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Abstract
This conversation-analytic paper investigates embodied practices through which participants organize coparticipation in collaborative storytellings. The data for the multimodal analysis is drawn from a corpus of video recorded French and Spanish conversations. We analyze two distinct teller-initiated forms of coparticipation, i.e., word searches and requests for verification, and three co-teller-initiated forms of coparticipation, i.e., adding omitted elements, affiliative other-corrections, and rendering one’s own side. We find that current tellers deploy specific turn-constructional as well as embodied resources, such as gaze, gesture, and body posture, in order to solicit conditional co-teller entry and to forward the overall progressivity of the telling sequence. When co-tellers enter the telling-in-progress, they design their actions within specific embodied participation frameworks that make recognizable the extent of their entry and how their coparticipation shall be treated by the current teller. We argue that a more granular understanding of this the participation role of the 'co-teller' is crucial to examine how co-telling is achieved.
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1. Introduction

This conversation-analytic paper investigates embodied coparticipation practices in collaborative storytelling. Conversational tellings, in which two participants share knowledge about the source events, are complex participation fields: both co-tellers need to accomplish the task of deciding who delivers what part of the telling, while simultaneously designing the telling for their audience and managing recipient alignment.

Drawing from a large corpus of video recorded French and Spanish conversations, we aim to develop a deeper understanding of ‘embodied participation frameworks’ (C. Goodwin 2007b) in collaborative storytelling. We depart from five recognizable actions that require participants to initiate and manage coparticipation: word searches, requests for verification, adding omitted elements, (affiliative) other-correction, and rendering one’s own side.

In searches and requests, it is the current teller who solicits a response from their co-teller (C. Goodwin 1981; Goodwin/Goodwin 1986; Lerner 1992, 1996). Therefore, the current teller needs to establish an embodied participation framework that allows the co-teller to recognize the action space, enter the turn, and provide the sought-for response. The other three action types, on the other hand, require the co-teller to initiate coparticipation. In order to do so, they monitor the ongoing telling for a possible place of entry and design their contribution in ways that makes it intelligible and accountable for other participants (Lerner 1992; Zima 2017). This study aims to investigate the embodied practices current tellers and co-tellers deploy in order to initiate and manage coparticipation and implement telling-relevant actions.

In what follows, we will first give an overview on storytelling in conversation (§ 2.1), as well as participation and embodied participation frameworks (§ 2.2). We
will then present our data and method (§ 3) and proceed to the analysis of teller-initiated (§ 4.1) and co-teller-initiated (§ 4.2) coparticipation practices. Finally, we will discuss our findings and their more general implications for the analysis of embodied participation practices in conversation (§ 5).

2. (Collaborative) storytelling and coparticipation

2.1. Storytelling in conversation

There exists a substantial body of conversation-analytic work on storytelling that examines how participants interactionally achieve this distinct activity and how they accomplish a range of social actions (for an overview see Mandelbaum 2013). Conversational storytelling plays a crucial role in the construction of identities and group membership (e.g., Schiffrin 1990; Bamberg 2004) and is a key locus where participants establish mutual intelligibility and accountability of shared values and normative conduct (see Sacks 1984, 1995; Pekarek Doehler/Berger 2015). Rather than merely focusing on the structure of such stories, Conversation Analysts are especially interested in the joint achievement of extended tellings by all participants. In this sense, storytelling is conceptualized as a dialogic process, during which all participants actively co-construct a telling sequence. In order for one participant to deliver an extended telling, other participants must recognize the telling as big package (see Sacks 1995, II:354) and align as story recipients (see Sacks et al. 1974; Jefferson 1979; Schegloff 1982; C. Goodwin 1984).

In face-to-face interaction, storytelling is a “a multi-modal, multi-party field of activity” (C. Goodwin 2007a:25) and bodily resources such as gaze, gesture, body position, and facial expressions are carefully attended to both by tellers and recipients. A growing body of research investigates the embodied aspects of conversational storytelling as situated activity within an interactional space (see Müller 2003; König/Oloff 2018a, 2018b). C. Goodwin (1984) showed very early that story recipients position their bodies in a way that displays their (dis)alignment with the ongoing telling and he argues that tellers design their talk to draw their audience’s gaze on them. Moreover, recipients deploy a number of resources such as nodding and facial expressions to provide sequentially situated stance displays (see Stivers 2008; Kupetz 2014). Eye gaze and gesture are also key resources for the organization of participation in storytelling (Rühlemann et al. 2019) and recent studies have used eye-tracking technology to show how participants systematically deploy bodily resources to negotiate participant roles and to allocate tellership (Zima 2017, 2020).

2.2. Participation and embodied participation frameworks

Storytellings are highly sensitive to shifts in participation roles and they require all present participants to distinguish different components of the telling and possible actions they invoke. Building upon Goffman’s (1979) early work on participation, Goodwin and Goodwin (1986, 1992, 2004; see also M. H. Goodwin 1997, 1999, 2006; C. Goodwin 1981, 1984, 2007a, 2007b) have developed the notion of partic-
ipation as action' and they describe a number of practices through which participants shape talk and other forms of face-to-face interaction (see for instance De Stefani/Gazin 2019 for participation in traffic interactions). Participation is essentially conceptualized as "actions demonstrating forms of involvement performed by parties within evolving structures of talk" (M. H. Goodwin 1999:177) and it can be analyzed as "a temporally unfolding process through which separate parties demonstrate to each other their ongoing understanding of the events they are engaged in by building actions that contribute to the further progression of these very same events" (C. Goodwin 2007a:24-25). From the beginning of their studies on participation, the Goodwins have insisted on the participants’ bodies as being crucial resources for the accomplishment and display of participation. They showed in great detail how gaze and body position in particular are used to establish the roles of story teller and recipient and how story tellers segment an extended telling through changes of posture (C. Goodwin 1984).

In order to investigate the interplay between telling-specific actions and multimodal practices, we take up the concept of embodied participation frameworks, which encompass "the talk, gesture and activity in progress [that] are framed by arrangements of the participants’ bodies that create a shared, public focus for the organization of attention and action" (C. Goodwin 2007b:57). Through this mutual arrangement of multimodal resources, participants establish "a dynamic frame that indexically grounds the talk and embodied action occurring within it" (ibidem). During telling sequences participants multimodally establish and readjust such frameworks, within which they accomplish actions, make relevant next actions, and make their participation intelligible for other participants. In our analysis, we aim to show that current tellers and co-tellers have distinct practices to maintain or re-adjust telling-specific embodied participation frameworks in order to accomplish locally relevant actions and to simultaneously manage tellership.

2.3. Participation in collaborative storytelling

One distinctive form of extended tellings are collaborative storytellings (shared storytellings, Mandelbaum 1987, 2010, 2013; Ochs et al. 1989; assisted storytellings, Lerner 1992; Coates 2005; Leung 2009), in which two or more participants share knowledge of the source events of the story. Since all knowing participants can potentially tell the story, they need to work out who tells what part of the story and they may need to negotiate the stances conveyed through the telling.

Lerner (1992) provides a systematic description of collaborative storytelling and emphasizes the "emergent, contingent, interactive, and yet routine character" (idem:245) of this distinctive form of sociality. He shows that consociate participation constitutes a distinct form of alignment to the story-in-progress, "one that in various ways displays and uses shared knowledge as a systematic basis for participation" (ibidem:268). Lerner examines telling-specific actions that are implemented at different sequential places of the storytelling. While his investigation emphasizes the complexity and multimodality of the participation fields that are collaborative storytellings, he does not systematically include bodily resources in his analyses.

One particular participation framework that participants can achieve is being treated as one single conversational 'party' during a collaborative telling sequence.
A party is understood here as "an assemblage of two (or more) individuals can become relevant as a single social unit" (Lerner 1993:213). When such parties are achieved in interaction, this allows for specific forms of non-problematic overlap of party members (Schegloff 1995) and one speaker’s talk can be treated as being on behalf of the party (Lerner 1993). Moreover, members of a party are addressed by other participants as a collectivity, bringing about the issue of next speaker selection (Lerner 1993). In our analysis, we will observe that, while two participants can achieve being one party, they can also establish themselves as being two distinct parties both at the moment of the telling and in the source events.

Faced with the complex task of jointly telling the story, the two knowing participants alternately take on the participation roles of current teller and co-teller (Quasthoff 1980; Lerner 1992; Zima 2017). While the participation role of the current teller is rather straightforward, we find in our analysis that the role of the co-teller is not restricted to one single participation role. Rather, it encompasses a dynamic constellation of many possible ways to (dis)align or (dis)affiliate with the ongoing telling and to engage with other present participants. The co-teller’s entitlement to enter the story-in-progress depends on its production format, i.e., the co-teller’s involvement as a character in the story (Lerner 1992; Dressel 2020). Throughout a collaborative telling sequence, both knowing participants can make relevant different degrees of involvement in the telling, ranging from assisting with the provision of a word to delivering whole parts of the story, sometimes even competing for different trajectories or versions of the story. These locally relevant, telling-specific complex forms of involvement are negotiated by the knowing participants and made recognizable for the unknowing story recipient.

3. Data & method

Our data stems from the Freiburg Sofa Talks Corpus, which comprises more than 200 video recordings ranging from 10 to 50 minutes in duration. The corpus encompasses German, Italian, Spanish, French, and Portuguese data, both from European and non-European countries and varieties. For this particular project, we focus on 50 recordings in Spanish and French. In each video, a couple, two family members, or two close friends jointly recount events they have experienced together (see also ‘entitlement to experience’, Sacks 1995, II:242-248). The participants are mostly recorded in their home, where they feel comfortable sharing memories with a third person. This person is the researcher, i.e., is the person tasked with bringing the camera to the participants’ home and informing them of the project, but is also always a close friend or relative. In this way, this conversational setting provides an authentic ‘opportunity space’ (Ochs et al. 1989:238) for joint storytelling activities. In most cases, the participants address this friend or family member as the unknowing recipient of the collaborative storytelling, who aligns as the addressed story recipient. All participants have signed informed consent forms before producing the material.

Drawing upon conversation-analytic methods (Sacks 1995; Schegloff 2007; Clift 2016), we have first identified storytelling sequences and then collected story-relevant action types. In our analysis, we describe how participants make them rec-
ognizable as such for other co-present interactants, focusing on the embodied prac-
tices they mobilize to initiate and manage coparticipation within those actions. Ex-
tracts have been transcribed according to the GAT2 conventions (see Selting et al.
2009; Ehmer et al. 2019). For visualizing embodied conduct, we have included
multimodal annotations (see Mondada 2020) as well as figures comprising anony-
mized screenshots from the video data.

4. Analysis

In the following, we will analyze and discuss nine examples of both teller-initiated
and co-teller-initiated coparticipation practices. We depart from the distinction of
self- vs. other-initiation (or -selection, Sacks et al. 1974; Zima 2017) in order to
examine which multimodal resources and practices participants deploy in order to
accomplish telling-specific actions. We will first focus on two action types in which
the current teller solicits co-teller participation, before examining three actions by
means of which co-tellers proactively enter the turn-in-progress. In addition to the
sequential structure of these actions, we are particularly interested in the embodied
practices tellers and co-tellers use to accomplish distinct forms of coparticipation.

4.1. Teller-initiated forms of coparticipation

We first want to discuss two actions through which the current teller can solicit co-
teller participation: word searches and requests for verification. Word searches are
designed for restricted or conditional entry by co-teller (Lerner 1996:261) and em-
body resources have shown to play a crucial role for the initiation and manage-
ment of coparticipation throughout search sequences (Goodwin/Goodwin 1986;
Dressel 2020). Requests for verification are designed to prompt a distinct next ac-
tion by co-teller, e.g., the confirmation of a specific element or explicit affiliation
with a stance expressed prior to the request. In our analysis, we show that, in both
searches and requests, tellers use similar practices to solicit restricted co-teller par-
ticipation and furnish spaces for conditional co-teller entry. We also observe that
tellers can layer multimodal resources in order to pursue a response by the co-teller.
Furthermore, we examine how (dis)preferred co-teller responses shape the trajec-
tory of the telling-in-progress.

4.1.1. Word searches

In a word search, a turn-constructional unit (TCU) is interrupted before it has
reached a point of possible completion. Word searches can be conceptualized as a
type of mostly self-initiated, forward-oriented repair in which the progressivity of
the speaker’s turn is delayed because an item (i.e., a word) is not readily available
to the speaker (see Schegloff et al. 1977). Through a word search, a speaker makes
visible the ‘relevant unavailability’ of a word (Goodwin/Goodwin 1986:55) and con-
vveys to other participants that an attempt is being made to continue the unfinished
turn (Lerner 1996:261). Through the coordination of verbal resources (i.e., hesita-
tion markers, lengthening, and prosody) and non-verbal resources (i.e., gesture and
facial expression), a word search is designed to obtain heightened attention from a
coparticipant and is therefore "a visible activity that other participants not only recognize but can also participate in" (Goodwin/Goodwin 1986:52). While word searches are designed for conditional entry and opportunistic turn completion by recipients (Lerner 1996), in collaborative storytelling, they provide "an environment for arranging who will deliver the story" (Lerner 1992:256). Since co-tellers have equal epistemic access to the source events and can potentially claim tellership, it is particularly relevant for current tellers to design the search as either a solitary attempt or a joint action (Goodwin/Goodwin 1986).

In the following, we will analyze two examples of joint word searches, during which the teller mobilizes their co-teller’s assistance in order to retrieve a TCU-final precise item (see Lerner 2012:103) at a pre-possible completion position (see Schegloff 1996:87). In both examples, the teller locally readjusts the embodied participation framework, creating an action space for co-teller entry. Whereas, in example (1), the co-teller only briefly enters the turn-in-progress to provide the sought-for word, the co-teller in example (2) uses the sequential structure of the word search to take the floor.

(1) 'Tango' (fgre201701_02.00-02.11)

In this extract, Robert (ROB) and his wife Claire (CLA) remember a night of tango dancing and tell their experience to GRE. Robert halts the progressivity of the utterance-in-progress, lengthening the preposition de:: (of, 01), latching it to a hesitation marker and pausing. Claire provides the sought-for word TANGO; (02), which is then ratified by Robert (03).

Already before the onset of the search, he readjusts the embodied participation framework, turning his gaze and upper body toward Claire (#2) and moving his left hand into their shared gesture space (#2, #3, see McNeill 2005). Having established a framework for potential coparticipation early, Robert does not pursue co-teller participation: he withdraws his gaze, assumes a 'thinking face' (M. H. Goodwin 1983:130) and maintains a 'palm up open hand' gesture (see Müller 2003; Kendon 2004; Streeck 2007). As he pauses, Robert gazes at his open hand, displaying that the search is in progress and making recognizable that the gesture is relevant for the search (Streeck 1994). He signals that he is ready to receive the sought-for word.
and thus provides a space for limited co-teller entry. As Robert resolves the word search by repeating the co-teller’s candidate solution, he withdraws his hand from the shared gesture space, turning away from his co-teller (#4) and assumes a body position similar to that prior to the search (#1, #5). Claire also readjusts her body position throughout the search: at the onset, she monitors Robert and gazes at him when she provides the candidate solution (#1 to #3). As Robert resumes his turn, she averts her gaze, leans back, and folds her hands in her lap, visibly leaving the floor (#5).

In example (2), we find another case of a collaborative word search. Ludmila (LUD) and Armando (ARM) are relating to Pedro (PED) about a hiking trip they made to the south of Argentina. After spending a night in the small town El Bolsón, to go hiking in close-by mountains, they went to a nearby shelter, but Ludmila, who is currently telling the story, does not remember its name.

(2) 'El Retamal' (ssat201802_03.45-04.00)

01 LUD:  **+lleGAmos, 
           we arrived 
   ped   *gazes at LUD-->  
   arm   +gazes down-->  

02      estuvimos una noche en el bolsón,=  
         We spent one night at El Bolsón

03      =§y después nos fu%I:$mos$=  
         and then we went to:::  
   lud   $gazes at PED------>$gaze down-->$gaze at ARM-->  
   lud   $..places hand on ARM thigh-->  
   arm   -->+gazes at LUD-->  
   ped   %..head nods---,   
   ped   -->*gazes at ARM-->
Ludmila initiates the word search by breaking off her turn, extending the preposition *a* (‘to’) and turning her gaze to Armando (03, #6 and #7). She thereby displays the possibility of a joint word search as opposed to a solitary search (Goodwin/Goodwin 1986; Dressel 2020). As Armando does not visibly respond, Ludmila explicitly asks for the name of the place while simultaneously patting Armando on his thigh (04), yielding for support (see Lynn 2012). After a brief silence, she provides a candidate solution: *el retaMAL* (05), maintaining the gaze on her co-teller. Thus, Ludmila progressively deploys different resources, i.e., prosody, gaze, touch, and a verifiable candidate solution, in order to mobilize a response (Stivers/Rossano 2010) from her co-teller. The expansion of the word search sequence creates an opportunity space for multiple courses of action beyond the provision of the word. Indeed, as opposed to example (1), Armando initiates his response with a verbal phrase (*es*, ‘it’s’, 06), which projects an entry that extends beyond the sought-for word by Ludmila’s turn in (03). In response, Ludmila initiates self-correction with *no* ‘no’ (07), making a (dis)confirmation and elaboration of the candidate solution conditionally relevant. By doing so, she lifts the sequential constraints of the word search environment and enables an extended change of tellership. This is acknowledged by Armando, who confirms the candidate solution (08) and proceeds to elaborate on the geographical location of the refuge with two *que*-initiated relative clauses (09, 10). In this way, he keeps the floor and a change of tellership is achieved, which is also recognized by the story recipient, who turns his gaze from Ludmila to Armando (08).
The change in the participation framework is made possible by the participants collaboratively lifting the sequential constraints of the word search environment, and it is supported by their embodied conduct. If we focus on the timing of Ludmila’s left hand gesture, we notice that she places her hand on Armando’s thigh before performing the patting and even before cutting off her turn and gazing towards him (03, #6). This alerts Armando of his potential co-participation in the story before it is made relevant as a word search. This activation can be observed as Armando changes from a disengaged position to a monitoring position right after Ludmila touches his thigh (03). Subsequently, Ludmila leaves her hand on Armando’s thigh after he has taken the floor (#8), which can be a way for her to support the change in the participation framework and avoid displaying competition for the floor.

While example Tango illustrates how the teller establishes a recognizable action space for local co-teller entry without change of tellership, example El Retamal shows that word searching is a sequential environment that can lead to a change of tellers (Lerner 1992). The examples differ in one important sequential aspect: in Tango, the co-teller provides a single, syntactically fitting word which is subsequently ratified by the teller. In El Retamal, the current teller provides a candidate solution, which is then confirmed and elaborated on by the co-teller. In both examples, the embodied participation framework is readjusted and oriented to by both participants. In El Retamal, we observe that, as the current teller launches the search, she progressively layers a number of embodied resources in order to pursue co-teller participation, going so far as to yield the floor through touch. She thus creates an opportunity space that allows for co-teller entry beyond the conditional provision of the sought-for word.

4.1.2. Requests for verification

This section focuses on a subtype of requests for confirmation, namely requests for verification. This type of request has been first described by Charles Goodwin (1981, pg. 151) and is specific to multiparty interactions where both knowing and unknowing recipients are co-present, such as collaborative storytelling. In this specific context, a teller can request a knowing co-participant to verify some aspect of the story-in-progress before its final delivery to the unknowing story recipient (C. Goodwin 1981; Mandelbaum 1987; Lerner 1992). Requests for verification are made recognizable by a shift in gaze direction towards the knowing recipient and a 'display of uncertainty' about a verifiable element (C. Goodwin 1981: 166). In this way, they anticipate the possibility of co-teller entry with regard to story correctness.
and accuracy (Lerner 1992:260), while displaying for the story recipient that a present coparticipant also has knowledge of the events being recounted. Furthermore, requests for verification can be a way for knowing coparticipants to accomplish being treated as a conversational party for the ongoing development of the storytelling activity (see Lerner 1993). Although requesting for verification does invite co-teller entry into the telling, it also constrains coparticipation to providing a specific type of response that is made relevant by the format of the request, which can be as minimal as a continuator or a head nod (C. Goodwin 1981:159).

As an illustration of this, consider example (3). Mar (MAR) and Juan (JUA) are telling their friend, Pedro (PED), about how they’ve first met. This happened at a party in the city of La Plata, in Argentina, when they both arrived and took the elevator together.

(3) 'All together' (ssat201703_01.28-01.35)

01 MAR: *$y:: +cuando llegamos nosotras llegó ÉL;#9 and when we arrived he did
       mar +gazes at PED-->
       jua *gazes towards MAR-->
       ped $gazes at MAR-->

02      <<p> @tamBIÉN.>>+
       as well
       ped @,,nods-->
       mar -->+gazes down-->

03     +subimos +en el@ ascensOR,*
       we took the elevator
       mar -->+gazes at JUA-->
       mar +,,raising right hand-->
       jua -->*gazes at MAR-->
       ped -->@

04     #10tos $JUN%tos?$+
       all of us together
       jua %,,nods-->
       ped -->$gazes at JUA-->
       mar -->+
       mar $frowns--_-->$

05     (0.2) +#11(0.1)$% (0.4)
       mar -->+gazes down middle dist.-->
       jua --->$
       ped -->$gazes at MAR-->

06 MAR: y NAda,+
       and nothing
       mar -->+gazes at PED-->

07       estuvimos#12 ahí* en@ la PREvia,
       we were there in the pre-party
       jua -->*gazes towards MAR-->
       ped @,,nods-->

In lines (01) and (02), Mar tells Pedro that they arrived together at the place where the party was taking place, gazing at the story recipient (#9). Subsequently, she adds that they took the elevator together (03, 04). However, in (03), she performs an open
hand prone (‘vertical palm’) gesture, which can be used to indicate "an intention to halt a current line of action" (see Kendon 2004:251), and shifts her gaze to Juan, establishing mutual gaze (#10). In this way, she alerts Juan that the progressivity of the story might be halted and that some form of coparticipation from him might become relevant. The relevance of a response by Juan becomes clear in (04), when Mar displays uncertainty about whether all of them took the elevator together, achieving a recipient-tilted epistemic asymmetry towards the co-teller (Stivers/Rossano 2010). She does so by frowning her eyebrows before introducing the word juntos (‘together’, 04) and by producing her turn with final-rising intonation, which can be used to mark a statement as problematic (see Goodwin 1981:151). Through this combination of resources, she also makes the action recognizable as a request for verification, which Juan responds to by nodding his head (04, 05). This embodied expression of confirmation is a minimal response that can be a sufficient in this type of request sequences (see Goodwin 1981:159). In fact, it is considered an appropriate response by Mar, who continues with the story (06, 07). Although Juan’s response is minimal, the request for verification provides a resource to publicly address Juan as a knowing participant and display shared knowledge of the events. 

Mar recognizably achieves a shift in the embodied participation framework by moving her gaze from the story recipient to the potential co-teller. In this way, she displays that coparticipation from Juan might be relevant, which is recognized by the story recipient, who also directs his gaze to Juan (04). Through different embodied practices, both participants mutually signal each other that coparticipation from Juan will be conditional to the provision of the verification and that the previous participation framework can be restored. Similar to example (1), Mar already withdraws her gaze from Juan to middle distance while Juan is still nodding (#11). Juan concludes his non-verbal verification, but avoids to enter the floor verbally, thus allowing for Mar to continue as the main teller, addressing again the story recipient (#12). However, this form of progressivity-forwarding bodily response does not always occur, as we will see in the following example, in which a request by the teller receives a dispreferred response.
In this example, Robert and Clara jointly remember that Robert had once been offered the opportunity to work in China for some years. The travel-loving couple had been excited about the idea of living abroad, but since Clara would not have been able to move freely outside of the gated community, they decided against the offer. Robert, the main teller at the beginning of this sequence, recalls that they had been given only a short time to decide and to prepare their leaving the country and he turns to his wife to confirm the time span of two months (05). Clara disconfirms this information (07) and then enters the floor to state that they had been given less than one month to get ready (09). She keeps the floor and continues to tell the story.

Example (4) 'Not even one month' (fgre201701_07.40-08.34)

01 ROB: donc c'était une opportunité,

so it was an opportunity

02 qui euhm qui m'était proposée par mon (0.9)

that uhm I was offered by my (0.9)

mon ma boîte, (0.5)

my office (0.5)

03 et euh où j'aurais pu aller en Chine euh-

and uhm where I could have gone to China uhm

04 pour euh (-) une durée de trois ou quatre ans (1.0)

for (-) a duration of three or four years (1.0)

05 *et euh: bon ben ça a durée pratiquement

and uh well it took practically

(0.7)*(0.1)#14(0.7) deux mois?

(1.5) two months

rob *gazes up middle distance-------*gazes at CLA-->

cla $gazes down-----$middle dist.$Sat ROB-->

06 ou un truc comme

or something like

[ÇA,]

that

07 CLA: [non] même pas trois pas tant que ça même (+) (0.5)

no not even not even that much (0.5)

rob -->*avert gaze up-->

cla -->$avert gaze down-->

08 ROB: *pour que: on en fasses +toutes les démarches, + +

so that we take all the steps

rob -->*gazes at CLA

cla +both hands rolling gesture+down+

09 CLA: [non] n

no.

cà a durée v (.) a

it took v (.) a

*pch: ça a durée même pas un mois*+ en fait euh#15-

pch it took not even one month actually uh

cla -->$gazes at ROB-->

rob -->*averts gaze up---------------------*middle dist.-->

rob +body movement leg repositioning +

rob +left hand on left knee +hands down
As Robert breaks off his utterance and hesitates (05). He initiates a change in the embodied participation framework by shifting his gaze to Clara, who reciprocates his gaze (#13, #14). Having established mutual gaze, Robert produces the verifiable turn-final element *deux MOIS?* (05) with rising pitch. As opposed to example (3), Clara does not provide any bodily response, such as nodding, and Robert maintains the gaze window. He further displays uncertainty (‘or something like that’, 06), possibly anticipating a dispreferred response by Clara and creating a potential for other-correction, i.e., a space for different trajectories of action. In overlap with this utterance, Clara disconfirms the information at stake (07). Robert, rather than ratifying Clara’s disconfirmation, expands on his initial utterance (08), still maintaining the gaze window. This sustained mutual gaze situation allows Clara to re-enter the floor in a disaffiliative manner (09) and to repair Robert’s initial claim. It is Clara who initiates a change of the embodied participation framework by shifting her gaze to the story recipient (#15). She produces a multi-unit turn providing more background information as well as her perspective of the telling. At the same time, Robert changes his body position: he leans back, puts his lap, and assumes a middle-distance gaze, aligning as story recipient. Robert’s request for verification within this particular embodied participation framework, i.e., sustained mutual gaze, thus lifts the constraint of conditional entry and allows Clara to establish herself as current teller, determining the trajectory of the story. Robert aligns as a knowing recipient, assuming a middle-distance gaze.

Similar to word searches, requests for verification make local co-teller participation relevant. As we have seen, both tellers and co-tellers have embodied practices for managing co-participation and accomplishing changes of the embodied participation framework. Both in word searches and requests, tellers deploy a range
of situated bodily resources, particularly gaze, body posture, and gesture, in order to furnish action spaces for co-teller entry and to mobilize co-teller responses. The sequential organization of these resources is consequential for the subsequent course of action. In examples 1 (Tango) and 3 (All together), co-teller participation is restricted to the minimal sought-for response and the teller immediately restores the previous embodied participation framework and resumes the telling. In examples 2 (El Retamal) and 4 (Not even one month), teller-initiated coparticipation leads to a change of tellership.

In our analysis of word searches and requests for verification, we observe that gaze and gesture can signal an upcoming problem early in the turn and establish a framework for potential coparticipation before the progressivity of the turn-in-progress is halted and co-teller participation is required, facilitating a smooth speaker transition. If the co-teller does not immediately respond, tellers can deploy further resources, such as touch, to pursue co-teller participation. Word searches and requests for verification are usually designed to solicit only limited coparticipation. They temporarily suspend extended tellership by one single participant, halt the progressivity of the telling, and current tellers readjust the embodied participation framework. Co-tellers can use this shift in the participation framework as well as the relevant next action to take the floor and to establish themselves as current teller. They accomplish this change of participation roles by shifting their gaze to the story recipient, while the previous teller aligns as knowing recipient. Teller-initiated coparticipation, therefore, always bears the potential of reallocating tellership and (temporarily) altering the trajectory of the telling-in-progress.

4.2. Co-teller-initiated forms of coparticipation

If co-teller entry is not invited by the current teller, the environment of collaborative storytelling also allows for the knowing co-teller to initiate entry (Lerner 1992; Zima 2017). It has been shown that co-tellers mostly initiate entry when adding omitted elements (C. Goodwin 1981; Mandelbaum 1987), doing other-correcting (Lerner 1992), repairing a teller’s self-initiated repair (Lerner 1992), completing the teller’s turn (Dressel/Teixeira Kalkhoff 2019; Pfänder/Couper-Kuhlen 2019), adding recipient designed clarifications (Lerner 1992), and delivering their own parts of the story (idem). Besides the different actions that co-tellers accomplish with self-initiated entries, it has been observed that they are also treated differently by participants in the subsequent course of action. Co-teller-initiated entries have been found to be ratified by the current teller or to occasion competitive turn-taking (Zima 2017). Moreover, while co-tellers can project limited entry, they can also accomplish a transfer of tellership (Lerner 1992).

In the second section of this paper, we aim to shed light on how participants manage co-teller-initiated entries through different embodied practices, and how they project and subsequently negotiate the extent of the entry with regard to a continuation or a modification of the participation framework of the story. In order to do that, we focus on three telling relevant actions that are accomplished through co-teller-initiated entry: adding omitted elements (4.2.1), doing other-correction (4.2.2), and rendering one’s own side of the story (4.2.3).
4.2.1. Adding omitted elements

Charles Goodwin (1981:156-158) has noted that co-present participants with knowledge of the story monitor for omissions by the current teller and, sometimes, add that piece of information, thus making it a noticeable omission. Goodwin shows that the placement of an omitted element is carefully monitored by participants in the ongoing development of the story. They wait long enough to provide the element until the omission is made explicit by the current teller moving to a new part of the story (otherwise it is not yet an 'omission'), but also do it quickly enough that its relevance is not lost. Participants can also make use of these environments to deliver their own version of the story, sometimes in a competitive way. In what follows, we focus on some of the embodied practices that participants mobilize to add omitted elements and on how they make visible restricted coparticipation as opposed to rendering their own version of the story.

In example (5), the participants are María (MAR), from Spain, and Pablo (PAB), from Argentina, who are a couple visiting a mutual friend in Germany (Pedro, PED). They are telling their friend about the beginning of their relationship and their move to the Basque Country. After explaining how their relationship began, Pablo moves on to talk about the next part of the story (01), namely when Maria went to live with him and some of his family members. This is taken up by Maria as possibility to start a collaborative list of the people who were living together with them.

(5) 'With Marta' (ssat201801_09.00-09.20)

01 PAB: *+después te viniste a vivir con[MI:go; ] after that you came to live with me
     pab *gazes at MAR-->
     mar +gazes at PAB-->

02 MAR: [co (. ) y con el] CHA:to;
    wi  and with the Chato

03 c+on su [herMA:+no; ]
    with his brother
     mar--->+gazes to PED +gazes down-->

04 PAB: [y con mi herMA:+no]= vivíamos los tres,%
    and with my brother we lived the three of us
     ped %head nods--------------%

06 (0.9)

07 que* ahi tuvimos #16MUY bue[nas* Épocas, ]
    that then we had a very good time
     pab -->*gazes towards PED----------*gazes at MAR-->

08 MAR: $[y+ con #17CA:rla;]$ %and with Carla
     mar -->+gazes at PAB-->
     mar $..pointing gesture,$

09 con+ eh::
    with eh
     mar -->+gazes down-->

10 PAB: y con mi PRIma;=
    and with my cousin

and with my cousin
11 =CLAro. (0.3) of course

12 MAR: cuando vivimos +los CUAtro, +
when we were living the four of us
mar --+gazes at PAB+

13 +fue %como lo me% (. ) [o sea no sé;=no?]
it was like the be (. ) I mean I don’t know, right?
mar +gazes at PED--+gazes at PAB-->
ped %head nods---%

14 PED: [<<:-)> hh°]  

15 MAR: yo* [tengo] super buen re+cuerdo.
I have a very good memory of that
mar --+gazes towards PED-->
pab --+gazes towards PED-->

16 PAB: [si ]
yes

Maria participates in the list by including another name ('Chato', 02), with the same prosodic contour as the previous list element, and also adding a clarification element su herMA:no ('his brother', 03), while gazing at the recipient of the story, who confirms with head nods (05), thus maintaining an orientation to the storytelling activity. María’s coparticipation is ratified by Pablo, who confirms the clarification and adds a post-detailing component that closes the list ('we were living the three of us', 04). After a silence, Pablo moves on to an assessing segment of the story ('we had a very good time back then'), shifting his gaze back to the unknowing recipient (07, #16). Nevertheless, after the move to a new segment is made explicit, María comes in in overlap to add one more member who was also living with them, Carla, who was left out of the list (08). This can be described as a now or never moment for María (Satti submitted). If she doesn’t include Carla now, then Pablo will move on to assessing how good those times were and the place for adding the information about this person would be lost. This way, she has no choice but to initiate an early entry into the turn space of Pablo if she wants to add the missing information.

As María adds the missing element, she mobilizes different gestural resources to display how this element ought to be treated in regards to Pablo’s trajectory of the story, as well as her affective stance towards it. In order to embed her additional element to the story, she performs a gesture with the index finger extended neutral (palm vertical), used to distinguish "an additional object which was to be placed in some sort of relationship with the first" (Kendon 2004:207). She points at Pablo (08, #17), thereby indicating the relationship of this element to what he previously
The same time, she displays her affective stance toward this person by smiling, thus stating relevance of the omitted element for assessing the source events as 'good times' (07).

Through this embodied practice, she not only accomplishes the task of adding an element and stating its relevance, but also accounts for how coparticipation in the telling is organized. Although Maria halts the progressivity of the story and disaligns with Pablo’s initiation of the assessing segment, she does so in a way that makes recognizable for Pablo that she is not initiating a competing trajectory of the story. She accomplishes that by recycling the format of the collaborative list and linking back to the previous embodied participation framework, first gazing at Pablo and then adding a clarification element to the story recipient. Pablo seems to understand it as such, since he completes the format by adding the clarification for the story recipient y con mi PRIma (‘with my cousin’, 10), after which María resumes the assessing activity originally initiated by Pablo (12).

In (6), we have another case of an addition by the co-teller. In this extract, Lise (LIS) and François (FRA) recount their travels to New Zealand. Lise remembers their hiking tours in several national parks and is about to engage in a telling about their experience at the famous Milford Sound.

(6) 'One of the fjords' (fgoe201601_14.50-15.13)

01 LIS: c’est quand même TRÈS naturel,=
    but it’s still very natural
02  *=mÊme que si i il y a plEin de touRISTES,
    even though there are loads of tourists
  lis *gazes towards FRA-->
03  [c’e:st] encore euh ‘bIen protéGÉ,*
    it’s still uh well protected
  lis -->*averts gaze *
04 FRA: [hm ]
    hm
05 LIS: et [et bien]
    and and well
06 FRA:  [ouAi$ $ouais c’est super% protéGÉ ouais;
    yes it’s super protected yes
  fra %nods head-------------%}
07 LIS: °h et +du coup+ voilÀ on est allés eu:h (0.7) voilÀ au:
    and so we went to uh well to
  lis +hand up+
    <<creaky> au: au:> *Milford SOUND,> +(0.5) +
    to to Milford Sound
  lis *gazes down towards FRA-->
  lis +head forward+
08 on a faIt le::__#18euhm [(-) ((clicks)) ]
    we did the uhm
09 FRA:  [qui$_%est un des] #19%FJORDES,__$%
    that is one of the fiords
  fra $at story recipient-------$LIS
  fra %right h forward% retract %
  lis -->*
After stating the reference to the location, Lise launches a search for the name of the trail they hiked, which is recognizable by the lengthening and hesitation marker and the click (08). As opposed to the previous example, where the co-teller initiated the turn in overlap, François uses this halt in progressivity to enter the turn-in-progress and to expand on the previous utterance. Instead of providing the solution to the word search, he adds information on the location reference 'Milford sound'. He does so by expanding on Lise’s prior turn with a clarifying appendor format (see Sacks 1995, I:661). The appendor qui est un des FJORDES (09), here a relative clause, is structurally dependent on the prior turn and displays a high degree of understanding (see Hayashi et al. 2013:31). By using such a collaborative syntax, the co-teller briefly takes the floor without starting a new turn, minimizing the disruption to the progressivity of the unfolding stretch of talk (see Heritage 2007). It is important to note that François does not address his contribution at the teller, but he gazes at the (invisible) story recipient and gestures in their direction (#19).

The multimodal design of the co-teller’s contribution suggests that adding an omitted element here serves as recipient design (see Sacks et al. 1974:727), providing the unknowing story recipient with relevant information. As François produces the appendor, he performs a palm up open hand gesture toward the story recipient and directs his gaze at them, ‘offering’ omitted information (Kendon 2004:275). Through this readjustment of the embodied participation framework, François locally changes his participation role from knowing story recipient to active co-teller. Despite this undisruptive design of François’ utterance, Lise does not immediately
resume the telling. She acknowledges her co-teller’s contribution, nods, shrugs her shoulders, and lifts both hands (11, #20). Emphasizing her shoulder shrug, she performs a brief palm up open hand gesture with both hands, acknowledging her co-teller’s contribution and possibly displaying that she is not too happy about his unsolicited entry. She then produces two more TCUs, reusing the same syntactic structure and elaborating on François’ contribution (12, 14). She thereby acknowledges the previous omission and the need to provide further background information before resuming the telling. The co-teller’s self-initiated coparticipation, albeit designed to be conducive to the telling-in-progress, changes its trajectory and significantly delays its progressivity.

In both of the examples, the co-teller carefully monitors the development of the telling in order to contribute an omitted element. Omissions are only made explicit after the teller moves on to a new segment of the telling. Co-tellers thus need to bear in mind the possibility that their contributions can be late and potentially out of place. In order to make visible that no competitive talk is taking place, they design their contributions to be structurally and semantically linked to a prior utterance. In example 5 (With Marta), the co-teller produces a belated list item, expanding on the previously produced collaborative list. In example 6 (One of the fjords), the co-teller produces a minimally disruptive utterance, providing background information for the unknowing recipient. Despite their collaborative designs, these interventions are consequential for the subsequent development of the interaction and they change the trajectory of the telling, even producing a momentary change of tellers beyond the addition in (5) and an embodied side sequence in (6). The embodied participation frameworks within which the actions of adding omitted elements are accomplished contribute to displaying that tellership is not being challenged and that participation in the telling is conditional to the repairing of the omission.

4.2.2. Affiliative other-corrections

In spite of the widely documented preference for self-correction, collaborative storytelling has been early referred to as an environment where other-correction frequently occurs (Sacks 1995; Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks 1977; Lerner 1992, 1993). The use of other-corrections in this context has been described both as affiliative and problematic, depending on different aspects of its occurrence. Regarding its more affiliative uses, it has been observed as part of a listening technique to deal with the consequences of ‘spouse talk’ (Sacks 1995 II:443) and as a vehicle to become a team with the current teller in the delivery of the story (Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks 1977:380). Furthermore, Lerner (1993:230) observes that, while being members of a party as tellers, other-correction is partly done in favor of the party thus resembling self-correction and relaxing the dispreference for other-correction. Nevertheless, Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977:380) also observe a potential relationship of other-correction to disagreement, since, depending on its design and the sequential implications of its occurrence, it can be treated as such by participants. Thus, even in the environment of co-telling, where other-correction may turn up to be more ‘tolerated’ by participants, correctors must still make an effort to achieve an affiliative correction in favor of the party. In this section, we examine some of the embodied practices that participants mobilize to accomplish affiliative
other-correction and to make recognizable that their self-initiated entry is not being used as a vehicle for a transfer of tellership. Example (7) will illustrate how participants achieve affiliative, minimally disruptive other-correction. In Example (8), we observe how other-correction considerably disrupts the ongoing telling, but ends up providing a resource for joint laughter.

In example (7), Valeria (VAL, on the left) and María (MAR, on the right), who are twin sisters, are telling their uncle Tato about the time they traveled alone through Bolivia to visit their ill grandma. They arrived in the middle of the night to Oruro where they had to change buses in order to reach their final destination.

(7) 'Four in the morning' (ssot201702_01.39-01.52)

01 VAL: hemos ido en los surubís de oRuro,
   we went in the Surubís (a type of transport) from Oruro
02      a llalLaGu.a.
   to llalagua
03      (0.8)
04    +*y oh (..) ay orUro no conoCEmos-
   and oh we don’t know oruro
   val +*gazes towards TAT-->
   mar *gazes at VAL-->
05    hemos #21llegado* tipo !CIN!co,
   we arrived like at five
   mar -->*gazes down-->
06 MAR: !C*U%[A!tro[#22 de la % ] [mañA#23na.]
   four in the morning
   mar -->*gazes towards bowl with crackers-->
   mar %brush away gesture%..picks up cracker-->
07 VAL: *[y nos han multa+DO.]
   and we’ve got a ticket
   val -->*gazes at TAT-----+gazes at MAR-->
08       [aJÁ. ]
   aja
09       n[os ha+ multado el:] de +la f1Ota;
   the driver gave us the ticket
   val -->*gazes at TAT------+gazes at MAR-->
10 MAR: [o %TRES,#24 ]
   or three
   mar -->%takes cracker to mouth-->
11      m*hm#25.
   mar-->*gazes at VAL-->
12      %(0.6)
   mar-->%eats cracker-->
13 VAL: y nosOtras qué haCEmos;=<<all> qué hacemos;=
   and us what do we do, what do we do
14    =y hemos+ Ido caminAndo asÍ::? (0.4)
   and we went kind went walking
   val -->*gazes towards TAT>-->
In (06), before Valeria starts elaborating on what happened to them while in Oruro, María corrects the time of their arrival. The correction by María comes in overlap with Valeria’s continuation of the story, who at the moment of the correction is still oriented towards the recipient. Coparticipation in the story is therefore initiated by María. Although this correction is clearly disaligning, it is not oriented to as disaffiliative. On the contrary, it seems to be oriented to as affiliative. The claim that it was four (06) or three (10) o’clock in the morning, instead of five (05), actually supports the embedded stance of the story as an adventure that encompasses the arrival in the middle of the night to an unknown city for two young females traveling alone. Three or four o’clock could be considered even deeper into the night as five o’clock, which is closer to rush hour for early workers.

Evidence that the other-correction affiliates with the affective stance displayed by the main teller is provided by its multimodal design. María prosodically emphasizes ‘four’, similarly to how Valeria produces ‘five’, and simultaneously performs a brushing away gesture (#22), which has been described as a way of performing negative assessments (Bressem/Müller 2014), in this case mirroring the stance of the teller towards the time of the arrival as being a bad time. The fact that María further extends the correction to three (10) can be considered evidence that the correction has already been treated as affiliative by Valeria when she quickly acknowledges the correction (08).

The correction by María is also not oriented to as a potential bid for a transfer of tellership. This restricted entry is interactionally achieved by the embodied practices that María mobilizes while performing the correction. In the precise moment before initiating the correction, María turns her gaze away from Valeria and directs it towards a bowl filled with crackers that is on the opposite side (#22). She also moves directly from the brushing away gesture to pick up a cracker in the bowl (#23, #24), thus making herself unavailable and projecting an action, namely eating, that is incompatible with a transfer of tellership. Subsequently, María produces a continuer (11) and goes back to monitoring position by gazing at Valeria (#25), thus offering the possibility for the continuation of the story, which in fact happens (13).

Example (7) confirms that other-correcting can be affiliative and only minimally disrupt the progressivity of the ongoing telling. Example (8) below shows a considerably more disruptive other-correction. While his entry into the current teller’s turn space is clearly disaligning, the co-teller mobilizes different embodied practices to make it recognizable as an affiliative other-correction that provides a resource for
joint laughter. In this extract, Elise (ELI) and Manuel (MAN) tell their mutual friend LIN about the day of the Gay Pride in Montreal. In order to understand this example, it is important to know that Elise is French and Manuel is Quebecois. In the French-Canadian community, it is well known that French people have a tendency to mock the Quebecois accent and vocabulary, oftentimes giving unsolicited advice on 'correct' French. In this example, Manuel inverts this dynamic and uses other-correction to tease his girlfriend.

(8) 'Gay Pride' (flin201601_09.40-10.13)

01 ELI: %c'était aussi le jour%  
  it was also the day
  de la gay $prIDE_euh à_euhm montréAL, %*  
  of the gay pride uh at uhm Montreal
  eli $gazes at story recipient LIN$
  eli %scatches her nose----%  
  man *gazes towards ELI-------------------------------------*
  02 (0.9)
  03 (%(click)) Et (.) le SOIR,=
  and (.) at night
  eli $gazes down-->
  04 =il y avAit $dans le quartier #26GAI [il$ y avait- (-) ]
  there was in the gay neighborhood there was
  eli -->$gazes at LIN--------$gazes at MAN
  05 MAN: *[on dit parade GAIE-]#27
  one says gay parade
  man -->*gazes at ELI-->
  06 <<p> en franÇAIS;>  
  in French
  07 ELI: $en para (.) en françois% on dit [parade ] GAIE,% (0.5)
  in para (.) in French one says gay parade (0.5)
  eli %turns back to LIN------%rolls eyes--------------%
  08 MAN: 
  [(laugh)])]*
  man -->*smiles--->
  09 ELI: Et_euh: $dAn:::s (.) #28dans$ +le quartIER> *eu:h-$
  and uh in (.) in the neighborhood uh
  eli $gazes at LIN--------$gazes down-------------$
  man +turns to ELI+
  man *ELI-->
  10 MAN:  *la parAde de la fierTé;§ (0.5)#29
  the Parade de la Fierté (Pride Parade) (0.5)
  man -->*
  eli $gazes at MAN-->
  11 <<p> j'arrÊte de +t'interROMPRE+;>
  I stop interrupting you
  man +right hand up+
  12 ELI: <<p> merci;§ (0.4)*
  thanks (0.4)
  eli -->$averts gaze
  man -->*averts gaze
Elise introduces the topic of the telling sequence by using the English expression gay pride (01). As she begins the telling sequence, Manuel enters the turn in overlap and initiates other-correction by providing the French expression parade GAIE (05) which he claims to be the correct French expression (06). Elise acknowledges her co-teller’s correction and repeats it almost verbatim (07). She resumes the story at the same place she has left it (‘the gay neighborhood’, 09), when Manuel enters the turn a second time, producing another corrected version of the repairable expression parade de la fierTÉ (10). This time, his other-correction is followed by the meta-comment j’arrÊte de t’interROMPRE (11), which accounts for the disruption of the story and also displays an orientation to Elise as main teller. Elise thanks him (12) and they both engage in joint laughter before she once more resumes the telling at the same place where it was halted (‘gay neighborhood’, 13).

Manuel’s double other-correction is consequential for the trajectory of the telling in that it occasions two side sequences, in which Elise responds to the correction. These other-initiated side sequences also manifest in the embodied participation framework.
At the beginning of the sequence, Elise gazes at the addressed story recipient while her co-teller monitors her talk (#26). During both other-corrections, Manuel gazes at Elise and establishes mutual gaze, briefly changing the embodied participation framework as the story progressivity is halted (#27, #28). When Manuel first enters the turn (05), his other-correction consists of two intonational units, the second of which is only produced after the embodied participation framework has been modified. Elise’s gaze response and smile display that Manuel’s disalignment is not perceived as too disruptive. Elise re-establishes the original participation framework after both other-corrections, gazing at the addressee as she attempts to resume the telling, while Manuel assumes monitoring position (#28, #30).

Through gaze, the co-teller explicitly addresses the teller in this example (rather than the story recipient), making a response by the teller relevant and occasioning temporary rearrangements of the embodied participation framework. It is important to note here that the co-teller’s disalignment and other-correction does not merely aim to correct a repairable expression. Rather, the co-teller uses the infrastructure of overt and disruptive other-correction to playfully tease his girlfriend, who recognizes the affectionate nature of his entry into the telling and who responds accordingly (12, 14). His bodily orientation toward Elise makes his entry recognizable as an activity within the conversational party. In fact, Elise appears to quickly recognize Manuel’s other correction as a teasing activity or jocular mockery (see Haugh 2010), which becomes a resource for laughter and for performing coupledom.

In this section, we hope to have shown that affiliative corrections are complex interactional achievements that require participants to mobilize different multimodal resources in order to display a) that the correction ought to be treated as affiliative towards the stance of the telling and b) that other-correction is not being used as a device for a transfer of tellership. The fact that participants have specific practices for doing affiliative correction accounts for the fact that this type of correction is only one of several ways of other-correcting and must be made recognizable as such. Our findings thus support previous studies (e.g., Lerner 1992) that suggest that other-corrections in collaborative storytelling can make different courses of action relevant, ranging from affiliative corrections in favor of the party to disagreement and bids for tellership.

4.2.3. Rendering one’s own side

In all of the examples above, participants deal with actions that have been described as potentially projecting limited or conditional entry. Lerner also observes that, occasionally, "tellers as actual co-tellers, enter to continue the story" (1992:261). Although this could happen with any next element of the story, Lerner points out that this frequently occurs when participants render their own side of the events or tell their own actions in the story. Whereas co-tellers claim their epistemic access to the telling through correcting and adding elements, they assert an entitlement to speak for themselves when rendering their own side (see Lerner 2004; Goffman 1979; C. Goodwin 2007a). These entries by the co-teller usually entail a change of tellership and a rearrangement of the participation framework. However, the extent of this change can be negotiated during the co-teller’s contribution and an orientation to main-tellership could still be displayed throughout. This can be observed in Example (9).
Flor (FLO), an English translator and Daniel (DAN), a lawyer, are an Argentinian couple living together. While they had their friend Gabriela (GAL) for a visit, they tell her about one day that Daniel had the day off and decided to sneak into an English translation seminar with Flor. The goal was to learn more about Flor’s profession, even if he doesn’t speak English himself. The event was supposed to be a master class full of people, but it turned out to be a very intimate class with around ten participants. At the onset of this fragment, Flor is describing how Daniel, who barely speaks English, was getting extremely nervous that he might get an assignment from the teacher.

(9) ‘Getting tense’ (sgal201801_04.33-05.00)

01 FLO: y lo veo a Daniel, and I see Daniel
02 como muy serio; like very serious
03 y muy nervioso, and very nervous
gal *..smiles and frowns-->
04 pero mirando la hoja; but looking at the sheet
05 y haciendo que ((laughs)) #31+leía, and pretending to ((laughs)) read
dan +gazes at GAL-->
06 se <<dim> acariciaba la barba así.> he was touching his beard like
07 DAN: <<:-)> [y porque en* cualquier momento $me* iba a hacer]
    and because in any moment he was going to
gal -->* *smiles frowns-->
gal $,,head nods-->
    una+ pregunta a mí [el tí;p{o;=#y:::#32}a] . ask me a question the guy, and
dan -->+gazes down--------->+G.atGAL+gazes at FLO-->
gal --+head nods..>$
08 FLO: [(laughs)]
09 GAL: [(laughs)]
10 DAN: [o sea ya era: ¡TEN!sa la cosa. ] I mean it was already getting tense
dan -->+gazes at GAL-->
11 FLO: [(laughs)]
12 GAL: [(laughs)]
13 DAN: [y%:#33: %]
    and
dan -->+gazes at FLO-->
dan %deictic nod%
14 FLO: [y:: ]
    and
15 GAL: [(laughs)]
16 FLO: BUE*no;=
    anyway
gal -->*
17 =y yo me empiEzo a tenTar- (-) and I start to laugh hard
Flor describes how Daniel was behaving during this uncomfortable situation (01-06). She introduces this part of the story in present tense (01), which is a resource for dramatization in storytelling (Couper-Kuhlen/Selting 2018:9). Subsequently, she animates Daniel pretending to read the exercise sheet provided by the teacher (#31), bodily restaging his conduct (see Goffman 1974). In this way, she presents Daniel’s conduct as a laughable, which is already foreshadowed by her with multiple embodied resources and reciprocated by the story recipient, who starts smiling and frowning early in line 3. Before the story recipient verbally reacts, Daniel enters the turn in overlap in order to account for his nervousness, recalling that he could have gotten a question at any moment, exposing him not speaking any English. Accounting for one’s own behavior is an action that is frequently accomplished through rendering one’s own part and usually warrants initiating entry (Lerner 1992:265). This type of entry is usually accomplished through a change of tellers. Although, in this example, there is indeed a momentary transfer of tellership, it can be argued that Daniel, through different embodied practices, orients to Flor as main teller throughout this sequence and projects only limited entry into the story.

Firstly, he displays an affiliative stance toward his behavior as laughable by smiling during the whole TCU. In this way, he legitimizes Flor’s animation of him, which in this context could potentially be face-threatening, and supports her stance, avoiding competitive stances towards the event and thus making recognizable that they are still to be treated as a party. This is confirmed by both Flor and Gabriela laughing (08, 09). Secondly, it can be argued that Daniel orients to Flor as the main teller of the story during his own telling. He shifts his gaze to Flor (07, #32) while ending the TCU with a turn final y (‘and’) with lengthening, i.e., a trail-off conjunctural that provides a space for negotiating speaker transition (see Jefferson 1983). In this way, Daniel provides an opportunity for her to take the floor immediately after his intervention. Instead, Flor continues to laugh and Daniel continues with the story himself (10). However, he does so while still gazing at Flor, maintaining an embodied participation framework that allows Flor to easily take the floor again and continue the telling. Moreover, he projects no further elaboration of his account by first initiating his turn with o sea (10), which can have a summarizing function in Spanish (Briz Gómez 2001), and then completing the TCU with falling intonation. This is confirmed by the participants themselves, who consider the account complete and almost simultaneously initiate the continuation of the story by projecting the next element with y (‘and’, 13, 14). Lastly, while Daniel utters his y-initiated continuation, he engages in mutual gaze with Flor and produces a deictic head nod with an upwards movement, yielding the floor to Flor (#33), who then resumes the telling (16).

In this example, we observe how the co-teller enters the turn in order to provide his perspective on specific events and to account for his behavior in the telling. His
contribution to the telling provides multiperspectivity and a source for joint laughter, while his embodied conduct allows for the smooth integration of his my-side telling into the ongoing telling sequence. Thus, co-tellers can project limited entry into the telling and maintain an orientation to main-tellership from one of the participants, even when delivering extended parts of the story, like accounting for their behavior. In this way, they display doing assistance instead of incipient tellership and preserve the relevance of the ongoing participation framework.

5. Summary

In this paper, we have examined both teller-initiated and co-teller-initiated coparticipation practices. Word searches and requests for verification are two recognizable action types through which current tellers solicit conditional co-teller entry. In joint word searches and requests for verification, the progressivity of the turn-in-progress is halted and the current teller briefly changes the embodied participation framework in order to establish an action space for coparticipation. Such changes are achieved primarily through gaze shifts toward the co-teller, hand gestures, and changes in body posture. When the co-teller immediately provides the sought-for response, i.e., the sought-for word, an acknowledgment token, or a head nod, the teller re-establishes the prior participation framework and resumes the telling. If the co-teller does not immediately respond, the teller can pursue co-teller response by reformatting their turn or by adding embodied resources, such as touch. As we have seen in our examples, teller-initiated coparticipation always bears the potential of (temporarily) altering the trajectory of the telling-in-progress and of reallocating tellership.

When co-tellers initiate entry into the turn-in-progress, they proactively change their participation role from being a knowing story recipient to actively co-telling the story, thereby asserting their entitlement to the telling. Adding omitted elements, other-correcting and rendering their own side of the story are recognizable actions that require co-tellers to initiate entry into the turn space of the teller. Self-initiated co-teller entry is always disaligning, in that it interrupts the telling-in-progress, and it is therefore potentially problematic. In order to accomplish these actions, co-tellers make visible a change in the embodied participation framework that contributes to mutually displaying that no competitive talk is taking place. This is achieved through both turn-constructional and embodied resources. Co-tellers design their contributions to be structurally and semantically linked to a previous utterance, thus displaying a continuation of the teller’s trajectory. Through gaze and body orientation, co-tellers make their entry recognizable both to the current teller and to the story recipient as an activity within the conversational party. Even when securing the floor for a multi-unit turn, such as by rendering their own side, gaze and body position contribute to maintaining the previous embodied participation framework and displaying limited entry. Through gesture and prosody, co-tellers can also express an affiliative stance that supports the current teller’s delivery of the story and forwards its overall production. In sum, co-teller-initiated forms of coparticipation are always disaligning and potentially problematic, since they disrupt the progressivity of the telling. When co-tellers do not want to compete for tellership, they can mobilize specific embodied practices to secure affiliation and show an orientation to main-tellership by the current teller.
6. Discussion

Throughout our analyses, we have observed that coparticipation is intimately linked to the progressivity of the telling activity. In teller-initiated coparticipation local halts of progressivity, such as hesitation markers, break-offs, and repetitions furnish entry spaces for the co-teller. Through gaze, gesture, and body posture, tellers can either readjust or maintain the embodied participation framework and mobilize co-teller participation to different degrees. We observed that teller-initiated coparticipation is oftentimes designed to only minimally disrupt the turn-in-progress and forward the overall telling sequence. When co-tellers initiate coparticipation, they almost always halt the progressivity of the telling sequence and occasion a change of the embodied participation framework. Although co-tellers can design their turns in ways that are minimally disruptive, their coparticipation can make relevant responsive side sequences and they therefore potentially change the trajectory of the telling.

We have explored the complex participation role that is the 'co-teller', i.e., the knowing participant who is currently not telling the story. Throughout a collaborative telling sequence, co-tellers have various possible ways to (dis)align or (dis)affiliate with the ongoing telling, to engage with other present participants, and to shape the trajectory of the telling. We have shown how locally relevant forms of coparticipation are achieved both by the current teller and the co-teller through changes of the embodied participation framework. Within this framework, telling-relevant actions are accomplished and made recognizable for story recipients. Our analysis suggests that participants navigate the complexity of their participation roles by monitoring each other throughout the telling activity and by negotiating forms of coparticipation when specific next actions become relevant. These complex forms of involvement are accomplished locally and multimodally throughout the telling sequence and they shed light on the contingent achievement of co-telling.
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