## Conference Report: Revisiting Participation – Language and Bodies in Interaction, University of Basel, June 2015

**Inke Du Bois / Christiane Opfermann**

## 1. Introduction

Participating in the EMCA oriented conference "Revisiting Participation – Language and Bodies in Interaction" was an inspiring and enriching experience in several ways. First, the rigorous reviewing process resulted in high quality up-to-date-research. Second, the presentations were diverse in scope and in internationality and were held at a manageable size. Third, the different locations selected for the social gatherings and the conference site in Basel were excellent. Fourth, the conference organization was overall outstanding. During four days of talks in the summer heat of Switzerland, researchers from 17 different countries presented more than 100 individual papers. Among the 152 participants the groups of Finish (20), British (20), Swedish (15), French (15), Swiss (13), United States (13), Japanese (11), Danish (11), German (8), Dutch (6) were among the most represented. Further overseas participants came from China, Australia and Brazil.

The conference was held at the University of Basel from June, 24th to 27th. A diverse range of EMCA-based studies displayed the "full complexity" and "changing configurations" of participation frameworks. Since the first discussion of the notion of participation by Erving Goffman (1974) in his essay *Frame Analysis*, the concept has been utilized, developed and criticized (Goodwin/ Goodwin 2004). However, the conference organizer Lorenza Mondada stressed that *participation* still does not have the same conceptual status as other established and comprehensively investigated conversation analytic notions such as turn and sequence. Goffman´s critique of the analytically insufficient distinction of hearer and speaker has led to a first distinction of the conversational paradigm into the categories of participation status and production format, including the well-known subcategories for hearer and speaker. Levinson proposed a further attempt of differentiating the concepts in 1988. Although there has been substantial research investigating the aspects of participation frameworks, Mondada pointed out the need for further conceptualization and analyses of participation.

In this report, we provide a summary of the keynote lectures held on very different aspects of participation, participation frameworks and coordinated task activities by Charles Goodwin, Christian Heath, Galina Bolden, Ray Wilkinson and Marjorie H. Goodwin, we discuss three panels and many individual papers. We selected them based on our personal professional background and research interests. Thus, our report represents the diversification of activities and settings in which the notion participation was analyzed within the context of this conference.

## 2. Keynote Lectures

### 2.1. Charles Goodwin:
### Inhabiting Each Others' Actions: Co-Operative Action as a Matrix for Participation in Distinctively Human Sociality

Building on his research of the last four decades, Charles Goodwin argued that central to the human adaptation is the distinctive structure of co-operative action: how human beings build new action by performing systematic operations on talk and other forms of action created by others, including prior speakers and absent predecessors. Co-Operations contrast with widespread research on cooperation in that the focus is on public interactive practices rather than a psychological or teleological orientation to mutual benefit.

Drawing on Schütz' outline of the fundamentals of social actions and the structures of the life world (e.g. the 'reciprocity of perspectives') and his definition of the 'We-Relationship' (Schütz 1967), C. Goodwin argued that we do not only apprehend others' actions in the incremental process of interaction, but that "we inhabit each other's actions" (talk C. Goodwin) as build our actions with the very resources also used by others. This point was demonstrated by audiovisual clips of stretches of talk among children who were de-composing and re-using with transformation the talk of the prior speaker, and by the practices used by C. Goodwin's aphasic father who was able to act as a powerful speaker despite being limited to a three word vocabulary by leading others to produce the words he needed.

C. Goodwin further pointed out that humans do not only inhabit others' actions within states of co-presence, but that we also "inhabit our predecessors' actions" (talk C. Goodwin) – by using language, symbols and tools, invented in the past in the uniquely human manner of performing accumulative transformations on what has been inherited. These aspects of unique human creativity were underlined in a comparison of cooperation in animal experiments where continuing re-use with transformation is not described. Finally, C. Goodwin examined how the 'agreement' necessary to constitute Peircian symbols is organized within a community by investigating the practices geologists in the field use to transform the rocks they are scrutinizing into the types that animate the discourse of geology. Co-operative action provides the infrastructure for the unique sociality of the human species and provides a mechanism for systematic accumulation and progressive change within human societies.

### 2.2 Christian Heath: Passing Moments: Micro-Ecologies and the Exchange of Instruments during Surgical Procedures

Christian Heath (with Nicholls, Patel and Luff) focused on the exchange of instruments in the operating theater and in particular the ways in which the scrub nurse assisted the surgeon during complex surgical procedures.

Alluding to an issue raised by Goodwin ("What makes us human?"), the principal concern of the analysis was the capacities of the human hand, especially in performing the actions of passing and grasping. Heath compared the hand and the actions performed by fingers to team work, and explored how the slightest movements of the fingers and hands were critical to the routine and unproblematic ex-

change of instruments. Heath convincingly showed the fundamental constituencies of passing instruments and discussed how the exchange of instruments helped preserve the integrity of the surgical procedure. It was rare for surgeons to request instruments but rather, the procedure's accomplishment relied upon the assistant's ability to remain sensitive to relevant next actions and anticipate just when a particular instrument is required and in what way and in what form. He explored how the passing of instruments involves progressive calibration, an emerging alignment and realignment of the fingers and hands, that enables a smooth exchange, an exchange that avoids tugging at, or even dropping, the implement.

Detailed analysis of the video-recordings revealed the gentleness and delicacy of the movements of both the giver and recipient and the ways in which they progressively anticipate and adjust to the emergent trajectories of the hands' pace, form and direction. It also pointed to how the seeming moment of an exchange involves an emerging process through which giver follows the progressive moment of the recipient. Heath concluded his presentation with questions concerning how we might identify specific actions and sequences within these emergent moments of exchange, where we might look for the factors that are conditional to the regularities of temporal succession, and how we can come to grips, analytically, with highly complex forms of agency in action we find within the slightest movement or gesture. He illustrated these issues by showing one or two fragments of recent work on robotics or so-called autonomous agents passing instruments in operating theaters.

In the following discussion, questions were raised concerning a further empirically based discrimination between the actions of 'tending', 'giving' and 'passing'. Heath agreed and remarked that an investigation of the distinction between 'passing' and 'placing and taking' required further investigation. When asked to explicate once more his notion of the hand as performing 'team' work, Heath clarified that he uses this image to accentuate the concerted action within the hand, carried out by the 'teams' of fingers that create certain shapes to enable an appropriate exchange and coordinate their emergent actions with the contingent formation of the hand and fingers of the recipient.

## 2.3 Galina Bolden:
## Repair initiation and trouble sources in multiparty situations

In her plenary talk, Bolden focused on responses by unaddressed participants that are disconfirming or resisting repair initiation. Actions accomplished by the intervening repair solutions are shaped by the person's epistemic status vis-a-vis the repairable. Bolden stated that epistemic authority is claimed through co-tellership and in the specific case of her data, by rejecting or resisting a repair initiation that an unaddressed story-recipient has produced. Epistemic status exists on an epistemic gradient where K+ is the interlocutor knowing about the topic at hand and K- is the less or not knowing participant (Heritage 2012, 2013). In her talk, she showed how unaddressed recipients positioned between K+ and K- take the turn while the addressed recipients due not. She demonstrated how a K+ speaker responds to interventions by K- interlocutors as s/he performs aggravated corrections holding the person initiating the repair (who interrupted asking for clarification of the reference of a pronoun for example) accountable for poor recipientship.

Bolden presented data of intimates and friends around a dinner table. Trouble sources often arise from problems of indexicality ("it is law school, not business school"). She showed a particularly interesting piece of data where the repairable, the question if the small children of the host go to day care every day is responded to with an "aggravated correction" (M.H. Goodwin 1983). She claimed that relational intimates as addressed recipients employ increased stress, exaggerated prosody and negative assessments ("That is crazy, they only go twice a week") to disconfirm the repair-initiation at hand.

Bolden advances the understanding of participation in conversational repair work, intervention in turn taking and the role of social epistemics.

## 2.4. Ray Wilkinson:
## Known Response Elicitation Sequences and Participation

In his plenary talk, Wilkinson examined three-turn courses of actions or so called known response sequences. These consist of a question that is known to the first speaker, a response by the second speaker and an assessment by the first speaker, which is either an approval or a rejection of that response.

Wilkinson based his analysis on a rich data set of aphasics and their conversational partners. The video recordings include conversations with i) speech therapists and persons with aphasia and ii) 50 dyads of conversations with spouses or significant others and persons with aphasia. Both types of data exhibit the structure of aforementioned three part sequences of elicitation techniques the a) testing prompt, b) known response question, c) the form correction, d) the response, and e) the acceptance.

When demonstrating the spouse conversation data, Wilkinson hinted towards the non-verbal and verbal resistance of the aphasia patients to the format. He interpreted this not fulfilling of conversational routines as the aphasia persons knowing that the conversation is going into a testing situation in which the aphasia spouse constitutes a K+ epistemic authority. Wilkinson showed specific instances where the management of social hierarchy through epistemic K+ and K– status (Heritage 2012; 2013) is given through the elicited response format (Labov/Fanshel 1977). Other speech therapy data showed sound error production and correction until the aphasia patient produced the targeted phonetic version of a lexeme. In other conversational data, the aphasia patient correctly interprets the delay in the tester's response as the first sign of a dispreferred response (i.e. rejection), the aphasia patient looks at the speech therapist, and then reproduces another correct proffered response. Other features of sequences in aphasic conversation were shown in data where the aphasia patient resists the elicited response format saying *Don't (2.0) it s driving me mad* waving her arms and turning her gaze to the floor. The activity production of the correct term takes a lot of silence: both participants focus on the aphasia speaker retrieving and producing the correct word, thus, waiting for the second turn is a routine part of such sequences.

In known response elicitation, the demonstration of ability is judged in the third turn (social control). The non-aphasic interlocutor particularly needs to pay attention to non-verbal and "semiotic structures of the surrounding" as important means of communication of the aphasic person (Goodwin/Goodwin/Olsher 2004:68). The aphasic person resists the verbal production of the second turn and

this hints towards the resistance of the conversational format where the third turn is an assessment of the non-aphasic speaker. (Wilkinson 2014).

## 2.5 Marjorie H. Goodwin: Haptic Sociality: The Embodied Interactive Constitution of Intimacy through Touch

In her plenary, Marjorie Harness Goodwin was concerned with the intertwining of bodies, touch and haptic sociality as a basic framework of practices for shaping experience and building in situ social organization. Seeing participation as a key locus of organizing experience within the consequential settings in families, M. Goodwin pointed out the variety in which haptic experiences are used, e.g. for diagnostic touch, directive or demonstrative touch or play.

Focusing on how participation is created in family-bound tactile inter-corpore-ality, she demonstrated in the detailed analysis of a first conversation and a hug between a mother and her daughter in the morning the practices of the embodied constitution of intimacy by simultaneous bodily actions and voice quality. Pointing out that the 'creaky voice' quality is very closely associated with intimate conversations, M.H. Goodwin showed several other incidents of intertwining bodies in combination with verbal utterances in a creaky voice in moments of intimacy-creating body contact. The extracts were taken from a huge corpus of video data from the Center on the Everyday Lives of Families (CELF) at UCLA, recorded in 32 multinational middle-class families who had been videotaped by two videographers for 40-50 hours per family.

Pointing out that haptical alignments are not unique to humans but are a basic building block of being a social animal, M.H. Goodwin drew on ethological studies on primates' use of touch (for grooming, reconciliatory sex, food sharing, proximity and care taking) which demonstrated the resemblance in humans' use of grooming and touch as a framework for other actions to occur.

M.H. Goodwin further presented instances of different kinds of hugs (alignment or rejection) and delineated them as an interactive sequence that is always initiated by a verbal and/or nonverbal invitation (in form of extended arms) and requires reciprocal actions by the other interactant. Moreover, she underlined the interdependence of hug-(non)reciprocations and the kind of pursued activity of the other party (e.g. children playing a video game when mother requests a hug) or the culturally organized setting (hugging the son in front of an 'audience' when saying goodbye at the school may lead to a rejection in contrast to hugging at home).

Besides seeing a hug as a locus for affiliation or disaffiliation, M.H. Goodwin also investigated the linguistic repertoire used in instances of hugging. She stated the common co-occurrence of touch with kin terms or terms of endearment as means of constituting intimate social relationships. Within the sequential organization of a hug or intertwined body activity, she gave very interesting insights into the prosodic variations in the unfolding sequence: high pitches, elongated nasals or creaky voice quality lead up to or accompany an unfolding embodied activity, thus displaying heightened affect. They are usually dropped when interactants go over to other activities.

She concluded her talk by stressing the embeddedness of language within the affective, iconic and indexical embodied activities between family members.

Moreover, she raised the question of further implications for the analytic frameworks for the study of creaky voice as well as for the display of relative relationships of power and compassion.

In the discussion, Marjorie Goodwin was asked to clarify the categorization of the verbal or vocal utterances in moments of being squeezed. In contrast to a discussant's proposal to categorize them merely as Goffmanian response cries, she argued for interpreting them as an embodiment of something else, e.g. affection or expressing the corporal feeling and enjoyment of being squeezed. When asked about the relation of the children's age to haptic practices of constituting intimacy, M.H. Goodwin confirmed that there is a clear dependence between these parameters with a presumed change in practices for older children. Moreover, she mentioned that not only age mattered in terms of practices of constituting intimacy, but also gender and culture, which would have to be investigated in the future.

## 3. Panels

### 3.1. Aesthetics in Interaction: Analyzing Forms of Participation in Artistic and Aesthetic Activities

The panel Aesthetics in Interaction: Analyzing Forms of Participation in Artistic and Aesthetic Activities organized by *Saul Albert*, Queen Mary University of London and *Yaël Kreplak*, EHESS, convened empirical studies from various artistic fields (choreography, partner dance, TV productions and art exhibitions), which analyzed the emergence of aesthetics through participation in interaction. All presentations revealed how embodied coordination in socio-aesthetic contexts enable a re-examination of Goffman's (1981) participation framework. Through close video analysis, each presentation contributed to the overall interest in interactional accounts of aesthetics by pinpointing the role of vocal, temporal, spatial, bodily and material accomplishments. At the same time, different insights into aesthetic activities from a conversation analytic/ethnomethodological perspective were provided.

The panel began with *Saul Albert*'s (Queen Mary University of London) talk on *Dancing through time and space.* Albert engaged the audience with a participatory activity, a joint rhythmic handclapping. By beginning to clap a specific rhythm, Albert pointed towards the fact that panel participants experience their own knowledge of rhythmic expectation, internalized rhythmic responses and projections. Also, the activity showed how social actors are used to lead and follow. Jack and Jill dance competitions examinations demonstrated how partner dancers manage to coordinate movement through response, following and projecting which coordinated movement is to be accomplished next. Thus, the talk showed how participants in partner dance competitions accomplish an interaction within time and space through highly detailed multimodal moves. Finally, Albert demonstrated the function of the rhythmic clapping and vocal responses of the audience as a co-ordinated embedded and parallel action of the Jack and Jill dance competition.

In her talk *Synchronizing the bodies in a dance class, Leelo Keevallik* from Linköping University presented an analysis of the multimodal interactions of dance class teachers and their students. Keevallik demonstrated how the teacher

effectively coordinated count-ins, claps, snaps, stomps and vocalizations in order to synchronize the bodies of her students. Sound onomatopoeia such as *dah-dah zi-dah* is indexical in that loudness and modulation mark bodily accents in the step sequences, vowel duration coincides with the duration of the move and stops are used for sharpness. Sounding and intoned prosody are employed to elicit the students' physical effort. So the exactly timed sounding such as *whum shuckida shuckida* provides a metacognitive paraverbal bridge for the sequence of movements as a mnemonic device to coordinate dance steps, body movement in a sequence with the rhythm of the music.

In his presentation on *Aesthetics of the performing body, Darren Reed* (University of York) focused on musical multi-master class interactions between an Alexander technique practitioner and student. The data analysis based on 40 hours of instructed performance training in front the class as an audience, focuses on the practitioner's demonstrative and manipulative touches, which are intended to correct the musician's or singer's body posture towards an optimum performance. Applying Heaths' transcription system, Reed shows how the simultaneous touching and addressing the intervention is accompanied by the collective judgment of an aesthetic improvement of the body posture by the present audience.

*Yaël Kreplak* (EHESS), in his presentation *Artwork as collaborative accomplishment: assessing and instructing action during the setting up of an installation* talked about the collective reformulation of problems occurring during setting up an art exhibition. While the artist and staff members focus on different tasks during the exhibition's preparation, the problem that one piece of artwork is not set up straight is addressed at one point. The participants move from focusing on different actions in co-presence to active collaboration, orienting to different MCDs to enact different forms of involvement. Through this, ad hoc participation frameworks are dissolved into new ones while the participants accomplish the artwork's continuous elaboration. The noticing of the problematic position of the artwork is part of the instruction. Thus, the participants engage in assessments and instructtions on repositioning the artwork as products and producers of participation.

*Mathias Broth* from Linköping University Sweden explored the practices of a French TV crew as they edit out camera people to create the illusion of an unrecorded natural event. His presentation *Showing but Unnoticed: Accomplishing the invisibility of camera-work in TV production* focused on this practice based on 22 hours of video recordings of TV production work of the French TV 5 debate show Rideau Rouge. Using an EMCA Approach, Broth finds that the camera operators avoid being visible in other camera operator's shots. This is a highly complex undertaking, because for doing so they need to project who among the TV show discussants will take the turn next, and they have to identify changing discursive identities during the debate. At the same time, they have to project the other camera operators' and debate discussants' spatial relations. All TV production staff members thus participate in the ongoing practice of making the operators invisible. Broth accomplishes to demonstrate that producing aesthetics, i.e. avoiding that other operators and their cameras are seen, is hard work: the director constantly monitors the operators in the control room, while the operators move cameras and themselves out of each other's shots. It would be interesting to see how this is operated in TV formats where camera operators are parts of the TV shows

as in many German TV formats in the 70s and 80s, such as "Disco", "1, 2 oder 3" or "Hitparade".

Overall, the panel was very well organized and attended by 35-40 people. Despite a daring range of different concepts of participation in artistic and aesthetic activities, the panel gathered researchers around the question of how participants communicatively engage in the production and simultaneous evaluation of aesthetic objects and events. Thus, while the contexts of TV productions, an art exhibition and dance classes might have little in common, Albert and Kreplak managed to achieve overall cohesion throughout the presentations: doing aesthetics is a combined cooperative multimodal effort of the participants to accomplish an artistic and aesthetic activity/product together through vocal, temporal, spatial, bodily and material modes.

## 3.2.  Panel: Learning Participation in Traffic

The panel *Learning Participation in Traffic* organized by *Mathias Broth* (Linköping University) und *Arnulf Deppermann* (University of Mannheim) convened a variety of presentations on driving school car interaction data from Sweden, Germany, Finland and Italy. Each presentation had a different focus of interaction but all were concerned in general with the questions how the driving instructor, student driver, the car itself and third parties, i.e. other traffic participants are categorized and how action relevance informs the driving options. On the other hand the projection of one's own and other's actions as a car driver are communicated through self- and other-categorization, turn construction concerning the visible availability of third parties and the multimodal actions such as handling the car's interior as a means of communication. The panel was very well visited, summing up to about 100 people during Arnulf Deppermann's presentation.

*Lena Levin*, *Mathias Broth* and *Jakob Cromdal* (Linköping University) started off the panel with their presentation *Showing where you're going: Self Categorization and Participation in Live Traffic.* Their data were taken from a corpus of 83 hours of video-recordings and 120 consecutive lessons in Swedish driving schools. The presenters claimed that driving includes two participation frameworks, inside of the car (trainee driver and driving instructor) and outside, the vehicle or public shell in traffic. Broth's and Cromdal's main concern was the analysis of the most frequently taught activity in their data, the relevance of turning on the indicator and its communicative relevance within the two proposed frameworks. The driving school instructor used revealing membership categorization devices (Sacks 1992) and references which reflect the complexity of overlapping participation frameworks during driving such as "*we* have to deal with *the truck we* activate the *indicator*, you can have your right foot on the *brake*."

Thus, they claim that the indicator is an important means of communication with surrounding traffic and the instruction of its use changes from beginning to later stages of instructions. Time constraints pertaining to driving as such become sensitive to the instruction, most instructions are given as directives about controlling the car and using the car, not only to navigate from one place to another, but also as a vehicle to communicate with other drivers (initiating the brake so that brake lights project to the cars behind that the car will slow down, or indicating a left turn through the indicator indicates that the car will turn left).

*Arnulf Deppermann* (Institute for the German Language, Mannheim) frames his talk *Accomplishing Intersubjectivity in a Fragile Ecology: Negotiating Coordination of Actions in Traffic* with Goffmanian related thoughts that space for walking and driving is a limited resource. Therefore, driving affords coordination tasks, which are managed by gaze, recognition and acknowledgment of recognition, the search for salient opportunities to pass or being oblivious to other participants' actions. Car traffic requires to be organized according to formal and informal rules since increased risk, speed, multi-activity requirements and restricted possibilities for monitoring are involved. For his analysis, Deppermann chose highly interesting video sequences of instruction strategies where cooperation problems occur between the driving instructor, the student driver and oncoming traffic in the precarious situation of passing obstacles.

On another level, Deppermann showed a video sequence which made the audience burst out in laughter: the driving instructor directly and dominantly grabbed the steering wheel, scolding the learner that he failed to foresee and project the danger of the upcoming obstacle in form of another car in a narrow street. The negotiation of recognition and anticipation of other traffic participants between instructor and student driver was best shown at failing to establish joint attention due to limited sight and short time frames for mutual monitoring. Deppermann manages to take theory a step further, through his in-depth analysis of the actions in the data he shows the multiplicity of different modes which are at stake in achieving intersubjectivity such as performative driving (by acceleration, projecting early to claim or yield right of way, etc.), distance (flashlights, honking) and proximity among instructor and student driver (gaze direction and gestures) which are all involved in the context of car traffic. He concluded that coordination in traffic may rely on intersubjectivity in different ways: Coordination problems may be solved by intersubjective negotiation, by the presupposition that all participants stick to mutually known, intersubjectively valid rules or by individual strategies of defensive driving (ceding right of way, reducing speed, etc.). In the latter case, drivers pursue a strategy of securing safety without having to rely on other traffic participants' orientation to negotiation or intersubjective rule-following.

*Anne Daniele Gazin* (Bern University) and *Elwys De Stefani* (KU Leuven) in their talk *Who's the Driver? Managing Diverging Action Projections in Driving Lessons* posed the research question "how do participants manage to sustain in-car interaction and interaction among road users at the same time?". They claim that participation is constituted through actions demonstrating forms of involvement performed by different parties (Goodwin/Goodwin 2012), which becomes conspicuous during unexpected traffic events. Based on 7 video-recorded driving lessons in Italy, Gazin and De Stefani focus on diverging orientations towards next actions as crucial moments where the action of instructor and student driver is negotiated. While instructor and student driver may take autonomous decisions in traffic events, the instructor takes on personal responsibility for the vehicle's action in traffic, thus adding another participation framework to the previous ones, namely the instructor as accountable for the mobile unit's traffic behavior in relation to other traffic participants (pedestrians or car drivers), e.g. through mutual 'thank you' gestures or complaining about pedestrians talking on their cell phones, he assumes epistemic and deontic superiority (Heritage 2012) to the student dr-

ivers. The video sequences shown had slightly humorous side effects: the communicative Italian manner of the driving instructor interacting with and commenting on third parties was equally entertaining.

*Mirka Rauniomaa* (University of Oulu) investigated *Participation in the Flow: Instructing Velocity to Older Drivers* with the focus on instructing speed to older women during their post-license training. The data represents seven hours of post-license training for older car drivers, recorded from 3 training sessions (10 hours) with different Finnish driving instructors. Rauniomaa showed how the teacher instructs the adjustment of velocity to the traffic flow. The challenges of velocity consist of multiple participation frameworks, the control of speeding through putting the foot on the gas pedal or on the brakes, the estimate of other vehicles, projecting one's own next moves and anticipating those of others and the monitoring of signs and meters. The measurement of velocity is referred to on signs and speedometers and sudden changes occur during traffic flow and at various junctions. Rauniomaa demonstrated how the instructor reinstates the activity frame, instructs the driver to use multiple modes for acceleration or changing lanes, e.g. "switch on the left indicator because we are changing lanes and through the left mirror and by glancing over the left shoulder…" Material places (acceleration lane) and signs index velocity where embodied action is required in response to entering those spaces and responding to signs. The analyses revealed how the driving teacher instructs and names the necessary actions in response to traffic flow and semiotic signs.

The panel addressed a highly interesting field with intertwining participation frameworks and shed light on the complex modes of the actions of driving and instructing driving from different angles. As a side effect, the contextualization of directives and conversational routines in Finnish, Italian, Swedish and German driving instruction was conspicuous when comparing the different presentations. The multiplicity of different actions and participation frameworks at stake in achieving intersubjectivity are evident in the different spaces within the participants are performing their embodied actions: the car (bound space) car window (permeable space) and street (unbound space), the semiotics of signs and lanes as communicative spaces represent complex configurations for analysis (Scollon 2003, White 2010) and finally, the semiotics of performative driving is ambiguous (Deppermann 2015) and calls for more of such research.


### 3.3. Panel: The Emergence of Participation

*Iris Nomikou (*Bielefeld University*) and *Carolin Demuth (*Aalborg University*) convened a variety of studies on how infants become participants in different socio-cultural settings. Most presentations dealt with early development of turn taking in vocal interaction between mothers and infants. *Revisiting participation* was addressed in the way that conversations are highly coordinated, multimodal interactions and that at least one participant, the infant under investigation, does not produce language but communicates through smiles, paraverbal cues or cries. The presentations dealt with a specific adult-infant turn taking format and showed how preverbal very young participants are able to anticipate the end of a turn in a conversation and perform actions in response to syntactic, prosodic and pragmatic cues.

Starting off with a presentation on preverbal infants, *Maya Gratier*, *Bahia Guellai* and *Emmanuel Devouche (*Universities of Paris*)* investigated 2-4 months olds anticipating turns without lexical information. Their talk *Turn-taking in Protoconversations* dealt with videos of mothers and infants imitating smiles and producing conversation-like turns in the naturalistic setting of the changing table. The analysis of a corpus of 51 mother infant dyads resulted in the finding that the patterning of sound in time, coordinated movement, interlocking rhythms, and the synchrony of counterpoint and syncopation represented ritualized forms of a self-other communion. The mothers and infants collaborated in a pattern of more or less alternating, non-overlapping vocalization, and produced brief joint performances, which were similar to a conversation. The data showed rhythm smiling and nodding have important functions. Questions such as how do babies anticipate transition relevance places of maternal utterances, how are latched turns shaped? Do infants actively shape pre-verbal semiotic processes? Do parents and infants form simultaneous co-participation as an indivisible team? were discussed with Charles Goodwin.

*Becoming a Participant: Shaping Infants Dialogical Actions in Repeated Interactions* by *Iris Nomikou, Katharina Rohlfing (*Bielefeld University*), Joanna Rzaszek-Leonardi* (University of Warsaw) posed the general research question "How do infants become participants of cultural organized social interaction?". Video sequences were selected from a longitudinal video corpus of 17 mother-infant dyads, which illustrated answers to the subordinated research question, how infants are treated as participants within a conversational dyad. The mothers' talk in the context of the babies' changing tables often imitates the babies' sounds, sometimes formulating the sounds as questions with a rising intonation. Vocalizations co-occur with bending forward, touching the legs of the baby, kissing the feet or the forehead and minimizing the distance. In one case, the mother responds to sounds asking, "Are you telling me something" and stops in the moment the child vocalizes similar sounds. Further video data showed how the shift of the infants' gaze initiates the mother to show a toy. The baby thus emerges as a conversational partner. Notably, all mothers have a friendly tone, a high intonation and they verbalize the actions of the infants. The researchers claim that through their repetitive behavior, the infants are enculturated into culturally specific conversational patterns, i.e. sequential versus simultaneous turn-taking.

In their presentation *Grounding participation: Exploring the interactional organization of postpartum depressed mothers and their infants Valentina Fantasia (*University of Portsmouth*), Laura Galbusera (*University of Heidelberg*)* and *Alessandra Fasulo (*University of Portsmouth*),* investigated the conversational behavior of postpartum depressed (PPD) mothers and non-depressed mothers. In the past, researchers had only looked at the mother's communication instead of also investigating the infants' reactions. The researchers set out to study if there are differences in the interactional aspects of the sequential organization of dyads with PPD diagnosed mothers versus healthy mothers and their infants. The data consisted of 64 recordings of mother child dyads in a laboratory. Episodes were selected with similar actions and five episodes were micro-analyzed. The audience was to guess which mothers had PPD. The first episode showed a dissonance in mother-infant communication, the mother persisted with snapping and smiling while the infant retreated. A smoother mother-child interaction occurred with the

healthy mothers. They marked interactional boundaries clearly and created recipient designed configurations of actions such as gestures and smiles. The interactional boundaries were often missing among the depressed mothers since monitoring of the infants' affective response did not occur among some mother-infant dyads. In persisting with one course of communicative action, some PPD mothers exhibited a low sensitivity to changes in affect and a lack of uptake of the infant's action. This resulted in a restriction of the infants' initiatives, responses and disfluency in engagement. It would be interesting to see more of such research and compare it with data from natural settings. The researchers used the ELAN editor, which enabled to view the video and the transcription of the mothers' and infants' verbal and nonverbal behavior at the same time.

In her talk, *Carolyn Demuth* (University of Aalborg) claimed that proto-conversation with infants is universal, but that sequential dyadic turn taking is not prominent in societies such as Papua New Guinea or South Africa. Often, a proto-song as a simultaneous co-production of the mother and the infant is a more frequent communicative form. Her presentation *Ways with Words, songs, body and voice: Cultural Forms of Crafting Infant Participation through Proto-Musical Communication* was a cross-cultural comparison between 20 farmer mothers of the Nso tribe in Cameroon with their infants and 20 German middle class mothers from Münster, Germany.

The video corpus consisted of mother-infant free play interaction. Among the Nso, music and dance play a prominent role in everyday life, the words dance and life have the same meaning and origin in their language. The Proto-conversations differed in that the Nso produced rhythmic choral interaction with the baby intensifying the rhythm, and the proto-conversation was more of rhythmic turn taking and co-production of a song whereas the German mothers produced less music, but enabled reciprocal turn taking through mirroring movements and gentle touching. The Nso mothers preferred a more rhythmic interaction with the child and sang. Thus, the proto-communication is a multimodal socio-cultural practice of crafting infants' participation in different kind of jointness and building rapport.

*Akira Takada (*Kyoto University*)*, in his presentation *Socialization of Toddlers through Participating in Singing and Dancing Activities of multi aged child group of the !Xun of North Central Namibia* showed highly interesting data, transcriptions and models of different child interactions among the !Xun. He first gave an anthropological description of the socialization children: Ju'hoan (a neighboring tribe) mothers nurse their children until they are 3 or 4 years old. After that they are raised in pure children's groups with an older child as the primary care taker. First data was collected in the 1960s among the Ju'hoan and video data of the 143 village people !Xun was collected by the researcher between 1998 and 2010. Nowadays, the toddlers enter the non-adult supervised children's groups at the age of two. Takada showed the actions of a 24 months old child that was not yet socialized within the larger children's group. While the children were singing and dancing, the 24 months old child that was standing outside of the group, walks towards the 11 year old care taker in the center of the circle formed by the other children to be held. The boy finished the singing and dancing and then took up the 2 year old.

In another video, a group of children play and climb up a water tank and sing a song. During the chanting, the smallest kid moves towards the primary caregiver, who is 13 years old, takes up eye contact and stretches her hand, the 13 year old boy eventually pulling her up the empty water tank. Akada managed to demonstrate the complexity of activity and the semiotic resources used to establish multiple boundaries of the activity.

Very notable are the musical transcriptions of the songs the children sang which Akada allocates with models of the children's movement in space.

## 4. Individual Papers

*Verónica González Temer* (University of York) presented her findings on the sequential organization of assessments in video recorded food-tasting sessions of six pairs of Chilean friends. In her paper *Gaze Patterns in the Production of Food Assessments in Chilean Spanish Interaction*, she focused on the import of gaze for mobilizing a first assessment after trying the food. With reference to previous work on assessments (Heritage 2002, Lindström/Mondada 2009) and on mobilizing response (Stivers/Rossano 2010), she found two differing participation frameworks in which gaze was used to initiate the production of a food assessment by the other participant. When one participant tried the food first, the waiting participant mobilized a first assessment by the food-taster by gazing at him/her. After noticing the other's gaze, the food-taster produced a verbal or nonverbal assessment. When both participants tried the food at the same time, a first assessment was only produced after noticing the gaze of the other participant. In the discussion, questions were raised concerning further specification of the gaze quality and its implications on assessment production as well as other nonverbal semiotic resources working as some kind of pre-assessment device, e.g. lip movements.

*Michael Smith* (UCLA) and *Saul Albert* (Queen Mary University of London) talked about *Participating in Discovery: Noticings, Assessments, and Their Role in constituting Scientific Discoveries*. They showed three different practices of noticing during fieldwork in their video data of geological excursions. Against the background of Sacks' omnirelevant noticings (1992), Schegloff's retro-sequences (2007) and M. H. Goodwin's and C. Goodwin's attention-organizing devices (2012), Smith and Albert could identify the following sequential patterns in the tasks of discovery: i) a noticing which is taken up by other participants and expanded until joint agreement of the type of discovery is reached. This kind of noticing changes the trajectory of the otherwise ongoing activities or tasks at hands. They found ii) a "divergent" noticing which receives a minimal up-take by the other geologists, but is then abandoned, and iii) a "disruptive" noticing in the middle of another ongoing project which is opened up and closed immediately only by the noticing person whereas the other participants follow their task at hand.

*Tom Koole* (University of Groningen), *Marloes Herijgers* (Utrecht University) and *Ellen Schep* (University of Groningen) explored the temporal organization of tokens of understanding in mundane and institutional Dutch interactions. Their paper *Linguistic and Embodied tokens of Understandings: Where do They come?* focused on vocal tokens of understanding such as *hm, oh, yes*, as well as on non-verbal practices for displaying understanding such as nods and gaze. They exempli-

fied their findings with the analysis of explanation activities in a bank counseling session. The video analysis showed how the understanding of each of the four explained items was ratified by a nod for the first three times, while the last item was ratified by a *yes* in a multi-unit-turn. Concerning the precise sequential position of nods in comparison with the token *yes*, it was demonstrated that *yes* is produced precisely at completion points without any overlap with the other speaker's turn. In contrast, nods also orient to completion points of TCUs, but begin and end slightly before respectively after the completion point of the preceding TCU. Koole pointed out that apparently "nods have a greater tolerance for overlap than vocal tokens" (quote from talk) and are used to show understanding in an earlier stage than verbal tokens. It was announced that further research should take into account the pragmatic distinction of the mentioned tokens for receiving information versus displaying hearership and sustained attention versus displaying understanding.

The presentation on *One Request – Multiple Responses* by *Axel Schmidt* and *Arnulf Deppermann* (University of Mannheim/Institute for German Language Mannheim) comprised video analysis of a German theater rehearsal in which a single request by the director usually prompted multiple responses by the actors. The individual requests studied made different responses from different participants conditionally relevant, depending on their task in the upcoming joint project. Depending on the particular 'joint project' (Clark 1996) (rehearsal resp. the transition from a discussion phase to an acting phase), it was demonstrated that the embodied actors' compliances with the director's request could be carried out in a more loose and not time-critical way, e.g. when positioning themselves on the stage before starting the first performance. On the contrary, director's requests during the rehearsal of the performance were responded to in a very precise and timely coordination between actors. Moreover, it was pointed out that corrective requests that were overtly addressed to a single performer also prompted multiple bodily responses by all performing actors in order to accomplish coordinated action on the level of the ensemble. Multiple responses of various actors occur even in the more time-critical cases and even in the case where only one actor was addressed.

In the discussion, questions were raised concerning the concept of conditional relevance with respect to requests. As one aspect, it was discussed that analyses become more challenging in cases of a single request that prompts an extended trajectory of actions, or for requests that are aimed at compliance in the future. Moreover, it was pointed out as a topic for further research that requests and questions often have an interactional history that might not be traceable in the directly preceding trajectory. As a last discussion point, cases were mentioned in which participants comply with a non-uttered, but inferable request (or an observed need for an adequate action), which might also challenge the classic categorization into first and second pair parts.

Addressing the question of *Multimodality of Turn-Taking: Auspicious Junctures for the Co-Coordination of Self-Selection and the Initiation of Actions*, *Ilkka Arminen* (University of Helsinki) presented the collaborative analyses by *Chiara Monzini, Ritva Laury* and himself. In video-recordings of Italian and Finnish family interactions, a recurrent pattern for self-selection occurred in a multi-person and multi-activity context in that incipient speakers may self-select by orienting to

their prospective recipient's bodily and visual activities when initiating their new interactional project (Levinson 2013). It was shown in two video data, that the incipient speaker might use slightly differing practices to implement his/her new action: in the first instance, the incipient speaker observed the prospective recipient's ongoing embodied action (i.e. cutting a piece of cheese) and self-selected as next speaker at the other's action completion, projecting her verbal utterances with a deictic gesture to the object that had been manipulated before. In the second data piece, the incipient speaker waited until the prospective recipient started moving her gaze, and he started the new action in the anticipation of the establishment of mutual gaze. Thus, the latter form of self-selection in an auspicious juncture was categorized as co-coordinated as it was initiated only after incipient speaker and prospective recipient were gaining a mutual gaze.

The presentation by *Allison King* and *Carolyn Dunn* (Teachers College, Columbia University) also focused on practices of self-selection in informal multi-party interaction. Their paper *PGC: A Multimodal Floor-Capturing Mechanism in Multi-Party Social Interactions* draws on previous work on collaborative floor mechanisms in multi-party encounters and takes into account concepts like schisming (Egbert 1997), the collaborative venture (Edelsky 1981) or Goodwin's 'unilateral departure' in multi-party talk (1987). In two video analyses, King and Dunn delineated a newly found combination of practices for capturing the floor: a verbal start, followed by a cut off and pause is continued with a restart that is accompanied with a gesture. This bundle of actions enabled the self-selecting speaker to attract other participants' attention and to get the floor successively. The innovative term 'perturbation gesture combination', in short PGC, was suggested for this multimodal practice. In the following discussion, the fundamental questions were raised about when multi-party starts and how it should be defined in numbers. King and Dunn who video recorded an interaction of ten participants suggested that differences in numbers of participants might show also differences in floor-capturing practices.

In their paper *Response Queueing in Multi-Person Interaction, Kobin H. Kendrick* and *Judith Holler* (Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics) reported on their findings of turn allocation in triadic interactions of friends. In the semi-experimental setting, each participant wore eye trackers and a head-set, so that reconstruction of the member's perspective was enabled. The triadic interactions of participants talking to each other in a video laboratory were additionally video recorded by external cameras. In their data corpus, Kendrick and Holler focused on multimodal practices of addressing multiple next speakers. The analyses showed that gaze alternation from one addressee to the other during the production of a question established the relevance of multiple answers. In addition, analyses suggested that the combination of lexical multiple addressing plus gaze alternation successfully prompts multiple responses whereas gaze alone does not necessarily. Moreover, it became clear how questioners pursued the response of the second addressee when it had first been absent.

*Ignaz Strebel* and *Alain Bovet* (ETH Zurich) focused on interactions between janitors and tenants that are resumed after extended repair work in their talk *Claiming, Maintaining and Ascribing Participation Status in Repair and Maintenance Work.* Their study on Summons in concierge-tenant-interaction was based on a corpus of 24 hours of video ethnography of concierges at work in three Swiss

cities. It focused on the situations with interactional configurations that are constituted by the activity of repair and the material conditions of the work environment. More specifically, they showed convincingly how the participation framework set at the end of the action of repair work is an orchestration of the demonstration of the functioning item (such as a faucet, a washing machine). The multimodal analysis takes into consideration how tenants and janitors are positioned towards each other, towards the equipment that they utilized and how the janitors maintain and convey the accomplished task of repair. For example, they find that the German discourse marker *so*, indexes accomplishment of a task or a reordering of an action. Specific to the interaction is also, that there is no expectance of the immediate answer, an assessment or a compliment (Pomerantz 1984) for example, but the janitors take the tenants' recipiency for granted. Very noticeable was that the speech was transcribed onto the video so that a focus on the dynamics of the evolving interaction was evident.

*Brian Due* (University of Copenhagen) presented insights from his research on the influence and implications of the use of Google Glass (GG) in interaction. In his paper *I'm Talking to Glass – How is Google Glass Interfering with the Turn-Taking System?*, he identified three emerging themes regarding 1) interference with the turn-taking system and participation framework, 2) epistemics in interaction and 3) membership categorization. His corpus of video recordings consists of five different settings and types of quasi-experimental data, of which he presented data of students having a conversation about an exhibition in a seminar room, students conversing about traveling in a lab and paramedics scanning medicine boxes in a hospital experimental room. Due described as one of his main findings that it is sometimes impossible for participants to determine the other participants' focus with respect to either the non-human interaction (with GG) or the human social interaction. In these cases, two different types of interactions are overlapping. In the data, it was shown that in such moments, participants have difficulties in projecting the next relevant action because the sequential context becomes unknown as soon as one participant interacts with GG without marking or embodying being involved in this activity. Due's concluding remarks highlighted the finding that 'nonhuman side sequences' often perturbate the human-human-interaction. This finding sheds new light on the analytic determination of what is a base sequence or side sequence. In addition, he stressed that the fundamental CA question "why that now" (Schegloff/Sacks 1973) becomes even more important when applied to human social interaction combined with the use of Google Glass.

Another paper concerned with participation status and participation framework in human-nonhuman interaction was presented by *Antonia Krummheuer* (Aalborg University). In her talk *Participating Technologies? Nonhuman Others and Socio-Material Assemblages*, she combined the conversation analytic approach with the notion of technical agency from actor-network theory (Latour 2005) for her analysis, pointing out very convincingly the advantages as well as limits of both analytic approaches. Her data came from recordings of humans interacting with the embodied conversational agent (ECA) MAX on the one hand, and patients using a walking help and being assisted by their physical therapists on the other hand. In the first data, Krummheuer showed that humans treated MAX' participation status in two different ways: Some oriented to him as a communicative other, while others engaged in side-sequences with the audience (Goffman) when solving a prob-

lem and thus treating MAX as a less competent participant. In the second data, it was shown how therapists ascribed agency to the non-human object in categorizing the walking help as "alive" to describe the technology´s agency to work against the joint activity of the human participants to move forward. In her concluding remarks, she underlined the importance of the research question of the members' perspective of whether technology is a participant or not. The following discussion concentrated, however, on the differences in levels of agency between the ECA and the walking help. It was suggested to consider in the analysis that MAX disposed of some level of interaction competence in contrast to the walking help as MAX can initiate actions which then have a conditional relevance, thus projecting next actions to which humans react to. Krummheuer agreed to that, stressed, however, the fact that her analytic focus lies on the emic perspective on technology´s agency respectively to participation status in interaction.

Subsequently, the conjoint work of *Keiko Ikeda* (Kansai University), *Keiichi Yamazaki* (Saitama University), *Akiko Yamazaki* (Tokyo University of Technology), *Michita Imai* (Keio University) and *Tetsuo Ono* (Hokkaido University) was presented which focused on *Multi-party Participation and Turn Allocations in Interaction with an Avatar Robot*. The semi-experimental setting consisted of two groups of participants, one group being elderly people at the so-called remote site, i.e. in an assisted living environment, sitting in front of a computer and the interface of the avatar robot. The other group being three younger people walking at a mall, with one having the avatar robot named TEROOS mounted on the shoulder. As TEROOS disposes of a microphone and a speaker, this setting thus enables the remote people to participate in the local interaction situation. The data was analyzed under the questions of i) how this setting shapes and changes the participation and ii) how turns are allocated between the participants of the local site and remote site. The video data confirmed that TEROOS broadens the interactional affordances in comparison to other telecommunication devices such as smart phones or skype. The delineated turn-taking sequences revealed additionally that the avatar robot can be seen as an efficient device to enable elderly people to be a part of the interaction in the local site with relatively low imposition on themselves.

*Klara Skogmyr Marian* and *Silvia Kunitz* (Stockholm University) presented their work entitled *Managing Epistemic Stances and the Right to Participate in the EFL Classroom*. They examined video recordings of students' group work in EFL classes in a Swedish junior high school and focused on a single case analysis of a vocabulary quiz performed by a group of four students. The analysis demonstrated how the agentive role of a student named Emma changed from primarily monitoring answers to providing answers from the beginning of the task to its end. This emerging change of participation was negotiated between the students in relation to Emma's demonstration of her epistemic status and in relation to changes in the affordances for participation. At first, another participant was in charge of the task, filling in the answers and thereby enacting the epistemic identity of the knowledgeable student. As the task progressed, Emma demonstrated her knowledge by correcting other students' answers and providing spelling help. The coparticipants accepted Emma's knowledge displays, but only after accusing her of cheating and after holding her accountable for any errors. In the end, Emma's repeated displays of knowledge led to a shift in her epistemic identity and agency level: from not being oriented to as an especially knowledgeable

participant and showing little participation in the group work, Emma became an agentive participant with strong epistemic authority which was eventually acknowledged by her coparticipants. Skogmyr Marian and Kunitz also hinted at the pedagogical implications of their analysis and suggested that, in order to allow for more varied participation configurations and affordances, the teacher should instruct students to: i) alternate leading roles within the same group, ii) change their seating arrangements to vary physical affordances for participation, and iii) periodically change group formations. The study also suggested that, in order to maximize student participation in classroom tasks, teachers should put great care into the timing of instructions.

*Evelyn Berger* (University of Neuchâtel) reported on her investigation of changes in body posture as a means of *Enacting Speakership in Classroom Interactions*. In her analyses of video-recorded French as a foreign language classes, she focuses on changes in body posture in relation to self-selection, maintenance and closings of a turn. She identified two relevant body postures as descriptive categories: posture A denominates a relaxed manner, with the torso leaned back and hands in rest position. Posture B describes a posture of a torso leaned forward and hands in readiness for action. Concerning the research questions about when and how this change in posture is enacted and how co-participants orient to it, Berger presented three instances of video data. The first two exemplified a change into 'speaking position', i.e. a corporal change from posture A to posture B, which took place right *before* the incipient speaker's turn onset and at a sequence-closing of the prior speaker, and *during* the speaker's overlapping turn, thereby displaying the primary speakership. Both instances of gaining speakership were successfully oriented to as such by the co-participants. The third video sequence showed a body shift from posture B to posture A, i.e. a change back to the relaxed position after a turn and when a shift in activity occurred to display disengagement from speakership. In conclusion, Berger underlined the importance of analyzing practices of posture shifts around sequence boundaries as means of gaining or maintaining participation status of speaker vs. non-speaker or co-speaker vs. primary speaker. Moreover, she argued that investigating changes in posture as a resource for managing classroom interaction would proffer insights beyond the well-known next speaker selection mechanism.

*Complex Constellations – Organizing Multiple Forms of Participation in Classroom Interactions* was the topic of the presentation by *Sören Ohlhus* (University of Bielefeld). His data consists of classroom interactions in first grade mathematics lessons. In these multi-person and multi-media classroom interactions, Ohlhus focuses on how the interactive construction of participation statuses of teacher and students is interrelated to the various semiotic resources which are used in the organization of different tasks, e.g. material objects, bodily postures, deictic gestures and language. In his talk, he presented the analyses of two interactions of a so-called 'didactic enactment' in which a student was asked to count the partly invisible constituent parts of a cube in front of the class. Within the framework of the conference theme, Ohlhus underlined the fact that this complex constellation comprises superimposing participation statuses. It is a dyadic interaction between the teacher and the selected student on the one hand. On the other hand, it represents a multi-person constellation because the dyad interaction takes place in front of the students who are not actively involved in the interaction, but

participating in the learning process. Ohlhus performed his analysis of participation status building on the analytic categories for participation frameworks elaborated by Charles Goodwin (2007), i.e. differentiating between instrumental, epistemic, cooperative, moral and affective stance. In the presentation of his findings, Ohlhus demonstrated convincingly the adequacy and suitability of the categories first described by Goodwin.

*Facilitating the Interactional Participation of Children with Autism Spectrum Disorders Using Multimodal Resources* was the topic of the presentation given by *Katja Tuononen* (University of Eastern Finland), *Terhi Korkiakangas* (Institute of Education, University of London), *Aarno Laitila* and *Eija Kärnä* (University of Eastern Finland). In contrast to the widespread research focus on the difficulties and impairments in social interactions of children with autism spectrum disorders (ASD), Tuononen and her colleagues are motivated by the question of how learning situations are managed – and consequently should be managed – to enable children with ASD to participate in certain exercises. Their corpus consists of 127 hours of video recordings of technology enhanced educational tasks between children, aged 6 to 14 years, and adult school staff. During a LEGO building task at a computer, various multimodal practices were used by the respective teacher or tutor to engage a student with ASD in a new task. The analyses demonstrated that the timing of the initiation of a new action was crucial for the child's participation. Not considering the child's current focus of attention hindered him from full participation. By contrast, a close monitoring of the child's visual attention and his actions enabled the adult to recognize an 'auspicious environment' for launching a request. Besides underlining the importance of a heightened interactional sensitivity for timely action initiation with children with ASD, Tuononen and her colleagues also demonstrated that CA provides for a detailed understanding of the challenges and the competencies of children with ASD when participating in social interactions.

In his presentation on video recorded L1-L2-interaction in a job qualifying center for immigrants, *Jan Svennevig* (University of Oslo) talked about *Presenting Complex Information in Installments* and described preventative procedures by L1-speakers to pre-empt potential problems of understanding. In contrast to well-known lexical and grammatical simplifications, he focused on interactional modifications that raise the accessibility of talk, e.g. by reducing utterance length (Bremer et al. 1996) or segmenting utterances into smaller packages (Clark 1996). Drawing on Clark's concept of 'installments' which describes the presentation of complex information in smaller units, Svennevig identified the sequential and sequence organization of presenting complex information in installments as follows: i) installments are units below the level of the TCU; ii) the pragmatic incompleteness is signaled prosodically by rising intonation and a pause after each installment; iii) L1-speaker´s gaze towards addressee during the pause functions for monitoring the addressee's display of understanding and for projecting more information; an additionally produced gesture by L1-speaker bridges the boundaries between installments; iv) addressees collaborate in the L1-speaker's production of a complex turn by giving only minimal acknowledgements, like nods or continuers, and by holding back substantial response until the turn is complete; v) only after the completion of the complex informative turn does the addressee produce more complex responses like change-of-state-tokens or assessments.

Addressing the question of *Participating without Speaking the Language of the Encounter: On Multimodal Action Formation for Participation*, *Satomi Kuroshima* (Chiba University) and *Lorenza Mondada* (University of Basel) presented video recordings of a group of Japanese friends shopping or preparing and eating meals with a European friend who does not speak Japanese. In their data collection, they identified the following phenomenon concerning participation framework: in the course of action, e.g. buying a product in a grocery shopping, a next, relevant, and projected action is expected in response to a previous one, but is either delayed or not realized. This latter action supposes the recognition of the former, which involves an unfamiliar object. The addressed participant does not recognize the relevance or the features of the material object as resource for the activity going on. The failing recognition leads to a delay of the progressivity of the ongoing activity, which occasions explanations, instructtions etc. by the co-participants. As a result, the formerly unknowing participant becomes able to implement the next projected action. Kuroshima and Mondada concluded that participants manage together the re-establishment of shared ways to participate in the activity and thus secure the progressivity. They suggested that these kinds of activities could also be a perspicuous setting for further research on intercultural interaction.

*Karola Pitsch* (University of Duisburg-Essen) talked about *Crafting Participation as and for a Cognitively Impaired Person: Doing Grocery Shopping*. She showed in detailed video analyses the usually unnoticed practices deployed by a caretaker (CT) when assisting a mildly cognitively impaired person (CIP) in doing their weekly grocery shopping. Her analysis focused especially on the question of how the CT brings the CIP in a position as to skillfully bring to bear his competencies in this routine task. This leads to the broader research question of what the interactional practices of caretakers consists of that allow their clients with mild cognitive impairments to successfully participate in the activities of daily live. The impressively fine-grained analysis revealed as key practice of the CT to pre-structure the rich semiotic field of the shop aisle or shelves, which involved e.g. the CT´s own bodily orientation towards products of interest, or/and a verbal noticing of some product. This is importantly followed by a "halt" of the CT's actions, which leaves the next step in the activity to the client, who – in turn – might choose to approach a specific product or not. The CT then monitors the CIP´s actions and might accompany it with a (verbal) online-confirmation of the emerging action. It seems, suggests Pitsch, that the exact timing of these interactional events makes a difference between 'CT makes an explicit suggestion' vs. 'CT provides resources to CIP to take a decision'. Within the interdisciplinary project KOMPASS, these findings might inform the design of an embodied conversational agent which should help people with mild cognitive impairments or elderly people to maintain their daily life structures as autonomously as possible.

The presentation on *Stopping and Preventing Turn Entry* by *Antti Kamunen* (University of Oulu) dealt with gestures of a current speaker as a tool for holding on to a turn. Kamunen works with a video corpus of ten hours of mundane and institutional interactions in English and Finnish and focuses mainly on the question of how bodily practices are used as turn-protecting devices, thus regulating other interlocutors' participation. In his data, Kamunen identified mostly hand gestures as turn-protecting practices. His analyses showed examples of so-called turn-en-

try-stopping gestures versus turn-entry-preventing gestures. In an example for the first case, the current speaker pre-empted an imminent self-selection by another interactant by putting her hand forward at the onset phase of the competitive speaker's turn. In an example for the second case, the current speaker seemed to assume a competitive turn entry, although there were no visible actions by current non-speakers. His hand gesture was categorized as preventing self-selection before it occurred. Kamunen ended his presentation with the remark that turn-protecting gestures seem to be collectively understood and not to be confused with referential pointing gestures.

*Maarit Siromaa* and *Elise Kärkkäinen* (University of Oulu) presented their paper *Changing Participation and Accomplishing Transitions between Activities at the Workplace.* Their video data consists of the regular break activities in a staff break room at a Finnish University. Within the recorded multi-party interaction they focused on the participation frameworks in the moments of transition, i.e. the staff members initiating the ending of the break and additionally the exiting of the room. In their analyses, Siromaa and Kärkkäinen investigated with special interest the bodily cues that were used to implement the transition, including surrounding objects and the arrangement of the room as potentially influential resources. Delineating the sequential organization of multilateral departures from the break room, they showed that participants make the transition to departure projectable mainly through bodily actions. Moreover, they pointed out that the exiting of the room was organized in view of the sequentially unfolding talk and often coordinated with topic closures, pauses or a lull. In the discussion, the relevance of joined laughter during the transition was pointed out as a further potential fruitful research aspect.

*Jürgen Streeck*'s talk *Perceiving Gesture, Sensing Action* dealt with the conundrum that i) the indexical function of gestures is a visual phenomenon for others and ii) the fact that gestures are actions performed and felt by the self. He stated that Conversation Analysis includes only phenomena that can be observed and it is not the object of study to look at what happens inside participants. However, Streeck claimed, gestures are a kinesthetic phenomenon within the haptic system and therefore, the self-dimension needs to be taken into consideration. Examining data from different cultures e.g. a narrative of two young German women and Japanese girls, he demonstrated that gestures are bodily acts, which are abstract but known and understood by the participants. The phenomenon of mirroring of gestures and movement of the interactants was presented in video sequences of a conversation with Japanese girls. Streeck claimed that mirror neurons are a lexicon of familiar actions, they fire when the animal recognizes an action that it knows to perform. Gestures that are performed in this manner thus project the next moment of interaction and encode culture.

Streeck finally showed examples of the closing gesture of a car dealer that illustrated that the hand of the man indicates the closing of the proposed action. Hand closings in general also indicate the completion of topics in the conversation. There are degrees of markedness of hand closings that might be more or less conscious and perceptually available to the speaker. The gesture also often occurs in closings of different kind of units, such as phrases and words searches. Streeck claimed that gestures might be mediating processes within the communicative action for the gesturer himself. He argued further that pragmatic gestures are spon-

taneous bodily acts that are abstract from inherently meaningful worldly actions and are typically unattended. Streeck advocates a more complex theoretical and empirical conceptualization of gestures that include cognitive and intercorporeal dimensions.

In their presentation *How the forklift drivers produce and maintain the witnessable details of their local driving circumstances*, *Dennis Day* and *Johannes Wagner* gave an insight into the autochthonous or native ethnomethodological solutions for order in the warehouse as a social setting. They presented two pieces of video data of forklift traffic in a forklift school, one where the traffic flows smoothly and one where problems occur. In the first case, a forklift driver reads instructions of turning and then going with a full speed, when he turns, another forklift driver is backing into the first driver's projected trajectory. The forklift drivers take up eye contact and after mutual understanding of following actions the first forklift driver continues his projected course via a sanctioning look. In a second video, the drivers do not have eye contact and a problem occurs with their routes, they do not communicate through gaze as other drivers as blocking their way. Both examples show how the forklift drivers produce witnessable concerted actions that provide the conditions for those actions, as orderly as necessary in just those actions. Day and Wagner close with an observation by Liberman (2013) "Rules exist to facilitate local orderliness, and wherever the local orderliness can be better served by not following rules, the rules may not be enforced." Finally they claim that participation among the forklift drivers does not have a common goal, but is socially organized in the warehouse as in other social spaces.

## 5. Concluding Remarks

The conference fulfilled its research desiderata in that the notion of participation was empirically investigated from almost all angles within the theoretical frameworks of Conversation Analysis and Ethnomethodology. The concepts such as footing, speaker identities, participation status and participation framework were considered within the context of video recordings for the analysis of human talk as embodied action. The variety of structured social encounters that participation occurs in and the diversity of participants investigated -non-human interactants, infants and toddlers, cognitively impaired, culturally and linguistically diverse and older people in addition to the "unmarked" European adult interlocutors and recipients- was remarkable. Participation takes place within larger social processes, but the mind-opening microanalyses of coordinated activities situated within professional, social and private domains showed that participation, participation frameworks and statuses do not only begin and change with single utterances anymore, but also with embodied actions.

## 6. References

Bremer, Katharina et al. (1996): Achieving Understanding: Discourse in Intercultural Encounters. London: Longman.

Clark, Herbert H. (1996): Using language. Cambridge/New York: CUP.

Deppermann, Arnulf (2015): When recipient design fails: Egocentric turn-design of instructions in driving school lessons leading to breakdowns of intersubjectivity. Gesprächsforschung 16, 63-101.

Du Bois, Inke (2012): Grammatical, Pragmatic and Sociolinguistic Aspects of the First Person Plural Pronoun. In: Baumgarten, Nicole / Du Bois, Inke / House, Juliane (eds.): Subjectivity in Language and in Discourse. Bingley (UK): Emerald Publishing, 229-246.

Edelsky, Carole (1981): Who´s got the floor? Language in Society 10 (3), 383-421.

Egbert, Maria (1997): Schisming: The Collaborative Transformation From a Single Conversation to Multiple Conversations. In: Research on Language and Social Interaction 30 (1), 1-51.

Goffman, Erving (1974): Frame Analysis. An Essay on the Organization of Experience. New York: Harper and Row.

Goffman, Erving (1979): Footing. In: Semiotica 25 (1/2), 1-29.

Goffman, Erving (1981): Forms of Talk. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goodwin, Charles (1987): Unilateral departure. In: Button, Graham / Lee, John R.E. (eds.): Talk and Social Organisation. Clevedon [England]: Multilingual Matters, 206-216.

Goodwin, Charles (2007): Participation, stance and affect in the organization of activities. In: Discourse & Society 18 (1), 53-73.

Goodwin, Charles / Goodwin, Marjorie H. (2004): Participation. In: Duranti, Alessandro (ed.): A companion to Linguistic Anthropology. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 222-244.

Goodwin, Marjorie H. (1983): Aggravated Corrections and Disagreements in Children's Conversations. In: Journal of Pragmatics 7, 657-677.

Goodwin, Marjorie H. / Goodwin, Charles (2012): Car talk: Integrating texts, bodies, and changing landscapes. In: Semiotica 191, 257-286.

Goodwin, Marjorie H. / Goodwin, Charles / Olsher, David (2004): Producing Sense with Nonsense Syllables: Turn and Sequence in Conversations with a Man with Severe Aphasia. In: Ford, Cecilia E. / Fox, Barbara A. / Thompson, Sandra A. (eds.): The language of Turn and Sequence. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 56-81.

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 (2012): Epistemics in Action: Action Formation and Territories of Knowledge. In: Research on Language and Social Interaction 45, 1-29.

Heritage, John (2013): Action formation and its epistemic (and other) backgrounds. In: Discourse Studies 15, 547-574.

Labov, William / Fanshel, David (1977): Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation. New York: Academic Press.

Latour, Bruno (2005): Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor Network Theory. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Levinson, Stephen C. (1988): Putting Linguistics on a Proper Footing: Explorations in Goffman´s Concepts of Participation. In: Drew, Paul / Wootton, Anthony (eds.): Erving Goffman. Exploring the Interaction Order. Cambridge [UK]: Polity Press, 161-293.

Levinson, Stephen C. (2013): Action Formation and Ascription. In: Sidnell, Jack / Stivers, Tanya (eds.): The handbook of conversation analysis. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 103-129.

Liberman, Kenneth (2013): More Studies in Ethnomethodology. New York: SUNY Press.

Lindström, Anna / Mondada, Lorenza (2009): Assessments in Social Interaction. In: Research on Language and Social Interaction 42 (4), 299-308.

Lucius-Hoene, Gabriele / Deppermann, Arnulf (2002): Rekonstruktion narrativer Identität. Opladen: Leske und Budrich.

Lucius-Hoene, Gabriele / Deppermann, Arnulf (2004): Narrative Identität und Positionierung. Gesprächsforschung 5, 166-183.

Mortensen, J. (2012): Subjectivity and Intersubjectivity as Aspects of Epistemic Stance Marking. In: Baumgarten, Nicole / Du Bois, Inke / House, Juliane (eds.): Subjectivity in Language and in Discourse. Bingley (UK): Emerald Publishing, 229-246.

Norris, Sigrid (2004): Analyzing Multimodal Interaction. A methodological framework. New York: Routledge.

Norris, Sigrid (2011): Identity in (inter)action. Introducing multimodal (inter)action analysis. Göttingen: De Gruyter.

Sacks, Harvey (1992): Lectures on conversation. Volumes I & II. Edited by Gail Jefferson. Oxford, UK, Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell.

Schegloff, Emanuel / Sacks, Harvey (1973): Opening Up Closings. In: Semiotica 8, 289-327.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (2007): Sequence organization in interaction. A primer in conversation analysis I. Cambridge, UK, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schütz, Alfred (1967): The Phenomenology of the Social World. Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

Scollon, Ron / Scollon, Suzanne Wong (2003): Discourses in Place: Language in the Material World. London: Routledge.

Stivers, Tanya / Rossano, Federico (2010): Mobilizing Response. In: Research on Language and Social Interaction 43 (1), 3-31.

White, Paul (2010): Reception as Social Action: The case of marketing. In: Norris, Sigrid (ed.): Multimodality in practice. Investigating Theory through practice in methodology. London: Routledge, 138-153.

Wilkinson, Ray (1999): Sequentiality as a problem and resource for intersubjectivity in aphasic conversation. Analysis and implications for therapy. In: Aphasiology, 13 (4-5), 327-343.

Wilkinson, Ray (2014): Intervening With Conversation Analysis in Speech and Language Therapy: Improving Aphasic Conversation. In. Research on Language and Social Interaction 47 (3), 219-238.

Inke DuBois, Dr. phil.
Universität Bremen
Fachbereich Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft
Sprachwissenschaft Englisch
Bibliotheksstraße 1
28359 Bremen

dubois@uni-bremen.de


Christiane S. Opfermann, M.A.
Universität Duisburg-Essen
Fakultät für Geisteswissenschaften
Institut für Kommunikationswissenschaft
Universitätsstraße 12
45141 Essen

christiane.opfermann@uni-due.de