Gesprächsforschung - Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion (ISSN 1617-1837)
Ausgabe 24 (2023), Seite 195-215 (www.gespraechsforschung-ozs.de)

Winter Conference in Summer: Report on the International Conference on Conversation Analysis (ICCA) from June 26th to July 2nd 2023 in Brisbane/Meanjin (Australia)

Laurenz Kornfeld / Christina Mack
Jowita Rogowska / Mojenn Schubert [1]

1. Introduction

From June 26th to July 2nd 2023 the *International Conference on Conversation Analysis* (ICCA) took place in Brisbane/Meanjin, Australia – after a long pause due to the Covid-pandemic and for the first time in the southern hemisphere. About 350 participants from about 50 different countries attended the conference. This year's ICCA came up with 36 panels and about 300 papers that were presented. Four plenary speakers have been invited and 24 pre-conference workshops took place. On Wednesday evening Ilana Mushin, in her role as conference chair, officially opened ICCA. The President of the *International Society of Conversation Analysis* (ISCA), Tanya Stivers, also welcomed all participants. To get acquainted with the indigenous culture of Queensland, the opening ceremony was enriched with a highly impressive dance performance by First Nations people. After the official inauguration the international community met at the Welcome Reception to look forward together to the days ahead with many opportunities for exchange and networking.

As it will become clear throughout this report, the research topics revolved around not only classic CA concepts, but also importantly concerned embodiment, which continued the line of past conferences (Dix 2019). Another aspect that has been highlighted was conflict and social norms. Due to personal capacities, we can only present a selection of presentations within the scope of this conference report. The selection was influenced by the personal interest of the authors and should not be understood as rating in any sense.

2. Plenaries and Panels

2.1. CA classics and innovations

The fact that many speakers chose to present on verbal turns in second position – in response to what came directly before – made it clear that the study of second actions is still a popular subject among conversation analysts and that it continues to offer rich insights into the finely tuned mechanisms of sequential organization. Many researchers looked at this specific locus in conversation to discuss how and why interlocutors correct others, respond to news and repeat what has just been said.

An important contribution to this classical area of CA-research was made by *Galina Bolden* (Rutgers School of Communication and Information). She dedicated her plenary talk to the phenomenon of other-initiated other-repair: *Correcting others in other-initiated other-repair sequences*. Although repair has been a major CA-topic for a long time, Bolden presented on a repair practice that is still not well

[1] The authors have contributed equally to this work and share first authorship.

understood. She referred to this practice as *other-correction*, because the "other" self-selects to correct what has been said before. She explored the different nuances and complexities of other-correction in conversation and elaborated on the necessity to self-select in order to launch the repair. Furthermore, Bolden focused on questions like: what occasions other-correction and what do participants accomplish in correcting others? She also referred to the preference of self-correction (Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks 1977) over other-correction. She showed cases where problematic aspects of another's talk become interactionally relevant. The action orientation to such "other-correction" sequences tells a lot about intersubjectivity and also about normativity as participants' concerns.

Another second action, repetition, was investigated in the panel *Repetitions as/in responsive actions across different languages* which was organized by *Marja Leena Sorjonen* (University of Helsinki) and *Galina Bolden*. While other-corrections typically deal with problematic moments in conversation, it became clear that other-repetitions occur in a variety of contexts – as everything can potentially be repeated. Building on existing work on repetitions that has been conducted for specific languages and specific types of responsive actions, the panel offered a more holistic picture by bringing together research on different aspects of the phenomenon. Amongst others, the panelists gave insight into how repetitions are realized in typologically diverse languages, just as they showed what kind of functions repetitions fulfill in particular settings and sequential environments. In this report only the first session of the panel is described.

Elwys De Stefani (Heidelberg University): investigated data from driving lessons and dedicated his talk to *Other-repetitions following instructions: a multimodal account of Italian talk-in-interaction*. His collection of cases encompassed not only instances of formally identical repetitions but also repetitions that modified the formal design of the previous turn, for example taking a perspective shift from a 2nd-person form to a 1st-person form. In connection to such shifts, but also to the bodily conduct of the participants, De Stefani highlighted the sensitivity that formats of other-repetitions show towards both the concrete physical environment and the sequential embedding in which they are produced.

What can happen when other-repetitions are produced by more than one participant was illustrated in *Ilana Mushin's* and *Rod Gardner's* (University of Queensland) talk about *Repeated responses to questions about traditional knowledge: Doing language documentation*. They analyzed the interaction between speakers of an Australian First Nations language, namely *Garrwa*, and a non-indigenous botanist. The focus was on one quite complex question-answer-sequence in which the responsive turn was followed by multiple repetitions. After having investigated the possible functions of these repetitions (e.g. display alignment, reveal an epistemic status), the authors raised questions about speaker selection and, finally, gave an interpretation of this response realization as a manifestation of successively developing consensus.

Rasmus Persson (Uppsala University) (*Repetitional responses to requests for permission in French talk-in-interaction*) elucidated what repetitions do in the context of granting permission. He collocated his considerations about repetitions within a wider range of permission-granting responses that encompassed other turn designs, too. The author stated that, while unmarked polar interjections miss to display sufficient deontic agency in order to grant permission, repetitional responses

can do this job – just as upgraded interjections and some specific modal verb constructions can. Persson pointed out that, in the context of deontic agency, it makes a crucial difference which part of the request is repeated in the granting. What all grantings with repetitional design have in common, on the other hand, is that they underscore the agency of the responding participant.

Extending the research on repetitions to a different lingo-cultural environment, *Kaoru Hayano* (Japan Women's University) and *Makoto Hayashi* (Nagoya University) talked about *Repetitional disconfirming responses to polar questions in Japanese conversation*. In samples of informal talk, they focused on repetitional disconfirmations realized in the specific format of predicate repeats with polarity reversal. After some considerations about the markedness of this form in comparison to interjection disconfirmations, they came to speak of a pivotal analytic distinction: namely, the fact that the preference set by a question can be either formal or social. This was illustrated by cases in which these two types of preference did not coincide. Altogether, the authors proposed a set of interactional contingencies that show a connection to the use of marked, assertive realizations of disconfirming responses.

How a second action is used across different languages was also relevant for the panel *Cross-linguistic perspectives on responses to news*, which was organized by *Michal Marmorstein* (Hebrew University of Jerusalem), *Beatrice Szczepek Reed* (King's College London) and *Xiaoting Li* (University of Alberta). Responses to new information are mainly concerned with epistemic issues. Following different kinds of first actions, such as informings and tellings, responses show how the epistemic transition from "unknown" to "known" proceeds and also how the unknowing party assesses the newly gained knowledge. Taking into account the language-specific affordances provided by response markers and the potentially high diversity in this regard, the panel gave researchers the opportunity to present contrastive work (especially in less researched languages and languages other than English, such as German, Mandarin and Japanese).

Alexandra Gubina (Leibniz-Institute for the German Language, Mannheim) and *Emma Betz* (University of Waterloo) presented a study on *Marking something as news(worthy): Prosodically marked 'no' in German* in mundane and institutional interaction. In their analysis they focused on *nein/nee*-responses to new information that the speakers didn't or couldn't know. They discussed functions of these response tokens and asked what kind of relation is observable between the news-type, prosody and embodiment. They showed that *nein/nee* in the service of marking an affective stance, as a news receipt, usually comes when the news is negatively valenced and non-beneficial. It may then include prosodic features such as lengthening or increased loudness. *Nein/nee* can also display 'disbelief', being possibly followed by additional newsmarks and prosodic features (e.g. low onset). As a newsmark, *nein/nee* rather implicate an account or/and an expansion.

In addition to lively discussions on these classical areas of CA-research, the conference also provided an opportunity to explore theoretical and methodological innovations. In their panel on *Interactional Histories and Conversation Analysis*, *Arnulf Deppermann* (IDS Mannheim) and *Pentti Haddington* (University of Oulu) deliberately moved away from the narrow sequential context of first and second action and instead turned to larger structures and relationships that are successively built over time. The panel adopted a longitudinal perspective and thus dealt with a more global approach to interactional phenomena: Different kinds of interactional

histories, for example such histories within one recording or over several recordings and within a specific period of time.

The panel was kicked off by *Simona Pekarek Doehler* (University of Neuchâtel) and *Klara Skogmyr Marian* (Stockholm University) with their talk *On the reflexive relation between interactional practices and social rapports: Responding to assessments over iterative encounters*. They showed how the language competence of a L2-learner developed over time in assessment sequences and how the participant developed her own level of speech competence and also interactional competence for taking part in the assessment sequences, which were initiated by a native speaker. They examined assessment sequences in different recordings over a time period of some months and explored how the competence of the L2-speaker develops.

Following that, there was a presentation on crisis management training by *Iira Rautianen* and *Tuire Oittinen* (University of Oulu; *Developing (good) interactional practices for teamwork and collaboration in crisis management training*). The authors showed how participants develop linguistic and interactional skills over more than one recording. As English is the lingua franca in these crisis management training, it is obligatory for all trainees to develop and improve both skill sets in order to learn how to work together as a team. The authors showed that the participants prioritized individual task work over teamwork, but over time they increased their ability to achieve both simultaneously and thereby work more effectively together.

The following study presented by *Pentti Haddington*, *Antti Kamunen*, *Tuire Oittinen* and *Iira Rautianen* (University of Oulu) also used data from the UN military observer training (*Change in joint interactional seeing: Noticing episodes in UN military observer training*). This presentation focused on the successive development of skills in dealing with specific tasks, in this case the use of noticings, over the period of one or more interactions within this setting. The authors focused on different episodes when the UN team notices military activity. As the teams change every day, the authors first showed how the accomplishment of noticing develops over the day, to then examine how the interactional and linguistic skills develop over time.

Lucien Tisserand (University of Lyon) presented data from simulation training for healthcare professionals in her talk *Simulated work and its debriefing: prospective and retrospective orientations*. He demonstrated how the doctors and their assistants interact with each other during the simulation training and how they connect this simulation training to its debriefing. The data suggests that participants orient themselves both pro- and retrospectively to the accountability of the interaction because their actions are evaluated later (during debriefing) and all participants share the same interactional history as members of the training, which has practical purposes for the debriefing.

The second session of the day dealt with data from psychotherapy and theater rehearsals. *Arnulf Deppermann* and *Alexandra Gubina* spoke about shared histories and thus shared knowledge between psychotherapists and their patients and how they use the shared and common histories over the time of a therapy (*Interactional histories and person reference: Changes over the course of a psychotherapy*). They showed how the patient's verbal means to refer to the same person change over the interactional history of the therapy. Most importantly, the found that non-adjacent re-references to the same person in sequence-initial positions in later sequences and

events regularly use demonstrative and definite reference, often accompanied by pointing and palm-up open-hand gestures.

The talk by *Bernadetta Janusz* (Jagellonian University, Cracow) and *Anssi Peräkylä* (University of Helsinki) dealt with the topic of losing children and how patients (or parents) refer to the death of the child (*The transformation of ambiguity in couple therapy: references to the deceased child after perinatal loss*). The authors examined how parents refer to the lost child during couple therapy. Mainly there are interactional trajectories that lead from impersonal to personal ways of referring to the child. The authors argued that this referential shift contributes to the parents' momentary display of their bond with the child.

In the last talk of this session, *Axel Schmidt* and *Arnulf Deppermann* (IDS Mannheim) showed data from theater rehearsals and focused on the development of referential expressions for one specific theatrical figure in the rehearsal (*An interactional history of referring to an embodied action – subsequent references to a figure in a series of theater rehearsals*). Lexical changes in referring to the figure over the interactional history are tied both to the emergence of common ground among the participants and to reconceptualizations of the referent over the interactional history. Subsequent references to the same referent lead not to stable, conventionalized expressions that are reused but participants change expressions referring to the same referent systematically in order to develop the play.

The last session of the panel started with a talk by *Hanh Nguyen* (University of Hawaii, Manoa) and *Taiane Malabarba* (University of Potsdam) in which they described the development of the pronunciation of one specific word (*massage*) in a holiday resort in Thailand (*The persistence of interactional history in service encounters with different co-participants*). They explored different phonetic patterns that developed over time, which also matter for the understanding and thereby the interaction itself. Interestingly, the co-participants change and thereby influence the pronunciation of the one word by the same participant. The authors showed how the sequences around the targeted word matter over time and have an impact and also achieve a change in the pronunciation.

Lastly, *Agnes Löfgren* (Linköping University) showed data from opera rehearsals and focused on the development of proposals over the time of a rehearsal (*From describing to depicting: the interactional history of proposals at opera rehearsals*). She showed that at the beginning, the participants tend to describe figures and proposals, while later in the rehearsals they tend to depict their character in, for instance, lying down or showing/singing something. As all participants share the knowledge of earlier descriptions of the same scene, depicting later seems appropriate and sufficient to refer to specific scenes or figures.

2.2. Body, Time and Space

Numerous contributions revealed a visibly increasing research interest in the body, time and space. The body can feel, smell, taste and memorize. We touch and we are being touched by others. We are then making sense of the felt. We focus, we learn, we experience, we move, we manipulate objects and we show, continuously making sense of what is shown. When, for how long and *why that now*? We form action based on the seen, the heard and the felt, taking into account the temporality of the

action. In this section we collected contributions that addressed embodiment, spatiality, and temporality.

The social organization of touch was addressed in the plenary talk by *Xiaoting Li* (University of Alberta). Li showed different practices for one of the simplest and shortest embodied engagements between participants: the touch (see also Li 2020). Using Chinese data, she pursued the question of how touch is organized and implemented in non-intimate everyday interaction. Different features matter for the interpretation of touch: e.g. type and intensity (brief vs. sustained touch), vis-a-vis bodily orientation of the participants towards each other or spatial possibilities to touch one another. In her talk she focused on brief touch, which most of the times can be seen as gentle while only 7% of all attempts were recognized as forceful. She discussed different functions of touch in interaction: requesting engagement, indexing intimacy, marking sudden remembering or recalling of information, seeking affiliation and more. The main focus was on the most common touch-function that Li observed: requesting engagement. Touch is physically recognizable (and therefore receivable) for participants, regardless of visual and verbal resources. This allows a course of action that may stop an ongoing activity before its completion. After or while being touched, the gaze of the *touchee* shifts to the toucher, thereby the participation framework changes and is established in a new constellation by mutual gaze and the body-orientation towards each other. Touch has been considered as a possible way to request a change in action and to request engagement. In the conclusion, Li addressed general sequential functions of touch and drew connections between touch and kinesthesia, as touch is a significant element of interaction, because it is physically recognizable for both active and passive participants. She emphasized the functional potentials of touch and the interplay of different resources during interactions.

Of course, interlocutors can also use their body in interaction without touching each other. In his plenary talk *Pointing it out Joe Blythe* (Macquarie University) presented on pointing as a central problem-solving resource known to language communities around the world. Blythe argued that the effectiveness of pointing can be explained with reference to the F-formation system (Kendon 1990), a basic spatial configuration in which multiple people face each other in a closed or open circle. This formation can be seen as the most primordial locus of interaction which in turn influences and informs the way speakers use and interpret pointing. He explained that apart from classical articulators for pointing (such as arms, hands or fingers), gaze also has a potential pointing function since it invites co-participants to follow its projected vector. Throughout his further talk, various usages of pointing gestures were demonstrated with examples from diverse languages, ranging from Murrinhpatha (an indigenous language found in the central north of Australia) to Australian English and Indonesian. Generally, pointing gestures are used to indicate referents that are important for the current talk: These often include locational information about the proximal or distant surroundings (Blythe et al. 2016; de Dear et al. 2021), but also persons or the addressee of an utterance (Blythe et al. 2018; Dahmen/Blythe 2022). Another relational domain which is often managed by pointing is discussions of kinterms, relational reference terms that express complex relations between people in indigenous languages (Blythe et al. 2022). Referring to Xioating Li's plenary talk on touch, he mentioned that although touching was quite present in Indonesian conversations as a device to seek engagement, he

did not find this to be the case for the other languages he studied. Finally, Blythe discussed the relationship between gaze and pointing as deictic resources within the framework of an F-formation: He argued that starting from the individual, gaze always constitutes a default vector, a potential point for others to see. Beyond that, the space between speakers is another joint reference point, a "here-space", which can be overridden by pointing. Therefore, the presence or lack of an F-formation influences the way speakers express spatial and social deixis in face-to-face interaction.

Following the interest in the interplay of multimodal resources and talk-in-interaction, *Alexandra Gubina* and *Arnulf Deppermann (IDS Mannheim)* organized a panel with the title *Embodiment in action formation and ascription*. The panel organizers invited contributors to discuss the extent to which embodied conduct may influence the conceptualization of fundamentals in Conversation Analysis, such as action, adjacency pairs or sequentiality.

Alexandra Gubina and *Arnulf Deppermann* opened the session with a study on temporal dependencies between embodied and verbal actions in the context of orientation to epistemic and deontic rights (Deppermann/Gubina 2021). In their talk with the title *Temporal relationship between verbal and embodied resources affects action ascription: The case of implementing projected embodied actions before recipient's confirmation*, they analyzed formats such as *I can*, *I must* and 1.Sg.-declaratives and asked how speakers announce future actions they are committed to accomplish before receiving a 'go-ahead'. Such announcements are mostly produced when participants treat the announced action as potentially problematic in a normative sense. The format choice is related to deontic rights and to how the actions of the participants may impact each other. It has been shown that embodied action displays deontic stance, which tends to match with the deontic stance displayed by the chosen linguistic format.

Finley Céline Jenni and *Lorenza Mondada* (University of Basel) focused in their presentation *Producing and interpreting offers here and now* on embodied accountabilities when making offers. Their analysis gave insights specifically into how offering is produced multimodally and how embodied actions can disambiguate action formation and ascription. They studied the embodied conduct in offers to taste something (Mondada 2021, 2022) in institutional settings, specifically in stores and food markets. Such embodied offers can open the encounter, are initiating and may be accomplished for instance by handing the offered object. Central to the analysis was the question of how temporality is related to responses and how the 'beneficiary' of the offer is established locally.

Jowita Rogowska (IDS Mannheim) talked about *Multimodal organization of 'advice-giving' in informal interaction in German and Polish*. Using comparable data, she analyzed cases in which A displays having a problem or dealing with acceptability of previous actions and B orients to that as requiring a solution. She showed that B's responsive turns were produced with the format *dann/to*/"then" + Imperative, including relevant embodied conduct. With regard to deontic and epistemic authority, it could be shown that the turn-design, *dann/to*/'then' + IMP + matching embodied action, is a device to treat locally emerging problems as 'trivial' or illegitimate and to bring them immediately to a close in both German and Polish.

Jessica La (King's College London) gave a talk on *Noticings in professional kitchens: Coordinating embodied action*. Her interest lies in the professional cooking setting, where talk-in-interaction shifts more into the background and interactional cooperation is achieved mainly through embodied action. The English data come from professional, institutional cooking interactions where deontic and epistemic inequalities are present. Addressing accountability, 'projection' and 'trajectory', La presented cases where task coordination was managed by multimodal resources. As 'noticings' she also included gaze treated by the participants as 'seen' and relevant for the next action.

Rebecca Clift (University of Essex) and *Giovanni Rossi* (University of California, Los Angeles) presented on *Speaker eyebrow-raises in the transition space: pursuing a shared understanding* and showed what speakers do with eyebrow-raises specifically in the transition space between turns at talk. Based on data from English informal interaction, they identified two different but nevertheless related practices: eyebrow raise and eyebrow flash. Eyebrow raise and hold occur in disaffiliative environments, following a challenge or mandating a response. Eyebrow flash occurs rather in more affiliative environments, following allusive TCUs and being more playful. For both action types, Clift and Rossi showed that this embodied conduct refers to shared understanding between the participants and invites the recipient to give a response: either in a combative or in a collusive way.

Cassidy Moore and *Jeffrey Robinson* (Portland State University) gave a talk titled *Extending the role of Gaze Orientation in Turn-Taking*. They presented cases of positive information-seeking polar interrogatives in American English informal interaction and tracked the gaze behavior with respect to the position in the turn. Based on prior research on gaze (e.g. Holler/ Kendrick/Levinson 2018; Rossano 2012), they addressed further questions: What is the gaze behavior of the responding person at the end of the first TCU and whether/how this may affect the dynamics of turn-taking itself. In the context of action formation and ascription, they also asked about the relationship between gaze behavior and repair organization.

Brittany Arnold, *Rein Ove Sikveland* and *Lindsay Ferrara* (NTNU Trondheim) presented on *Extending and revising manual holds when managing non-answers to questions* in Norwegian Sign Language. They collected and analyzed moments when the response is treated as not matching the first pair part. Based on data from interactions between deaf, fluent signers of Norwegian Sign Language, they examined how participants solve this non-matching, particularly with the embodied resource of a manual hold. With regard to action formation and ascription, they showed how the multimodal device of holding a sign is accomplished differently in relation to how 'appropriate' the problematized response actually is. Thus, they argued that this embodied resource is a sensitive way to navigate through and resolve local, reparable inconsistencies.

Jürgen Streeck (University of Texas) devoted his talk *How gestures of the hand display communicative action* to pragmatic gestures and addressed several questions that emerged when studying them. Pragmatic gestures convey something about the talk itself, e.g. its structure or the action performed. In his data, he observed a so-called "completion gesture" that occurs at the end of a conversational unit and resembles the movement of gestural closure itself. Streeck argued that in order to understand what this gesture conveys, it is necessary to take into account where it

comes from. The path of development and conventionalization of a gesture has received little attention so far, although it seems plausible that most gestures originate from practical actions in the material world.

Continuing on the theme of gesture, *Mojenn Schubert* (IDS Mannheim) investigated how pointing gestures and speech work together to implement the action of asking a question (*What does gesture contribute to a social action? The case of pointing when asking a question*). In her data from naturally occurring German conversations, asking a question can be done primarily through speech, so that the co-occurring pointing takes on a supportive role, or rely on the gesture as a central action component. She also identified pointing gestures that complement the action by pragmatically enriching the question. This usage was demonstrated through a micro-longitudinal analysis of addressee-directed pointing while asking for a script prompt.

The panel has been concluded with the presentation of *Antti Kamunen* (University of Oulu) on *The use of bodily-spatial resources in the management of linguistic asymmetry*. He presented a single case study from an institutional context: computer-aided crisis management. Central to his analysis was the interplay of embodiment and verbal resources which were not fully accessible to L2 participants. He asked how actions are being ascribed on both sides and how participants locally overcome linguistic asymmetry in favor of progressivity of the joint task.

The body also represents a pre-initial resource in encounters in public space. The panel on *Openings of Encounters between Strangers in Public Space*, organized by *Elwys De Stefani* and *Lorenza Mondada*, provided insights into valuable, hard-to-get data on initial and spontaneous encounters in public (D'Antoni et al. 2022). It also shed light on the social relevance of language choice in a multilingual environment.

Kristina Savic and *Elwys De Stefani* (University of Heidelberg) started with an analysis on how visitors of tourism offices display hesitation to open the interaction through their bodily conduct (*On the visibility of customers: Hesitant openings*). Hesitant openings are usually characterized by a specific gaze behavior and by a particularly "waddling" or "jerky" gait. Also, visitors usually do not choose the shortest path to the counter. The presenters argued that both visitors and tourism officers orient to and make use of two opportunity spaces to establish a focused interaction: When visibility of both participants is ensured and mutual gaze is established, overt interaction can be initiated, e.g. by exchanging greetings. Only when this first step has been taken the participants can further develop the interaction.

Burak Tekin and *Lorenza Mondada* (University of Basel) presented on *Trajectories of embodied actions in public space*. They demonstrated that people coordinate their walking movement in accordance with the conduct of others and different spatial ecologies. On a narrow path, pedestrians and cyclists inevitably have to take into account other people's projected movement and adjust their own pace and route to avoid collisions. In an open street, environmental activists strategically position themselves in the walking trajectory of approaching pedestrians to intercept their path. And when there is a queue, pedestrians who approach a market from another side indicate by their posture that their positioning is only temporary. Through these mutual adaptations of movement, people in public space coordinate and manage their co-presence with other people.

Based on video recordings of dog walks in the German speaking part of Switzerland, *Julia Schneerson* (University of Basel) took a close look at the situation *When the dog approaches a stranger on the walk*. Initial behavior of an approaching dog that is deemed problematic – such as running or jumping at the unacquainted walker – is often responded to with a question or an ascription about the dog's supposedly young age. Portraying the dog as juvenile makes it possible to frame its marked behavior as an expression of the ongoing learning process. Thereby, the participants account for and legitimize the dog's problematic conduct and raise the issue of socialization in an affiliative way.

Philip Hänggi (University of Basel) talked about *The interactional negotiation of language choice in impromptu encounters between strangers*. His study focuses on initial encounters between environmental activists and pedestrians in a multilingual city. He demonstrated how language choice and competence are used as a resource to both invite (on the part of activists) and avert (on the part of pedestrians) entry into a conversation. Negotiation of language choice allows to display one's (dis)alignment with the fundraising activity and at the same time gives a hint about the target's eligibility as a candidate for fundraising.

Thomas Debois (KU Leuven) presented his work on *Mutual availability as an interactional achievement: on openings in service encounters* with service providers engaged in other activities. Showing data from tourism offices, Debois demonstrated how participants deal with displays of temporary unavailability. Through various data examples, it became clear that availability is a highly emic issue for the participants. Both customers and service providers need to be sensitive to competing engagements in order to align their availability displays. Misalignments of these displays can in turn create interactional trouble and delay or otherwise impede the opening of a service interaction.

Federica D'Antoni (KU Leuven) presented a talk on the topic of *Becoming co-present in the waiting room of a doctor's practice*. When visitors enter a waiting room, they not only need to orient themselves within the institutionally structured space itself, but also in accordance with the other persons that are already present. In her analysis, she showed how newcomers observe the positioning and gaze behavior of others in order to "make sense" of the room they just entered. On the basis of subtle monitoring practices, occasionally accompanied by minimal greeting sequences, participants reflexively adjust the interpersonal organization of the room they share and thereby collaboratively achieve co-presence.

Another productive resource in interactions is physical experience, such as tasting and smelling. The topic of *Sensoriality in Social Interaction* has become more and more prominent over the last years and has been addressed in the panel with the same title organized by *Lorenza Mondada*. Due to capacity constraints, the following contributions can only be described in the form of an overview. Despite the increasing interest for embodied practices in general that came with the "embodied turn" (Nevile 2015; Mondada 2016) in Conversation Analysis, sensing practices, being an integral part of embodied practices, are not represented to an extent that would do justice to their importance. Yet, interactions in which the human body becomes relevant as a sensing body can undoubtedly pose a productive challenge to EMCA and interaction analysis, stimulating them towards refining their methods - and discovering new fields of interest.

This starts with the decision which settings to choose in order to approach sensoriality in interaction. Tasting sessions are certainly one of the settings that are particularly eligible for facing this challenge, since experiencing sensorial qualities of food and/or drinks is not just a random accompaniment of this interaction type, but right at the center of interest. In her panel-opening talk, *Lorenza Mondada* (*Sequentializing the senses: the normative order of tasting sessions*) gave a comprehensive outline of the normative order of tasting sessions.

Going more into specific practices, *Guillaume Gauthier* (University of Basel) pursued this further in his talk *Problematizing 'Assessments' through the Prism of Multisensorial Social Conduct(s) with and around Food*. In particular, he reflected on the limits of such practices with respect to action ascription. Anyway, not only the taste but also the haptic qualities of food can become relevant for participants: Having a closer look at cooking lessons at secondary schools in Switzerland, *Sofian Adam Bouaouina* (University of Basel) (*Doing intervening in the kitchen: temporality, materiality and sensoriality in and of instructive sequences*) analyzed how the touching of dough contributes to the realization of intervening actions, as a part of an overall instructional setting. Another dimension of touch opens up when humans are touching each other: This was explored by *Asta Cekaite* (Linköping University) who talked about "Mundane diagnostics in adult-child interactions: corporeal intersubjectivity and touch". Since touch is only one of many means for establishing intersubjectivity between participants, Cekaite analyzed how this resource is intertwined with talk and other modalities. In sequences in which caregivers are concerned with a bodily examination of their children, the author identified some specific interactional functions of touch like the recalibration of recipients' affective stance, to name just one. But sometimes even the boundaries between humans and objects are fuzzy.

This became evident in a talk by *Lorenza Mondada* and *Fernanda Miranda Da Cruz* (University of São Paulo) (*Touching ontologies: handling bones as objects vs as human remains*) who analyzed the interaction between forensic professionals while they are examining bones. The way in which the bones were treated, physically and verbally, seemed to depict the conceptualization of their ontologic status.

Michael Smith (Linköping University) and *Oskar Lindwall* (University of Gothenburg) presented data from a similar setting in their talk *Eliciting understanding from hands-on experience in anatomical instruction*. In contrast to the previous presentation, they were more interested in touch as a means of teaching and learning. Since in the teaching hospital setting analyzed by them it is crucial for the students to develop manual abilities, Smith and Lindwall showed how the clinical instructors monitored students' displays of such abilities involving - or consisting of - touch.

A quite different and certainly not less complex context was studied by *Minato Suzuki* and *Aug Nishizaka* (Chiba University; *Seeing what one senses: aspects of multimodal perception*): They showed that taking into account sensorial practices - that are present in the interaction directly or indirectly - can contribute to a better understanding of the perceptual experience of artworks and, especially, of art performances. A very special interactional reality can be encountered when participants have limited sensorial access to the physical world around them. Such constellations raise interesting issues about how participants interactionally manage dif-

ferent tasks. Driven by this interest, *Shimako Iwasaki, Meredith Bartlett, Jim Hlavac, Howard Manns* and *Louisa Willoughby* (Monash University) took a closer look at *Deafblind tactile signers and mediating interpreters negotiating unknown environments*.

Continuing this interest in interaction in which sensorial constraint plays a role, *Hanna Svensson* (University of Basel) presented a study about *Formulating an invisible field of scrutiny: the case of blindfolded fire fighters at work*. In this talk she retraced practices by which participants manage to coordinate their actions - for example when carrying bodies out of a house - despite shared visual access to the objects in question. Altogether, the panel contributions confirmed the standing of sensoriality as a strongly upcoming topic in interactional research.

The body senses not only tastes and smells but also other physical signals, such as its own effort and intensity of exhaustion. In their *panel* on *Exertion and strain in interaction, Leelo Keevallik* and *Emily Hofstetter* (Linköping University) invited talks and discussions on moments when physical effort is made relevant in and for social interaction. The panel explored how the voice, breathing, facial expressions and bodily conduct are used to display exertion and how these embodied practices are organized sequentially and temporally. The settings under study ranged from social encounters revolving around sports and physical training to intimate interactions between infants and their caregivers.

First, *Misao Okada* (Hokusei Gakuen University) presented on the *Japanese turn-initial particle, hai, in instruction-compliance sequences* during boxing sessions. Positioned at the beginning of an instructive turn, *hai* retrospectively marks closure of what came before and at the same time projects the start of something new. Instructors use the particle in certain transitional moments of the boxer´s embodied behavior, when the ongoing movement shifts from a completion phase to an initiation phase. *Hai* thereby imposes structure onto otherwise dynamically moving bodies and verbalizes this structure to make other people's physical effort public.

Shifting the setting under study from athletic activities to private care tasks, *Iris Nomikou* (University of Portsmouth) and *Emily Hofstetter* investigated *Strain sounds in infants* during nappy changing sessions. Their study was based on longitudinal data, which enabled them to capture how effort sounds produced by young infants were responded to by their caregiver over a 15 month-period. Caregivers acknowledged and showed appreciation for the physical effort, but also produced candidate understandings and thereby ascribed goals to the infant's action. Overall, the presenters observed a development where the actions of the infant were at first opaque and then became more transparent and recognizable, so that in later sessions caregivers could respond with a more fitting second pair part.

Eiko Yasui (Nagoya University) again focused on a single linguistic resource, the interjection yoisho (*Vocalization of effort and force as a device for coordination: A Japanese interjection Yoisho in instructions of a physical activity*). Yoisho is an interjection that communicates the effort and strength that participants have to put into a guided physical movement. In traditional Japanese dance workshops, she identified different patterns of coordination between the interjection and the dance movements of instructors and students. The internal two-part structure of yoisho can be used to reflect a two-part movement pattern: The preparation, e.g. lifting one foot, can be instructed with yoi-, while the subsequent phase, e.g. stomping on the ground, is instructed with the second syllable -sho. Prosodic features such as the

pitch or lengthening of the vowels can encode further characteristics of how the movement should be performed and how the body should feel.

With his talk *It Hurts to Watch: How sports crowds use pain sounds to comment on sequences of play Adrian Kerrison* (Ulster University) continued on the theme of sport-related interaction. He explored the function of strain sounds produced by sports crowds during ice hockey games. They arise when members of a fan section coordinate and synchronize their individual utterances to jointly build a collective expression of discontent, a clustered response cry. Unlike cheers (Kerrison 2018), sounds of pain and strain are most often reacting to sports events such as missed shots, failed passes, player injuries or penalties. Fan crowds also use them to comment on sequences of play which remain incomplete or unresolved to show their attendance to the progression of the game.

The last talk of the panel was held by *Edward Reynolds* (University of New Hampshire) on *The sequential organization of effort display vocalizations versus post-effort vocalizations in the sport of powerlifting*. He stressed the importance to distinguish between vocalizations accompanying the apex of a powerlifting move – used to display the effort needed at this moment in time – and sound objects produced after the lifting sequence has been completed. Such post-positioned vocalizations are in no direct connection to the strength invested in the move, but have a stance-taking quality: they represent retrospective assessments of one's performance and open it up to the judgment of others.

2.3. Managing the 'problematic' in interaction: norms, (potential) conflict and social cohesion

Another overarching field into which the CA/IL community showed strong interest was all about norms, norm deviations and the management of 'delicate' - or even clearly problematic - matters in interaction. This range of topics was approached with different foci: some of the talks focused more on interactions in which the topics of talk held 'problematic' potential, while other talks provided insight into how participants deal with 'problematic' behavior of others. The contributions were not limited to the micro level of phenomena like, for example, local conflict management and preference organization. They also raised questions about the social genesis and maintenance of norms, the role of self, the nature of social cohesion and what makes them fragile. Anyway, these considerations, in turn, led back to concrete practices and resources to be explored, including even the option of leaving things unsaid as one out of multiple ways of dealing with (socially) delicate matters.

The panel *Monitoring and modifying problem behavior in informal interaction* organized by *Uwe-Alexander Küttner*, *Laurenz Kornfeld*, *Christina Mack*, *Jowita Rogowska* and *Jörg Zinken* (IDS Mannheim), gave space to a true qualitative micro-perspective on the social management of problematic behavior. Including mundane and educational settings, the panel contributed to elucidating multimodal practices of problem management.

Uwe-Alexander Küttner and *Jörg Zinken* opened the panel with a presentation about *(Dis)approval relevant events and methods for their management: Towards an integrative framework for analyzing moments of trouble*. They introduced the so-called (D)AREs concept (for: '(dis)approval relevant events'), showing how this

analytical framework can help to make sense of the temporal and sequential organization of the complex empirical variety innate to individual cases of problem management. This was demonstrated practically by the authors who used the '(D)AREs' model to cluster cases and identify structural relations between formal, functional and contextual features. As a prospect for future research, the authors argued for the applicability of the proposed model to comparative CA/IL studies – not limiting the notion of "comparative" to cross-linguistic research, but also drawing a beat on the comparison of different settings.

Jörg Zinken, in collaboration with *Uwe-Alexander Küttner*, *Laurenz Kornfeld*, *Emma Betz* (University of Waterloo), *Christina Maria Ma*ck, *Jowita Rogo*wska and *Giovanni Rossi* (UCLA), concretized this prospect in their talk *Confronting problem behavior: First results from a cross-linguistic quantitative study*. Drawing on a collection of about 1000 cases, the before mentioned (D)AREs model was 'translated' into quantifiable categories using a coding scheme especially developed for this purpose (Küttner/Kornfeld/Zinken in press). The authors demonstrated that this approach allows for a truly systematic comparison of social problem management. For example, as confrontations of rule violations can apparently take different shapes, they shared first quantitative considerations about what these differences have to do with whether the violated rule is codified or more implicit.

Still in the spirit of the (D)AREs model, *Christina Maria Mack* (*Imperatives and modal verbs in direct confrontations of problem behavior*) added some qualitative considerations, analyzing confrontational sequences with a stronger linguistic focus. Drawing on German and Italian data, she compared two different turn designs: turns that had an imperative built in, and such that were based on a modal verb. While modal verbs are rather used to remind others of already established rules, implying high agency of the addressee, imperatives seem to come into play when more implicit norms are invoked and when this is not projectable by the addressee. Anyway, Mack endorsed that the affordances and typological restrictions of German and Italian should be paid attention to as well.

The second session of the panel was opened by *Laurenz Kornfeld* who looked at how participants are *Invoking and re-invoking rules and norms over the course of an interaction*. While in other studies the analysis of rule violations is often built on collections of many single sequences that stand for themselves, Kornfeld chose a different approach: he argued that it is worthwhile to track how the same participants, in the same interactional event, deal with a specific rule over time. In his analysis, he showed how participants come back to rules that have been addressed before, treating them as a resource for accounting. He also did not miss to illustrate the complexity of interactional rule management, demonstrating that rules can be adapted over time, yet this calls for intersubjective recognition that has to be established.

Carolin Demuth (Aalborg University) completed the panel with a study about *Monitoring and modifying problem behavior in early childhood educational settings*, presenting analyses of Indian preschool data. She combined the methods of Conversation Analysis and Discursive Psychology and provided a detailed multimodal analysis of how teachers sanctioned children's 'transgressive' conduct. The talk was embedded in the overall question of how such sanctionings can help socialize children towards accountability for their conduct. It also went into more specific considerations about moralizing implications of sanctionings and about the

asymmetries between teachers and children. Drawing a parallel to Potter and Hepburn (2020), Demuth concluded that in her examples children were mainly oriented to as accountable agents.

Still concerned with conflict in mundane interactions, the panel *From polarization to transcending differences: Exploring the 'fingerprint' of conflict and dialogue* organized by *Lotte van Burgsteden*, *Elliott Hoey* and *Hedwig Te Molder* (VU University Amsterdam) extended the focus some further: Not only 'clashes' between participants were looked at, the panelists also took into account how conflict arises and how differences are managed interactionally. This, in turn, entailed reflections on participants' relationship management and, in particular, on strategies that help to avoid aggravation of incipient polarization. In this report we discuss only the second one out of three sessions that were part of the panel.

The very 'transition zone' between mild polarization and dramatic discord was explored by *Tessa Van Charldorp* and *Marije Van Braak* (Utrecht University). In their talk *Dealing with differences in mildly polarized 'every-day-talk' discussions on COVID-19: an attempt to understand polarization in the making* they looked at discussions on Covid-19 that took place both in face-to-face encounters and in online calls between students from the Netherlands and from the US. In their presentation they discussed various instances of disaffiliation while a special focus was put on the management of self-other relations. Not only can such considerations provide us with a better understanding of the step-by-step development of increasing polarization. They can also help us identify productive procedures of handling differences.

A particular practice representing conflict talk was the topic of *Natalie Flin's* (Loughborough University) and *Jack Joyce's* (University of Oxford) presentation *'That's Karen and she's calling the cops': orienting to individualised sanctionable behaviours as a cultural phenomenon in public disputes*. In data of everyday talk that took place in public spaces, they looked at sequences in which others' problematic behavior was made accountable by invoking publicly well-known social actors - for example 'Karen'. This specific practice, called 'karening', implies the ascription of specific traits that are originally associated with the (social) media stereotype 'Karen' - for example being racist, exaggeratedly antagonistic etc. But the authors did not limit themselves to investigate 'karening' sequences in terms of membership categorizations. As they pointed out, even observations from the micro-level of interaction can provide insight into the policing of social conduct in a larger cultural context.

A less confrontative - and yet potentially delicate - type of interaction was dealt with in the following talk: *Hedwig Te Molder*, *Lotte Van Burgsteden* and *Elliot Hoey* (*Dealing with differences in mildly polarized 'every-day-talk' discussions on COVID-19: an attempt to understand polarization in the making*) explored relationship-building in practice. In order to 'open up the black box of first encounters', the authors chose a setting in which scientists and community members, both previously unacquainted, engaged in conversations about science with each other. This allowed them to look at the concrete ways in which participants approached controversial topics. In the specific sequential environment of you said + personal information queries produced by scientists, resources for displaying other-attentiveness were identified.

In her presentation, *Kang (Constance) Sun* (University of York) (*Disaffiliation and Discord in Ordinary Mandarin Chinese Social Interaction*) looked at the dynamics of conflict as they were observable in informal interactions of Chinese couples during joint car rides. In particular, her considerations were concerned with the transition from implicit to explicit disaffiliation, but she also raised the question of what it takes to restore social cohesion. One of her findings was that implicit disaffiliation can already be done by minimal acknowledgements, for example by using the particle *èn*. But Sun also considered what happens once it has come to overt disagreement: for example, tendentious queries were identified as one of the practices to restore social cohesion.

But not only the overt sanctioning of misconduct and the likes can reveal a lot about the social dynamics that are at work when norms are (made) relevant. The panel *Exploring Social Norms across Languages* organized by *Tanya Stivers* and *Giovanni Rossi* (University of California, Los Angeles), was dedicated to more subtle manifestations of social norms, as they are recognizable in interactional structures. Having deliberately chosen a broad contrastive perspective, the panelists gave an example of how to extend the focus of comparative research beyond just two or three languages. Data from an impressively wide range of languages - eight in total (three national and five indigenous languages) - was presented. This made it possible to come up with quite robust claims about which norms are culturally specific and which commonalities, in turn, can be attested. One of the main endeavors of this panel was to take up specific practices that have already been described in CA/IL, such as recruitment or storytelling, and extend their investigation to a cross-cultural perspective.

Giovanni Rossi, together with *Jörg Zinken*, *Julija Baranova* (Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics), *Joe Blythe*, *Mark Dingemanse* (Radboud University), *Simeon Floyd* (University of San Francisco De Quito), *Kobin Kendrick* (University of York) and *Nick J. Enfield* (University of Sydney), presented a comparative study about *Recruitment systems around the world: A quantitative analysis*. In data encompassing eight languages (Murrinhpatha, Siwu, Cha'palaa, Lao, Italian, English, Polish and Russian), recruiting and responding turns were analyzed with focus in their linguistic design. In particular, they focused on imperatives, interrogatives and declaratives. While entitlement to collaboration showed to be one of the commonalities in recruitment sequences, negotiations of autonomy and responsibility seem to underlie cultural variation.

Akira Takada (Kyoto University) presented a work on *Norms and practices that enrich storytelling among the Glui/G‖ana of the Central Kalahari*. Data was taken from an interactional setting with three informants in which the author himself was present as an addressee. Takada demonstrated that the *G|ui/G‖ana* speakers make use of the personal pronoun system and other morpho-syntactic resources that make the story appear lively and dynamic. As for the interactional dimension, he also considered how co-tellership is established, pointing in particular to shifts in narrators that come with it.

A specifically linguistic conceptualization of norms was offered in *Tanya Stivers', Andrew Chalfoun's* and *Giovanni Rossi's* (University of California, Los Angeles) presentation about *Departures: the relationship between norms and preferences*. They approached the field of interactional norms in terms of preference or-

ganization. In order to gain a comprehensive understanding of participants' departures from norms, they considered the quantitative frequency of preferred vs. dispreferred actions just as qualitative features of turn design. It was argued that the occurrence of rebukes or sanctionings subsequent to norm departures does not basically depend on the nature of the departure but rather has to do with accounting. The authors expressed the hope that their findings might stimulate other fields of research and, thus, help gain insight into social norms in a broader sense, too.

To zoom in on the phenomenon of accounting some further, *Andrew Chalfoun* dedicated his talk to the investigation of participants' practices for *Shifting Responsibility onto Coparticipants: Disaffiliative Accounts as an Interactional Practice*. Chalfoun pointed to a previously neglected distinction in this field, noticing that accounts for speakers' own problematic actions are actually different from accounts that are produced to mitigate disaffiliation. Rather than pointing out to what extent they are different, Chalfoun went beyond this with his observation that, other than only mitigating disaffiliation, accounts themselves can indeed be disaffiliative. Based on this evidence, he argued that, conceptually, the demonstration of normative conformity being present in accounting practices should be kept apart from the notion of affiliation.

Anyway, dealing with delicate matters and orienting to norms of what is socially and conversationally acceptable can run into various interactional directions. While on one side participants choose verbally explicit ways to deal with problematic matters, on the other side there are much more implicit resources that, amongst others, can help participants handle delicate situations - especially when it is about avoiding conflict or social rupture. *Marina Cantarutti* and *Richard Ogden* (University of York) encouraged discussion about moments in which participants deliberately choose not to say anything. The panel *Managing the Unsaid in Interaction* organized by them focused on two different aspects of not saying something: Either the physical way of not saying anything by verbal means, or leaving something intentionally unsaid.

Marina Cantarutti opened the panel herself with a talk on *Secrets, complicity and improprieties*. She showed different practices for dealing with topics that are unsayable or should be unsaid and explored different recurrent patterns participants orient to for unsayable matters. Therefore, Cantarutti showed examples in which participants, for instance, orient themselves to the fact of being recorded with gaze and thereby leaving something unsaid (as it could be socially delicate). In most of the cases the delicate matter was something like gossip or impropriety. Participants show different orientations to such unsayable matters, some orient prospectively and some retrospectively to something that is unsayable.

The second talk in this panel was by *Samu Pehkonen* (Tampere University): *Professional detachment: on not responding to 'no reason to live' in police simulation training*. He showed data from a simulation training where police officers had to tell family members that someone died (e.g. a child). As part of the simulation the family member then mentioned at one point that there is no more reason to live. Pehkonen explored in his talk different practices in responding to that message, as the officers are told to not respond to such topics. He focused on embodied engagement with the mother as not responding verbally, but showing empathy, for instance, in an embodied way.

In the following talk *Alexa Hepburn*, *Jonathan Potter*, *Galina Bolden*, *Kaichend Zhan*, *Hyun Sunwoo*, *Aleksandr Shirokov*, *Hee Chung Chun*, *Marissa Caldwell* and *Jenny Mandelbaum* (Rutgers School) presented a topic on using repair to manage delicate actions (*Retracting the unsaid: Using repair to manage delicate actions*). This talk dealt with delicate topics or actions participants don't want to talk about. The authors showed how the participants use repair to manage these delicate actions. Otherwise by using formulations like I don't want to say that but… the participants orient themselves to something as being too delicate to talk about, but they talk about it anyway.

Richard Ogden presented the last topic of this panel: *Swallowing in interaction*. He showed even though swallowing is one of the physical things participants have to do (like breathing etc.), swallowing can be seen in specific (sequential) positions or interactional moments. Ogden argues that placement of swallows suggests that linguistic and somatic functions are co-planned. This might show that participants use swallowing in interaction as they use other embodied or physical resources. Swallowing does at some points not just show unavailability to speak, but sometimes also inability to speak and thereby sometimes is used when participants don't know what to say.

When talking about delicate matters and problematic moments in interaction, at some point considerations always touch relationship management. While for other talks and panels it has already been a crucial - yet subliminally treated - issue how self relates to other(s), *Anssi Peräkylä* (University of Helsinki) devoted his plenary talk to the topic *Vulnerability of self in social interaction*. In doing so, he opened up another analytical level, demonstrating that the concept of 'self' can be an excellent point of intersection between psychotherapeutic and conversation analytic approaches. Not only did Peräkylä delineate how the self is interactively constructed. His talk went beyond that by looking at the way participants expose their 'self' to the dynamics of talk and interaction - especially when the interactional setting can hold serious challenges for participants' habitual ways of self-construction, as it is the case in psychotherapy.

First, Peräkylä gave an overview of the development of research on dependency of *self* on interpersonal recognition and led over to his starting point, Erving Goffman's early insights on recognition and non-recognition in moment-by-moment interaction as well as (in)security of the self therein (Goffman 1956). Thus, to examine the vulnerability of the self, he uses moments where such self-recognition is threatened. Such sequences are found in informal interactions but also in psychotherapeutic contexts where the self is challenged openly, implicitly or endogenously especially in narcissistic personalities. He showed this in sequences with assessments and disaffiliative responses where through the action an in-situ projection of what the participants are, becomes visible. A relevant point for the analyses is that self is encoded in all actions: both passive and active. In further examples, Peräkylä showed sequences in therapy as a setting where the self can be openly challenged and where it functions as a therapeutic practice. He then discussed orienting at such challenges in psychiatric diagnostic interviews, including embodied displays of self-reproaching. In contrast to that, he also presented a case where the self is protected by defying the reproach. Finally, Peräkylä spoke about his research project on narcissism in social interaction. He described the aspects of narcissistic perso-

nality traits and narcissistic personality disorder. Since self-experience, presentation and high vulnerability of the self are central to narcissism as such, interactions of these participants can provide the opportunity to examine the self in interaction more closely. The self in the presented data is revealed through a 'negative lens', self-descriptions are being revised. The goal of the project is thus to systematically investigate moments of threatened self-recognition. For CA, the self is relevant for aspects such as accountability, affiliation, epistemics and preference.

3. Closing remarks

ICCA 2023 in Brisbane was a well-organized conference with many different topics and areas that showed the wide range of subjects worth exploring within the area of conversation analysis and interactional linguistics. Both as attendees as well as presenters, it was very stimulating/interesting to see in what settings and for what research questions conversation analysis is used to explore interactional phenomena. In addition to the ever-growing emphasis on embodied aspects of interaction, the conference contributions also showed an extensive use of CA to study institutional settings, indicating the potential for improving interactions in applied research.

This year's ICCA in Brisbane has been a great experience for all participants and also a nice way of reconnecting after the pandemic. Now everyone looks forward to the next ICCA in Edmonton, Canada at the University of Alberta (chair: Xiaoting Li), which is already in three years (2026) due to the delay of this year's ICCA.

4. References

Blythe, Joe / Gardner, Rod / Mushin, Ilana / Stirling, Lesley (2018): Tools of Engagement: Selecting a Next Speaker in Australian Aboriginal Multiparty Conversations: In: Research on Language and Social Interaction 51 (2), 145-170. doi: 10.1080/08351813.2018.1449441.

Blythe, Joe / Mardigan, Kinngirri Carmelita / Perdjert, Mawurt Ernest / Stoakes, Hywel (2016): Pointing Out Directions in Murrinhpatha: In: Open Linguistics 2 (1). doi: 10.1515/opli-2016-0007.

Blythe, Joe / Mushin, Ilana / Stirling, Lesley / Gardner, Rod (2022): The epistemics of social relations in Murrinhpatha, Garrwa and Jaru conversations: In: Journal of Pragmatics 191, 175-193. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2022.01.006.

Dahmen, Josua / Blythe, Joe (2022): Calibrating recipiency through pronominal reference: In: Interactional Linguistics 2 (2), 190-224. doi: 10.1075/il.22005.dah.

D'Antoni, Federica / Debois, Thomas / De Stefani, Elwys / Hänggi, Philipp / Mondada, Lorenza / Schneerson, Julia / Tekin, Burak S. (2022): 10. Encounters in public places: The establishment of interactional space in face-to-face openings: In: Jucker, Andreas H. / Hausendorf, Heiko (Hg.): Pragmatics of Space: De Gruyter, 281-316. doi: 10.1515/9783110693713-010.

de Dear, Caroline / Blythe, Joe / Possemato, Francesco / Stirling, Lesley / Gardner, Rod / Mushin, Ilana / Kofod, Frances (2021): Locational pointing in Murrinh-patha, Gija, and English conversations: In: Gesture 20 (3), 417-452. doi: 10.1075/gest.20035.dea.

Deppermann, Arnulf / Gubina, Alexandra (2021): When the Body Belies the Words: Embodied Agency with "darf/kann ich?" ("May/Can I?") in German: In: Frontiers in Communication 6, 661800. doi: 10.3389/fcomm.2021.661800.

Deppermann, Arnulf / Streeck, Jürgen (Hg.) (2018): Time in embodied interaction: synchronicity and sequentiality of multimodal resources: Pragmatics & beyond new series (P&bns): Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Dix, Carolin (2019): Looking into the future of Conversation Analysis - Report on the 5th International Conference on Conversation Analysis (ICCA) 2018: In: Gesprächsforschung - Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion (20), 43-52.

Goffman, Erving (1956): The presentation of self in everyday life: University of Edinburgh: Doubleday.

Holler, Judith / Kendrick, Kobin H. / Levinson, Stephen C. (2018): Processing language in face-to-face conversation: Questions with gestures get faster responses: In: Psychonomic Bulletin & Review 25 (5), 1900-1908. doi: 10.3758/s13423-017-1363-z.

Kendon, Adam (1990): Conducting interaction: patterns of behavior in focused encounters: Studies in interactional sociolinguistics: Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kerrison, Adrian (2018): We're All Behind You: The Co-Construction of Turns and Sequences-at-Cheering: Student thesis: Doctoral Thesis.

Küttner, Uwe-A. / Kornfeld, Laurenz / Zinken, Jörg (in press): A coding scheme for (dis)approval-relevant events involving the social sanctioning of problematic behavior: Mannheim: IDSopen.

Li, Xiaoting (2020): Interpersonal Touch in Conversational Joking: In: Research on Language and Social Interaction 53 (3), 357-379. doi: 10.1080/08351813.2020.1786970.

Mondada, Lorenza (2022): Appealing to the senses: Approaching, sensing, and interacting at the market's stall: In: Discourse & Communication 16 (2), 160-199. doi: 10.1177/17504813211043597.

Mondada, Lorenza (2021): Sensing in Social Interaction: The Taste for Cheese in Gourmet Shops. 1. Auflage: Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/9781108650090.

Mondada, Lorenza (2016): Challenges of multimodality: Language and the body in social interaction: In: Journal of Sociolinguistics 20 (3), 336-366. doi: 10.1111/josl.1_12177.

Nevile, Maurice (2015): The Embodied Turn in Research on Language and Social Interaction: In: Research on Language and Social Interaction 48 (2), 121-151. doi: 10.1080/08351813.2015.1025499.

Rossano, Federico (2012): Gaze in Conversation: In: Sidnell, Jack / Stivers, Tanya (Hg.): The Handbook of Conversation Analysis: Wiley, 308-329. doi: 10.1002/9781118325001.ch15.

Rossi, Giovanni / Stivers, Tanya (2021): Category-Sensitive Actions in Interaction: In: Social Psychology Quarterly 84 (1), 49-74.
doi: 10.1177/0190272520944595.
Schegloff, Emanuel A. / Jefferson, Gail / Sacks, Harvey (1977): The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation: In: Language 53 (2), 361.
doi: 10.2307/413107.
Tuncer, Sylvaine / Haddington, Pentti (2020): Object transfers: An embodied resource to progress joint activities and build relative agency: In: Language in Society 49 (1), 61-87.
doi: 10.1017/S004740451900071X.
Zinken, Jörg (2015): Contingent control over shared goods. 'Can I have x' requests in British English informal interaction: In: Journal of Pragmatics 82, 23-38.
doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2015.03.005.

Laurenz Kornfeld
kornfeld@ids-mannheim.de
ORCID: 0000-0002-6349-5413

Christina Mack
mack@ids-mannheim.de

Jowita Rogowska
rogowska@ids-mannheim.de

Mojenn Schubert
schubert@ids-mannheim.de
ORCID: 0009-0005-1238-8529

Leibniz-Institut für Deutsche Sprache
R5 6-13,
68161 Mannheim

Veröffentlicht am 11.12.2023