Editorial
When objects become the focus of human action and activity:
Object-centred sequences in social interaction

Sylvaine Tuncer / Christian Licoppe / Pentti Haddington

This special issue originates in a series of data sessions where our attention was drawn to intriguing phenomena of joint orientation to, manipulations of, and talk about objects. Considering emerging directions in the field of ethnomethodology and conversation analysis (EMCA), 'object-centred sequences' seemed a relevant analytical issue and conceptual problem in its own right. We, then future co-editors, convened a panel at the *International Pragmatics Association Conference* (IPrA) in Belfast in July 2017. The panel presenters' enthusiasm towards the theme, and the rich range of analytic observations around it, have now come to fruition in the form of this special issue. Throughout the process, our goal has been to provide empirical, systematic and detailed studies of 'object-centred sequences' so that it can become a shared and established concept for future research. In the following editorial, we first delineate related research areas and topics to demonstrate the relevance of this agenda. We bring together advances in research on embodied interactions in the material world, and describe the progressive emergence of the notion itself. Then, we describe the main features of what could be defined as an 'object-centred sequence', and its bearing on studies on social interactions and practices. Lastly, we introduce the six contributions to this special issue, in all demonstrating that and how they advance the themes and issues which have recently emerged in EMCA, video-based research, and beyond.

1. A timely topic and focus for video-based research in EMCA

1.1. From conversation analysis (CA) to objects in interaction

It did not take long for conversation analysis to broaden its scope from talk-in-interaction to the diversity of semiotic fields relevant to participants in the particulars of their situation, and to explore how participants combine, articulate, and coordinate those different fields in the accomplishment of action in face-to-face interactions (e.g., Goodwin 1981; Heath 1986). Ethnomethodology's attention to lived practices and particular settings, as well as E. Goffman's ground-breaking argument within sociology of an 'interaction order', were major moves in this movement, albeit from two perspectives. Additionally, and more particularly, C. and M.H. Goodwin's research on collaborative action and activities in diverse professional and mundane settings has had a major influence in drawing attention to embodied conduct and the material environment within studies of human communication more broadly (Stivers/Sidnell 2005; Streeck/Goodwin/LeBaron 2011; Nevile 2015). As

a matter of fact, today, research on language and social interaction commonly rests on multimodal conversation analysis (Deppermann 2013).

Within this strand, some studies focus specifically on objects in interaction (Nevile/Haddington/Heinemann/Rauniomaa 2014). Objects in interaction can feature, and be studied, as tools or commodities – for interaction and/or for practical activities. While some studies explicitly circumscribe their focus on interactional practices such as turn-taking (e.g., Day/Wagner 2014), others, including C. Goodwin, unpack how participants intricately involve objects in the pursuit of various activities (e.g., Goodwin 2007). In a pioneering study, Streeck (1996) explores the ways two businessmen talk about and manipulate cookie packages, providing them with various semiotic and symbolic meanings, using them as proxies for other abstract or concrete entities. Objects' status thus changes on a moment-by-moment basis in the course of the encounter according to the momentary interactional purpose. Many other studies – and this is not a complete list of them – have explored the role of objects in the organisation of social interaction. For example, Kidwell/Zimmerman (2007) show that children commonly establish joint attention by showing objects to each other, such as shoes or toy figures, and thus initiate object-mediated activities. Heath/Luff (2013) study how auctioneers and buyers produce the price of a work of art around the movements and strike of a hammer. De Stefani (2014) shows how couples shopping together coordinate joint mobility in the store through joint orientation to objects. Mondada/Sorjonen (2016) show that customers and sellers in convenience stores, as they orient to and manipulate newspapers, sweets or cigarette packets in different ways, can project and anticipate whether the customer will make one or several requests, and what type of goods will be requested. In this case, particular ways of orienting to and manipulating objects enable the smooth progression of the economic encounter (see also Mondada this volume). Interactive technological objects are also studied: while Haddington/Rauniomaa (2011) and Rauniomaa/Haddington (2012) study how drivers and passengers begin mobile phone calls in cars, DiDomenico/Raclaw/Robles (2018) show how co-participants manage the reception of a text message by orienting to and handling the mobile phone. In all, this bulk of studies addresses how participants interact *with* and *through* objects, or how objects feature as means for the interaction.

We find that within the same strand of 'research on objects in interaction', a number of studies remarkably stand out from those mentioned above, targeting *objects as resources for interaction*. Here, objects are the central concern in the interaction and activity in progress. They are both the focus and the product of participants' interactions with them. Thus, two types of interactions – object-focused interactions and object-implicating interactions – can be distinguished with respect to participants' forms of involvement with objects, as well as to objects' status in the interaction. The distinction itself surfaces sporadically and *sotto voce*; nevertheless, it remains unspecified, despite its major consequences on sequential organisation, progressivity, intersubjectivity and sociality.

1.2 An emergent conceptual distinction

Far from claiming discovery of this distinction, we contend there is a pressing need to formulate and clarify the features of this second type of interactions about objects.

It seems that the first explicit mentions of 'object-focused interaction' as relevantly distinct appear in the fields of human-computer interaction (HCI) (Hindmarsh et al. 2000) and computer-supported cooperative work (CSCW) (Hindmarsh et al. 2001). One can see this as a result of more than a decade of EMCA-oriented research stimulated by the development of technologies at work and for work (Suchman 1987), and designers' aim to improve the design of distant communication technologies in particular. Workplace Studies emerged, and began to explore the particular demands put on technology for participants to be able to jointly refer to and maintain a shared perspective on objects in the unfolding of an activity. This prominence of joint orientations to objects in technology-rich, collaborative settings is nicely put forward in the concise and efficient title "Formulating planes" (Goodwin/Goodwin 1996)[1], for instance. Through their actions involving objects, participants "infuse them with characters and actions […] that may otherwise remain unavailable" (Hindmarsh/Heath 2003:43), such as the resistance of an object's rubber surface through gesture.

More recently, the bi-partition of the edited volume "Interacting with objects" (2014) reflects the basic conceptual distinction we aim to reinforce: "Objects as situated resources" and "Objects as practical accomplishments". In the same book, Weilenmann/Lymer (2014) distinguish "object-implicating interactions" and "object-focused interactions": participants are "incidentally involved" with objects in the former and "essentially involved" in the latter, and objects' statuses are contrastive too, either "incidental" or "essential". Lastly, the authors emphasise that in object-focused interactions, the very aim is to create a shared understanding of a feature of the object. Analysing the progressive soothing of a child by other children through manipulations and joint orientations to a toy, Kidwell (2012:524) uses in turn the expression "object-focused interactions". Kidwell argues that the toy helps to stop the child from crying, not only because it distracts him, also because joint orientation to the toy projects the possibility of a joint activity with and through it. Another example of this type of interaction through objects can be found in Licoppe's (2017) study of participants showing objects to each other in video-mediated interactions. In some cases, a "gestural showing" is produced as a contribution to the ongoing talk-in-interaction; while in other cases – called "showing sequences" – the visual display of the object becomes the focus of the interaction. As a final example, Ekström/Lindwall (2014) distinguish sequences where the interaction is aimed at "intersubjectivity or the progression of the communicative exchanges *per se*", and sequences where the interaction is aimed at "the achievement of material objects". The authors observe that in the former, "orientation to and manifestation of progressivity change" (244). This is also what this special issue, in many ways, aims to unpack and demonstrate.

A number of video-based, EMCA studies on multimodal interactions deal with object-centred sequences and activities, more or less explicitly. Studying fashion designers assessing a clothing item, Fasulo/Manzoni (2009) show in particular how jointly and progressively produced verbal assessments are inseparable from concomitant joint orientations to and manipulations of the clothing item. Also in relation to fabrics, Ekström/Lindwall (2014) show how instructors and students in crochet lessons can locate mistakes, make the students perceive them, and propose

---

[1]   Again, their work has been a major influence to the authors in this special issue, and it is also visible in the contributions.

remedial action, through touch, vision and talk, gradually manipulating the fabric, looking at it and talking about it. These trajectories exemplify a characteristic feature of object-centred sequences: once the instructors have responded to the students' call for help, they are committed to one another until they have generated and agreed on a shared understanding of this piece of fabric, so that the student can resume the task on her own. Fox/Heinemann (2015) focus on how customers in a shoe repair shop proffer, move, and verbally refer to their shoe during the openings of these service encounters. Retailers' anticipations show how these multimodal practices frame and project a yet-to-be-stated problem and request from the customer. The encounter's trajectory is tied to how objects will be characterised, and not only jointly oriented to as, for example, a purchasable object as in Mondada/Sorjonen (2016), which otherwise share many similarities with Fox/Heinemann (2015). In the hair salons studied by Oshima/Streeck (2015), the progressive and collaborative production of a final assessment is a particularly delicate matter since the 'object' is part of a participant's body, and the final assessment wraps up the service encounter and determines the customer's satisfaction.

To sum up, object-centred sequences are far from overlooked but they remain underspecified as such. In the following section, we provide a definition and describe the characteristics of object-centred sequences. We aim to direct the readers to the articles in this edited volume and highlight how they approach different aspects of object-centred sequences.

2. What are object-centred sequences?

Participants can make objects a relevant focus for a stretch of interaction in different ways. For instance, they can treat objects as 'mentionables' and refer to them in talk, to further elaborate on them. However, objects that are locally available to participants can also be shown and manipulated so that participants collaboratively create a shared material environment and establish a relationship through these objects and the broader environment. This special issue, in the framework of multimodal conversation analysis, focuses on the latter phenomenon, where embodied actions towards objects and talk-in-interaction are sequentially articulated, as participants orient towards getting and exhibiting a shared grasp of some feature of their environment. A typical situation for object-centred sequences is when participants bring some physical object to the foreground and establish it as a relevant concern in interaction. This projects and leads to further talk about the object, as well manipulation and physical consideration of the object so that it can be jointly apprehended and considered. Participants do this by handing over the object, inspecting it visually, moving it around, touching it, smelling it, and so on.

Because of this constitutive articulation between object-oriented actions, embodied conduct, and talk, multimodal object-centred sequences are not "just" talk-in-interaction; they are recognisable sequences on their own. They provide for distinctive stretches of sequentially-organised interaction, with a beginning, a development, and a closing. The beginning phase of an object-centred sequence involves two concomitant, occasioned, and methodical achievements, and is in turn recognisable through the same achievements as potentially the beginning of an object-centred sequence. First, participants steer the focus of the interaction towards an object by making it relevant in a certain way, for instance through prefaces

(Licoppe/Tuncer this issue), or requests (Mondada this issue). Such preliminary work provides a particular frame of relevance for the object as an "attendable" (Licoppe/Tuncer this issue), setting up an opportunity for "instructed vision" (Tuncer/Haddington this issue) or classification (Keisanen/Rauniomaa this issue). Second, participants manipulate the object so that it is available for scrutiny, and that its 'inspection' becomes relevant and achievable as a public accomplishment (on the notion of 'inspection sequences', see Mortensen/Wagner this issue). The object's features or qualities are revealed in the course of the sequence, in an emergent fashion (Mondada this issue; Smith/Goodwin this issue). In such an inspection phase, the sequential organisation of talk and embodied conduct are rearticulated, so that further talk becomes contingent on the object as it is made relevant and manipulated at a given moment, that is, the way in which it becomes "progressively witnessable and discourseable" (Garfinkel/Lynch/Livingston 1981:138).

During their opening phase, typical object-centred sequences include ostensive practices, such as displaying and showing, but they may also involve object transfers, either in ordinary settings (e.g., Tuncer/Haddington in press) or in more complex gift sequences (Good/Beach 2005; Robles 2012). The crucial and characteristic feature of object-centred sequences is therefore that they make talk-in-interaction topically and sequentially contingent on participants' joint orientation to the object. In this progressive and reconfiguring articulation of talk and embodied, object-oriented conduct, talk is sequentially produced and topically designed so as to be 'about the object'; it may be made into a 'viewable', a 'manipulatable', or a 'mentionable' in the here and now. In other words, in object-centred sequences participants both handle and assemble objects, and make objects accountable for the occasion (Hindmarsh/Heath 2000). This progressive and collaborative constitution of objects' qualities is both a resource and a topic for the unfolding interaction.

Following the establishment of a sequential frame for an object-centred sequence, the second, development phase, unfolds in which turns-at-talk are designed and treated as accountable with respect to the moment-by-moment consideration and manipulation of the object, both in terms of sequential positioning and topicality. Indeed, on the one hand, manipulations provide emergent slots for talk, such as assessments, or displays of recognition (Keisanen/Rauniomaa this issue); on the other hand, talk relevant to the object of interest, assembled in a certain way to be considered in the here and now, is somehow expected, and its absence might be treated as an indication of trouble (Tuncer/Haddington, this issue).

In the closing phase, participants display that they have achieved an adequate enough grasp of the object, for all practical purposes (Tuncer/Haddington this issue), through agreement tokens, and by progressively disengaging from the object with their bodies. Such displays may then be treated as opportunities to move on topically and sequentially, for instance to discuss the object itself, or introduce some other topic, shifting back to the sequential organisation of ordinary conversation.

Object-centred sequences can be brief, or they can expand in time. One example of the latter comes from foetal ultrasound scan encounters in clinical settings where the operator is – for an extended stretch of time – engaged in a continuous exploration of the pregnant woman's body, searching for potential showables related to the baby, in order to present them on the screen, to be considered and scrutinised by her and the parents (Nishizaka 2014).

Object-centred sequences can be placed on a continuum. At one end of the continuum, they can be a shared achievement through and through, so that participants jointly orient to and discuss the object from the beginning to the closing of the sequence. At the other end, they can involve individual moments with one participant withdrawing from the interaction to inspect the object on her own (see especially with tasting: Morten/Wagner this issue; Mondada this issue). In the latter case, once an object-centred sequence has been initiated, participants work in concert to open a slot where bodily joint orientation, joint orientation to the object and talk about it are suspended. The sequence is resumed when the participant who is still involved with the object displays that she has reached a different perception of the object and is now ready to re-engage in interaction. These sequences can have marked openings and closings and thus feature as inserted sequences within the object-centred sequence. Alternatively, cues of suspension and disengagement can be subtle and the individual inspection be less jointly oriented to.

Additionally, it is important to note that the focus on an object in interaction is an ongoing, dynamic achievement. Objects and the ways in which they can be apprehended through various sensory mediations are co-assembled for the occasion. The ways in which objects are made relevant for consideration and inspection therefore may be (and often are) revised and adjusted in the course of unfolding interaction. Objects and the perspective in which participants consider them (and particularly apprehend them perceptually), are therefore continuously produced and reproduced in the course of object-centred sequences.

In the case of vision, which has been discussed more extensively, this resonates with Wittgenstein's idea of 'aspectual seeing'[2] (Wittgenstein 1953; Mulhall 1990). For Wittgenstein, several ways of 'seeing-as' may become relevant with respect to objects through time, with the famous example of the duck-rabbit drawing, first seen as a duck, then as a rabbit. The paucity of language does not do justice to the richness of perception-in-action (Coulter/Parsons 1991): if seeing is assembled for the occasion, then there is an infinite number of ways of 'seeing' (and more generally 'perceiving'). Moving from individual to shared, intersubjectively-built perception, these different ways of perceiving objects can be occasioned, jointly made relevant and publicly exhibited in the course of an interaction. That very richness is the kind of stuff on which object-centred sequences build as a resource.

It must be noted that, while vision and gaze in interaction have been given a lot of attention in EMCA studies and are often treated as paradigmatic cases for philosophical concerns, other sensorial as well as semiotic fields and interactional resources are available and resorted to in human interaction. EMCA studies have begun to expand towards other sensorial fields (see Mondada 2019), to understand how participants both use them in interaction and try to establish a shared perceptual apprehension of the world they have constituted in the here and now. The investigated sensory modalities involve taste (Wiggins et al. 2001; Wiggins 2002; Mondada 2018; Mondada, this issue; Keisanen/Rauniomaa this issue), touch (Cekaite 2015; Nishizaka 2017; Iwasaki et al. 2018, Smith/Goodwin this issue), and smell (Mortensen/Wagner this issue). Any of these modalities to approach and apprehend the world can be(come) relevant in object-centred sequences. In these joint multi-

---

[2]   Wittgenstein uses this notion for another purpose, that of countering mentalist, sense data-based theories of perception.

sensorial productions, objects and relevant orientations to them are mutually elaborative, continuously elaborated, and produced so as to be available for various relevances to be scrutinised. The lived and witnessable work of such joint multisensorial productions is the core phenomenon of object-centred sequences.

The joint consideration and handling of objects creates opportunities for achieving intersubjectivity locally and in a dynamic way. In addition to this, such an achievement has moral and relational implications, integral to object-mediated relationships. In the course of object-centred sequences, participants can claim, deny or negotiate their respective rights and obligations, expertise or entitlement. One can be deemed worthy of, allowed to, or accountable for making relevant a specific object in a certain way; or capable of considering and assessing an object in a certain way. For example, a seller can deny a customer's deontic right to manipulate a piece of cheese (Mondada this issue), or a novice mushroom picker can expect that the more experienced partner has the final word to qualify the mushroom (Keisanen/ Rauniomaa this issue). The moral and relational enactments involved in the initiation and accomplishments of object-centred sequences are intimately tied to membership categorisation issues (Sacks 1992; Hester/Eglin 1997). Membership categories can emerge with the object-centred sequence, that is, to paraphrase Sacks' notion of 'interaction-generated' categories, (Sacks 1992), be 'object-sequence generated'. Just like a telephone call can generate 'caller' and 'called party', "standard relational pairs" (Sacks 1974) such as 'show-er'/'show recipient', or 'giver'/'taker', may become relevant as an integral part of the collaborative work of initiating an object-centred sequence. These categorial devices and incumbencies enacting rights and obligations are category-bound to the object, and might be consequential to the way an object-centred sequence unfolds. This categorial work through an object is oriented to and produced in the detailed way access and orientation to the object are achieved. Friendship and intimacy can become a lived and witnessable accomplishment in the here and now, for instance when, and in the details of how, a Skype conversationalist initiates the showing of an object framed as her latest purchase, subsequently manipulating and elaborating on it in a dynamic and collaborative fashion (Licoppe 2017). Or, a novice-expert "standard relational pair" becomes accountably relevant when the two parties try to make sense together of some potentially perceptible shape in the dirt for archaeologists (Goodwin 2000).

From a praxeological perspective, object-centred sequences also retain an important relationship with verbs of perception such as "to see". Ryle (1956) notes that such words are not processual and do not account for an experience. Rather, they index an endpoint, at which "I have seen it", or "I have not seen it". This particular indexical feature seems to operate in object-centred sequences because they involve displaying that one 'sees' or perceives objects in this way at some point (Keisanen/Rauniomaa this issue; Tuncer/Haddington this issue). The orderly articulation of talk and embodied conduct through which and as which they unfold is oriented so as to provide an opportunity for participants to display that they have arrived to a recognisably adequate enough (for all practical purposes) shared perceptual apprehension of material features in their environment. In that sense object-centred sequences inherit the directional and indexical gradient which Ryle finds to be characteristic of some verbs of perception, and such an orientation towards an endpoint appears as a constitutive feature of object-centred sequences. One of the ways in which such directionality may become visible, is in the kind of talk which

is produced as objects are manipulated in the course of object-centred sequences, and its relation to the trajectory of the overall sequence. In showing sequences it is for instance common for the response to an assessment by the show recipient to be further manipulation of the object by the show-er. This is intelligible as a treatment of the prior assessment as displaying an inadequate grasp of the object, and of its further manipulation as having a remedial character, in providing an opportunity for another and different display of understanding from the show-recipient. Conversely, when the show-er does not do this but affiliates with the assessment and steers the interaction into another sequence, she displays that an adequate understanding of the object in play has been achieved, and that the show-recipient has grasped the object in a way which is adequate with respect to all practical purposes: the sequence has been 'successful' in the same sense Ryle (1956) discusses with verbs of perception ('A now sees X').

Moreover, this feature intersects with the moral and relational character of such sequences. Object-centred sequences may often work as a kind of 'relational bid', where the perceptual endpoint, at which participants display that they somehow 'grasp' the object together, is also one at which they have enacted the kind of categorial relationship which looking at and then seeing together this object, in this particular way, progressively makes relevant. By constituting co-participants as able to share, worthy of sharing, and competent to share, a perception of some features of their world potentially in common is achieved, adequate enough for the purposes of the current activities, through a process which also enacts participants as members of an emergent, locally defined community of practice (Lave/Wenger 1991).

Because they require frequent opportunities for displays of intersubjectivity, and because such displays may work as potential interactional building blocks for local communities of practice, object-centred sequences tend to feature prominently and saliently in interactions between professionals, or experts and novices, where the outcome depends on co-participants' success in getting one another to recognisably orient to some feature of the environment in a certain way. Such public procedures for recognisably perceiving and acting together "in the middle of things" (Livingston 2008) are cumulative and "through such accumulation highly varied settings, cultures and distinctive ways of knowing and operating upon the world are created and lodged endogenously within particular communities, whether it be foragers (Keisanen/Rauniomaa this issue), laboratory scientists (Tuncer/Hadddington this issue) or geologists (Smith/Goodwin this issue). Members of such communities thus face, as part of the intrinsic organisation of action itself, the task of building "new members who can be trusted to see, understand and act upon the world in relevant ways" (Goodwin 2013:9). In light of this quote, it is interesting to note that many of Charles Goodwin's examples of participants' collaborative efforts of various types to apprehend some features of the environment could be re-specified in the vocabulary of this special issue as object-centred sequences. Even though they occur routinely in everyday settings, object-centred sequences are also powerful resources to enact, display and teach "professional vision" (Goodwin 1994) in highly specialised settings. The very notion of "co-operation" which Goodwin makes central to his understanding of embodied interaction (Goodwin 2017), rests on the achievement of some joint understanding of the prior materials out of which the next action will be built, and the next action makes publicly available some

understanding of these prior building blocks. Object-centred sequences are a primordial site for the production of culture and sociality.

This special volume aims to add to the above work and to contribute to the understanding of 'object-centred sequences' and their orderliness. It brings together a consistent series of cutting-edge studies in ethnomethodological, multimodal conversation analysis, studying naturally-occurring interactions with video recordings from different settings.

3. Overview of the contributions

In the first article of this joint volume, Kristian Mortensen and Johannes Wagner bring together a collection of similar interactional instances from various settings (e.g. design workshops, supermarkets and tasking fairs) to investigate and describe 'inspection sequences'. From the opening and closing of 'inspection sequences', through the way unfamiliar objects are handled, the paper shows that inspection sequences are composed of particular actions occurring in a particular order and that the resources utilised for the inspection are contingent on the features of the object and the environment. The authors explore how human senses – not only vision and touch, which have hitherto been the main focus of interaction analytic research, but importantly also taste and smell – are involved in the action of inspecting an unfamiliar object. The paper also provides different cases, from sequences in which the participants share the focus of attention on the inspected object, to those involving inserted, individual inspection sequences with inspectors gazing away or momentarily withdrawing from the F-formation. Thus, the authors show that inspection sequences can be '*private'* sequences that are publicly available to co-participants, or shared ones through and through. In any case the inspection is made witnessable to co-participants as a sensorial activity.

Objects can also be tasted and require individual inspection, as shown in Lorenza Mondada's article on requests for products in food shops. Her paper is part of a series of studies on interactions among professionals and customers in cheese shops. The article focuses on the initiation of this particular type of object-centred sequence. It identifies several mobile, bodily and verbal practices in relation to the placement of goods in the shop, such as requests with body orientation and walking towards the location of the product, or requests including pointing and naming. While customers' initiations can sometimes occasion a new negotiation of asymmetrical deontic rights to approach and/or manipulate cheeses, it is shown that, besides their location, various sensorial characteristics of products can become relevant through talk and embodied conduct, such as touch, smell and taste. The paper therefore unpacks how shared assessments are both revealed and jointly produced in the course of request sequences through multiple senses. It thus sheds light on fundamental achievements of these service encounters, in which the aim is that the seller and customer find together which product the customer likes and may want to purchase.

Sylvaine Tuncer and Pentti Haddington's paper "Looking at and seeing objects: Instructed vision and collaboration in the laboratory" follows biochemists jointly orienting to and discussing a work-oriented object. Through detailed analyses, they show how scientists may manipulate, inspect, and talk about the object so as to see it together as potentially problematic. Here, object-centred sequences are embedded

in laboratory work and pervaded with a concern to progress the tasks under way. Highlighting that a prior distinction in the Science and Technology Studies literature between immediate recognition ('mere' seeing) and interpretation (or the scientific interpretation of the visible features of objects of knowledge) may be less clear-cut, they focus on the early phases of these object-centred sequences, and the way these display phenomena of 'instructed vision' and 'seeing work' in which the ways to see the object together are constantly updated and transformed in an emergent fashion. From the moment a common perception is established, biochemists can look for new knowledge in and of the object.

The next paper by Mick Smith and Charles Goodwin's called "Revealing objects via aspectual-seeing in situated work" also explores interaction between scientists at work; more specifically, geo-scientists in the laboratory and in the wilderness. The paper focuses on the practices these professionals use for directing attention towards co-present features and/or materials in a given setting, for revealing certain sensorial and corporeal aspects of those for others, for the purpose of revealing those phenomena as categorically-relevant and/or work-relevant objects. Smith and Goodwin show how these practices are systematically organised and display a constitutive tension between the routinely categorisable object and the object which has to be made to emerge from the ecology it is embedded in through a complex set of collaborative practices, both elaborating one another as the object-centred sequence unfolds. What otherwise might be experientially ineffable aspects of a given phenomenon are transformed into public resources for interlocutors to build current and subsequent action. What is empirically available are precisely those situated practices through which participants reveal their experience to others in a community of practice. Because of the embeddedness of the objects, there is a particularly tight relationship between the perceptual qualities being oriented to and aspects of the objects being scrutinised which are relevant to that community of practice.

Tiina Keisanen and Mirka Rauniomaa investigate another, non-professional community of practice: family members or foraging groups picking mushrooms in the wild, to address issues of classification, sensoriality, and developing expertise. The authors unpack how object-centred sequences are initiated as one participant draws attention to the mushroom through talk and ostensive practices, and then another participant is oriented to and solicited for her expertise through recognisable methods. Phenomena of guided inspection are publicly accomplished and exhibited, with foragers positioning themselves as more experienced taking a moment to examine the find before confirming or disconfirming the proposed classification. The analyses shed light on particularly emergent processes which bind participants together in object- and sense-mediated relationships. The authors also identify a variety of possible classifications and forms of assessments involved, such as edible vs. non-edible, for eating or for other purposes, or simply naming. The chosen examples give an overview of the variety of senses possibly involved in foraging mushroom, from vision to smell through touch, nicely observing that "stroking and tapping enable quite different types of access to the mushroom", more to the surface or to the texture. In the last section, the ineffability of some senses is demonstrated when participants fail to create a shared perception of the mushroom.

In "The initiation of showing sequences in video-mediated communication", Christian Licoppe and Sylvaine Tuncer study object-centred sequences where co-

participants show objects to each other during Skype video calls. They focus specifically on the beginnings of 'showing sequences'. Their analysis illustrates that 'showing sequences' can be initiated first, at moments of topic shifts; second, as side sequences after a noticing of a 'showable' object; and third, after there has been a mention about a potential showable object, making the showing an expected next action. They also argue that as object-centred sequences, 'showing sequences' follow a particular pattern: the showing is preceded by a verbal preface that initiates the sequence; the object is manipulated and brought to the recipient's view for seeing; and the recipient produces 'appreciative talk' that indicates the 'seeing' of the object. Manual actions with the objects are inevitably constrained by the video-mediated character of the interaction, as much as the latter seems to encourage efforts to build a material world in common. The paper highlights that these object-centred sequences touch upon delicate, intimate matters as participants have visual access to one another's personal environment, often their homes. Pointing to an object and shifting the conversation to it enacts certain claims, and is also inseparable from the material practices deployed to give the other perceptual access to it.

The six contributions provide converging findings about object-centred sequences as a type of interaction, oriented to by members as such, with recurrent and constitutive features. The edited volume reinforces this by bringing together studies from a variety of settings and with different foci. We hope it provides new knowledge and will be useful for future video-based research on multimodal interaction, and offers new knowledge that such research can build on.

4. References

Cekaite, Asta (2015): The coordination of talk and touch in adults' directives to children: Touch and social control. In: Research on Language and Social Interaction 48 (2), 152-175.

Coulter, Jeff / Parsons, E.D. (1991): The praxiology of perception: Visual orientations and practical actions. In: Inquiry 33 (3), 251-272.

Day, Dennis / Wagner, Johannes (2014): Objects as tools for talk. In: Nevile, Maurice et al. (eds.), Interacting with objects: Language, materiality, and social activity. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing, 101-124.

Deppermann, Arnulf (2013): Multimodal interaction from a conversation analytic perspective. In: Journal of Pragmatics 46 (1), 1-7.

De Stefani, Elwys (2014): Establishing joint orientation towards commercial objects in a self-service store. In: Nevile, Maurice et al. (eds.), Interacting with objects: Language, materiality, and social activity. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing, 271-294.

DiDomenico, Stephen M. / Raclaw, Joshua / Robles, Jessica S. (2018): Attending to the mobile text summons: Managing multiple communicative activities across physically copresent and technologically mediated interpersonal interactions. In: Communication Research.
https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650218803537

Ekström, Anna / Lindwall, Oskar (2014): To follow the materials. The detection, diagnosis and correction of mistakes in craft education. In: Nevile, Maurice et al. (eds.), Interacting with objects: Language, materiality, and social activity. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing, 227-247.

Fasulo, Alessandra / Monzoni, Chiara (2009): Assessing mutable objects: A multi-modal analysis. In: Research on Language and Social Interaction 42 (4), 362-376.

Fox, Barbara A. / Heinemann, Trine (2015): The alignment of manual and verbal displays in requests for the repair of an object. In: Research on Language and Social Interaction 48 (3), 342-362.

Garfinkel, Harold / Lynch, Michael / Livingston, Eric (1981): The work of a discovering science construed with materials from the optically discovered pulsar. In: Philosophy of the Social Sciences 11, 131-158.

Good, Jeffrey S. / Beach, Wayne A. (2005): Opening up gift-openings: Birthday parties as situated activity systems. In: Text 25 (5), 565-593.

Goodwin, Charles (1981): Conversational Organization: Interaction Between Speakers and Hearers. New York: Academic Press.

Goodwin, Charles (1994): Professional Vision. In: American Anthropologist 96 (3), 606-633.

Goodwin, Charles (2000). Practices of seeing. In: van Leuwen, Theo / Jewitt, Carey (eds.), Handbook of visual analysis. London: Sage Publications, 157-182.

Goodwin, Charles (2007): Environmentally coupled gestures. In: Duncan, Susan D. / Cassell, Justine / Levy, Elena T. (eds.). Gesture and the dynamic dimensions of language. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins, 195-212.

Goodwin, Charles (2013). The co-operative, transformative organization of human action and knowledge. In: Journal of Pragmatics 46 (1), 8-23.

Goodwin, Charles (2017). Co-operative action. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, Charles / Goodwin, Marjorie Harness (1996): Seeing as a situated activity: Formulating planes. In: Engeström, Yrjö / Middleton, David (eds.), Cognition and Communication at Work. New York: Cambridge University Press, 61-95.

Haddington, Pentti / Rauniomaa, Mirka (2011): Technologies, multitasking and driving: Attending to and preparing for a mobile phone conversation in the car. In: Human Communication Research 37, 223-254.

Heath, Christian (1986): Body movement and speech in medical interaction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heath, Christian / Luff, Paul (2013): Embodied action and organisational interaction: Establishing a contract on the strike of a hammer. In: Journal of Pragmatics 46 (1), 24-38.

Hester, Francis / Eglin, Peter (eds.) (1997). Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis. Washington D.C: University Press of America.

Hindmarsh, Jon / Fraser, Mike / Heath, Christian / Benford, Steve / Greenhalgh, Chris (2000): Object-focused interaction in collaborative virtual environments. In: ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI) 7 (4), 477-509.

Hindmarsh, Jon / Fraser, Mike / Heath, Christian / Benford, Steve (2001): Virtually missing the point: Configuring CVSs for object-focused interactions. In: Churchill, Elizabeth F. / Snowdon, David N. / Munro, Alan J. (eds.), Collaborative Virtual Environments. London: Springer, 115-139.

Hindmarsh, Jon / Heath, Christian (2000): Sharing the tools of the trade. The interactional constitution of workplace objects. In: Journal of Contemporary Ethnography 29 (5), 523-562.

Hindmarsh, Jon / Heath, Christian (2003): Transcending the object in embodied interaction. In: Coupland, Justine / Gwyn, Richard (eds.), Discourse, the body, and identity. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan, 43-69.

Iwasaki, Shimako / Bartlett, Meredith / Manns, Howard / Willoughby, Louisa (2018): The challenges of multimodality and multi-sensoriality: Methodological issues in analyzing tactile signed interactions. In: Journal of Pragmatics 143, 215-227.

Kidwell, Mardi / Zimmermann, Don H. (2007): Joint attention as action. In: Journal of Pragmatics 39, 592-611.

Kidwell, Mardi (2012): Interaction among children. In Sidnell, Jack / Stivers, Tanya (eds.), The Handbook of Conversation Analysis. Oxford, U.K: Wiley-Blackwell, 511-32.

Lave, Jean / Wenger, Etienne (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Licoppe, Christian (2017): Showing objects in Skype video-mediated conversation: from showing gestures to showing sequences. In: Journal of Pragmatics 110, 63-82.

Livingston, Eric (2008). Ethnographies of Reason. Farnham: Ashgate.

Mondada, Lorenza (2018): The multimodal interactional organization of tasting: Practices of tasting cheese in gourmet shops. In: Discourse Studies 20 (6), 743-769.

Mondada, Lorenza (2019): Contemporary issues in conversation analysis: Embodiment and materiality, multimodality and multisensoriality in social interaction. In: Journal of Pragmatics 145, 47-62.

Mondada, Lorenza / Sorjonen, Marja-Leena (2016): Making multiple requests in French and Finnish convenience stores. In: Language in Society 45, 733-765.

Mulhall, Stephen (1990): On being in the world: Wittgenstein and Heidegger on seeing aspects. London and New York: Routledge.

Nevile, Maurice (2015): The embodied turn in research on language and social interaction. In: Research on Language and Social Interaction 48 (2), 121-151.

Nevile, Maurice / Haddington, Pentti / Heinemann, Trine / Rauniomaa, Mirka (eds.) (2014): Interacting with objects: Language, materiality, and social activity. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing.

Nishizaka, Aug (2014): Instructed perception in prenatal ultrasound examinations. In: Discourse Studies 16 (2), 2, 217-246.

Nishizaka, Aug (2017): The perceived body and embodied vision in interaction. In: Mind, Culture and Activity 24 (2), 110-128.

Oshima, Sae / Streeck, Jürgen (2015): Coordinating talk and practical action: The case of hair salon service assessments. In: Pragmatics and Society 6 (4), 538-564.

Rauniomaa, Mirka / Haddington, Pentti (2012): Driven by a Social and Interactional Routine: Responding to a Mobile Phone Summons in a Car. In: International Journal of Cyber Behavior, Psychology and Learning 2 (3), 39-58.

Robles, Jessica (2012): Troubles with assessments in gift-giving occasions. In: Discourse Studies 14 (6), 753-777.

Ryle, Gilbert (1956): Sensation. In: Lewis, H.D (ed.), Contemporary British Philosophy (Third Series), London: George Allen & Unwin, 349-362.

Sacks, Harvey (1974): On the analyzability of stories by children. In: Turner, Roy (ed.), Ethnomethodology. Penguin, Harmondsworth, 216-232.

Sacks, Harvey (1992): Lectures on conversation. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Stivers, Tanya / Sidnell, Jack (2005): Introduction: Multimodal interaction. In: Semiotica 156 (1/4), 1-20.

Streeck, Jürgen (1996): How to do things with things. Objets trouvés and symbolization. In: Human Studies 19, 365-384.

Streeck, Jürgen / Goodwin, Charles / LeBaron, Curtis (eds.) (2011): Embodied interaction: Language and body in the material world. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Suchman, Lucy (1987): Plans and situated action: The problem of human-machine communication. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Weilenmann, Alexandra / Lymer, Gustav (2014): Incidental and essential objects in interaction. Paper documents in journalistic work. In: Nevile, Maurice et al. (eds.), Interacting with objects: Language, materiality, and social activity. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing, 319-337.

Wiggins, Sally (2002): Talking with your mouth full: Gustatory mmms and the embodiment of pleasure. In: Research on language and social Interaction 35 (3), 311-336.

Wiggins, Sally / Potter, Jonathan / Wildsmith, Aimee (2001): Eating your words: Discursive psychology and the reconstruction of eating practices. In: Journal of Health Psychology 6 (1), 5-15.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig (1953): Philosophical investigations. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sylvaine Tuncer
Stockholm University
Department of Computer and Systems Sciences/DSV
Postbox 7003
SE-164 07 Kista
Sweden

sylvaine@dsv.su.se
sylvainetuncer@gmail.com

Christian Licoppe
Department of Social Science, Telecom Paris
19 place Marguerite Perey
F-91120 Palaiseau
France

christian.licoppe@telecom-paristech.fr

Pentti Haddington
Research Unit for Languages and Literature
English Philology, Faculty of Humanities
P.O.Box 1000
FI-90014 University of Oulu
Finland

pentti.haddington@oulu.fi