal Communication*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 77-105.
- Brinton, Laurel J. / Traugott, Elizabeth Closs (2005): *Lexicalization and Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995): *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth (1993): *English Speech Rhythm*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth (2009): *Relatedness and Timing in Talk-in-Interaction*. In: Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar / Dehé, Nicole / Wichmann, Anne (eds.), *Where Prosody Meets Pragmatics*. Bingley: Emerald, 257-276.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth (in press): *Prosody as Dialogic Interaction*. In: Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar / Szczepek-Reed, Beatrice (eds.), *Prosodie und Phonetik in der Interaktion - Prosody and Phonetics in Interaction*. Mannheim: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth / Selting, Margret (2001): *Introducing Interactional Linguistics*. In: Selting, Margret / Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth (eds.), *Studies in Interactional Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1-22.
- Craven, Alexandra / Potter, Jonathan (2010): *Directives: Entitlement and Contingency in Action*. In: *Discourse Studies* 12 (4), 419-442.
- Curl, Traci S. (2006): *Offers of Assistance: Constraints on Syntactic Design*. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 38, 1257-1280.
- Curl, Traci S. / Drew, Paul (2008): *Contingency and Action: A Comparison of Two Forms of Requesting*. In: *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41 (2), 129-153.
- Duncan Jr., Starkey (1972): *Some Signals and Rules for Taking Speaking Turns in Conversations*. In: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 23 (2), 283-292.
- Fox, Barbara (2007): *Principles Shaping Grammatical Practices: An Exploration*. In: *Discourse Studies* 9 (3), 299-318.

- Goodwin, Charles (1981): *Conversational Organization – Interaction Between Speakers and Hearers*. New York: Academic Press.
- Günthner, Susanne (1999a): Entwickelt sich der Konzessivkonnektor *obwohl* zum Diskursmarker? Grammatikalisierungstendenzen in gesprochenem Deutsch. In: *Linguistische Berichte* 180, 409-446.
- Günthner, Susanne (1999b): Grammatikalisierung von *weil* als Diskursmarker in der gesprochenen Sprache (in collaboration with Christine Gohl). In: *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 18 (1), 39-75.
- Günthner, Susanne (2005): Die Entstehung von Diskursmarkern im Deutschen – Ein Fall von Grammatikalisierung? (in collaboration with Peter Auer). In: Leuschner, Torsten / Mortelsmans, Tanja (eds.), *Grammatikalisierung im Deutschen*. Berlin/New York: Gruyter, 335-362.
- Henrich, Joseph / Heine, Steven / Norenzayan, Ara (2010): The Weirdest People in the World? In: *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 33 (2-3), 61–83.
- Heritage, John (1984): A Change of State Token and Aspects of its Sequential Placement. In: Atkinson, John M. / Heritage, John (eds.), *Structures of Social Action – Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 299-345.
- Heritage, John (1998): *Oh*-Prefaced Responses to Inquiry. In: *Language in Society* 27, 291-334.
- Heritage, John (2002): *Oh*-Prefaced Responses to Assessments – A Method of Modifying Agreement/Disagreement. In: Ford, Cecilia E. / Fox, Barbara A. / Thompson, Sandra A. (eds.), *The Language of Turn and Sequence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 196-224.
- Heritage, John (2012a): Epistemics in Action: Action Formation and Territories of Knowledge. In: *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45 (1), 1-29.
- Heritage, John (2012b): The Epistemic Engine: Sequence Organization and Territories of Knowledge. In: *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45 (1), 30-52.
- Heritage, John (2013): Turn-Initial Position and Some of Its Occupants. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 57, 331-337.
- Heritage, John (2014): Welcoming Note in the ICCA-14 Conference Program.
- Hopper, Paul J. / Traugott, Elizabeth Closs (1993): *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Indefrey, Peter / Levelt, Willem J. M. (2004): The Spatial and Temporal Signatures of Word Production Components. In: *Cognition* 92, 101-144.
- Indefrey, Peter (2011): The Spatial and Temporal Signatures of Word Production Components: A Critical Update. In: *Frontiers in Psychology* 2 (255), 1-16.
- Jefferson, Gail / Lee, Robert E. (1981): The Rejection of Advice: Managing the Problematic Convergence of a "Troubles-Telling" and a Service Encounter. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 5, 399-422.
- Jucker, Andreas H. (1993): The Discourse Marker *Well*: A Relevance-Theoretical Account. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 19, 435-352.
- Jucker, Andreas H. (1997): The Discourse Marker *Well* in the History of English. In: *English Language and Linguistics* 1 (1), 91-110.
- Kim, Hye Ri Stephanie (2013): Retroactive Indexing of Relevance: The Use of *Well* in Third Position. In: *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 46 (2), 125-143.

- Levinson, Stephen C. (1983): *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, Stephen C. (2013): *Action Formation and Ascription*. In: Sidnell, Jack / Stivers, Tanya (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. West-Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 103-130.
- Lindström, Jan (2009): *Interactional Linguistics*. In: D'hondt, Sigurd / Östman, Jan-Ola / Verschueren, Jeff (eds.), *The Pragmatics of Interaction – Handbook of Pragmatics Highlights Vol. 4*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 96-103.
- Linell, Per (2009): *Rethinking Language, Mind, and World Dialogically: Interactional and Contextual Theories of Human Sense-making*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Loehr, Daniel (2007): *Aspects of Rhythm in Gesture and Speech*. In: *Gesture* 7 (2), 179-214.
- Maynard, Douglas (2003): *Bad News, Good News – Conversational Order in Everyday Talk and Clinical Settings*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ogden, Richard (2006): *Phonetics and Social Action in Agreements and Disagreements*. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 38, 1752-1775.
- Plug, Leendert (in press): *On (or not on) the 'upgrading-downgrading continuum': The case of 'prosodic marking' in self-repair*. In: Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar / Szczepek-Reed, Beatrice (eds.), *Prosodie und Phonetik in der Interaktion - Prosody and Phonetics in Interaction*. Mannheim: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung.
- Pomerantz, Anita (1980): *Telling My Side: "Limited Access" as a "Fishing" Device*. In: *Sociological Inquiry* 50 (3/4), 186-198.
- Pomerantz, Anita (1984): *Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments – Some Features of Preferred/Dispreferred Turn Shapes*. In: Atkinson, John M. / Heritage, John (eds.), *Structures of Social Action – Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 57-101.
- Pomerantz, Anita (1988): *Offering a Candidate Answer: An Information Seeking Strategy*. In: *Communication Monographs* 55 (4), 360-373.
- Raymond, Geoffrey (2003): *Grammar and Social Organization: Yes/No Interrogatives and the Structure of Responding*. In: *American Sociological Review* 68 (3), 939-967.
- Rossano, Federico (2013): *Sequence Organization and Timing of Bonobo Mother-Infant Interactions*. In: *Interaction Studies* 14 (2), 160-189.
- Sacks, Harvey (1972): *On the Analyzability of Stories by Children*. In: Gumperz, John J. / Hymes, Dell H. (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics – The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 325-345.
- Sacks, Harvey (1984). *On Doing "Being Ordinary"*. In: Atkinson, John M. / Heritage, John (eds.), *Structures of Social Action – Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 413-429.
- Sacks, Harvey (1995a): *Lectures on Conversation Volume 1*. Edited by Gail Jefferson. Malden Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sacks, Harvey (1995b): *Lectures on Conversation Volume 2*. Edited by Gail Jefferson. Malden Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Sacks, Harvey / Schegloff, Emanuel A. / Jefferson, Gail (1974): A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. In: *Language* 50, 696-735.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1987): Recycled Turn-Beginnings: A Precise Repair Mechanism in Conversation's Turn-Taking Organisation. In: Button, Graham / Lee, John R. E. (eds.), *Talk and Social Organisation*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters, 70-85.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1996): Turn Organization: One Intersection of Grammar and Interaction. In: Ochs, Elinor / Schegloff, Emanuel A. / Thompson, Sandra A. (eds.), *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 52-133.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (2004): On Dispensability. In: *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 37 (2), 95-149.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (2006): On Possibles. In: *Discourse Studies* 8 (1), 141-157.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (2007): *Sequence Organization in Interaction – A Primer in Conversation Analysis Vol. 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. / Jefferson, Gail / Sacks, Harvey (1977): The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation. In: *Language* 53 (2), 361-382.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A / Lerner, Gene H. (2009): Beginning to Respond: *Well*-Prefaced Responses to *Wh*-Questions. In: *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 42(2), 91-115.
- Schiffrin, Deborah (1987): *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schourupp, Lawrence (2001): Rethinking *Well*. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, 1025-1060.
- Selting, Margret (2007): Lists as Embedded Structures and the Prosody of List Construction as an Interactional Resource. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 39 (3), 483-526.
- Sidnell, Jack / Enfield, Nick J. (2012): Language Diversity and Social Action: A Third Locus of Linguistic Relativity. In: *Current Anthropology* 53, 302-333.
- Stevanovic, Melisa / Peräkylä, Anssi (2012): Deontic Authority in Interaction: The Right to Announce, Propose, and Decide. In: *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45 (3), 297-321.
- Stevanovic, Melisa / Peräkylä, Anssi (2014): Three Orders in the Organization of Human Action: On the Interface Between Knowledge, Power, and Emotion in Interaction and Social Relations. In: *Language in Society* 43, 185-207.
- Stivers, Tanya (2007): Alternative Recognitionals in Person Reference. In: Enfield, Nick J. / Stivers, Tanya (eds.), *Person Reference in Interaction – Linguistic, Cultural, and Social Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 73-96.
- Stivers, Tanya / Hayashi, Makoto (2010): Transformative Answers: One Way to Resist a Question's Constraints. In: *Language in Society* 39, 1-25.
- Voutilainen, Liisa et al. (2014): Affective Stance, Ambivalence, and Psychophysiological Responses During Conversational Storytelling. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 68, 1-24.

Uwe-A. Küttner
Universität Potsdam
Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik
Am Neuen Palais 10
D-14469 Potsdam
Germany

ukuettne@uni-potsdam.de

Veröffentlicht am 26.3.2015

© Copyright by GESPRÄCHSFORSCHUNG. Alle Rechte vorbehalten.