Hva fanden ('what the devil'): A conversation analytic investigation of swearing and stance in questions and quotation

Søren Sandager Sørensen / Christina Emborg / Andrea Bruun

Abstract

This study investigates the use of the swear word expression *hva fanden* ('what the devil') in Danish talk-in-interaction by analysing 17 cases using Conversation Analysis and Interactional Linguistics. *Hva fanden* occurs in information-seeking actions, which include repair (i.e., word search and other-initiated repair) and requests for information. *Hva fanden* conveys the speaker's non-access to certain information, in word search without stance-taking but in other functions displaying a negative stance to e.g. a referent. *Hva fanden* also occurs in quoted usage, where it performs assessment by framing some conduct as worthy of a response with a negative stance, with variation in their responses (i.e., immediate or none). Through detailed analyses of interaction, the study contributes to knowledge on swearing in interaction.

Keywords: Swearing – repair – reported speech – assessing – telling – word search – stance.

German abstract

Dieser Beitrag untersucht den Gebrauch des Schimpfwortausdrucks *hva fanden* ('was zum Teufel') in dänischen Interaktionen durch eine Analyse von 17 Belegen mittels Konversationsanalyse und Interaktionaler Linguistik. *Hva fanden* kommt in Äußerungen vor, die Informationen erfragen, darunter Reparaturen (Wortsuchen und fremdinitiierte Reparaturen) und direkte Fragen. *Hva fanden* zeigt eine negative Haltung ("stance") zu den fehlenden Informationen an, bei Wortsuchen allerdings nicht. *Hva fanden* kommt auch in zitierter Rede in negativen Bewertungen von unangemessenem Verhalten vor, wo es die Bewertung verstärkt. Die Studie soll zum Wissen über den Gebrauch von Schimpfworten beitragen.

Keywords: Schimpfen – Reparatur – Redewiedergabe – Bewertungen – Erzählen – Wortsuchen – Haltung.

1. Introduction

Swear words have been defined as words or phrases that express a feeling or have an emphasising function, and they are not always considered appropriate or acceptable to use (Andersson 1985:78). The attitudes towards swearing expressions have been studied in relation to various social variables. However, what it means for a swear word to express feelings or emphasise in interactional detail has only recently started to receive attention. The interactional details of stance may be an important factor in why swear words are perceived as "strong", and this paper contributes to knowledge in this area by studying the variation in meaning in the common Danish swear word expression *hva fanden* 'what the devil'.

It turns out that *hva fanden* is very common in question-like turns performing word search, initiating repair and request for information. An illustrative example is provided in (1), where David, in a group of four, is trying to read something on a picture:

(1) samtalebanken:fyrne:49

```
01 DAV: hva +fanden står der der,
          what the devil does it say there
     dav      +turns picture->
02       (0.3)+
     dav      ->+
03 CHR: °der står godt nok (så er der skrevet,)=
          it says well enough (then there is written)
04 BEN: =det [det: <numre>.
          it   it's numbers
05 ERI:      [er det ikk ↑tal?
              is it not numbers
```

Here, David asks what a text in the picture says. But rather than asking *hva står der der* ('what does it say there'), he uses *hva fanden står der der* ('what the devil does it say there', l.1), employing *fanden* after the question word *hva* 'what'. This is understood as a request for information, as the other speakers answer with what they believe can be seen in the picture afterwards.

This paper will elaborate on the kinds of information-seeking that *hva fanden* occurs in. Besides the information-seeking use, *hva fanden* also turns out to be frequent within quotes.

This article studies the variation in stance-taking in the different practices with *hva fanden*. The description shows that the practices include word search, other-initiated repair and requests for information, and that they range in stance from no (interactionally relevant) display of stance to different kinds of negative stance. *Hva fanden* is also used within quotes, often as part of storytelling, where it seemingly takes on stronger negative stance-taking. We argue that the quoted use is based on the information-seeking use, indexing a situation as being characterized by despair or someone's actions as an accountable breach of acceptable behaviour.

In section 2, a background is given on swearing in Danish, interactional research on swearing, and stance-taking. Section 3 describes the method and data used, while section 4 is the analysis detailing first information-seeking uses (4.1) and then quoted uses (4.2). Section 5 is a concluding discussion of the different usages of *hva fanden*, the degree of stance-taking involved in each, and the relation between them.

2. Background

2.1. Swearing in Danish

Danish swear words have been divided into three semantic areas: religion (e.g., *Gud* 'God', *helvede* 'hell'), diseases (e.g., *pokker* 'smallpox', *kræft* 'cancer' in *kraftedme* 'cancer take me'), and excrements or actions associated with lower body parts (e.g., *lort* 'shit', *pis* 'piss'). A potential fourth type are 'minced oaths', consisting of euphemistic replacements of swear words to avoid the taboo associated with them (i.e., using *Søren* instead of *satan*) (Rathje/Andersen 2005). The word *fanden* (variously translatable as 'the devil', 'the hell', 'damn' etc.) is a religious swear word. It is the second most frequent swear word in Danish social media (including variants) after *sgu* 'damn' (Coats 2021). Historically, the word *fanden* refers to the devil, and the Danish Dictionary (Den Danske Ordbog, DDO) states that it is used to express anger, despair, irritation or another emotion (DDO 2024a). *Fanden* is used in different constructions and forms, for instance *fandme*, a contraction of *fanden æde mig* ('the devil eats me'), which is also used in swearing. Syntactically, *fanden* and other Danish swear words have the characteristic feature of being able to occur immediately following a question word, for example in *hvad fanden* ('what the devil') (Jespersen 1911; Hansen/Heltoft 2011:604), which is the focus of this study. Previous descriptions of Danish swear words have often centered around the attitudes surrounding them (e.g. Rathje 2009; Rathje/Grann 2011; Jensen/Rathje 2022) or their relation to social variables (e.g. Rathje 2010). These investigations mostly focus on groups of swear words at a time, and often give general descriptions of their meaning. However, the studies note that these swear words are particularly frequent in speech or informal interaction (Rathje 2011).

2.2. Swearing in interaction

Recently, interactional studies on swear words started describing swear words on the basis of recordings of naturally occurring interaction. This allows us to study "the contextual details that participants use to make sense of everyday language [...] by grounding analyses in participants' observable orientations to the phenomenon" (Hoey et al. 2021:6), and thereby connect the words to the practical relevancies of situated action. Grammatically, swear words can function as various word classes such as interjections, verbs, and nouns, and thereby occur as part of various constructions within different phrases, sentences, etc., but also in a variety of positions within the turn-at-talk such as turn-initial, -medial, and -final position. They can also constitute an entire turn (Calabria/Sciubba 2022).

When looking at what speakers accomplish when using swear words in interaction, Calabria/Sciubba (2022) shows that Italian swear words can be used to reinforce a speaker's stance and make affiliation or agreement relevant. This study also shows that swear words can be used as a resource to display urgency and exasperation, and negative emotions. Swear words can be part of reported speech (and reported thought, Fiedler 2024:50), and thus be directed towards or occasioned by something that was part of a different interaction, in the case of e.g. storytelling (Calabria/Sciubba 2022). Through a sequential and situated analysis of swear words, the study shows how negative emotions can emerge and be locally managed

in the speakers' lexical choices, their stance projection, and responses (Calabria/ Sciubba 2022).

Butler/Fitzgerald (2011) investigates swearing in live media broadcast data in English and shows how swearing is oriented to as norm-breaking by the swearing person in a certain interactional environment, and how participants can orient to swear words as taboo through repair, display of shock, laughter, and the reproaches surrounding them (Butler/Fitzgerald 2011). Sciubba/Calabria (2023) also shows such orientation taking place in both mundane and institutional interactions in Italian.

Hoey et al. (2021) explores sequences with an expletive in English, such as *the fuck*. This study presents the structure as a three-turn sequence where the swear word is used in the third turn, upgrading a sequence-initiating action. It demonstrates how this sequence embodies a normative ordering whereby participants first manage interactional difficulties through relatively tacit procedures, and then given the failure of those, through more explicit and escalated ones (Hoey et al. 2021).

2.3. Stance in interaction

As stated above, swear words are used to display a stance in interaction. Swearing, at least in our data, turns out to be common in quotation. Stance is the display of a speaker's position or relation compared to other speaker in terms of e.g. knowledge (epistemic stance) or emotion (affective stance) (Stevanovic & Peräkylä 2014). Affective stance can work as an "overlay" to action (Couper-Kuhlen 2009), for instance by embedding attitude into questions (Steensig/Drew 2008). Stance can have positive or negative valence (Maynard/Freese 2012), somewhat like assessments (Couper-Kuhlen/Selting 2018:287), but everyday terms for emotions do not reflect the interactionally relevant categories very well (Local/Walker 2008). The exact details of what may be an appropriate or relevant response in a stance-loaded context is up for negotiation (Kjaerbeck/Asmuß 2005).

Quotation is used to back up claims, giving access to, e.g., the details of a story and may thereby make more involved responses relevant (Holt 1996; Stivers 2008). Quotation can also be used to respond to assessments (Clift 2007) and display stance-taking (Clift 2006).

Until now, there has been no systematic analysis of how the Danish swear word *fanden,* or any other Danish swear word for that matter, is used in interaction. For this reason, this study aimed to explore where the Danish swear word *fanden* occurs in Danish talk-in-interaction and its range of functions.

3. Method and data

The study aim was addressed by analysing occurrences of *fanden* in Danish interactions using the methods of Conversation Analysis (CA) (Sacks/Schegloff/Jefferson 1974) and Interactional Linguistics (IL) (Couper-Kuhlen/Selting 2018). CA is a research approach used to systematically analyse social interaction through close investigation of how participants produce turns at talk (Stivers/Sidnell 2013) and thereby display their understanding of the interaction as it unfolds. The analysis describes the interactional structure in terms of how practices, actions, and activities

are organised by and between speakers. The IL approach combines CA with attention to linguistic units and structures.

The study was conducted as part of the on-going work of the Danish Talk-in-Interaction (DanTIN) research group that the authors are members of.

The authors searched a total of 24 recordings of 20 distinct interactions and created a collection (Schegloff 1996) of all instances of *fanden* and related forms. Nine recordings were from Samtalebanken, the Danish part of TalkBank (MacWhinney/Wagner 2010), and 15 recordings were from AULing (Samtalegrammatik.dk 2024). Samtalebanken is publicly available online, and participants have agreed to the use of their data in this way. Participants in the AULing database have provided informed consent to being recorded and that their data can be shared and analysed for research purposes. Recordings were collected between 1999 and 2019.

The data include both audio- and video-recordings of face-to-face and phone conversations, but mostly comprise face-to-face videos. Interactions were all in Danish and took place mainly in naturally occurring everyday contexts (e.g., coffee chats, cooking, and informal telephone calls) with a small part containing set up or semi-structured interactions such as board game activities. The number of participants in each recording varied from two to four participants. The total playtime of the interactions are 8 hours and 40 minutes (10 minutes were phone conversations, and the rest were face-to-face).

Instances were identified in existing transcripts, either directly from Samtalebanken, AULing or through re-transcriptions made during previous projects. Transcripts were searched for cases of any form of *fanden*, including variations such as *fandens* and *fandme*.

The data search yielded a total of 76 cases, including three main variations of *fanden*: 29 cases of *fanden*; 45 cases of *fandme*; and two types of other variations (see Table 1).

Variation of *fanden*	Number of cases
Fanden	29
Hva fanden	17
Other question word + *fanden*	7
Other *fanden*	5
Fandme	45
Other variations	2
Total	**76**

Table 1: Distribution of *fanden*

As evident in Table 1, most cases of *fanden* occurred with a question word, predominantly *hvad* ('what'), which is usually pronounced *hva* [ʋæ] in spoken Danish (Jørgensen 2015). Cases of another question word + *fanden* included four instances of *hvor* ('where'), one case of *hvem* ('who') and *hvorfor* ('why'). Moreover, there was one other case where the question word could not be heard clearly. Cases with *fanden* without a question word included four cases of *for fanden* ('for the devil') and one case of the genitive *fandens* ('the devil's') within a noun phrase. Two other

variations were identified as well, *fandernedme* and *fandeneddeme*, which can be considered expanded variants of *fandme* ('the devil eats me'). This paper focuses and reports on analyses of the 17 cases of *hva fanden*. This is due to it being the most varied construction, both in terms of meaning and the interactional contexts it is used in.

Single-case analyses (Pomerantz/Fehr 1997) were conducted on the instances of *hva fanden*. These cases form a collection analysis of the construction *hva fanden* ('what the devil'). Collection analyses systematically explore patterns of an interactional phenomenon (Hoey/Kendrick 2018). Data and analyses were also discussed in CA data sessions; a common practice within CA methodology and community (Stevanovic/Weiste 2017).

Common CA and IL transcription conventions were followed, in this case Jefferson (2004) and Mondada (2022). All names, locations, and other potentially identifying information have been pseudonymized.

4. Analysis

Hva fanden occurs in two interactional environments: The first is in information-seeking actions including repair (both word search and other-initiated repair) and requests for information, where *fanden* is used to distance the speaker from the referent in question, both by underlining the speaker's epistemic non-access to the referent and by displaying a negative assessment of it. The second use appears in quotes, which employs the information-seeking framing to assess a situation or someone's conduct negatively. The distribution of *hva fanden* is displayed in Table 2.

Function of *hva fanden*	Number of cases
Information-seeking use	8
Word search	3
Other-initiated repair	1
Information requests	4
Quoted use	9
Receiving immediate response	3
Receiving response within a telling	3
Receiving no response	3

Table 2. Functions of *hva fanden*

The following sections present analyses of the interactional function of these types. The analyses show that while the types are distinct, they relate to each other.

4.1. Information-seeking use

A total of eight cases of *hva fanden* occurs in information-seeking activities with various interactional functions. They appear in repair sequences, either as part of a word search or other-initiated repair, and in requests for information.

4.1.1. Word search

Interactional repair refers to a set of practices used to attend to troubles in speaking, hearing or understanding talk (Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks 1977). 'Troubles' include, for instance, speakers' unavailability of a word when needed and participants' problems with understanding what another party says. The former, denoting a type of repair initiated by the speaker of the trouble-source ('self-initiation of repair'), is here referred to as 'word search' (Schegloff 1979). In the following section, cases of *hva fanden* used for initiating word searches will be described and analysed.

Excerpt (2) is from a study group meeting between three students, Georg (GEO), Isabella (ISA), and Hans (HAN). Prior to the excerpt, Georg has sought the others' advice on relevant theory for an assignment.

(2) auling:feedback1:11

```
01 ISA: ja men nu +spurgte du oss om teori.+
        yes but now you also asked about theory
   isa            +         smiling        +
02 GEO: ja nå jo:.
        yes oh yes
03 HAN: men du har- havde du ikk- du har jo oss martin,=ikk?
        but you have had you not  you have Martin too   right
04 GEO: °jo°
         yes
05 HAN: ja
        yes
06      (4.5)+       (0.5)        +
   isa       +looking up at HAN+
07      m:.
08      €(5.3)
   han  €scratches his forehead->
09 HAN: #°hva fanden er det den hedder°
          what fanden is it it is called
   geo  #looking at HAN->
10      (2.3)
11      jeg har en eller anden€ bog derhjemme
   han                       ->€
        I have some or another book at home
12      hvor der så vistnok står noget om sån noget.
        where it then probably says something about such stuff
13 GEO: mm,
14 HAN: en af kristian holst#
        one by Kristian Holst
   geo                     ->#
15      #(4.2)
   geo  #looking down at his laptop, nodding->
16      jeg ka prøve å finde ud af hva det er den hedder,=øh:
        I can try to find out what it is it is called     uh
```

```
17        så ka du jo:=
          then you can
18 GEO: =mm-=
19 HAN: =må du meget gerne #(0.9) låne den
           you are very welcome to borrow it
    geo                    ->#looking at HAN->>
```

Georg's request for theory in the talk prior to the excerpt constitutes the first pair part of the base sequence in this excerpt, and Hans offering Georg to borrow one of his books (l.17-19) is the second-pair part. Before delivering his offer, Hans checks, in a pre-second insert expansion (in l.3), that Georg's teacher is Martin, which seems to be a prerequisite for offering the theory book in question. Georg confirms, thereby opening up the possibility of producing an offer next.

However, Hans initiates his offer with a word search, searching for the title of the book: °*hva fanden er det den hedder*° ('what the devil is it it is called', l.9). Word searches are common in cases where speakers need to produce precise terms, such as names or titles, that do not have a simple substitute (Goodwin/Goodwin 1986; Lerner 1996). Hans' word search is initiated tacitly with no explicit indications (besides the extended silence, l.6-8) that the progressivity will be suspended. Clearly, Hans shapes the word search as a question for himself (cf. Clausen/Pedersen 2017): the co-participants have no opportunities to help repair the trouble source, as Hans, at this point in the conversation, has not provided any information as to what the trouble source, *den* ('it', l.9), refers to. In other words, only Hans knows what the trouble that needs fixing is. Hans' scratching of his forehead during the extended silence and the production of his question can be seen as another marker of the question being designed as a word search. Retrospectively, the earlier pauses (l.6-8) can then be seen as Hans trying to recall the name of the book, with *m:* (l.7) possibly being a kind of *uh(m)*, and the turn with *hva fanden* (l.9) making the failed word search explicit.

Evidently, Hans does not succeed in recalling the title of the book, and after 2.3 seconds of silence (l.10), he moves on to providing other types of information about the book instead: Hans has the book at home (l.11), it probably says something relevant about the theory they are discussing (l.12), and it is written by Kristian Holst (l.14). This description contains several markers of uncertainty: *en eller anden bog* ('some or another book', l.11), *vistnok* ('probably', l.12), and *noget om sån noget* ('something about such stuff', l.12). The use of *hva fanden* in the initial word search seems to underline and upgrade this uncertainty by marking the book as unidentifiable. Based on this, *hva fanden* (as opposed to just *hva*) used in word searches seems to project that self-repair will not be executed, as the word searched for is not recallable for the speaker. In all instances of *hva fanden* used for word search in our data, the trouble source is not subsequently repaired by the *hva fanden*-speaker. Thus, *hva fanden* seems to show an orientation to the trouble source as something that cannot be repaired.

Another case of *hva fanden* used to initiate a word search can be seen in excerpt (3). In this interaction, four young men are sitting around a table: Benjamin (BEN), Chresten (CHR), David (DAV), and Erik (ERI). Here, Chresten uses *hva fanden* to search for the name of a computer program he had tried to download (l.4), so that he could watch TV series online for free.

(3) samtalebanken:fyrne:53

```
01 CHR: nej >jeg tror jeg ville< prøve å downloade
        no   I think I would    try to download
02      >et eller andet-<
        something
03      (0.8)
04      hva fanden var det det var.
        what fanden was it it was
05      (0.3)
06 BEN: porno.
        porn
07 DAV: [*ja*]
         yes
08 ERI: [ Hh ] h h hH
09 CHR: [nej ] det var >det nu ikk-<
         no it was not
10      (.)
11      det v- det var et eller andet program der gjorde et eller
        it w-  it was some program         that did something
12      andet.
```

As in excerpt (2), the co-participants have minimal opportunities to help the speaker of the trouble source carry out repair, as the only information provided by Chresten is that the trouble source is something he was trying to download. Benjamin's suggestion, *porno* ('porn', l.6), is thus a humorous comment rather than an actual attempt at repair, eliciting laughter and an instant rejection from Chresten *nej det var >det nu ikk<* ('no, it was not', l.9). Similar to excerpt (2), Chresten then moves on to deliver a description of the program he tried to download, rather than carrying out the repair: *det v- det var et eller andet program der gjorde et eller andet* ('it w- it was some program that did something', l.11-12), once again using markers of uncertainty (*et eller andet program* 'some program', *gjorde et eller andet* 'did something'). Again, Chresten's use of *hva fanden* when initiating the word search seems to underline that he is unlikely to recall the name of the computer program searched for.

In this section, the use of *hva fanden* to initiate word searches has been described. Common to all three instances of *hva fanden* used for word search in our data is that *hva fanden* is used to initiate solitary word searches for information that belongs solely to the speaker's epistemic domain (Dressel 2020). By using *hva fanden* to initiate a word search, the speaker indicates that an immediate repair solution is out of reach, since the speaker (who is the only participant with epistemic access), is unable to recall the item searched for. Thus, *hva fanden* seems to project that the specific word searched for will remain unrepaired.

4.1.2. Other-initiated repair

Hva fanden can also be used to initiate repair of other speakers' talk (i.e., 'other-initiated repair'). This type of repair indicates some problem in hearing or understanding what has been said in the preceding turn (Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks 1977).

This is the case in excerpt (4). This conversation takes place between members of a mothers' group, Susanne (SUS), Mia (MIA), and Tanja (TAN). The mothers

are having breakfast while talking about a Christmas event one of the mothers has recently organised, where she was responsible for buying candy for the children. When the excerpt begins, Susanne compares her way of buying and packing candy bags with how the prior organisers did it. When describing the prior organisers' procedure, Susanne mentions a candy company *Candinavia* (l.3). Yet, Tanja, who does not recognise this referent, initiates repair by repeating the trouble source (l.6) followed by a *hva fanden*-initiated turn (*hv↑a↓: fanden er det* 'what the devil is that', l.8). Tanja's repetition of the trouble source, *Candinavia*, claims the ability to reproduce it, but not to understand what is meant by it (Kitzinger 2013:249). This is confirmed by her subsequent repair initiation, *hv↑a↓: fanden er det* ('what the devil is that', l.8).

(4) samtalebanken:moedregruppen1:68

```
01 SUS: plus de de::r slikposer=altså før da blev givet fem
        plus these candy bags   so before then was given five
02      kroner ved <candinavia>
        kroner at   Candinavia
03      å så har de så fået en pose kemisk affald      ikk
        and then they have got a bag of chemical waste right
04      °de så      [ ku ]°.
         they then could
05 MIA:            [hmf::]°hu[hu° ]
06 TAN:                      [<can]dinavia>
07 SUS: ja
        yes
08 TAN: (altså det sku) +hv↑a↓: fanden+ er det.
         well it should  what    fanden is that
   tan                 + shakes head +
09 SUS: det: sån et slikfirma de::r  [ville være ] med til å
        it is such a candy firm that  would help
10 TAN:                              [(°nå okay°)]
                                       oh okay
11 SUS: sponsorere
        sponsoring
```

Besides underlining Tanja's epistemic non-access to the Candinavia reference, *hva fanden* here also implies a negative orientation towards the referent. Earlier in the conversation, Susanne has assessed the candy company negatively, and Tanja's use of *hva fanden* (as opposed to *hva* by itself) in her repair-initiation displays a condemnation that matches Susanne's stance. The pitch movements on *hva* may be part of displaying such a stance (and the slow production of the repeat in l.6 is possibly part of stance-taking too).

Subsequently, the speaker of the trouble source, Susanne, carries out other-initiated self-repair by providing further information about Candinavia: *det: sån et slikfirma de::r ville være med til å sponsorere* ('it's such a candy firm that would help sponsoring', l.9-12). In this way, the use of *hva fanden* is analogous to the use of *the fuck* in English identified by Hoey et al. (2021), which we return to in the discussion.

Common to *hva fanden* used in the two repair environments presented – whether it is for self-initiation or other-initiation of repair – is that *hva fanden* emphasises the speaker's current lack of access to specific knowledge. But the two usages have

slightly different functions in terms of distancing the speaker from the trouble source: Whereas *hva fanden* used for word search projects the speaker's inability to repair a trouble source not yet produced (i.e. pre-positioned self-initiated repair), the instance of *hva fanden* used to initiate repair of another party's talk (i.e. post-positioned other-initiated repair) not only emphasises the speaker's epistemic non-access to the trouble-source, but implies a negative assessment of it too.

4.1.3. Requests for information

A third usage of *hva fanden* in information-seeking activities is when *hva fanden* initiates requests for information. In these cases, no trouble source is produced prior to the *hva fanden*-turn, but aside from that, the *hva fanden*-initiated requests for information are closely related to initiating repair of others' talk. The speaker assumes that the recipient is more knowledgeable on a given topic and therefore requests further information. As in 4.1.2, *hva fanden* induces negative stance-taking, both by upgrading the speaker's lack of epistemic access to the requested information and by displaying a negative assessment of the referent or topic in question.

In excerpt (5), Benjamin and David are talking about changing rooms, and David suggests that they can undergo sex-changing surgery in order to be able to *komme ind (0.3) til pigerne* ('get in (0.3) to the girls', l.9-11). This leads to David's request for information about how a "hermaphrodite" chooses changing room (l.15).

(5) samtalebanken:fyrne:56

```
01 BEN: så går man (.) så går man ind til k- tøserne=
        then you go     then you go into the girls
02      =>sådan er det<.
          that is how it is
03      (1.8)
04 DAV: Å[:H                         ]
        oh
05 BEN: [det kunne være meget sjovt og] prøve det den anden
         it  could  be  very  fun  to   try it the other
06      vej r[undt
        way around
07 DAV:      [>(du har ret)<?=
               you are right
08      =£skal vi ikk få en kønsskifteoperation=
         should we not get a sex-change operation
09      =bare for at kunne komme ind
         just to get in
10      (0.3)
11      til pigerne,£
        to the girls
12      (0.3)
13      +[hor- hor- hor-                +
   dav  +exaggerated facial expression+
14 ERI: [ødh: hehe
15 DAV: HEY=hva fanden gør en hermafrodit
        HEY what fanden does a hermaphrodite do
16      (0.6)
17      svar mig
        answer me
18 BEN: man vælger køn sgu da.
        you choose gender duh
```

Prior to the request for information, David makes the humorous proposal about sex-changing surgery (l.8-11) which is not responded to. After a short silence (l.12), David laughs at his own joke (l.13) and requests Benjamin for information about hermaphrodites with *HEY=hva fanden gør en hermafrodit* ('hey what the devil does a hermaphrodite do', l.15). David initiates his information request with a misplacement marker, *HEY* (l.15), which indicates that the following will deviate from the course of the prior talk or suspend its progressivity (Schegloff/Sacks 1973:319). *Hva fanden* is here used both to underline David's own epistemic non-access to the requested information and to distance himself from the changing room habits of "hermaphrodites".

Probably because of the unseriousness of David's prior talk, Benjamin does not immediately respond to the request, and a long gap emerges (l.16). However, David pursues a response (in line with swearing expressing urgency, Calabria/Sciubba 2022), as he explicitly asks Benjamin to treat his turn as a request for information: *svar mig* ('answer me', l.17). Benjamin finally provides an answer to David's question, *man vælger køn sgu da* ('you choose gender, duh', l.18). The use of *sgu da* ('duh') also underlines that Benjamin is the epistemic authority of the requested information and positions David as less knowledgeable. Moreover, it points to David's question as silly and unworthy of being treated as an actual request for information.

As was the case for other-initiated repair in excerpt (4), requests for information initiated by *hva fanden* imply an emphasis on the requester's epistemic non-access to the requested information as well as a negative orientation towards the requested information or referents as part of it. The negative stance may be seen in contrast to the use in word search, where no negative framing of a referent seems to be interactionally relevant (although *hva fanden* could be understood as displaying frustration towards the situation of being unable to recall the word, this does not seem to be interactionally relevant for the responses).

To sum up, the information-seeking use of *hva fanden* includes cases where *hva fanden* performs repair-initiating actions, both self-initiation (in the case of word search) and other-initiation of repair, as well as information requests. *Hva fanden* is here used to upgrade the speaker's uncertainty about and/or epistemic non-access to the information sought after, and potentially also assess the referent negatively.

4.2. Quoted use

A total of nine cases of *hva fanden* occurs in quotes, where they are used as part of an assessment activity or telling. The quoted cases include reported speech and reported thought of both the speaker themselves and others, often as part of some reported interaction. They display stance-taking by framing some reported conduct as being worthy of a response, either by initiating repair or by requesting information as described in the previous section. However, the quoted context seems to strengthen the negativity or affect in the stance. Some cases receive a response from another speaker, while others receive a response within a reported interaction, performed by the same speaker. Both are usually part of a telling.

4.2.1. Quotes receiving immediate response

In this section, cases are examined where *hva fanden* occurs in a quote or reported action and performs an assessment. The action is also responded to as an assessment by another speaker (Pomerantz 1984). The utterances with *hva fanden* are directed at a recipient within the story, keeping this reported recipient accountable for unreasonable or unacceptable conduct. This is done by framing the conduct of a person in the telling as worthy of a frustrated repair initiation or request for information, which may act as a request for an account.

In excerpt (6), Sisse (SIS) tells a story about her reaction to her boyfriend starting to shave her while they were showering. Sisse's story ends with her using *hva fanden*:

(6) auling:haarfarvning2:28

```
01 SIS: ↑så be+gynder han å stå+ å
           then he starts to stand and
   sis        +points to armpit+
02      bar$bere mig↑ under arm$ene. ·hh
           shave me under the arms
   lin     $slaps knee twice   $leans back->
03 LIN: ↑det er så$ fucking  [$sjovt↑ (haha/det er)$
           it is so   fucking  [ funny (haha/it is)
04 SIS:                        [+å jeg ka bare huske +
                               [ and I can just remember
   lin          ->$slaps chair$moves body upright  $
   sis                            +puts hands into hair+
05      +jeg står bare der å så+ kommer den der skraber
           I'm just standing there and then comes this shaver
   sis  +mimicks hair scrubbing+holds hands in hair
06      >å jeg så(n)< f- +hva FANDEN ↑LAVER DU.     +
           and I'm like f-  what fanden are you doing
   sis                  +looks behind over shoulder+
07 LIN: h fuck det: bare grinern det er
           h fuck it's just laughable it is
08      hold kæft det sjovt.
           shut up it's funny
```

The situation Sisse is describing at the beginning of the excerpt involves her boyfriend shaving Sisse's armpits to her surprise. From l.5, the situation is described in further detail, in which the shaving is responded to with *hva FANDEN ↑LAVER DU* ('what the devil are you doing', l.6). This is the climax of the story, marked partly by a quote of what was said at the time (Stivers 2008), but also through high pitch and loudness (Mikkelsen/Kragelund 2015) and Sisse bodily mimicking the situation. The *hva fanden*-framed question of the type *what are you doing* specifically targets someone's actions, and similar to why-interrogatives, it can be considered a specific format for requesting/soliciting accounts, thereby assessing the boyfriend's actions as unreasonable, unacceptable, and unexpectable (Bolden/Robinson 2011). In this interaction however, the story climax makes a response relevant, and Line (LIN) delivers an agreeing assessment through *fuck* followed by the description of it as *grinern* ('laughable', l.7) and later *sjovt* ('fun', l.8). Her use of *fuck* and *hold kæft* 'shut up' are other cases of swearing (in line with Calabria/Sciubba 2022:D22

on responding swear words used for affiliation). Line's response displays an understanding of Sisse's turn with *hva fanden* as an assessment by responding with another assessment (Pomerantz 1984). The response also marks a point where the story has reached its end, as the response consists of multiple turns rather than passing back the floor or otherwise responding minimally. After the excerpt, Sisse returns to a previous topic.

In the next case, excerpt (7), Dorte (DOR), part of the mother's group, is producing a telling about students contacting her outside of ordinary working hours. She describes this as an unpleasant experience. Just before the excerpt, she has mentioned that students were sending her emails during the Easter break. In the beginning of the excerpt, her description is approaching a 'prime' example of unacceptable times to contact her, as formulated through *til sidst* ('lastly', l.1), and the extreme case turns out to be Holy Saturday (*påskelørdag*, l.3). The pause before and head gesture during the turn draw attention to the utterance. Mia (MIA) responds with an assessment, saying (ironically) *det var dejligt* ('that was nice', l.4), which displays the understanding that the telling is part of an assessment activity.

(7) samtalebanken:moedregruppen1:69

```
01 DOR: ·hhh til sidst er der en af dem der ringer til mig.
        ·hhh lastly there is one of them who calls me
02      (1.0)
03      +påskelørdag                       +
         Holy Saturday
   dor  +makes circular motion with head+
04 MIA: °det var dejligt°
         that was nice
05      (0.8)
06 DOR: jeg havde det bare sån
        I had it just like
07      <hva fanden i [helvede (.) [tror du det her det er.>
         what fanden in hell (.) do you think this is
08 MIA:               [-hhehh       [°hhuh°
09      °ja haha°
         yes haha
10      (1.0)
11 DOR: jam altså den der <fuldstændige> m:angel på ø:::h på pli
        yeah but well that complete lack of u:h of manners
12      å: [på ø:::h >situa]tionsfornemmelse< å
        and of u:h sense of situation and
13 MIA:    [hhu ·hh °*jaer*°]
            hhu ·hh yeah
```

After Mia's response and a pause, Dorte continues her telling, stating how she felt by using a quote with *hva fanden* in *<hva fanden i helvede (.) tror du det her det er>* ('what the devil in hell do you think this is', l.7). By framing it with *jeg havde det bare sådan* ('I felt like', more literally 'I had it like this', l.6), the *fanden*-utterance is projected as reflecting her state of mind and subjective assessment in that situation, rather than being framed as an accurate portrayal of what she said or thought. It frames the conduct of the student as something warranting a question, using not only *fanden*, but also the swearing expression *i helvede* 'in hell'. The multiple swear words and the slow pronunciation can be considered a further upgrade. Mia responds with a *ja* ('yes', l.9) and laughter, having understood the previous turn as a

reasonable thought in the situation and agreeing with it with *ja*. Dorte then expands her utterance (l.11) and makes it explicit that she considers the student's actions an accountable breach of manners, thus elaborating on the type of norm breached by the student. The turn with *hva fanden* can then be seen as an upgrade of the assessing aspect of l.3, seeking a more affiliating response.

These cases show how *hva fanden* is used to portray a remote reaction in a recounted interaction. When doing so, it assesses something that the speaker supposedly reacted to as an accountable deviation from what is expected and acceptable in the context. The assessment has relevance in the current interaction, as seen in responses doing agreeing or further assessing actions by other speakers (in line with Calabria/Sciubba 2022). They often form part of a telling or another extended activity.

4.2.2. Quotes receiving response within a telling

While it was shown that turns with *hva fanden* as part of a telling could be responded to in ways seen in the previous section, this section focuses on those that do not elicit a speaker-transition in the current interaction. Instead, the response forms part of the telling and is animated by the speaker telling the story.

Excerpt (8), from the same interaction as (3) and (5), illustrates the use of *hva fanden* as part of a quote in storytelling conveying a stance towards a certain, despairful situation. The four participants have been talking about a series of entertainment events where a group organizes each, and Benjamin has announced that his groups is to organize the next. In the excerpt, Benjamin talks about his group's situation when they were supposed to organise it the year before. In his telling, the group reacts to becoming aware of a deadline. This is framed as a quote through *der v<u>a</u>r vi sån lidt* ('we were a bit like', l.1).

(8) samtalebanken:fyrne:51

```
01 BEN: $s̲i̲dste år der$ v̲ar vi sån lidt
            last year then we were a bit like
     eri  $head tow. BEN$
02       €fu̲ck $d̲e̲t: sån €i overmorgen
          fuck that's like the day after tomorrow
     chr  €looks up at BEN€looks down at pen->>
     eri        $head dir. at BEN->
03       å $hva fanden ska >vi lave
            and what fanden do we do
     eri    $head moves slowly away from BEN->
04       vi l̲a̲ver en< rou̲ladespisningskonkurre̲nce.$
            we make a roulade eating competition
                                                ->$
05       (0.3)
06       å [vi̲ f- næ̲ (.) jo̲ $en rou- var det i̲kk det?$
            and we f- no (.) yes a rou- wasn't it that
07 ERI:  $[Hhh
     eri  $looks up          $looks at BEN->           $
08       $(0.4)
     eri $looks at the others->>
09 BEN: *e*llers s̲å var det +a̲visdans jeg kan ikk h̲uske det.
            otherwise then it was newspaper dance I cannot remember
     dav     ->>holds paper up+moves paper out of sight->>
```

The first quote (l.2) consists of a problem statement – that the deadline is soon – which can make the handling of the problem or registering that there is a problem relevant (Schegloff 1988; Yokomori 2023). The latter is achieved through the second quote, a turn with *hva fanden* about what they are going to do (l.3), registering that something must be done, but without offering a solution. In the recounted interaction, this is responded to with a proposal, a *roul<u>a</u>despisningskonkurr<u>e</u>nce* ('Swiss roll eating competition', l.4).

The use of *hva fanden* to ask what to do mirrors the despair of the situation already indexed by the first turn with the problem statement and an initial *fuck* in the reported interaction. Here, the use of *fanden,* and the stance associated with it, is part of setting the scene for a story and the problem that is central to the events of the story. The turn is exclamative-like in nature through asking a very general question and the (imagined) speaker(s) displaying lack of knowledge about what to do, and the use of *hva fanden* negatively assessing the recounted situation by conveying the frustration felt (*exasperation* in Calabria/Sciubba 2022).

The turn makes an answer relevant, at least in the sense that the teller animates both a question and response (note that he uses *vi* 'we' throughout the telling) within the telling, but not in the interaction among the teller and listeners. During the telling, both the teller and most participants display few changes in bodily orientation. The quoted question with *hva fanden* and its response is delivered by Benjamin with rush-through, by speeding up at the end of the quote (l.3) and the response being prosodically integrated with the quote, with no pause in between. Erik, who sits beside Benjamin, turns his head towards Benjamin at the start of the telling. At the start of the quote, Erik very slowly turns his head slightly away from Benjamin, not disengaging, but displaying an understanding of Benjamin's telling as not requiring mutual gaze at this point or soon. Erik's head movement does not change around the end of the quote or the start of the response, showing that he has understood it as not being a transition-relevant place. While employing a question-like format, the *hva fanden*-construction is in this case recognizably part of the telling and not designed to elicit any response from listeners.

In excerpt (8), the *fanden*-turn did not assess in the current situation in the sense that it did not make agreement from the listeners a relevant response, but it still relayed some affect or stance that was supposed to have been displayed in the told situation. Something equivalent occurs in the next case, excerpt (9), but in the speaker's reported thoughts. Here, Anne (ANN) asks a question regarding the status of a type of assignment known as a "feature" that Beate (BEA) is supposed to write (l.1). It is formulated as a request for confirmation whether it has been written. Beate replies after a pause with *j<u>o</u>* (l.3). *Jo* is type-non-conforming as it can mean 'yes' but it is usually only used in negatively formatted contexts (Heinemann 2015). The *<u>o</u>kay*, in this position, also projects that some non-straight-forward answer is underway (deSouza et al. 2021). Her answer develops into a story about her thought process when having to find a topic for her feature.

(9) samtalebanken:anne_og_beate:32

```
01 ANN: havde (du egentlig) øh nået å lave din ↑feature.
        had you actually øh managed to make your feature
02      +(0.9)              +
   bea  +possibly chewing+
03 BEA: jo.
        yeah
04      +(0.4)                  +
   bea  +smacks hand on table+
05      okay.
06      (0.8)
07      mm- (.) faktisk så starter det med (.) jeg ligger
        mm (.) actually then it starts with (.) I'm lying
08      om aftenen på min seng?
        on my bed in the evening
09      (0.6)
10      å så tænker jeg hva ↑fanden jeg skal lave
        and then I think what fanden I should make
11      den her *ø:h* feature om.
        this u:h feature about
12      (0.6)
13      å så lige pludselig så: (.) kommer det
        and then suddenly then (.) it comes
14      bare (.) so:m altså (.) ↑slam (0.3) ↓skrald.
        just (.) like well (.) slam (0.3) garbage
```

As in the previous case in excerpt (8), an idea is needed, and the frustration experienced in the situation is expressed in the *hva fanden*-turn where Beate asks herself what to do with the assignment. This case can be seen as a hypothetical interaction in which she comes up with an idea shortly after (l.14). It is very similar to the previous case, but the report only contains her own thoughts and no interaction with other people. But like the previous case, it sets the scene and is part of framing the problem whose solution the story is about, here elicited by a question. The choice of framing it through reference to her own thought is in line with other use of reported thought to display a stance (Fiedler 2024).

Note that this instance has a different word order than the others, and that the subject, rather than the verb, appears immediately after *hva fanden*. This word order is associated with embedded clauses, meaning that it is indirect rather than direct reported thought. A total of four cases has this word order. The three other cases do not receive any response, either being part of a longer unit as in (9) or being followed by a change in topic. All four cases may be said to occur in reported speech or thought.

This section showed how quotes with *hva fanden* can be used to frame someone's conduct in a certain way. This was done through formulating a question about someone's behaviour and being part of conveying some affective state that took place as part of the told or imagined interaction. The assessment can target someone else's behaviour by framing it as unreasonable or one's own behaviour by framing the situation as one where knowledge was lacking, causing frustration. The turns with *hva fanden* may either receive a response as part of the story or in the current interaction, treating them as assessments by continuing assessing or displaying agreement.

5. Concluding discussion

In this paper, a number of practices involving the use of the form *hva fanden* 'what the devil' has been described: Some mark word search, repair or request for information in the current situation, while the others display a negative stance towards some non-current conduct, by framing that as worthy of a response building on the former function of *hva fanden*. This shows that the swear word construction *hva fanden* in general is used with displays of trouble. As part of word search, *hva fanden* may not display a stance, but indicates that the speaker may be unable to recall the sought term, marking the word search as solitary (Dressel 2020), potentially highlighting the amount of trouble in the attempt at recalling. In other-initiated repair and requests for information, the use of *hva fanden* may be related to displaying a negative stance or assessment in the context. This can surface as a repair-initiation being in line with earlier assessments by others, or through a request for information framing some people or conduct as "questionable". In quotation, *hva fanden* is part of framing a situation as frustrating or part of treating the actions of someone non-present as an accountable norm breach. This shows that the strength or source of the stance varies and must be understood in relation to the action that it is part of, and that the form and the action may be seen as forming a "package" together to achieve the marking of stance. The study also shows how interactional practices within a quote contribute to the overall activity that the quote is part of (in line with Fiedler 2024) and suggests that quotation may strengthen the negativity in the stance or otherwise make it play a bigger role.

The overview provided for these functions achieved with the same form indicates a relation between the interactional functions. The function of repair and request for information is used (or embedded) in the assessing quotative use, where the stance-taking could be said to take a more important role. In the case of *hva fanden*, the same linguistic material is used for potentially highly dispreferred actions (negative assessments of other's conduct) and word search, which may be considered "basic" and should not be expected to be dispreferred (Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks 1977). The derivative (quotative) uses of repair (which has not been the focus of earlier research and is excluded in, e.g., Dingemanse/Torreira/Enfield 2013), may have a collateral effect (Sidnell/Enfield 2012) on the more basic functions and be another factor in explaining why repair or requests for clarification may occasionally be considered unpleasant or avoided in certain contexts, such as interactions with second language speakers (Pica 1987; Svennevig 2009).

While swear words are often considered taboo words that should not be used in certain contexts, this study has focussed on informal contexts where the participants seemingly do not orient to swearing as "forbidden". However, the taboo status of swear words may contribute to negative assessing or stance (Sciubba/Calabria 2023), especially in the case of quoted use where it is often used to express the view that some behaviour was impolite or norm-breaching (somewhat like the act of swearing can be). The swear word may be part of framing the problem as causing negative affect, or at least to strengthen the display of problematicity for the speakers, through the projection of inability to solve a word search or challenge. Rathje (2010:140) rightly points out that it is difficult to provide a fully interactional definition of swear words, but their interactional stance could be an important factor in

the perception of them as swearing, or the taboo status is part of achieving the stance displayed in certain functions.

In comparison to other languages, *hva fanden* seems to do work similar to English swear words. Some cases of word search with *hva fanden* can be considered upgrades (excerpts (2), (4) and (5), for instance), which are somewhat comparable to the sequential structure of *fuck*-insertion in the work by Hoey et al. (2021). The cases examined here are much less adversarial, however, but provide perspectives on the role of swearing in the context of repair and word search. The lack of strong conflicts is possibly due to a bias towards friendly interaction between acquaintances in the corpora used in this study. It is possible that more hostile versions of requests for information (i.e., turns like *hva fanden laver du*, 'what the fuck are you doing' directed at someone present, more comparable to the cases of *fuck*-insertion) exist in Danish and could provide a closer link between the information-seeking and quoted uses.

While previous literature seems to focus on free-standing usage like *for fanden* or *hva(d) fanden* as a turn on its own (DDO 2024b), the overall frequencies in our data suggest that free-standing use is not the most common use of *fanden*. When assembling the collection, we did not come across any cases of *hva fanden* as a turn-prefacing element, and only a few cases of *for fanden* being added before or after a turn. The genitive form *fandens*, which can be used free-standingly, was only found in one case where it had an attributive function within a noun phrase and was thus syntactically embedded, in a way like most cases of the *fandme* variation. This could be different for other swear words. However, it may be important to bear in mind for future studies of *fanden* that it frequently occurs in complex constructions.

It would be interesting for future studies to look further into the relation between these interactional practices and the sociolinguistic variation in swearing. For instance, there are differences between younger and older generations when it comes to swearing, popular claims about who swears more, (Rathje 2011; Rathje/Andersen 2005), and differences in *what* is perceived as swear words, and *which* are used by, e.g., different age groups (Rathje 2009; Rathje/Grann 2011; Jensen/Rathje 2022). Unfortunately, many of the factors expected to affect swearing (e.g., age or educational background) are not available in our data. However, this description suggests some interactional functions that future studies on sociolinguistic factors could consider in relation to social variables and other contexts.

This study only looked specifically at *hva fanden*. It provides some knowledge and a basis for further study on several related linguistic constructions, such as other swear words after *hva* (as in *hva fuck, hva satan, hva søren* etc.) or practices without swear words (e.g., repair, word search or quotation). For instance, word search with *fanden* in comparison to word search without it displays the speaker's expectation of not being able to come up with a solution to the word search themselves. Based on the database search results, it is also likely that other question words than *hva* have similar functions together with *fanden*. The descriptions presented in this paper point towards multiple other constructions for future studies.

6. References

Andersen, Margrethe Heidemann / Rathje, Marianne (2021): "Så kommer der kraftedeme to altså, what the fuck": Bandeord i Ex on the beach. In: Danske Talesprog 21, 199-233.

Andersson, Lars-Gunnar (1985): Fult språk. Stockholm: Carlsson.

Bolden, Galina B. / Robinson, Jeffrey D. (2011): Soliciting accounts with *why*-interrogatives in conversation. In: Journal of Communication 61(1), 94-119. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2010.01528.x

Butler, Carly W. / Fitzgerald, Richard (2011): "My f***ing personality": swearing as slips and gaffes in live television broadcasts. In: Text & Talk 31(5), 525-551. https://doi.org/10.1515/text.2011.026

Calabria, Virginia / Sciubba, Maria Eleonora (2022): "Adesso m'incazzo!": Swear-words as resources for managing negative emotions in interaction. In: mediAzioni 33, D4-D28.
https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1974-4382/15263

Clausen, Olja Hedelund / Pedersen, Nikoline (2017): En samtaleanalytisk undersøgelse af respons i forbindelse med formatet *hva hedder det*. In: Skrifter om Samtalegrammatik 4(3), 1-40.

Clift, Rebecca (2006): Indexing stance: Reported speech as an interactional evidential. In: Journal of Sociolinguistics 10(5), 569-595.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2006.00296.x

Clift, Rebecca (2007): Getting there first: Non-narrative reported speech in interaction. In: Holt, Elizabeth / Clift, Rebecca (eds.): Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 120-149.
https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486654.006

Coats, Steven (2021): 'Bad language' in the Nordics: profanity and gender in a social media corpus. In: Acta Linguistica Hafniensia 53(1), 22-57.
https://doi.org/10.1080/03740463.2021.1871218

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth (2009): A sequential approach to affect: The case of "disappointment". In: Haakana, Markku / Laakso, Minna / Lindström, Jan (eds.): Talk in Interaction: Comparative Dimensions. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society (SKS), 94-123.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth / Selting, Margret (2018): Interactional Linguistics. Studying Language in Social Interaction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139507318

DDO (2024a): fanden. In: Den Danske Ordbog. Copenhagen: Det Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab. Online at (visited 18.03.2024):
https://ordnet.dk/ddo/ordbog?query=fanden

DDO (2024b): hvad fanden. In: Den Danske Ordbog. Copenhagen: Det Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab. Online at:
https://ordnet.dk/ddo/ordbog?query=hvad+fanden, visited 18.03.2024.

deSouza, Darcey K. et al. (2021): Taking a detour before answering the question: Turn-initial *okay* in second position in English interaction. In: Language & Communication 76, 47-57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2020.09.005

Dingemanse, Mark / Torreira, Francisco / Enfield, N. J. (2013): Is "Huh?" a Universal Word? Conversational Infrastructure and the Convergent Evolution of Linguistic Items. In: PLOS ONE 8(11), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0078273

Dressel, Dennis (2020): Multimodal word searches in collaborative storytelling: On the local mobilization and negotiation of coparticipation. In: Journal of Pragmatics 170, 37-54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.08.010

Fiedler, Sophia (2024): The Grammar-in-use of Direct Reported Thought in French and German: An Interactional and Multimodal Analysis. Mannheim: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung.

Goodwin, Marjorie Harness / Goodwin, Charles (1986): Gesture and coparticipation in the activity of searching for a word. In: Semiotica 62(1-2), 51-75. https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1986.62.1-2.51

Hansen, Erik / Heltoft, Lars (2011): Grammatik over det danske sprog. Copenhagen: Det Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab.

Heinemann, Trine (2015): Negation in interaction, in Danish conversation. In: Skrifter om Samtalegrammatik 2(12), 1-452.

Hoey, Elliott M. et al. (2021): Using expletive insertion to pursue and sanction in interaction. In: Journal of Sociolinguistics 25(1), 3-25. https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12439

Hoey, Elliott M. / Kendrick, Kobin H. (2018): Conversation Analysis. In: Groot, A. M. B. De / Hagoort, Peter (eds.): Research methods in psycholinguistics and the neurobiology of language: A practical guide. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 151-173. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781394259762.ch8

Holt, Elizabeth (1996): Reporting on talk: The use of direct reported speech in conversation. In: Research on Language and Social Interaction 29(3), 219-245. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi2903_2

Jefferson, Gail (2004): Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In: Lerner, Gene H. (ed.): Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 13-23. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125.02jef

Jensen, Johanne Niclasen / Rathje, Marianne (2022): Generationernes holdninger til bandeord – 10 år senere. In: Nyt fra Sprognævnet 2022(2).

Jespersen, Otto (1911): Om banden og sværgen. Iagttagelser om edernes sproglære. In: Svenska landsmål ock svenskt folkliv 114, 33-40.

Jørgensen, Maria (2015): "Hvad" i dansk talesprog. In: Skrifter om Samtalegrammatik 2(6), 1-18.

Kitzinger, Celia (2013): Repair. In: Sidnell, Jack / Stivers, Tanya (ed.): The Handbook of Conversation Analysis. Oxford, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell, 229-56. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118325001.ch12

Kjaerbeck, Susanne / Asmuß, Birte (2005): Negotiating meaning in narratives: An investigation of the interactional construction of the punchline and the post punchline sequences. In: Narrative Inquiry 15(1), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.15.1.01kja

Lerner, Gene (1996): On the "semi-permeable" character of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In: Ochs, Elinor / Schegloff, Emanuel A. / Thompson, Sandra (eds.): Interaction and Grammar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 238-276. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620874.005

Local, John / Walker, Gareth (2008): Stance and affect in conversation: On the interplay of sequential and phonetic resources. In: Text & Talk 28(6), 723-747. https://doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2008.037

MacWhinney, Brian / Wagner, Johannes (2010): Transcribing, searching and data sharing: The CLAN software and the TalkBank data repository. In: Gesprächsforschung - Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion 11, 154-173.

Maynard, Douglas W. / Freese, Jeremy (2012): Good news, bad news, and affect: practical and temporal 'emotion work' in everyday life. In: Peräkylä, Anssi / Sorjonen, Marja-Leena (eds.): Emotion in Interaction. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 92-112. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199730735.003.0005

Mikkelsen, Nicholas Hedegaard / Kragelund, Mathias Høyer (2015): Exaggerated pitch as a story-ending device. In: Skrifter om Samtalegrammatik 2(3), 1-23.

Mondada, Lorenza (2022): Conventions for multimodal transcription. Online at: https://www.lorenzamondada.net/multimodal-transcription, visited 18.03.2024.

Pica, Teresa (1987): Second-Language Acquisition, Social Interaction, and the Classroom. In: Applied Linguistics 8(1), 3-21. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/8.1.3

Pomerantz, Anita (1984): Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In: Atkinson, J. Maxwell / Heritage, John (eds.): Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 57-101. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511665868.008

Pomerantz, Anita / Fehr, Barbara J. (1997): Conversation analysis: An approach to the study of social action as sense making practices. In: Dijk, Teun A. van (ed.): Discourse as social interaction: Discourse Studies 2 - A multidisciplinary introduction. London: Sage, 64-91.

Rathje, Marianne (2009): Sådan oplever de unge bandeord. In: Mål & Mæle 2009(4), 5-11.

Rathje, Marianne (2010): Generationssprog. Copenhagen: Dansk Sprognævn.

Rathje, Marianne (2011): *Fuck*, *fandme* og *for pokker*. Danske bandeord i tre generationers talesprog. In: Språk och stil 21, 81-109.

Rathje, Marianne / Andersen, Margrethe Heidemann (2005): Fuck, sgu og søreme. Bandeord og andre kraftudtryk i tre generationer. In: Nyt fra Sprognævnet 2005(2).

Rathje, Marianne / Grann, Daisy S. (2011): Unge og gamle holdninger til bandeord. In: Nyt fra Sprognævnet 2011(4), 1-10.

Sacks, Harvey / Schegloff, Emanuel A. / Jefferson, Gail (1974): A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. In: Language 50(4), 696-735. https://doi.org/10.2307/412243

Samtalegrammatik.dk (2024): Data. Online at (visited 18.03.20249: https://samtalegrammatik.dk/om-samtalegrammatikdk/vores-metode/data

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1979): The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. In: Givón, Talmy (ed.): Discourse and Syntax. New York: Academic Press, 261-286. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368897_012

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1988): Goffman and the analysis of conversation. In: Drew, Paul / Wootton, Anthony. (eds.): Erving Goffman: Exploring the Interaction Order. Cambridge: Polity Press, 89-135.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1996): Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. In: The American Journal of Sociology 102(1), 161-216. https://doi.org/10.1086/230911

Schegloff, Emanuel A. / Sacks, Harvey (1973): Opening up closings. In: Semiotica 8(4), 289-327. https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1973.8.4.289

Sciubba, Maria Eleonora / Calabria, Virginia (2023): "You can't curse". Topicalizing and sanctioning swearing in everyday interactions in Italian. In: Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquée 117, 9-33.

Sidnell, Jack / Enfield, N. J. (2012): Language Diversity and Social Action: A Third Locus of Linguistic Relativity. In: Current Anthropology 53(3), 302-333. https://doi.org/10.1086/665697

Steensig, Jakob/Drew, Paul (2008): Introduction: questioning and affiliation/disaffiliation in interaction. In: Discourse Studies 10(1), 5-15. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445607085581

Stevanovic, Melisa / Peräkylä, Anssi (2014): Three orders in the organization of human action: On the interface between knowledge, power, and emotion in interaction and social relations. In: Language in Society 43, 185-207. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404514000037

Stevanovic, Melisa / Weiste, Elina (2017): Conversation-analytic data session as a pedagogical institution. In: Learning, Culture and Social Interaction 15, 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2017.06.001

Stivers, Tanya (2008): Stance, Alignment, and Affiliation During Storytelling: When Nodding Is a Token of Affiliation. In: Research on Language and Social Interaction 41(1), 31-57. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351810701691123

Stivers, Tanya / Sidnell, Jack (2013): Introduction. In: Sidnell, Jack / Stivers, Tanya (eds.): The Handbook of Conversation Analysis. Oxford, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell, 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118325001.ch1

Yokomori, Daisuke (2023): *Kedo*-ending turn format as a formula for a problem statement with a deontic implication. In: Journal of Japanese Linguistics 39(1), 59-79. https://doi.org/10.1515/jjl-2023-2006

Søren Sandager Sørensen, PhD
Department of Nordic and Media Studies
University of Agder
4604 Kristiansand
Norway

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7843-566X

soren.s.sorensen@uia.no

Christina Emborg, PhD
Dept. of Psychology and Behavioural Sciences, Aarhus BSS
Aarhus University
Bartholins Allé 11, Bld. 1350, room 319
8000 Aarhus C
Denmark

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9867-3999

chrisemb@psy.au.dk

Dr Andrea Bruun
Kingston University London
Department of Public Health and Children's, Learning Disabilities and Mental
Health Nursing
Kenry House, Kingston Hill Campus
Kingston upon Thames KT2 7LB
United Kingdom

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9620-0290

a.bruun@kingston.ac.uk