

Report ICCA-14: International Conference on Conversation Analysis¹

David Monteiro / Hanna Svensson / Nynke van Schepen

1. Introduction

Four decades have passed since the groundbreaking paper *A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation* (Sacks/Schegloff/Jefferson 1974) was published in *Language*, since when it has become one of the most quoted articles from the journal and contributed to the foundation of a new field, Conversation Analysis (CA). This paper proposed a framework for studying issues that are central to the sequential organization of social interaction, such the coordination of action and the deployment of multimodal resources by interactants to manage turn-taking in ordinary and institutional settings. ICCA-14 was a testament to the vitality of the field, showcasing new research on established issues, developments in new areas such as multimodality and interdisciplinary work encompassing experimental and biological approaches. In this report, which complements the others provided in this journal, we first focus on an established issue in CA, namely sequence organization, reporting Pomerantz's plenary and panels dealing with actions in second positions (Section 2); we then discuss the panels considering links between CA and experimental research (Section 3); a section is dedicated to new developments in the field of multimodality (Section 4); we then report on panels on institutional talk and workplace interactions (Section 5) before ending with some concluding remarks (Section 6).

2. Actions in second position

Actions are rendered intelligible and observable in the sequential organization of social interaction by their relative temporal location and how interactants format them (Sacks/Schegloff/Jefferson 1974; Schegloff 2007). A first action projects a second one, which may in turn constitute a new first action or, alternatively, close the sequence.

A number of panels presented at ICCA-14 addressed issues related to sequence organization, either by privileging actions in first position - *Request design in conversation*, *Question design: forms and functions* and panels on repair initiation - or by dealing with actions in second position, on which we focus here.

In recent years there has been increased interest in the constraints that the turn construction of an initial action imposes on the responding action (for instance use of *yes/no* interrogatives). The studies presented here focus on congruity of responding action format with the expectations set up by the preceding action.

We start with a review of the plenary speech by *Pomerantz*, who investigated how conversationalists orient to the junction between first and second actions by resisting the premises of the first action when responding or choosing not to re-

¹ We are very grateful to Lorenza Mondada for comments on an earlier draft of this report.

spond to it. We then turn to two larger cross-linguistic panels on turn construction in responsive actions and on turn-initial particles in responsive actions.

2.1. Responses that counter background assumptions of requests for information and for assessments - Pomerantz's plenary

The plenary given by Pomerantz dealt with the questions of *Why this question now and how to respond to it?* Pomerantz proposed that inferences participants make about the questioner's purpose in making the inquiry provide a partial answer. Exolingual conversations, in which non-native speakers of a language may have trouble in drawing such inferences, offer an interesting setting in which to explore this issue.

In a paper based on video-recorded data of talk-in-interaction between native and non-native speakers of English Pomerantz demonstrated how non-native speakers resist and counter preconditions for requests for information and assessments through the turn formatting of their responses. Drawing on Sacks's notion of a *Correction Invitation Device* Pomerantz showed that one way of making such inferences about a question's 'project' is by local invocation and establishment of common knowledge (Sacks 1989:249):

You can name one, and they know, by virtue of the use of that one, what class you're referring to, and can give you another. And that's a non-trivial way of seeing that, and how common knowledge has its organization seen and understood by members.

By invoking a specific member of a category, the questioner provides the respondent with hints about possible intentions lying behind the question. Three principal ways of countering background assumptions were highlighted by Pomerantz's study of responses to requests:

- (1) *Not A but B*. Replacing a category in a collection of categories is a way for participants to claim that there is no observable or acceptable precondition for the request.
- (2) *Yes, but not for 'that' reason*. By answering an inquiry by providing a reason for giving specific information participants assert that a background assumption is inaccurate.
- (3) *Trouble with the precondition*. By responding to a request yet clarifying or specifying terms in the response participants may implicitly contest background assumptions. For instance, one precondition for making an assessment is that the assessing party has knowledge about, access to, or experience of the referent; one way of declining to provide the requested assessment (or information) is to disclaim epistemic access to the assessable. By adopting a low epistemic stance relative to the assessable, the respondent adjusts the epistemic status ascribed to him/her by the questioner.

Pomerantz's paper demonstrated that declining to provide a requested report about some event is an accountable action. By pointing to insufficient preconditions as a reason for failing to give a report the speaker argues strongly that the inquiry cannot be responded to in a way that refers to its original terms. On the other hand, by

conveying that the precondition has only been partially satisfied, a speaker anticipates that a weak claim on knowledge will be used to justify the inability to provide the report. This suggests that by examining how interactants express the inferences they make about the precondition for a first action, analysts can gain insight into participants' understanding of the ongoing interaction. This suggests that it may be profitable to study much longer sequences of speech than is general practice in CA.

2.2. Panel: The grammar of responsive actions - a cross-linguistic view

The panel organized by *Thompson, Couper-Kuhlen* and *Fox* investigated the formatting of responsive actions and its implications for the continuation of a sequence. Responsive actions in typologically different languages including English, Danish, Finnish, Russian, German, Japanese, Polish, Caribbean English, Creole and Lao, were considered. The data discussed by the panel included audio and video recordings of naturally occurring speech-in-interaction, most taken from everyday interactions in these various languages. The panel focused on issues relating to alignment or non-alignment of actions in first and second position.

Several papers dealt with resisting responding to questions through the use of turn-initial particles. *Heinemann* and *Steensig* looked at resistance to *wh-questions* in Danish. They showed that in response to 'telling' *wh-questions*, the particles *ja*, *jo* and *nej* project a multi-unit turn that is aligned with the initial action whilst by omitting these particles from responses speakers resist the projection of 'telling'. In the case of 'specifying' *wh-questions* when there is a preference for expanded clauses in response, a turn-initial particle projects a somewhat problematic answer. When a response to a 'specifying' *wh-question* is phrasal, indicating that the initial action is inappropriate or unexpected, such indication is further increased through the deployment of a turn-initial particle.

In a comparative study of *a*-prefaced responsive actions in Japanese and *oh*-prefaced responsive actions in English *Hayashi* and *Hayano* demonstrated that despite the similarities between these particles, the Japanese *a* differs from the English turn-initial particle *oh*, as it does not routinely mark the previous question as inappropriate as is generally the case with the English *oh*. Comparison of *a* with another Japanese particle, *eh* which, although sharing many of the characteristics of *a*, is a strong indicator of inappropriateness when used in the same sequential environment, and was used to extend the analysis. This analysis demonstrated that particles that in principle share similar properties across and within languages, are mobilized to do different things, although they operate in the same sequential environment.

Betz demonstrated that participants use the response token *genau* ('right' or 'exactly') for confirmation, but not necessarily as an aligning action. When the token is produced in the context of repair and used to confirm understanding in third position, it takes epistemic authority over the prior proposition. On the other hand, in a context in which *genau* is produced in response to a first informative action, it claims epistemic rights and assumes independent knowledge about the prior turn, contrary to the epistemic status conveyed by the format of the initiating prior action.

Whereas other papers showed how particles operate on the previous turn *Bolten* demonstrated how the Russian particle *nu* projects that the following turn is not the appropriate next (responsive) action. By prefacing a responsive action with *nu* the speaker in second position indicates that the epistemic stance conveyed by the first speaker is not compatible with the questioner's actual epistemic status with regard to the subject.

It was shown that both turn-initial particles and the practice of repeating were used to manage epistemic matters in relation to questions. *Hakulinen* and *Sorjonen* presented a paper on Finnish interrogatives in which the response to a turn-initial verb was a repeat of the finite verb. The repeat can be minimal or extended by using a following subject or object complement within the same prosodic unit, using a new prosodic and syntactic unit, or using a double verb repeat. The repeat reveals how the response relates to the initial action, for example whether the question is congruent with the participants' supposed and relative epistemic status or not.

The panel also raised the issue of how to account for the conformity of responsive actions with first actions in given sequential positions in various languages. *Zinken's* paper showed that, in Polish, there seems to be a preference for 'compliance only' requests, this is indicated by the fact that it is the most common way by which requests for actions are expressed; requests for action projecting an acceptance token are marked as problematic in the response and as something that should be 'taken for granted'.

In an analysis of responsive actions to information and accounts, first assessments, *wh-questions* and requests for actions *Fox, Thompson* and *Couper-Kuhlen* showed that, in English, deontically weak forms of initial actions make a response relevant next which is grammatically maximally formatted, whereas a deontically strong first action makes a grammatically minimal response relevant.

Ways of responding to actions in second position are closely related to linguistic specifics and differences between languages. *Enfield* and *Sidnell* showed that answer design is constrained as much by the grammatical characteristics of the language as by the format of the question.

In summary, the papers presented at this panel showed how the turn-construction of a responding action can be modulated to agree with, resist or even reject or modify what the previous initiating action made relevant next; they also showed how participants modify prior displays of epistemic stance through the formatting of responsive actions.

2.3. Panel: Cross-linguistic perspectives on turn-initial particles

Turn-initial position is crucial for the organization of a sequence, being the sequential *locus* in which the speaker expresses a retrospective relationship with the prior action and prospectively establishes some constraints on the imminent or ongoing turn. This has prompted an interest in particles occupying this position. The panel organized by *Heritage* and *Sorjonen* was dedicated to studies of turn-initial particles used in responsive actions in ten languages (French, Korean, English, Spanish, Estonian, Finnish, Polish, Swedish, German and Dutch). Many of the papers looked at particles related to issues of rights and access to knowledge, as well as participants' negotiation of their relative epistemic statuses.

The panel was preceded by Heritage's keynote speech that considered the very same issue; Heritage discussed the specific turn-initial particle *well*, which in responsive actions signals a departure from the constraints projected by the prior action. Readers interested in an extended review of this keynote speech are referred to other reports in this issue (see Stoenica).

Various papers presented at the panel demonstrated how turn-initial particles express a shift in stance towards the implications of the action in first position, or counter presumptions associated with it. *Golato's* paper considered the use of the German particle *naja* for overcoming contiguity problems in the conversation by, for instance managing topic shifts. This study also compared the particle with other similar German particles and English equivalents, raising problems of translatability.

Lindström looked at the Swedish particles *nåja* and *okej*, which are both used for admitting or agreeing that something is true after first denying or resisting this. Lindström demonstrated how these particles do the interactional work of alignment as a concessive action in responsive turns in interactions where the participants have different epistemic positions.

Keevalik dealt with the initiation of preferred second pair parts in Estonian, which is delayed with the Estonian particle *no*. Considering actions such as invitations, requests and offers in first position, Keevalik showed that when the action is prefaced by the particle *no*, even a preferred second pair part (such as accepting an invitation) marks a transition from non-compliance to compliance with the action in first position.

Similarly, *Kim* demonstrated that, although Korean is known as a language in which turn-final positions hold crucial interactional information, turn beginnings in Korean nevertheless signal what the following talk will do. Participants use the particle *ani* in response tokens in order to express surprise, thus treating the prior turn as unexpected whilst creating a new first pair part.

C.W. Raymond presented a study on two Spanish particles which are used like the English turn-initial particle *well* but do different interactional work: while *bueno* is tacitly type-confirming and accepts the design of the previous turn, subsequently launching a new topic, *pues* challenges the preconditions of the prior turn and offers an explanation of its inappropriateness, thus departing from the constraints set by the prior turn. Raymond further showed that by combining these particles, a speaker accepts what the design of the previous turn projects, although he or she does not accept its preconditions. The use of the particles in different dialects was also discussed.

Sorjonen investigated the Finnish particles *siis*, *eli(kkä)* and the particle cluster *niin että* in the context of prefacing an other-initiated repair on a prior turn, through the offering of a candidate interpretation. These particles, which are close to the English repair-prefacing practices 'so you mean', 'in other words' and 'so', were each shown to set up different constraints on the following turn, displaying a specific relationship to the problem that was the source of the repair initiation. *Siis* frames the following turn as a problem of understanding for the repair initiator; however the particle *elik(ää)* indicates a problem of some sort with the source of the problem and prefaces a candidate interpretation indicating comprehension of the prior turn. The combination of the two particles *niin että* was shown to signal that the responsibility for the repair lies with the speaker of the source of the

problem (this contrasts with the ways in which a speaker expresses a problem of understanding).

Mazeland also focused on clusters of turn-initial particles and the relative and ordered placement of them, showing that the internal order of the Dutch particles investigated relies primarily on global rather than local variables. Mazeland also observed that participants distribute the particles according to both their expressed understanding of the prior turn and what follows subsequently (directionality type), and noted that particles projecting a type of action are placed before them, relating prior and subsequent talk or discourse organizationally (connectivity type).

A number of papers looked at how turn-initial particles modulate epistemic relationships with regard to both the immediately prior talk and to the interaction as a whole. *Mondada* presented a paper on the French particle *voilà* in second or third position in a possible sequence closing which showed that using this particle makes a claim for epistemic superiority with respect to the matter dealt with in the preceding interaction. Mondada analyzed *voilà* in various contexts: stand alone, preceded by other particles or followed by a partial repeat of the prior turn; furthermore multimodal analysis demonstrated that embodied conduct which concurs with *voilà* in turn-initial position is different from gestures responding to other turn-initial particles and expresses a bodily orientation to the closings.

Raclaw demonstrated how speakers who have been treated as being in a K-position in the previous talk use the English turn-initial *no* in responsive turns, as a turn-initial particle to claim epistemic access and K+ status with regard to the previous talk. This study comprised analyses of ordinary and institutional interactions in which participants used this form to resolve epistemic incongruities between presumed and displayed knowledge.

Weidner investigated participants' use of the Polish turn-initial *no*, which expresses and establishes epistemic status relative to a topic. The study investigated the unconventional use of the *no* particle, which is known to be highly indexical and is used in a wide range of contexts for initiating confirmations on three different levels: firstly, basic confirmation, treating the prior talk as something obvious or redundant; secondly, asserting epistemic independence vis-à-vis the prior talk, rather than acknowledging any change of state and thirdly, on a sequential level, the use of a *no*-prefaced turn to claim a K+ position, treating the matter of the immediately prior talk as 'their side knowledge', thus instigating sequence closure.

The panel illustrated the diversity of the interactional functions of particles in turn-initial position. Particles mobilized in this position retrospectively register and modify aspects of the previous action. Alone or in clusters - where they might be combined with other particles - they can also shape the emerging action of the forthcoming turn in multiple ways.

2.4. Final comments

The plenary talks given by Pomerantz and Heritage and the theme of the panel discussed above provide evidence of continuing interest in responsive actions and what information their format provides about participants' comprehension of, or alignment with, a prior action. Several papers demonstrated that responsive ac-

tions are not merely binary indicators of alignment or non-alignment with the first action, but can serve to express a selective degree of alignment.

The importance accorded to epistemic stance and status in the formatting and interpretation of social actions was a notable feature of the papers discussed above, however the most striking aspect of these studies was their demonstration of the ways in which the sequential organization of social interaction allows interactants continually to adjust and negotiate their mutual understanding of the communicative project in which they are engaged.

A remarkable number of panels and presentations offered a cross-linguistic perspective on these interesting phenomena; the typological variety of languages studied indicates not only how CA has become an international field but, more importantly, the relevance and value of using CA to investigate language diversity and in comparative analysis of interactional practices. This was illustrated particularly well by the panel on *Human Diversity in Conversation* which explored issues relating to language diversity in interaction and cross-linguistic studies of conversational data by focusing on two types of actions, repairs and requests, through a series of comparative studies encompassing a variety of languages and quantitative data.

3. Experimental and quantitative approaches to CA

CA has developed sophisticated, systematic analyses of turn, sequence and action organization in a variety of contexts, activities, languages and other resources, but inspired by other fields, principally the cognitive and biological sciences, it has also addressed related issues, such as the processing of interactional resources in the production and reception of turns and the evolutionary, neurological and physiological dimensions of turns-at-talk. These discussions were represented at ICCA-14, particularly in the panels reviewed here and in Levinson's plenary talk (see Küttner in this volume).

3.1. Panel: Hybrids, heretics, and converts - experimental and comparative methods in conversation analysis

The evolutionary character of turn-taking was implicit in the analysis by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, which invoked "a set of distinct factors that conspire to cause turn-taking in the way it does" (Enfield 2007:70). It is an explicit concern of research, which extends the analysis of the moment-by-moment adjustments of interactants to show, through neuropsychological experiments, that speakers start planning their intervention before the preceding turn is completed. This evidence runs counter to the original studies of interaction that characterized it as an emergent phenomenon. Speakers require certain information to plan an intervention. In question-answer sequences the start of the cognitive process of planning a response depends on when the information necessary to the response is produced (Bögels, Magyari, Levinson *et al.*). Comprehension of the first part of an adjacency pair (FPP) (Schegloff 2007) depends on the temporal placement within it (e.g. early focus vs. late focus), of information required to produce the second part of the adjacency pair (SPP) (Gísladottir, Chwilla, Levinson). Word order has con-

sequences for turn-planning (*Barthel*). Speakers start planning their subsequent turn-at-talk as soon as they have the information needed to produce a SPP (between 0.6 and 1.2 seconds before turn-completion; Levinson 2012). Whilst encoding processes may start earlier, the in-breath before launching a new turn starts only at the interlocutor's turn completion (i.e. in reaction to this event) (*Torreira*), which explains why the modal response latency is around 200 ms rather than around 0 ms.

The findings from these studies of turn-taking were corroborated by multi-modal analysis of gaze direction in triadic conversation which showed that gaze is linked with semantic processing of the interaction (*Holler, Kendrick*) and a study of overlap in sign language (*De Vos*). Lastly, cross-linguistic analyses have shown that the notion of 'turn-taking' is applicable to the ten languages investigated.

3.2. Panel: CA and biological sciences

Levinson's plenary talk and the panel organized by the Levinson group highlighted the possible role of cognition in the temporal organization of emerging turns at talk. A panel on *Conversation Analysis and Biological Sciences* (convened by *Peräkylä*) explored another domain with possible relevance to organization of turns and actions in social interaction, namely the physiology and biology of humans and other higher primates.

The panel explored behavioral interactions among partners who do not interact with talk. *Rossano* presented a comparative analysis of the behavior of humans and great apes, arguing that some of the behavioral patterns displayed by apes were very similar to those of humans, especially the young children who were the primary subject of the research. Requests provide one example of this similarity: the young of humans and great apes share an interest in, and reliance on, contextual inferences for sense-making, but whereas children gradually develop an orientation to the accountability of actions great apes do not learn to hold their fellows accountable for their actions.

In an investigation of young children's gaze behavior during the changing of a diaper *Nomikou* and *Rohlfing* showed that eye contact is more likely to be established during verbal than non-verbal interactions. Statistic evidence provided for the fact that three-month-old children tended to look at their mother when she was talking, but this was not the case in six-month-old children.

The panel also explored the physiological foundations of interactional behavior. *Peräkylä, Henttonen, Voutilainen, Stevanovic, Kahri, Sams* and *Ravaja et al.* investigated possible links between reciprocal displays of affective stance and activation of the sympathetic nervous system (heart rate and skin responses) in the context of storytelling. These studies showed that whilst listening to a story conveying an ambiguous tendency with regard to positive or negative newsworthiness, interactants enter a state of sympathetic arousal, which is manifested in skin responses (e.g. goosebumps, a possible involuntary physiological response to experiencing strong emotion).

3.3. Final comments

Considering social interaction from a psycholinguistic, cognitive or biological perspective opens up new avenues for research, for example the projectability of turn completion. Interdisciplinary research also raises as an important issue the compatibility of the CA mentality with these experimental approaches. The possibility of extending and developing our understanding by focusing on longer and more complex multi-unit turns, on complex multimodal actions and on conversations in diverse naturalistic contexts is an exciting challenge.

4. The coordination of multimodal resources in interaction

Schegloff, Sacks and Jefferson (1974) pointed out that analysis of turn-taking in talk-in-interaction must incorporate an understanding of how sound is produced. Over the last two decades a growing body of literature has stressed the need to consider extra-linguistic resources to capture fully the techniques used to organize social interaction (Schegloff 1984; Goodwin 2000; Heath/Luff 2007; Local/Walker 2012; Mondada 2013). A large number of panels addressed multimodality explicitly, exploring issues such as the use of multimodal resources to initiate social activities or interactional projects; the role of gestures in turn and sequence organization and multimodal perspectives on symmetries and asymmetries in professional and institutional interactions. In the following section we first review panels that offered papers on tactility and objects as resources for accomplishing actions in social interaction. Second, we discuss panels that focused on the convergence and coordination of multiple modalities and activities, addressing issues such as the relationship between linguistic and embodied resources, and the techniques used – more or less successfully - to coordinate multiple activities or mobilize several resources simultaneously.

4.1. Panel: Tactility as an interactional resource

Nishizaka and *Clemente* convened a panel on the topic of touch as a communicative tool and as an interaction organizational resource. All the presentations used video recordings to explore the temporal structure of the interplay of talk, movements and touch. Presentations focused on specific configurations involving the use of touch by speakers of different languages (e.g. English, Swedish, Wolof, Mandarin Chinese) and in diverse contexts in institutional settings (such as medical clinics, instructions in textile craft and archaeology) or ordinary interactions between couples, friends and parents and children.

In a study of medical interactions in a pediatric clinic *Clemente* showed how touch is used for displaying knowledge and expertise when demonstrating evidence for medical diagnosis, using the patient's body as a clinical object. In another clinical context – vaccination of a one-month-old infant by a nurse - the nurse and the child's caregiver use verbal and tactile resources to respond to the infant's reaction, a rhythmic crying, thus comforting him or her (*Berducci*).

Meyer and *Li* showed that when initiating and responding to action, participants use touch to manage attention and the allocation of turns-at-talk if other re-

sources are unavailable. Comparative analysis demonstrated that speakers of different languages used different body parts (back, toes and shoulders are used by Wolof speakers; hands, arms and shoulders by Mandarin Chinese speakers) and that the touch configurations used to format actions (such as touching with the palm vs. touching with the back of the hand), depend on the orientation of the interactants (face-to-face, face-to-back, back-to-back).

Lindwall and *Ekström*'s paper focused on use of touch for controlling and shaping the recipients' responses. They analyzed instructive correction sequences in textile craft workshop classes centered on the production of objects and the development of skills in handling the materials. In such sequences teachers correct students by moving their hands and fingers into certain configurations, thus shaping the actions of the instructed party through physical manipulation. Touch is also used for enacting normativity in interactions between adults and children.

Cekaite's paper on embodied directive sequences in adult-child interactions discussed how parents and other caregivers use 'shepherding moves' to control and shape the child's responses to requests and directives (e.g. controlling the child's body movement and posture to ensure that the requested action is executed). *Cekaite*'s analysis focused on the configurations of these embodied actions, and on coordination of talk, touch and movements.

Use of touch to display affiliation and intimacy was the focus of *M. H. Goodwin*'s analysis of concurrent operations in hugs during interactions between family members (spouses, parent-child); this analysis showed that the speech and body configurational responses to hug invitations are integrated and can be adjusted to indicate affiliation, slight disaffiliation or refusal. Hugs are accompanied by a range of systematic changes in voice quality and pitch (such as creaky voice), which lend interchanges a highly affective character and provide audible indications of heightened engagement, which is central to the establishment of intimacy.

C. Goodwin's presentation dealt with the organization of touch and the ongoing constitution of members' knowledge. Using video recordings of instruction in geological and archaeological sites, the talk illustrated how members of a particular community – archeologists and geologists – make sense of a complex environment by scrutinizing small parts of it (such as rocks). The categorization of the environment is the product of an unfolding, public interactive practice, emerging through the participants' feeling, probing and manipulating of its parts (e.g. by touching and grasping).

During the discussion *Nishizaka* argued that although analysts studying touch cannot feel what the participants feel, they nevertheless have access to the interactants' tactile percepts through their observation of other interactional resources mobilized by participants. It was also pointed out that there is no such thing as 'tactility' per se, as it is intrinsic to an abundance of interactions that unfold in time. It is important to note that touch can be used in interactions as an action in its own right, or as an aspect of an action composed through lamination of linguistic and embodied conduct. This underlines the importance of considering touch in conjunction with other aspects of multimodality.

4.2. Panel: Interacting with objects

The panel organized by *Rauniomaa*, *Nevile*, *Heinemann* and *Haddington* explored interactional practices which, within the temporal unfolding of the interaction, makes the use of objects relevant for the participants. Using data from video recordings of interactions in different languages (Danish; Swedish; Finnish; English; French), the studies presented showed how participants orient to objects in the environment and render them meaningful in both institutional and ordinary settings, either as relating them to the tasks at hand, or using them to influence the development of an encounter.

In interactions with patients, doctors assign meaning to computer use through verbal and embodied conduct, using its function as a resource for obtaining information about the patient's medical history to account for their behavior. Orienting to the computer thus anticipates and initiates medical history-taking (*Nielsen*).

Other objects, such as checklist documents, are used to standardize procedures for routine flight tasks. The complexity of these tasks, which require distributed cognition and the use of visual, material and linguistic resources, can make it difficult to create an appropriate checklist (*Auvinen* and *Arminen*). On a different note, *Koschmann* and *Zemel* showed how the bodies of patients become clinical objects during surgical instruction, i.e. they become 'learnables' that are subject to inspection using resources such as digital examination or surgical tools.

It was also shown that objects forming part of the material context could be used for organizing interactional exchanges related to turn allocation and distribution of turns at talk (*Day* and *Wagner*); for diagnosing problems and contrasting incorrect and correct performance and to overcome disruption to the progress of an activity (*Ekstrom* and *Lindwall*); and for reference and symbolic representation (*Hazel*). Blind participants can use touch and palpation to sense, understand, interpret and experience the symbolic properties of art objects aesthetically (*Kreplak* and *Mondemé*).

Participants can also contextualize their use of objects to influence the organization and development of an encounter. *Rauniomaa* and *Heinemann* presented work on negotiation of turning off objects that produce sound as a primary function (e.g. audio entertainment systems) or as a secondary consequence of their primary function (e.g. vacuum cleaner). When participants indicate that another activity, namely talk, should take priority over the use of objects whose sound is interfering with, the negotiation of the objects' relevance to the interaction, this then has consequences for the content and sequence of the interaction.

4.3. Panel: Disjunctive and convergent temporalities and the coordination of action

Multimodality, temporality and the coordination of action were at the heart of the panel organized by *Deppermann* and *Streeck*. Presentations based on video recordings of interactions in different languages (e.g. German; French; English; Japanese) explored the relevance of various resources to multimodal conduct and investigated their temporal properties and role in coordination and identification of actions. Methodological and analytical issues were raised, including how to

identify units in various modalities across distinct modalities (*Streeck*, based on the study of two varieties of 'posture', one of which is recognizable from its relationship with other turn-taking behaviors). Other studies investigated the potential primacy of embodied action over talk in the organization of some activities (*Laury* and *Monzoni*); advantages and potential shortcomings of using video recordings and technologies such as eye-tracking devices to analyze interactions (*Oloff*, *Stukenbrock*) and the highly contextual nature of the coordination of various actions (*Deppermann*).

Made visible by interactants, independent actions can turn into convergent actions (*Vom Lehn*) which, given the synchronous organization of multiple modalities (talk and other semiotic resources such as gestures, gaze, miming and non-linguistic sounds), enables novices to learn by overlapping their body movements with those of experts (*Sunakawa*, on interactions between novice and expert music conductors).

The importance of multimodality to the organization of referential practices was a recurrent theme at this panel. *Stukenbrock* used video data recorded with eye-tracking technology to investigate participants' joint production of expansive actions, such as requests and instruction sequences, in contexts where both embedded referential practices and embedding actions constituted multi-layered phenomena with heterogeneous temporalities. *Laury* and *Monzoni* also presented work on referential practices, discussing whether embodied activities may take priority over verbal ones in certain contexts, and whether, during collaborative attention-giving and co-construction of concrete objects present in the physical context, participants first orient to them using linguistic or by embodied resources.

The importance of multimodality to the organization of responsive actions was also discussed. In a study of delayed completions containing no verbal response to the co-participant's turn, *Oloff* argued that a multimodal approach enables the analyst to demonstrate how visible actions are used to organize such sequences, and how action trajectories - rather than turns - can be used as coherent action units, even in the absence of strong linguistic coherence, thus extending earlier research on delayed completions (*Lerner* 1989, 2004) which described the phenomenon purely in terms of syntactical and lexical completion.

Iwasaki showed that participants make simultaneous use of multiple modalities to suspend ongoing talk in order to create space for responsive actions, for example by use of linguistic units that do not mark the turn constructional unit as potentially complete in combination with embodied displays indicating degree of alignment, stance and affiliation.

Based on the study of request sequences produced in driving instructions, *Deppermann* concluded that the coordination of responsive actions requires more than simple production of a conditionally relevant, requested action; rather, it requires the generation of a causally dependent, progressive sequence of actions. This approach to coordination of activities is sensitive to contingent and continual changes in the environment (e.g. driving behavior and the traffic situation) and is flexible, and context-dependent.

4.4. Panel: Multi-activity in social interaction

Multi-activity, which has been defined as "the participants' finely tuned coordination of concurrent activities in which they are involved at the same time" (Mondada 2014:33), is a recently topic of research in CA and was the focus of a panel organized by *Haddington, Keisanen, Mondada* and *Nevile*. Presentations used video recordings of interactions in different languages (e.g. Finnish; French; German; Italian) to demonstrate that multi-activity occurs in institutional settings (e.g. traveler-official interactions at the window of a customs office, the everyday work of nurses with patients and trainees at the hospital, interactions in the office and service encounters in a travel agency) as well as in ordinary conversation (e.g. whilst driving or during Skype videoconference calls in domestic contexts). Concurrent activities – such as answering questions whilst driving, talking to a customer and to a colleague, summoning colleagues, or orienting to outgoing or incoming phone calls – are managed using linguistic (e.g. code-switching, specific linguistic markers) and embodied resources (e.g. gaze, body torque, embodied actions) whereby speakers demonstrably and visibly attend to the management of multiple courses of action.

Techniques used for the orientation and management of an emerging, interrupting activity, which might constrain other action possibilities, were an important topic at this panel. When two or more activities require a participant to talk or use the same embodied resources simultaneously this creates conflict between them and suspension turns are used to minimize incompatibilities or reorganize the activities so that they take place successively (*Keisanen, Rauniomaa* and *Haddington*). It was shown that suspension of the primary activity i.e. putting it on hold, then resuming it after completion of the secondary activity was a social process achieved through participants' management of the interaction. Activities may be managed in a gradual, stepwise process, or through sudden suspension of one activity and initiation of the next, depending on the nature of the activities and the constraints applicable (*Sutinen, Ticca*).

Mondada and *Oloff* demonstrated that it is possible to achieve multiple activities by making use of complex sequential configurations, either by dealing with the two activities autonomously, in parallel or by alternating them within the same stretch of talk. *Rauniomaa* and *Jeppesen* argued that the shape of multi-activity is dependent on the activity/ practice in question, where it takes place, the participants involved and their respective institutional responsibilities.

4.5. Multimodal conduct in interactions with children and animals

Multimodal resources are important to all social interactions, but they are critical to interactions involving participants who do not talk, such as infants and animals. Interactions involving non-verbal participants are therefore a particularly interesting substrate for investigating embodied organization of action. Children's interactions and interactions with animals provide a different perspective on the role of objects and embodied resources in interaction.

In the panel *Children in action: Exposing the interaction order of childhood* Lerner, the organizer, argued that toddlers' social encounters are a consequence of being perpetually on the move and surrounded by objects. Lerner drew on the rule

'take what you see' to develop the concept of 'interactional serendipity', presenting examples of situations in which the presence of objects might result in incidental self- or other-occasioned interactions. In another of the presentations in this panel *Zimmerman* demonstrated that the orientation of both small children and adults to 'task transition spaces' and to the manipulation of objects, is a salient part of creating a routine or schema for an activity such as eating a meal.

The panel *Animals in interaction* presented phenomena such as animal-directed vet-to-pet talk (*McMartin, Coe, Adams et al.*) and a breaching experiment between a dog and the owner (*Simonen, Tiira, Eriksson, Lohi*), showing that dogs use a range of embodied resources such as gaze and tail wagging as attention-seeking devices to non-responding owners. Dogs initially reacted to the lack of response by escalating these behaviors, but subsequently abandoned the attempt to elicit a response.

Mondemé used research on dogs' gaze as a response-eliciting resource to argue that work on this topic had potentially important implications for conceptualizing participation in social interaction, namely by enabling the dog to be considered a 'participant'.

4.6. Final comments

Numerous papers presented in the various panels confirmed the extent to which interactants continually mobilize, adjust and coordinate resources in multiple modes to format actions and sequences of action; the resource mobilization process was described in terms of fine-grained temporal coordination between actions. The presentations support and enrich earlier research on the importance of the embodied moment-by-moment achievement of the organization of social interaction.

The rich array of presentations and panels dealing with multimodality at ICCA-14 illustrated the growing strength of this kind of analysis and the extension of CA to include hitherto unstudied and more complex configurations, including material objects, and senses other than sound and vision.

5. Institutional talk and workplace studies

Institutional interaction has been a key CA research topic since Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson first made a distinction between turn-taking systems in ordinary interaction and in other settings (Sacks/Schegloff/Jefferson 1974). Following on from this early work other researchers have focused on particular institutional settings (e.g. courtroom interactions; Atkinson/Drew 1979) to elucidate the distinction between ordinary talk and institutional talk (Heritage 1992).

Nowadays, the study of institutional talk and interaction at the workplace is an important field of inquiry in CA and ethnomethodology. At ICCA-14, these fields were central to a wide range of panels, and to the plenary talk presented by *Maynard* (see for a more extended report Groß in this volume).

The asymmetry that characterizes most institutional interactions influences, amongst other things, on the kinds of interactional contributions that are locally assigned to and accomplished by the parties involved through specific recurrent

sequence organization (Drew/Heritage 1992) and the distribution of knowledge indicated by participants' various epistemic stances. The following sections address these issues.

5.1. Panel: Knowledge management in institutional interaction

A defining feature of many interactions in institutional settings is the asymmetry between professionals and laypersons. This asymmetry is often particularly salient in the distribution of knowledge between participants. A panel on the relationship between institutional talk and epistemics was organized by *Pino* and *Fasulo*; the panel focused on how participants' relative knowledge status is made relevant and procedurally consequential to activities within institutions.

It was demonstrated that tensions between the knowledge claims of professionals and laypersons in institutional settings are relevant to the management of participants' rights and obligations as institutional actors. It was shown that several issues are at stake: maintaining clients' autonomy vs. ensuring their adherence to a set of rules and principles imposed by the institution and enforced by the professionals (*Pino* and *Mortinari*); allocating responsibility to other professionals and enacting the existence of an institutional network which assume responds to clients' problems (*Monteiro*); prompting the professional to respond directly to patients' questions (*Fasulo*, *Zinken* and *Zinken*) and resisting claims made by third parties in order to assert one's expertise (*O'Reilly* and *Lester*).

This panel also discussed practices for promoting participation and managing knowledge, including techniques used to render professionals' reasoning accessible to laypersons. Teachers in primary education classrooms use multiple interactional resources to provide clues that will make the answers to questions accessible to the entire student group, thus encouraging all students to participate actively (*Margutti*). In financial helpline consultations professionals use repetition and specific formulations to make the initial explanation of financial products more accessible to clients and to make sure that the caller has obtained and interpreted the information correctly (*Nell*, *Herijgers* and *Koole*). The presentation by *Alby*, *Baruzzo*, *Fatigante*, *Zucchermaglio et al.* looked at patient participation and involvement in decision-making in the context of oncologist-patient interaction, showing how professionals 'socialize' patients to medical reasoning and expert knowledge via a stepwise transition into the doctor's deliberations about potential treatment options.

5.2. Panel: Journalistic questioning

Another characteristic of institutional interaction is that there are institution-specific constraints on formulation of actions. The aim of the panel *Journalistic questioning*, organized by *Clayman*, was to explore how the institutional context for news interviews is created. Papers focused on journalists' questions to presidents and how presidents respond to them (in English, Swedish and Korean). Research on journalism in American English (Clayman/Heritage 2012) and Russian (*Comstock*) demonstrated that journalists' questions have become more adversarial. It was shown that the journalist's stance is related to the hostility of his or her

question. *Ekström* demonstrated that adversarial questions were often a response to previous presidential aggression. It was shown that in Korean two different discourse markers used in turn-final position could account for the degree of hostility of adversarial questions (*Young Bae* and *Jeong*). *Heritage* and *Clayman* (2010) pointed out that flat refusals of such adversarial questions are rare and that in most cases a rationale is given for the refusal to respond. Analysis showed that former U.S. president G. W. Bush was not explicit in formulating a rationale in this context, using embodied techniques to express a rationale for his non-response (*Hualpa*).

5.3. Panel: Workplace interaction

Workplace studies is a domain closely related to the study of institutional talk. It emerged from the ethnomethodological framework and is concerned with the everyday uses of technologies in the workplace, in particular how technology constrains the way people interact (*Heath/ Knoblauch/Luff* 2000), as well as with institutional talk. A panel on this topic was organized by *Hindmarsh* and *Llewellyn*, discussing a set of studies encompassing a wide range of practices which showed that issues relating to negotiation, participation, knowledge management, embodied resources and the use of objects are critical to the delicate action coordination process which characterizes workplace interaction.

Having as the main theme the relationship between the negotiation of agreement and the various sequential positions in which it is carried out, the panel focused on actions produced in first position (opening sequences in price negotiations in sales settings; *Llewellyn*), second position (persuading clients to buy goods; *Clark*), or closing position (the step-by-step production of a series of recognizable actions in work meetings; *Tuncer*).

Some presentations explored how participants in various institutional roles manage participation, discussing how issues such as visibility can be crucial for successfully take part in a given turn-taking system. In participatory democracy meetings, where the professional skills of the facilitator and the everyday interaction skills of citizens jointly determine the selection of next speakers, embodied actions (such as circulating the microphone) facilitate and make visible, but prolong the process of selecting a next speaker (*Van Schepen, Mondada* and *Svensson*). Visibility and participation are similarly at stake when customers at a bar position themselves in physical space, monitoring the actions of the bartender and other customers in their immediate surroundings, thereby defining themselves as 'waiting customers' in an accountable way (*Richardson*).

Visibility, institutional roles and activity boundaries become relevant to participation when, for example a client uses his or her mobile phone – visible only to the client – during a service encounter in a beauty salon. If the client's phone usage interrupts the provision of beauty services it will compel the client to manage two engagements simultaneously (*Nizameddin*). Another presentation explored interaction practices and resources for indicating availability for participation; it demonstrated that in open plan offices in organizational settings, participants identify and construct opportunities to intervene appropriately in another person's conversation using verbal, embodied and material resources (*Salvadori*).

It was shown that visibility is related to knowledge management as well as participation. *Lymer* and *Lindwall's* study of instructional demonstrations in a dental education setting provided a good illustration of this: performance of surgical operations was broadcast to a group of students, instigating sequence-initiation and making visibility relevant. In professional communities - particularly those of various healthcare professions including anesthetists, surgeons or dentists - talk and a range of embodied resources including touch are used to manage and organize knowledge including shared understanding of phenomena that are not readily accessible to collaborative viewing (*Hindmarsh*).

The importance of touch to the acquisition of professional knowledge in healthcare settings was demonstrated by a study which investigated the processes of training and learning an invasive procedure, namely venous cannulation i.e. inserting a peripheral venous catheter (*Melander*). In student nurse training sessions, relevant embodied actions are first performed on objects, then on human beings, as participants display an orientation to touch and demonstrations of bodily pain.

Professional coffee tasters base the organization of their professional knowledge on taste information gained through the production of an intersubjective account of coffee taste that may be unique to a particular group of professionals (*Fele*).

5.4. Final comments

The panels and presentations at ICCA-14 considered interaction in institutional settings, dealing with a wide range of settings and domains. The most frequently used research contexts were healthcare/counseling and instruction/education, but many other settings were also represented, including sales and service encounters, broadcast sessions, office interactions, ludic activities in institutional contexts and public debates and meetings in the context of a participatory democracy project. This diversity enabled discussion of social issues such as the management of knowledge with a community of institutional actors; how institutional identities are talked into being and how interaction practices relate to norms, persuasion and participation in various institutional settings. Research also addressed socially sensitive issues such as the challenge 'end-of-life' consultations pose for professional oncologists (see *Maynard's* plenary talk) and interactional episodes related to the aftermath of the environmental catastrophe in Fukushima, Japan (a panel organized by *Hayano* and *Nishizaka*).

6. Conclusion

The field of CA has developed enormously since the publication of *Sacks*, *Schegloff* and *Jefferson's* seminal paper (1974). The talks presented at ICCA-14 indicated the vitality of the discipline and demonstrated that the initial proposition for a systematic description of the organization of social interaction remains relevant and stimulating to researchers currently working in the field.

The papers and panels reviewed here show how subsequent research has progressively confirmed and extended the findings of the initial turn-taking paper and the early, ground-breaking articles on sequence organization. First and second ac-

tions and orientations to previous and next actions remain the building blocks of sequential analysis. Sequential environments remain the key locus in the shaping and attribution of meanings to action formation and turn formatting. The study of the sequential organization of social interaction has been expanded in various directions and research now encompasses more complex *sequences*; a wider range of *resources*: the interplay of linguistic resources, such as phonetics, prosody, syntax, and lexis is now an active research area, as is the study of embodied resources and the integration of language, gesture, gaze, body postures and movements; the range of *cultural contexts* has expanded: more languages are studied and systematic cross-linguistic research is increasing in importance and a greater range of *social settings* is considered. Audio and video data are collected in an impressive range of contexts including face-to-face interactions with different kinds of typical and atypical populations, encounters in a wide range of institutional and professional settings and a range of technologically mediated exchanges.

7. References

- Clayman, Steven E. / Heritage, John (2012): Question Design and Social Contexts: The Case of U.S. Presidential News Conferences and President-Press Relations. In: Ayass, Ruth / Meyer, Christian (eds.), *Sociality in Slow Motion*, Wiesbaden: VS Verlag, 503-524.
- Atkinson, J. Maxwell / Paul Drew (1979): *Order in court*. Oxford Socio-Legal Studies. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities.
- Drew, Paul / Heritage, John (1992): Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In Drew, Paul / Heritage, John (eds.), *Talk at work*. Cambridge: CUP, 3-65.
- Enfield, Nick (2007): Meanings of the unmarked: how "default" person reference does more than just refer. In: Enfield, Nick / Stivers, Tanya (eds.), *Person reference in interaction: linguistic, cultural and social perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 97-120.
- Goodwin, Charles (2000): Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 32, 1489-1522.
- Heath, Christian / Luff, Paul (2007): Ordering competition: the interactional accomplishment of the sale of art and antiques at auction. In: *British Journal of Sociology* 58, 63-85.
- Heath, Christian / Knoblauch, Hubert / Luff Paul (2000): Technology and social interaction: the emergence of 'workplace studies'. In: *British Journal of Sociology* 51 (2), 299-320.
- Heritage, John (2002): Oh-prefaced responses to assessments: a method of modifying agreement/disagreement. In Ford, Cecilia / Fox, Barbara / Thompson, Sandra A. (eds.), *The language of turn and sequence*. New York: OUP, 196-224.
- Heritage, John / Clayman, Steven (2010): *Talk in action: interactions, identities, and institutions*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lerner, Gene (1989): Notes on overlap management in conversation: The case of delayed completion. In: *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 53, 167-177.

- Lerner, Gene (2004): Collaborative turn sequences. In Lerner, Gene H. (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis. Studies from the first generation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 225-256.
- Local, John / Walker, Gareth (2012). How phonetic features project more talk. In: *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* (42 (3), 255-280.
- Mondada, Lorenza (2013): Embodied and spatial resources for turn-taking in institutional multi-party interactions: the example of participatory democracy debates. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 46, 39-68.
- Mondada, Lorenza (2014): The temporal orders of multiactivity: Operating and demonstrating in the surgical theatre. In: Haddington, Pentti / Keisanen, Tiina / Mondada, Lorenza/ Nevile, Maurice (eds.), *Multiactivity in social interaction: Beyond multitasking*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 33-76.
- Sacks, Harvey (1989): Lecture Three: The Correction-Invitation Device. In: *Human Studies*, 12 (3/4) Harvey Sacks Lectures 1964-1965, 247-252.
- Sacks, Harvey / Schegloff, Emmanuel / Jefferson, Gail (1974): A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. In: *Language* 50, 696-735.
- Schegloff, Emmanuel (1984): On some gestures' relation to talk. In: Atkinson, John M. / Heritage, John (eds.), *Structures of social action*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 266-298).
- Schegloff, Emmanuel (2007): *Sequence organization*. Cambridge: CUP.

David Monteiro
Hanna Svensson
Nynke van Schepen

Universität Basel
Französisches Seminar
Maiengasse 51
CH-4056 Basel
Switzerland

davidtomas.monteiro@unibas.ch
hanna.svensson@unibas.ch
n.vanschepen@unibas.ch

Veröffentlicht am 26.3.2015

© Copyright by Gesprächsforschung. Alle Rechte vorbehalten.