

Doing formulating: “Writing Aloud Voice” sequences as an interactional method

Kristiansen, Elisabeth Dalby

Published in:
Journal of Pragmatics

DOI:
10.1016/j.pragma.2017.04.002

Publication date:
2017

Document version:
Accepted manuscript

Document license:
CC BY-NC-ND

Citation for published version (APA):
Kristiansen, E. D. (2017). Doing formulating: “Writing Aloud Voice” sequences as an interactional method. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 114, 49-65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.04.002>

Go to publication entry in University of Southern Denmark's Research Portal

Terms of use

This work is brought to you by the University of Southern Denmark.
Unless otherwise specified it has been shared according to the terms for self-archiving.
If no other license is stated, these terms apply:

- You may download this work for personal use only.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying this open access version

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details and we will investigate your claim.
Please direct all enquiries to puresupport@bib.sdu.dk

Doing formulating: “Writing Aloud Voice” sequences as an interactional method

Corresponding author

Elisabeth Dalby Kristiansen

Department of Language and Communication, University of Southern Denmark, Campusvej 55, 5230 Odense M, Denmark

elkr@sdu.dk

Acknowledgements

The collection of the data used in this study was carried out by Janus Mortensen in connection with his Ph.D project (2010), and I wish to thank him as well as the CALPIU project for allowing me to make use of the data for my own research.

I also wish to thank members of the SoPraCon research center at SDU for helpful comments and advice in data session discussions as well as during the writing of this article.

Finally, I wish to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their comments to an earlier version of this article.

Doing formulating: “Writing Aloud Voice” sequences as an interactional method

Abstract

Participants in interaction take various stances towards the content of their turns. For instance, in direct reported speech sequences, the footing (Goffman, 1979) is changed as the speaker recycles one or more turns from a previous interaction. This article defines and describes *Writing Aloud Voice* (WAV) sequences - a specific change of footing used in hypothetical speech (Haberland, 1986) for doing formulation. This research explores a collection of video recordings of student project group meetings and was analyzed with Ethnomethodological and Conversation Analytic methods. It demonstrates that WAV sequences consist of 1) a quotative construction projecting a change of footing 2) a WAV clause produced with a prosody resembling that of reading aloud, and 3) an exiting device constituting a return to the previous footing. WAV clauses contain numerous speech perturbations, and the article shows how these are used by speakers to demonstrate the ongoing work of formulating a potential text.

Keywords

Footing; Writing Aloud Voice; quotative; unquote; hypothetical discourse

Funding:

This work was supported by the University of Southern Denmark.

1 Introduction

This article explores the interactional phenomenon of Writing Aloud Voice (WAV) sequences. In WAV sequences, speakers display to their co-participants that they are formulating a piece of text. The term Writing Aloud Voice refers to the marked prosody with which WAV sequences are produced: When uttering a WAV sequence, speakers sound as if they were reading aloud from a text, whereas they are in fact in the process of composing one. The examples below provide two preliminary illustrations of WAV sequences. In both examples, the speakers are formulating a research question during a student group meeting in connection with a group project about pedagogical practices at a Danish university. Sif, Ann and Lars are sitting at one end of a table. There is a laptop on the table but no one is reading or typing in the examples below. Behind them, Jens is standing by a whiteboard with a pen in his hand. However, he is not writing during these examples. The examples are transcribed using Jeffersonian transcription conventions with some additions (see Appendix). Speakers' use of the marked prosody mentioned above is indicated with boldface. Immediately prior to the transcribed sequence, Sif has suggested a possible formulation of their research question, and example 1 presents Ann's response:

Example 1:

56 ANN: i think but i- if we wanted to bring all that information≈
((ANN><SIF))
57 ≈we just ha- have to do something *like\
((ANN><SIF))
((*both hands extended forward, palms upards, fingers spread))
58 (1.0) ∇**as** **X**¹ was ***built**→∇
((*forward circular movement with both hands))
((ANN><SIF))
59 ****as an: as an ***ehh**→
((**forward circular movement with left hand))
((***right hand backward circular movement, then both hands on legs))
((***SIF>towards whiteboard))

¹ University name, anonymised

60 (1.4) *↑modreak**tion↘ (0.6)
counter reaction
 ((*right hand extended, slapping motion to the left, then on leg))
 ((*ANN><SIF))

61 SIF: counter reaction↘
 ((SIF><ANN))

62 ANN: **Δcounter reactionΔ to: the** *??you know?? bla bla↘
 ((*right hand extended, fingers spread))
 ((ANN><SIF))

63 it's it's just *i think euww (0.2) ten lines is a lot but→
 ((*hands extended, forming ball shape))

Example 2 similarly presents a formulation of a research question. Prior to the transcribed sequence, the students have discussed the characteristics of a good research question. The sequence below presents Sif's contribution to this discussion.

Example 2

89 LARS: *you know* [let's talk about it]↘
 ((*left hand extended, circular gesture*))
 ((LARS><SIF))

90 SIF: [and i think in] *the intro**duction and then** some[thing*]→
 ((elbows on table, right hand touches face))
 ((*LARS moves chair backwards*))
 ((LARS>chair))

91 LARS: [yeah]↘

92 PPP: (0.5)

93 SIF: *kind of (0.3) **∇based on** **this** we think that ↑it∇**
 ((*SIF>table*))
 ((*SIF>ANN**))

94 PPP: **∇is [the] problem∇ because**↘ (0.3)
 ((SIF><LARS))

95 LARS: [yeah]

In the examples above, Ann and Sif, respectively, offer a suggestion for the formulation of a research question. The suggested formulation is produced with a prosody that is noticeably different from the surrounding talk. Specifically, it sounds as if they are reading aloud even though they are in fact producing spontaneous talk. The rest of this article presents an investigation of this phenomenon.

1.1 Changing the footing: Direct reported speech and hypothetical speech

Using marked prosody to set a sequence of speech apart from surrounding speech is a well-known interactional phenomenon. For instance, studies of direct reported speech (DRS) have found that speakers change a range of prosodic features, including voice quality, pitch, volume, speed, etc., in order to differentiate the reported speech from the surrounding speech (e.g. Coulmas, 1986; Holt, 1996; Günthner, 1999).

The change that DRS sequences accomplish has been described as a change of 'voice' (Bakhtin, 1981) of the reported sequence. Others use Goffman's notion of footing (Goffman, 1981) to account for the changed participation framework in DRS sequences (e.g. Holt, 2000; Clift and Holt, 2007). Goffman (1981: 128) describes footing as "the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance". In DRS, speakers distance themselves from their words by producing them in such a way as to show that they are a quote, not the speakers' own utterance.

Haberland (1986) describes a special kind of reported speech, so-called hypothetical direct speech in which the speaker "reports something which some other speaker might have said but which he or she did not actually say" (1986: 225). Here, speakers do not quote material uttered by somebody else but rather invent a hypothetical situation including hypothetical characters whose hypothetical talk they may reproduce by means of hypothetical direct speech (Golato, 2002; Sams, 2010). Other studies also include possible discourse (i.e. discourse that may take place in the future) as a phenomenon of hypothetical discourse (HD) (e.g. Sams, 2010; Golato, 2012). Kunitz (2015) uses the term HD in a study of planning speech to describe quotations modeling scriptlines that may possibly be said in a future presentation. Similarly, the WAV

sequences described in this study constitute HD since they are quotations that model discourse, in this case written discourse, that has not yet been produced. Further, the WAV sequences occur as part of a planning activity, in the sense that the students are negotiating a research question, and hence are representing possible future actions in their talk (cf. Suchman, 1987; for a recent review of the literature on planning, see Markee and Kunitz, 2013). However, the present study does not approach WAV sequences primarily as planning talk, focusing instead on the internal structure of WAV sequences as one type of HD.

1.2 Direct reported speech and hypothetical speech: Structural features

Some sequences of reported speech rely only on prosodic marking to set off the quoted material from the surrounding speech. But most are framed not only by prosodic changes but also by a specific turn design; they contain an introductory element which establishes an onset boundary and an exiting element which marks the end of the DRS sequence. Hence, DRS sequences consist of three elements: a quotative consisting of speaker (often a pronoun) and a reporting verb (Tannen, 1986; Mathis and Yule, 1994); at least one unit of quoted material (produced with marked prosody); and an unquote which constitutes a return to the pre-change state (Ebert, 1986; see also Golato, 2000; Bolden, 2004). This three-part structure offers speakers a method for temporarily suspending the previous footing while introducing an additional footing.

In DRS sequences, the change in footing serves to decrease the speaker's authorship by introducing a third party as the original author of the quoted material so that the speaker is only the animator, in Goffman's terms, of the reported utterance but not the author and not necessarily the principal (Goffman, 1981). In sequences of HD, the change may be different, however, since the speaker is not quoting a real, previously occurring situation but is imagining

a fictitious or future situation. In WAV sequences, as this study will demonstrate, the change in footing serves to increase the speaker's authorship by framing the quoted material as a potential piece of text.

In the following sections, the article takes a conversation analytic approach to WAV sequences. The analysis describes the sequential structure of WAV sequences and demonstrates how they are produced and oriented to by participants as demonstrations of doing formulating.

2 Data and method

Using a conversation analytic approach (Sacks, 1984; Garfinkel and Sacks, 1986; Goodwin, 2013), the article describes the sequential structure of WAV sequences and discusses conversational goals that speakers pursue by means of such sequences. The study is based on a data set consisting of 20.5 hours of recordings of project group meetings in which students are working on a semester long project (Mortensen, 2010). A collection of 30 WAV sequences were identified in the data, using the following procedure: First, all sequences with the characteristic prosodic features which are associated with WAV sequences as well as with reading aloud were identified. Second, sequences in which the speaker was reading aloud from a text or in which there was doubt whether or not the speaker was reading aloud were excluded from the collection. Hence, all the examples analysed feature speakers producing the prosodic features associated with reading aloud without actually reading from a text. Similarly, sequences in which the speaker was writing or in which someone else was writing down what the speaker said were excluded from the collection. In that way, only sequences are analyzed, in which prosodic features associated with reading aloud are used independently of reading and writing. The sequences were transcribed using the transcription conventions established by Jefferson (e.g. 2004) with some changes (see Appendix).

The interactions are all in English though the participants are native speakers of Danish or other European languages. The phenomenon of interest is thus described on the basis of its occurrence in non-native interaction in an academic setting. However, the phenomenon occurs in other settings and among other types of participants as well, though they are not included in this particular collection.

The article relies on an auditory analysis of the prosody of WAV sequences which argues that certain features appear to be systematic and recognizable to participants in the interaction. A description of the acoustic properties of the phenomenon would be interesting but is an analytical undertaking in its own right which lies outside the scope of this article.

3 The sequential structure of WAV sequences

This section describes the sequential structure of WAV sequences. WAV sequences consist of three elements: an introductory element establishing an onset boundary of the changed footing; a unit of material produced in marked prosody; and an exiting device signaling the return to the previous footing. In the following, these elements are referred to as the quotative, the WAV clause and the unquote, respectively.

3.1 WAV quotatives

In DRS sequences, the quotative usually consists of a pronoun and a reporting verb. Most studies cite the use of 'say' and 'think' along with more recent forms such as 'go' and 'be like' as the most common verbs in quotatives (e.g. Blyth et al., 1990; Holt, 1996; Buchstaller, 2011). Studies of HD, however, show that the quotation format of HD sequences makes explicit the fact that the following talk is hypothetical, e.g. by means of modal verbs followed by a reporting verb

(Myers, 1999; Golato, 2012). Simmons and LeCouteur (2011) also note the use of more unusual quotative constructions in HD, such as “you might even make a resolve to yourself” (2011: 3184).

In the current data set, 10 of the 30 quotatives feature a pronoun plus a reporting verb. However, other quotatives feature more elaborate constructions: often they consist of a noun expressing an assertion, such as *claim*, *presumption* or *thesis* plus a form of either *be*, *say* or *have*. Overwhelmingly, the reporting verb or construction is followed by a pause and/or other hesitation markers before the onset of the WAV clause (cf. the similar practice in DRS, see Klewitz and Couper-Kuhlen, 1999). WAV quotatives exhibit present and future tenses, which further contributes to framing WAV clauses as hypothetical, i.e., potential or future texts rather than quoted material. Example 1, reprinted for convenience below, provides an example of a WAV quotative:

Example 1:

```
56 ANN: i think but i- if we wanted to bring all that information≈
      ((ANN><SIF))
57 ≈we just ha- have to do something *like\
      ((ANN><SIF))
      ((*both hands extended forward, palms upards, fingers spread))
58 (1.0) Vas X2 was *built→V
      ((*forward circular movement with both hands))
      ((ANN><SIF))
59 **as an: as an ***ehh→
      ((*forward circular movement with left hand))
      ((*right hand backward circular movement, then both hands on legs))
      (**SIF>towards whiteboard))
60 (1.4) *↑modreak**tion\ (0.6)
      counter reaction
      ((*right hand extended, slapping motion to the left, then on leg))
      (**ANN><SIF))
61 SIF: counter reaction\
      ((SIF><ANN))
62 ANN: Δcounter reactionΔ to: the *??you know?? bla bla\
```

² University name, anonymised

((*right hand extended, fingers spread))
 ((ANN><SIF))
 63 it's it's just *i think euww (0.2) ten lines is a lot but*→
 ((*hands extended, forming ball shape*))

The quotative (line 57) consists of a reporting construction *we have to do*, followed by *something like* and a one second pause before the onset, at the beginning of line 58, of the marked prosody. A large majority of the WAV quotatives share this structure: pronoun followed a reporting verb or construction plus *something like* and a pause which is followed by the onset of marked prosody in the next word uttered. *Like* functions as a marker of comparison to *something*, and the WAV clause serves as a complement to *like*. Hence, *like*, although sequentially located in the quotative, projects a complement before the turn reaches a possible completion point. In this way, the WAV quotative establishes a conversational position from which the speaker can perform the formulation of the candidate text.

Most WAV sequences are initiated as described above. But some lack the pronoun and reporting verb or construction as in example 2 below, which is reprinted for convenience below.

Example 2

89 LARS: *you know* [let's talk about it]↘
 ((*left hand extended, circular gesture*))
 ((LARS><SIF))
 90 SIF: [and i think in] *the intro**duction and then** some[thing*]→
 ((elbows on table, right hand touches face))
 ((*LARS moves chair backwards*))
 ((LARS>chair))
 91 LARS: [yeah]↘
 92 PPP: (0.5)
 93 SIF: *kind of (0.3) based on* ****this**** we think that ↑**it****
 ((*SIF>table*))
 ((*SIF>ANN**))
 94 PPP: **is [the] problem because**↘ (0.3)
 ((SIF><LARS))
 95 LARS: [yeah]

The quotative in example 2 consists only of *something* (line 90) *kind of* (line 93), a pause (line 90), and the onset of marked prosody in the next word. In this case, the onset of the marked prosody retrospectively allows *something kind of* to be heard as a quotative despite the lack of reporting verb or construction. Hence, the sequential position of *something kind of* significantly contributes to its function as a quotative.

The quotative structure includes pronoun and reporting verb or construction and also *something like*, pauses, and hesitation markers. In the collection, some WAV quotatives contain all or most of the possible constituent elements, while others contain only one or two, as in example 2 above. Accordingly, the structure of WAV quotatives can be described as consisting of a number of the following possible elements in the order listed below:

Pronoun | reporting verb or construction | construction with *something like* | pause and hesitation marker | onset of marked prosody in next word

Further, the sequential location of the quotative – immediately preceding a change in prosody – contributes to the understanding of these elements as a quotative construction. This makes possible very different realisations of WAV quotatives which nonetheless result in the same interactional achievement.

3.2 The prosody of WAV clauses

WAV sequences are produced in a prosodic format resembling that normally associated with reading aloud. Despite inter-speaker differences, the prosody in WAV clauses is characterized by a number of prosodic changes which are usually associated with reading aloud rather than spontaneous speech (e.g. Howell and Kadi-Hanifi, 1991; Blaauw, 1994; Laan, 1997; Smith, 2004). The prosodic features have been identified through auditory analysis including a comparison of each speaker's WAV sequences with their non-WAV talk to establish the intra-speaker changes

of each speaker as well as a comparison of WAV sequences produced by different speakers to describe the prosodic changes on a more general level. The analysis revealed that speakers' prosody in WAV sequences differs from the surrounding speech in the following ways: a) slower tempo, b) more distinct pronunciation of individual words, c) a more monotonous intonation pattern. The prosodic changes are realized in different ways and to varying degrees by different speakers, but for every speaker the different prosodic changes result in a prosody that is noticeably closer to reading aloud than the surrounding speech. This sets WAV sequences apart from other types of HD and DRS, since these are characterized by significant variation in the prosodic changes that signal the quoted or hypothetical element, even including a reversal of markedness, so that the quoted speech is prosodically unmarked while the surrounding speech is marked (Klewitz and Couper-Kuhlen, 1999).

The above description of the prosody of WAV clauses does not claim there is no intra- or interspeaker variation in the prosodic format of WAV clauses. Neither does it claim that the prosodic features mentioned are used exclusively in WAV clauses. Rather, the interest and relevance of the description arises from the finding that prosodic features usually associated with reading aloud are used by speakers to achieve a different conversational goal. In that way, it confirms Walker's (2014) conclusions in her discussion of the distinction between form and function for prosodic aspects of in talk-in-interaction. The description of prosodic characteristics of WAV clauses bears out Walker's claim that any conversational practice, i.e. form, may be used to perform various actions, i.e. functions, and conversely, that any conversational action may be performed by means of various practices.

However, the prosodic features of WAV clauses differ from reading aloud in other respects: First, the tendency to increase or decrease the markedness of the prosody during the production of

the WAV clause. The marked prosody tends to be most noticeable at the beginning and end of WAV clauses, whereas the intonation pattern, the tempo, and the distinctness of the pronunciation in the middle part of the WAV clause may resemble the speaker's prosody in the surrounding speech. This indicates that the change of prosody helps delimit the WAV clause from the surrounding speech (Couper-Kuhlen, 1999; Klewitz and Couper-Kuhlen, 1999). Several studies (e.g. Local, 1992; Couper-Kuhlen, 2004) demonstrate that marked changes pitch are used as a conversational resource for indicating the beginning of a new activity in contrast to continuation of the previous activity. However, the change of prosody that occurs at the beginning of WAV clauses, though it may include a change in pitch, encompasses a cluster of prosodic features as described above. Hence, the change of prosody at the onset of a WAV clause accomplishes more than the beginning of something new: it accomplishes a change of footing, i.e. it initiates hypothetical discourse.

Second, WAV clauses are characterized by a high frequency and long duration of pauses – a phenomenon specifically related to spontaneous speech (Blaauw, 1994). Pauses and other speech perturbations are well-known methods for speakers to display doing formulating as will be demonstrated in the following sections. Thus, the features that differentiate WAV sequences from reading aloud result from the fact that WAV sequences are an interactional practice used by interlocutors in talk-in-interaction – and prosody and pauses are interactional devices that speakers exploit to construct WAV clauses as a coherent conversational unit.

3.3 Word searches and repair in WAV clauses: Keeping the turn despite delayed progressivity

In WAV sequences, the progressivity of the turn is slowed down by frequent pauses, restarts, reformulations, and repetitions. Such speech perturbations initiate self-repair of an already produced element or of the next-due element of the turn (Schegloff, 1979) and are often used

by speakers in word searches, i.e. delays in the progress of a turn which display that the speaker cannot immediately find the word with which to continue the utterance (e.g. Goodwin and Goodwin, 1986). The following sections demonstrate in more detail how word searches in WAV sequences are constructed and oriented to as demonstrations of formulation work in progress. In WAV clauses, word searches occur in many different syntactic environments – but overwhelmingly not at possible completion places (cf. Lerner, 1996). In this connection, it is important to keep in mind that “*for the participants*, possible completion is always oriented to, reckoned and encountered from the start of the turn or the TCU, forward in real time” (Schegloff, 1996: 82, emphasis in the original). Participants do not know *during the production* of each word search what will follow or how or when the turn will end.

3.3.1 Repair of a known trouble source

In the collection of WAV sequences, only a few instances of repair include an identifiable trouble source. One of these is presented in Example 3. In the sequence transcribed, Jens is standing with his left shoulder against the wall, facing a whiteboard and holding a whiteboard marker. He is not, however, writing on the board while talking. A table is in front of the whiteboard, and Sif and Ann are sitting on one side of the table, facing the same way as Jens, while Lars is sitting at the other side of the table, facing Jens and the girls. Immediately before the beginning of the transcribed sequence, Lars has suggested a research question in which he stated that the university was founded on what he calls ‘progressive pedagogical methods’, and Jens has suggested that they use the adjective ‘revolutionary’ instead of ‘progressive’.

Example 3

```
123     JENS:eh- so you could actually call eh  
        ((JENS>LARS))  
124     you could actually say→  
        ((JENS><SIF))  
        ((ANN>JENS))
```

125 (0.3) ehm:→ (1.3)
 ((JENS>table))

126 ΔIn YEAR* **when UNIVERSITY³** ***was ****f-Δ eh:m**** *
 ((*JENS>LARS*))
 (**right hand w/marker moving slightly up and down**))
 (**takes pen with left hand))
 (**right hand closed and extended, two beats**))

127 (0.2) *w- erh-*
 (**right arm horizontal, hand hangs down**))

128 (0.2) *was-*
 (**right hand touches marker**))

129 *(0.4) builded⁷ **
 ((*JENS>table, thinking face))
 (**right hand raised))

130 (0.2) *ehm:→ (1.1)
 ((JENS>table, thinking face))
 (**right hand index finger pointing, beats once))

131 or (.)Δin *YEAR UNIVERSITY wasΔ (.) built (.) up on*→
 ((JENS>table, thinking face))
 (**both hands extended, forming ball shape, moving up and down**))

132 (0.4) ehm:→
 ((thinking face, gazes at table))

133 (0.3) a number of *revolutionary-*
 ((*JENS>LARS))

134 (0.2) eh: pedagogical *ehm-
 ((*JENS>table))

135 (0.2) methods\

In line 126, Jens cuts off what is presumably the head verb of a verb phrase, signaling repair of the word that is being cut-off (cf. Schegloff, 1979). Next, he engages in a search activity, displaying continuation by beating time with his right hand while doing searching (lines 126-128). Note that the word search is produced at a place of “maximum grammatical control” (Schegloff, 1996: 93): after the auxiliary verb *was* which projects a head verb. Similarly, e.g. the word search in line 132 occurs after the preposition *upon* which projects a prepositional complement as the next relevant element. Such word searches display the speaker’s hesitation, thereby making evident the formulation work that the speaker is doing while uttering the WAV

³ Name of university, anonymised

clause. At the same time, the speaker's gestures and gaze combined with the unfinished syntax and prosody of the turn contribute to displaying the speaker's desire to continue producing the remaining parts of the turn rather than inviting other participants to participate in the search activity (e.g. Oelschlaeger and Damico, 2000). In example 3, Jens is looking at Lars throughout the search activity (lines 126-128), thus not withdrawing his gaze as is usual in word searches (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1986). This may be due to the fact that Jens is using Lars' previous suggestion in his formulating work. This also explains the higher tempo of the first part of the WAV clause (line 126). Thus, Jens' cut-off word *f-* (line 126) can be heard as repeating Lars' use of the word *founded* previously in the interaction. However, in line 129, Jens produces the head verb *builded*, which is produced with an upward, try-marked intonation (Sacks and Schegloff, 1979). Further, Jens's gaze is lowered to the table while uttering this word. This displays uncertainty about the acceptability of the word, marking it as a potential locus of trouble, and it simultaneously displays that Jens is at this point adding his own new material to Lars' previous suggesting by changing the verb of the sentence.

After another search sequence in line 130, JENS recycles the entire WAV clause in line 131 and reformulates the try-marked word *builded* to *built*, thus making a same-turn self-repair of an item previously marked as a trouble source. This repair practice is rare in WAV sequences, however. Most word searches in WAV sequences occur without an apparent trouble source.

3.3.2 Repair with no apparent trouble source

Goodwin (1987: 115-116) notes that word searches without an identifiable trouble source constitute displays of forgetfulness which enable speakers to display to others the “back-stage” work involved in producing an utterance”. In WAV sequences, most word searches do not have an identifiable trouble source. These word searches can be heard as displaying the back-stage work of doing formulating. As demonstrated in the analyses below, this interactional work

includes displays of doubts regarding the formulation (3.3.2.1), reformulations of the formulation (3.3.2.2) as well as clarifications (3.3.2.3) and even abandoning the formulating activity before the WAV clause has reached a possible completion place (3.3.2.4).

3.3.2.1 Displaying doubt

Some word searches in WAV sequences are used by speakers to downgrade the certainty with which the candidate formulation is produced even though the projected syntax continues unchanged after the word search (cf. Fox and Jaspersen, 1996). Prior to the transcribed sequence in example 4, the students have discussed how to incorporate the experience of students at the university into their research question about the pedagogical methods of the university. Summing up the discussion, Lars, standing by the whiteboard, facing Ann and Jens (Sif is not present at this moment) offers the following formulation of a research question:

Example 4

```

38   LARS: based on the *students' experiences^
      ((LARS><ANN))
39   (0.2) experience^*
      ((*LARS>window))
40   (0.8) experiences→
      ((LARS>window))
41   (0.5) eh:
      ((LARS>window))
42   (0.4) *is there a conflict between the ideal^*
      ((LARS>JENS))
      ((*JENS moves across the room ->laptop on other side of table*))
43   *(0.2)* environment→
      ((LARS><ANN))
      ((*JENS takes laptop from table*))
44   (1.1)
      ((JENS moves back to his previous position with laptop))
45   *for these concepts and eh actual→
      ((*JENS>LARS))
      ((LARS><ANN))
46   *(1.2) Δenvironment* kind of thingΔ two thousand seven here\
      ((*circular motions with both hands*))

```

The WAV clause in example 4 contains a number of pauses and word searches. In the following, the pauses in lines 43-46 will be considered in detail to see how they contribute to the formulation taking place in the WAV clause. In line 43 the pause before *environment* is heard as a short-lived loss-of-words rather than a word search. Lars' gaze remains focused on Ann and is not withdrawn as is usual in word searches. The pause immediately after *environment* (line 44), despite its length, does not display hesitation with regard to the formulation. Rather, Lars is waiting while Jens is moving around, so that the next part of the turn is delayed until Jens' gaze displays that he is again orienting to the interaction (cf. Goodwin, 1980).

The filled pause *eh* preceding *actual* (line 45) and the following pause (line 46), however, seem to constitute a word search activity which results in the word *environment*. Lars hesitates before *actual* and again after that word, which displays a problem with the next-due word. Further, after uttering *actual*, Lars makes a circular motion with his hands which displays continued activity, thus indicating that he is in the process of retrieving the desired term. The circular motion continues during the pronunciation of the retrieved word *environment* (line 46) so that the progression of the interaction is never completely halted (cf. Lerner, 1996). The word *environment* is produced in a prosody that is different from the WAV clause with respect to tempo and articulation, so that it is heard as not part of the WAV clause. Further, the word is followed by the hedging *kind of thing* (line 46) which indicates that *environment* is not the exact term Lars was looking for. In sum, the word search activity (lines 45-46) is used in combination with other resources for demonstrate uncertainty to display the speaker's dissatisfaction with the word *environment*.

By making noticeable the undecidedness of the speaker with regard to the precise form and content of the sentence, the hesitations in this extract display the formulating work carried out

in and through the WAV clause. While some pauses orient to interactional contingencies, other pauses and hesitations contribute to making audible the process of formulating a research question, including evaluating and revising the sentence as it evolves. In that way, the speaker achieves and sustains a conversational space in which the he is visibly and audibly in the midst of formulating a research question.

3.3.2.2 Reformulation

In example 4 above, the speaker paused in mid-sentence and continued without changing the previously uttered material. In other WAV clauses, however, the speaker pauses in mid-sentence and subsequently reformulates the whole WAV clause or parts of it. Reformulations may involve a change of a single word, a phrase or clause or the entire WAV sequence as in example 5 below. Immediately prior to the transcribed sequence, Lars, sitting by the whiteboard and facing Jens who is standing by the whiteboard and Ann who is sitting at the table, has recapitulated the background information about pedagogical methods and the origins of the university, and following this, he offers the WAV sequence below:

Example 5

85 LARS: *then ↑our* **claim is→**
 ((*LARS><ANN*))
 ((**LARS><JENS**))

86 *(0.2) is there a conflict* **betwee:n→**
 ((LARS><ANN))
 ((**LARS>window, thinking face**))

87 (0.2) eh: *or (.) **Δwe can say like thisΔ** **
 ((*LARS><ANN*))
 ((**both hands raised in from of body, placing gesture**))

88 * **↑based on** ***(.) the way that the*** * ****students****
 ((*both hands move slightly up and down, marking emphasis*))
 ((**LARS><ANN**))
 ((***LARS>window***))
 ((****LARS><JENS****))

89 (0.3) *experience* **their own education→ **
 ((LARS><ANN))

```

    ((*outwards circular movement with both hands*))
    (**both hands extended, palms up))
90  (0.5)*is there**Δthen aΔ conflict** *between these** * ***(.)*** methods**
    ((*hands moving slightly up and down, marking emphasis*))
    (**LARS>window**))
    (**LARS>whiteboard**))
    (****left hand and arm towards whiteboard****))
91  (0.2) and→
    ((left hand and arm down))
92  (0.7) and what the:y→
93  *(0.4)* **Δthe studentsΔ** get out of it\
    ((*left hand forward, circular motion*))
    (**left hand forward, circular motion**)

```

In example 5, the WAV clause features the beginning of a question *is there a conflict* (line 86). The next word *between* projects a two-part structure to follow in the prepositional complement. Instead, however, a word search follows (line 87). In line 86, while uttering *between*, Lars moves his gaze from Ann to the window, adopting a so-called thinking face which displays doing searching (Goodwin, 1983). The next word produced after the word search (line 87) cannot be heard as the projected prepositional complement or as a repetition of some earlier material. Instead, an alternative formulation is initiated with *or* (line 87).

After *or*, however, both the quotative and the WAV clause are reformulated. In contrast to the first quotative, the second quotative is produced at a noticeably higher speed than the surrounding speech, and its language is more informal (line 87). Further, it is produced with falling intonation on *this* and without a pause before the initiation of the WAV clause. These differences display LARS' orientation to the unusual sequential position of the second WAV quotative. Usually, a quotative is the first element of a WAV sequence, but the second WAV quotative in example 5 is positioned in the slot of an expected reformulation projected by *or* (line 87). It is thus a place-holder delaying the production of an expected element rather than an initiator of something new.

After the second quotative, LARS produces a prepositional phrase (line 88) which does not provide the expected parallel to the first WAV clause (lines 86-87). That parallel, i.e. an interrogative clause, is not produced until line 90. This retrospectively establishes lines 88 and 89 as an addition to the question rather than a new beginning. By introducing a second WAV quotative prior to the long addition, LARS emphasises the fact that the WAV sequence is being continued despite the apparent lack of connection with the preceding WAV clause. The reformulation of the quotative is thus a method for maintaining the unity of the WAV sequence despite the extensive prepositional phrase which precedes the expected restart of the question.

3.3.2.3 Clarification

In a few cases, speakers of WAV sequences provide a description of the word they are searching for instead of producing the desired word. Example 6 contains an example of this. Prior to the transcribed sequence, Jens has suggested a possible structure for the research question, and Lars supports Jens' idea, proposing the following:

Example 6

236 LARS: (0.4) eh: and we then (.) have a (0.3) *thesis* or an idea→
 ((LARS><SIF))
 ((*circular motion with left hand*))

237 (0.6) that ehm: (0.6) *students→*
 ((*LARS>>JENS))

238 (0.4) ehm: (1.6) *are ****in** ehm→* **
 ((*LARS>middle distance, thinking face*))
 (**left hand extended, finger tips touch**))

239 (1.7) *the the: →*
 ((LARS>middle distance, thinking face))
 ((*left hand extended, fingers forming ball shape*))

240 (0.8) how can you say↘
 ((LARS>down))

241 *(1.2)* ****okay Δwe ***have to fi- formulate it sometime≈Δ***** ***
 ((*left hand raised, then lowered*))
 (**LARS><JENS**))
 (**both hands extended, palms up**))

242 ≈but *there's a* the way the way that→

((*left hand moves forward, then back, fingertips upwards, touching))
 ((LARS><JENS))
 243 the students they * **attack these→****
 ((*left hand moves forward, then back, fingertips upwards, touching))
 (**LARS><ANN))
 244 or the way that they ** **connect with them→*****
 ((*left hand moves forward and back, marking emphasis))
 (**left hand moves forward, then back, fingertips upwards, touching))
 (**LARS><JENS**))
 245 or the way that they investigate them or use them→
 ((*left hand moves forward, then back, fingertips upwards, touching))
 (**left hand moves forward, then back, fingertips upwards, touching))
 ((LARS><JENS))
 246 Δor something like that→Δ
 ((hands extended, palms facing each other))
 247 (0.2) **have changed and there might be a conflict here→***
 ((hands extended, left hand more than right, fingers pointing inwards))
 (*LARS><ANN))
 248 (0.2) **and based on this yadadadannh→* ****
 ((*both hands extended, fingers forming ball shape*))
 ((LARS><JENS))
 249 (0.2) we can then pose the question
 ((*left hand extended, fingers forming ball shape*))
 ((LARS><JENS))

In example 6, a word search begins in line 238 with a series of filled and unfilled pauses followed by a minimal continuation *are in* at which point Lars withdraws his gaze, signalling doing searching. The search activity continues in line 239 with a long pause, another minimal continuation with *the*, and a wh-question which makes the search activity explicit (line 240). In line 241, the speaker continues with *okay* which marks the end of the search and signals a topic shift (Beach, 1993). Lars continues by stating that they will eventually have to find a satisfactory formulation and proceeds to describe and clarify the word or phrase he was unable to find (line 242). The description is done in a prosody that resembles the talk surrounding the WAV sequence, which marks the description as a parenthesis inserted into the WAV sequence. After the description, the WAV sequence continues (line 246) as the speaker again uses the prosodic features associated with WAV sequences. The description thus serves as a place-holder for and

a clarification of the meaning of the word not found, so that the WAV sequence can be completed despite the failure to retrieve it.

In line 248, Lars uses another method for avoiding a precise formulation. *Yadadadnnnh* displays that *this* will eventually have to be elaborated. Here, the use of a place-holder merely displays that this part of the research question is not significant right now.

3.3.2.4 Abandoning

In example 6 above, Lars was unable to retrieve the word he was looking for, but he nevertheless managed to finish the WAV clause by reaching a possible completion place. In a few cases, however, the speaker is unable to complete the WAV clause, so that it is abandoned. An example of this is presented in example 7. Prior to the transcribed sequence, Jens has proposed that the group's research question should contain some information about the origins of the university. Sif continues his line of thought as follows:

Example 7

30 SIF: *i think that*(.)**it should start out by saying***something like ehm→** ***
 ((*SIF><JENS*))
 (**SIF>her own knees, thinking face**)
 (**left hand scratches left knee**))
 31 (0.6) ø:::h ph→
 ehm:::
 ((SIF>her own knees))
 32 (1.1) Vin- inspired *by the students' revolution→V*
 ((*SIF><JENS*))
 33 Veeh in nineteen eh sixty eight^V
 ((SIF><JENS))
 34 (1.4) *°sixty **eight ja→°*
 yes
 ((SIF>her own knees*))
 (**slight nod))
 35 (0.3) *ehm X was* *** **founded as counterreaction to bla bla bla and→** ***
 ((*SIF><JENS*))
 (**SIF>ceiling))
 (**right hand extended, beating time**))

36 (0.3) **and had these and *these ehm→** (0.2)*
 ((SIF><JENS*))

37 and then *we we (.) say some* **keywords**→
 ((SIF><JENS*))
 ((*left hand thumb and index finger pointing*))
 (**left hand thumb and index finger touch, sideways motion**)

38 (1.0) altså sån ideology and then→
 well like
 ((SIF>< JENS*))

39 (1.3) *ej jeg ved ik (.) ik noget* (.) **°jeg ved ik°**
 No I don't know (.) nothing (.) I don't know
 ((SIF><JENS*))
 (**SIF>her own knees**)

The WAV sequence in example 7 is noticeably problematic from the very beginning. The pause marking the transition from quotative to WAV clause is prolonged by means of a combination of filled and unfilled pauses (lines 31-32), and the first word of the WAV clause is cut off and restarted (line 32). In lines 35 and 36, the speaker uses place holders such as *bla bla bla* and *these* instead of semantically significant words or phrases in the clause, and in line 37, she resorts to a general description of the intended continuation of the unfinished clause in line 36 – a description which is reformulated in line 38. However, this description is also cut off before completion (line 38). This is followed by a long pause after which the speaker abandons the entire attempt to produce a WAV sequence (line 39). In example 11, the WAV speaker is thus unable to reach a possible completion point and eventually the WAV sequence is abandoned at a noticeably incomplete place and by use of language alternation, which is striking as this is otherwise very rare in the data.

WAV sequences that are abandoned are very rare. Most WAV sequences reach a possible completion place, so that the relevant next action is either an extension of the turn by the WAV speaker or some kind of uptake from the other participants.

In WAV clauses, speakers perform the formulation of the possible text, using a marked prosody to display the changed footing which characterizes this part of the WAV sequence. The above analyses have demonstrated how speakers display ongoing formulating work by means of e.g. word searches while simultaneously orienting to interactional contingencies. Hence, even though WAV clauses are in one sense the first step towards turning speech into writing, in another sense, they are firmly rooted in the moment-to-moment production of talk-in-interaction.

The next section briefly reviews the last part of WAV sequence: the unquote in which the speaker exits the changed footing and returns to the previous footing.

3.4 Unquote

After the last unit of WAV clause material, the speaker may produce an unquote to mark the return to unmarked speech. The unquote includes a return to unmarked prosody, and this is often but not necessarily accompanied by pauses or other speech perturbations (for a discussion of the unquote features in DRS, see Golato (2000)). Sometimes, a clearly falling intonation on the last part of the WAV clause is used by speakers to signal the end of the WAV sequence without any other unquote elements (see for instance example 5). This resembles the practice in reading aloud of marking a full stop by a falling intonation.

In addition, speakers often mark the return to unmarked speech by commenting on the WAV clause just produced. The unquote comments produced in WAV sequences overwhelmingly concern one or more of the following themes: evaluating, often negatively, one or more words or phrases used in the formulation; arguing for or against the formulation proposed in the WAV clause; or proposing an action that is made relevant as a consequence of accepting the candidate formulation (cf. the exit strategies for direct reported speech described by Bolden

(2004)). Example 8 below presents one example of an unquote. Immediately prior to the transcribed sequence, Lars has proposed a formulation of a research question which was criticized by Ann. In response to her criticism, Lars responds as follows:

Example 8

34 LARS: we have a claim then\

((LARS><ANN))

35 or we'll set fort a (0.2) set (.) forth a cl- (.)*

((**left hand extended, palm up**))

((LARS><ANN))

36 thesis that says something like→

((**LARS>window**))

37 (0.4) ehm: (1.1)

((LARS>table))

38 **students: ehm**

((LARS>window))

39 (0.3) **of today**→ (1.2)

((LARS><ANN))

40 **do not believe that these *****methods*** are *****working*******→**

((**LARS>window**))

((****LARS><ANN****))

((*****left hand circular motion*****))

41 ΔalrightΔ something like that* i don't know how it exactly should be≈

((LARS><ANN))

((**left hand circular motion**))

42 ≈b- it should be a claim* that we can *****somehow*****

((**left hand extended**))

((****left hand towards side of head****))

43 **≈see** that it will be possible* we can *****answer*****≈

((**left hand lowered towards table**))

((****fingertips touch table****))

44 ≈***based on the* *****focus*** *****group interviews*******→**

((**left hand moves to the left**))

((****fingertips touch table****))

((*****left hand moves to the right*****))

In example 8, the unquote begins in line 41 with an evaluation of the candidate formulation. The speaker seems to downgrade the quality of his own proposed formulation. After that, the speaker goes on in lines 42-44 to describe what qualities he believes their research question should

possess in relation to the research process which they are engaged in. In other words, he engages in a planning activity (cf. Markee and Kunitz, 2013; Kunitz, 2015), mapping out what kind of formulation they must aim for. Negative evaluations and planning activities such as those illustrated in example 8 are common actions performed in unquote comments of WAV sequences.

4 Discussion

The previous sections demonstrate how WAV sequences constitute an additional footing: a sequential environment in which speakers engage in formulation work using speech perturbations to demonstrate formulating work in progress as well as to orient to interactional contingencies. The framing structure and the syntactic unity of WAV sequences establish and maintain a conversational space in which speakers can display – in and through the formulating activity – the formulation itself, the work of composition, as well as doubts, hesitations, etc. regarding the formulation. Further, the formulating activity adds a potential textuality to WAV sequences; hence, the change of footing adds a dimension of authorship, recasting the WAV speaker as also, potentially, a writer.

WAV sequences can thus be heard as the speaker's performance of an act of composition: in and through WAV sequences, speakers demonstrate their ability to create a piece of text, in this collection specifically a research question. This displays the speaker's knowledge and understanding of the subject matter of the research question as well as their mastery of relevant conventions for writing. In addition, the formulating activity of WAV sequences also displays the proficiency of the WAV speaker in the register and specialised vocabulary of the relevant (in this case academic) field, as well as in the relevant language (which in this case is English). In the student group meetings, WAV sequences thus constitute moments in interaction in and through

which speakers lay out their understanding of the topic and the academic requirements for their project for scrutiny by the other members of the group. WAV sequences demonstrate the speaker's status as a competent member of the group as well as of the wider community of academia.

5 Conclusion

This article describes one particular additional footing (Goffman, 1979, 1981): speakers demonstrating doing formulating work. WAV sequences consist of a quotative, a WAV clause produced using a number of prosodic features otherwise associated with reading aloud, and an unquote. WAV speakers use the practices associated with word searches as a method for demonstrating doing formulating a potential text. This enables speakers to demonstrate knowledge of the subject matter at hand as well as mastery of relevant genre conventions, register, and language.

The phenomenon of WAV sequences opens up several directions for further study. First, the collection presented in this article only contains WAV sequences from one type of setting. Studies of WAV sequences in other settings would shed further light on the sequential properties of WAV sequences and the conversational goals that speakers achieve by means of this practice. Second, WAV sequences constitute one step in the process of transforming talk into text, and as such WAV sequences present a possibility for studying how members' orientations to correctness, clarity, formality etc. change as spoken language becomes writable. Lastly, WAV sequences provide an opportunity for observing how students demonstrate learning in and through talk-in-interaction. In WAV sequences students make use of all the aspects of academic knowledge and practices that they encounter as part of their education as an integrated part of

their daily interactions. And we can see how such demonstrations of competence are in fact part and parcel of our everyday undertakings and what makes us members of a community.

References

- Bakhtin, Mikhail M, 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* (trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist; ed. M. Holquist). University of Texas Press, Austin, Texas.
- Beach, Wayne A., 1993. Transitional regularities for 'casual' "Okay" usages. *Journal of Pragmatics* 19, 325-352. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(93\)90092-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(93)90092-4)
- Blyth, Carl, Recktenwald, Sigrid, Wang, Jenny, 1990. I'm like, "Say What?!": A New Quotative in American Oral Narrative. *American Speech* 65, 215-227. 10.2307/455910
- Blaauw, Eleonora, 1994. The contribution of prosodic boundary markers to the perceptual difference between read and spontaneous speech. *Speech Communication* 14, 359-375. 10.1016/0167-6393(94)90028-0
- Bolden, Galina, 2004. The quote and beyond: defining boundaries of reported speech in conversational Russian. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36, 1071-1118. 10.1016/j.pragma.2003.10.015
- Buchstaller, Isabelle, 2011. Quotations across the generations: A multivariate analysis of speech and thought introducers across 5 decades of Tyneside speech. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 7, 59. 10.1515/cllt.2011.004
- Clift, Rebecca, Holt, Elizabeth, 2007. Introduction, in: Holt, Elizabeth, Clift, Rebecca (Eds.), *Reporting talk: Reported speech in interaction*. Cambridge University Press, New York, pp. 1-15.
- Coulmas, Florian, 1986. *Direct and indirect speech*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, 1999. Coherent voicing: On prosody in conversational reported speech, in: Bublitz, Wolfram, Lenk, Uta, Ventola, Eija (Eds.), *Coherence in Spoken and written Discourse*. John Benjamins Publishing, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, pp. 11-35. 10.1075/pbns.63.05cou
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, 2004. Prosody and sequence organization in English conversation, in: Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, Ford, Cecilia E. (Eds.), *Sound patterns in interaction: Cross-linguistic studies from conversation*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, pp. 335-376.
- Ebert, Karen, 1986. Reported speech in some languages of Nepal, in: Coulmas, Florian (Ed.), *Direct and indirect speech*. Mouton De Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 145-159.
- Fox, Barbara A, Jasperson, Robert, 1996. A syntactic exploration of repair in English conversation, in: Davis, Philip W (Ed.), *Alternative linguistics: descriptive and theoretical modes*. John Benjamins Publishing, Amsterdam, pp. 77-134. 10.1075/cilt.102.04fox

- Garfinkel, Harold, Sacks, Harvey, 1986. On formal structures of practical actions, in: Garfinkel, Harold (Ed.), *Ethnomethodological studies of work*. Routledge, London, pp. 160-193.
- Goffman, Erving, 1979. Footing. *Semiotica: Journal of the International Association for Semiotic Studies/Revue de l'Association Internationale de Sémiotique* 25, 1-30. 10.1515/semi.1979.25.1-2.1
- Goffman, Erving, 1981. *Forms of talk*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- Golato, Andrea, 2000. An innovative German quotative for reporting on embodied actions: Und ich so/und er so 'and i'm like/and he's like'. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32, 29-54. 10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00030-2
- Golato, Andrea, 2002. Grammar and interaction: Reported discourse and subjunctive in German. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 21, 25-56. 10.1016/S0378-2166(01)00040-6
- Golato, Andrea, 2012. Impersonal quotation and hypothetical discourse, in: Buchstaller, Isabelle, Van Alpen, Ingrid (Eds.), *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary perspectives*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, pp. 3-36.
- Goodwin, Charles, 1980. Restarts, Pauses, and the Achievement of a State of Mutual Gaze at Turn-Beginning. *Sociological inquiry* 50, 272-302. 10.1111/j.1475-682X.1980.tb00023.x
- Goodwin, Charles, 1987. Forgetfulness as an interactive resource. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50, 115-130. 10.2307/2786746
- Goodwin, Charles, 2013. The co-operative, transformative organization of human action and knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics* 46, 8-23. 10.1016/j.pragma.2012.09.003
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness, 1983. Searching for a word as an interactive activity, *Semiotics* 1981. Plenum Press, New York, pp. 129-137. 10.1007/978-1-4615-9328-7_13
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness , Goodwin, Charles, 1986. Gesture and coparticipation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica: Journal of the International Association for Semiotic Studies/Revue de l'Association Internationale de Sémiotique* 62, 51-76. 10.1515/semi.1986.62.1-2.51
- Günthner, Susanne, 1999. Polyphony and the 'layering of voices' in reported dialogues: An analysis of the use of prosodic devices in everyday reported speech. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, 685-708.
- Haberland, Hartmut, 1986. Reported speech in Danish, in: Coulmas, Florian (Ed.), *Direct and indirect speech*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 219-254.
- Holt, Elizabeth, 1996. Reporting on talk: The use of direct reported speech in conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 29, 219-245. 10.1207/s15327973rlsi2903_2
- Holt, Elizabeth, 2000. Reporting and reacting: Concurrent responses to reported speech. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 33, 425-454.
- Howell, Peter, Kadi-Hanifi, Karima, 1991. Comparison of prosodic properties between read and spontaneous speech material. *Speech Communication* 10, 163-169.

- Jefferson, Gail, 2004. Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction, in: Lerner, Gene H (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation*. John Benjamins Publishing Co., Amsterdam, Philadelphia, pp. 13-34. 10.1075/pbns.125.02jef
- Klewitz, Gabriele, Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, 1999. Quote-unquote? The role of prosody in the contextualization of reported speech sequences. *Pragmatics: Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association* 9, 459-485. 10.1075/prag.9.4.03kle
- Kunitz, Silvia, 2015. Scriptlines as emergent artifacts in collaborative group planning. *Journal of Pragmatics* 76, 135-149. 10.1016/j.pragma.2014.10.012
- Lerner, Gene H, 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 A (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 238-276. 10.1017/CBO9780511620874.005
- Local, John, 1992. Continuing and restarting, in: Auer, Peter, Luzio, Aldo Di (Eds.), *The contextualization of language*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, pp. 273-296.
- Laan, Gitta Pm, 1997. The contribution of intonation, segmental durations, and spectral features to the perception of a spontaneous and a read speaking style. *Speech Communication* 22, 43-65.
- Markee, Numa, Kunitz, Silvia, 2013. Doing planning and task performance in second language acquisition: An ethnomethodological respecification. *Language Learning* 63, 629-664. 10.1111/lang.12019
- Mathis, Terrie, Yule, George, 1994. Zero quotatives. *Discourse Processes* 18, 63-76. 10.1080/01638539409544884
- Mortensen, Janus, 2010. Epistemic stance marking in the use of English as a lingua franca: A comparative study of the pragmatic functions of epistemic stance marking in problem-solving sequences at student project group meetings, with special emphasis on meetings where English is used as a lingua franca, Department of Culture and Identity. Roskilde University.
- Myers, Greg, 1999. Unspoken speech: Hypothetical reported discourse and the rhetoric of everyday talk. *Text: Transactions of the Society for Textual Scholarship* 19, 571-590.
- Oelschlaeger, Mary L, Damico, Jack S, 2000. Partnership in conversation: a study of word search strategies. *Journal of communication disorders* 33, 205-225. 10.1016/S0021-9924(00)00019-8
- Sacks, Harvey, 1984. Notes on methodology, in: Atkinson, J. Maxwell, Heritage, John (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge University Press, Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Cambridge, Paris, pp. 21-27. 10.1017/CBO9780511665868.005
- Sacks, Harvey, Schegloff, Emanuel A, 1979. Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction, in: Psathas, George (Ed.), *Everyday language: studies in ethnomethodology*. . Irvington Publishers, New York, pp. 15-21.
- Sams, Jessie, 2010. Quoting the unspoken: An analysis of quotations in spoken discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42, 3147-3160. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.04.024>

Schegloff, Emanuel A, 1979. The Relevance of Repair to Syntax-for-Conversation, in: Givón, Talmy (Ed.), *Syntax and Semantics: Discourse and Syntax*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 261-286.

Schegloff, Emanuel A, 1996. Turn organization: one intersection of grammar and interaction, in: Ochs, Elinor, Schegloff, Emanuel A, Thompson, Sandra A (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 52-133. 10.1017/CBO9780511620874.002

Simmons, Katie, Lecouteur, Amanda, 2011. 'Hypothetical active-voicing': Therapists 'modelling' of clients' future conversations in CBT interactions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, 3177-3192.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.06.002>

Smith, Caroline L, 2004. Topic transitions and durational prosody in reading aloud: production and modeling. *Speech Communication* 42, 247-270.

Suchman, Lucy A, 1987. *Plans and situated actions: The problem of human-machine communication*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Tannen, Deborah, 1986. Introducing constructed dialogue in Greek and American conversational and literary narrative, in: Coulmas, Florian (Ed.), *Direct and indirect speech*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 311-332.

Walker, Traci, 2014. Form≠ Function: The independence of prosody and action. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 47, 1-16. 10.1080/08351813.2014.871792

Appendix: Transcription conventions

The transcription conventions are based on the conventions developed by Gail Jefferson (e.g. 2004). The following symbols not included in the above reference are also used:

Description		Example
Intonation: rising	↗	between this↗
continuing	→	the: claim that we put up is→
falling	↘	get out of it↘
Sharp pitch rise	↑	then ↑our claim is
Stress	underline	ex <u>perience</u> their <u>own</u> educa <u>tion</u>
WAV prosody	bold	in what eh identity
Accelerated speech	Δ Δ	Δcounter reactionΔ

Slower speech	∇ ∇	∇as X was built∇
In-word laughter	hh	okhhahhy
Continuation on next line	≈	if we wanted to bring all that information≈ ≈we just ha- have to do something like
Translation	italics	det ↑opstod øhm:↘ <i>it originated ehm</i>
Gaze	>	((LARS>window))
Mutual gaze	><	((LARS><ANN))