

## Conversation Analysis

"Conversation analysis" is an approach to the study of social interaction that focuses on practices of speaking that recur across a range of contexts and settings. The early studies in this tradition were based on the analysis of English conversation. More recently, however, conversation analysts have begun to study talk in a broader range of communities around the world. Through detailed analyses of recorded conversations, this book examines differences and similarities across a wide range of languages including Finnish, Japanese, Tzeltal Mayan, Russian and Mandarin. Bringing together interrelated methodological and analytic contributions, it explores topics such as the role of gaze in question-and-answer sequences, the organization of repair, and the design of responses to assessments. The emerging comparative perspective demonstrates how the structure of talk is inflected by the local circumstances within which it operates.

JACK SIDNELL is an Associate Professor in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Toronto.



### **Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics**

#### **EDITORS**

Paul Drew, Majorie Harness Goodwin, John J. Gumperz, Deborah Schifrin

- 1. Discourse Strategies John J. Gumperz
- 2. Language and Social Identity edited by John J. Gumperz
- 3. The Social Construction of Literacy Jenny Cook-Gumperz
- 4. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson
- 5. Discourse Markers Deborah Schiffrin
- 6. Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse Deborah Tannen
- 7. Conducting Interraction: Patterns of Behaviour in Focused Encounters
  Adam Kendon
- 8. Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings edited by Paul Drew and John Heritage
- 9. Grammar in Interaction: Adverbial Clauses in American English Conversations Cecilia E. Ford
- 10. Crosstalk and Culture in Sino-American Communication Linda W.L. Young (with a foreword by John J. Gumperz)
- 11. AIDS Counselling: Institutional Interaction and Clinical Practice Anssi Perakyla
- 12. *Prosody in Conversation; Interactional Studies* edited by Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Margret Selting
- 13. Interaction and Grammar edited by Elinor Ochs, Emanual A. Schegloff and Sandra A. Thompson
- Credibility in Court: Communicative Practices in the Camorra Triales Marco Jacquement
- 15. Interaction and the Development of Mind Anthony J. Wootton
- 16. The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air Steven Clayman and John Heritage
- 17. Gender and Politeness Sara Mills
- 18. Laughter in Interaction Philip Glenn
- 19. Matters of Opinion: Talking about Public Issues Greg Myers
- 20. Communication in Medical Care: Interaction between Primary Care Physicians and Patients edited by John Heritage and Douglas Maynard
- 21. In Other Words: Variation in reference and narrative Deborah Schiffrin
- 22. Language in Interaction in an urban school Ben Rampton
- Discourse and Identity edited by Anna De Fina, Deborah Schiffrin and Michale Bamberg
- 24. Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction edited by Elizabeth Holt and Rebecca Clift
- The Social Construction of Literacy, 2nd edition by Jenny Cook-Gumperz
- 26. Talking Voices, 2nd edition by Deborah Tannen
- 27. Conversation Analysis: Comparative Perspectives edited by Jack Sidnell



## Conversation Analysis

Comparative Perspectives

Edited by

JACK SIDNELL

University of Toronto





> CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi Cambridge University Press The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

> Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521883719

© Cambridge University Press 2009

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2009

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-0-521-88371-9 hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



### **Contents**

	List of figures	page vii
	List of tables	ix
	List of contributors	xiii
	Transcription conventions	XV
Part l	Introduction	1
1	Comparative perspectives in conversation analysis JACK SIDNELL	3
Part l	I Repair and beyond	29
2	Repetition in the initiation of repair RUEY-JIUAN REGINA WU	31
3	A cross-linguistic investigation of the site of initiation in same-turn self-repair barbara fox, fay wouk, makoto hayashi, stev fincke, liang tao, marja-leena sorjonen, mintlaakso, and wilfrido flores hernandez	
4	Repairing reference MARIA EGBERT, ANDREA GOLATO, AND JEFFREY D. ROBINSON	104
Part I	II Aspects of response	133
5	Projecting nonalignment in conversation ANNA LINDSTRÖM	135
6	Two answers to inapposite inquiries TRINE HEINEMANN	159



vi		Contents
7	Gaze, questioning, and culture federico rossano, penelope brown, and stephen c. Levinson	187
8	Negotiating boundaries in talk MAKOTO HAYASHI AND KYUNG-EUN YOON	250
Part I	V Action formation and sequencing	279
9	Alternative responses to assessments MARJA-LEENA SORJONEN AND AULI HAKULINEN	281
10	Language-specific resources in repair and assessments  JACK SIDNELL	304
11	Implementing delayed actions GALINA B. BOLDEN	326
Part V	V Conclusion	355
12	One perspective on Conversation Analysis: Comparative Perspectives EMANUEL A. SCHEGLOFF	357
Biblio	ography	407
Index		436



## **Figures**

4.1	Open-class repair German "Wa?"	page 108
4.2	Open-class English "What?"	109
4.3	Underspecified referent repair initiation (URRI)	
	German "Was."	110
4.4	URRI German "Was denn."	110
4.5	URRI English "What."	111
7.1	Location of three cultures	204
7.2	Gaze toward other participant, by language	208
7.3	Gaze behavior across the three cultures clustered	
	by participation role	209
7.4	Distribution of actions by languages	214
7.5	Distribution of percentages of each action in	
	which the Q-speaker looks at the addressee,	
	by language	215
7.6	Distribution of percentages of each action in	
	which the Q-recipient looks at the Q-speaker,	
	by language	217
7.7	Italian dyads	227
7.8	Tzeltal dyads	228
7.9	Yélî Dnye dyads	229
9.1	Responses to assessments with a verb repeat	282



## **Tables**

3.1	Post-beginning and pre-completion	
	repair initiation	page 68
3.2	Recognizable completion and repair initiation	
	in English	75
3.3	Recognizable completion and repair initiation	
	in Indonesian	77
3.4	Recognizable completion and repair initiation	
	in Finnish	77
3.5	Recognizable completion and repair initiation	
	in Bikol	78
3.6	Recognizable completion and repair initiation	
	in Japanese	78
3.7	Recognizable completion and repair initiation in	
	Sochiapam Chinantec	79
3.8	Recognizable completion and repair initiation	
	in Mandarin	79
3.9	Site of initiation of simple recycling repair	
	initiated in monosyllabic words	81
3.10	Site of initiation of simple replacement repair	
	initiated in monosyllablic words	82
3.11	Site of initiation in recycling repairs in words	
	of three or more syllables	84
3.12	Site of initiation in replacement repairs in words	
	of three or more syllables	84
3.13	Frequency of monosyllabic words for each	
	repair type	86
3.14	Frequency of multisyllabic words for	
	each repair type	86



X		Tables
3.15	Site of initiation of recycling repairs in	
	bisyllabic words	89
3.16	Percentage of recycling repairs initiated in	
	bisyllabic words	90
3.17	Recycling repairs: Bisyllabic words by	
	syntactic class	91
3.18		
	syntactic class	92
3.19	English replacement repairs by word type	
	for monosyllabic words	93
3.20	Replacement repairs by word type for	
	monosyllabic words	94
3.21	Word length in recycling repairs	95
7.1	Instances of Q-speaker and Q-recipient gaze toward	
	other participant, by language	207
7.2	Logistic regression analysis predicting gaze toward	
	other participant in relation to role (Q-recipient as	
	reference group), by language	209
7.3	Logistic regression analysis predicting Q-speaker gaze	;
	toward Q-recipient in relation to language (Italian and	1
	Tzeltal as reference group)	210
7.4	Logistic regression analysis predicting Q-recipient	
	gaze toward Q-speaker in relation to language (Italian	1
	and Tzeltal as reference group)	211
7.5	Instances of mutual gaze by language	213
7.6	Logistic regression analysis predicting mutual	
	gaze in relation to language (Italian and	
	Tzeltal as reference group)	213
7.7	Questions in which speakers look at recipients and	
	recipients do not look back, by language	214
7.8	Distribution of actions performed by questions,	
	by language	214
7.9	Q-speaker looking at Q-recipient, by action and	
	by language	215
7.10	Q-recipient looking at Q-speaker, by question type	
	and by language	217
7.11	Distribution of response types by language	218
7.12	Distribution of responses to questions, by language	218



Tabl	es	xi
7.13	Distribution of questions that do not get	
	responded to in which the recipient does not	
	look at the speaker	220
7.14	Logistic regression analysis predicting no response	221
7.15	Logistic regression analysis predicting no response if	
	Q-recipient is not gazing, by language	222
7.16	Q-speaker gaze, by language	222
7.17	Q-recipient gaze, by language	223
7.18	Questions in which lack of Q-speaker gaze toward	
	Q-recipient motivated by question content or	
	competing activity	224
7.19	Questions in which lack of Q-recipient gaze toward	
	Q-speaker motivated by question content or	
	competing activity	224
11.1	Transcription symbols	352
	Distribution of "so"- and "oh"-prefaced	
	sequence initiators	388
	1	



### **Contributors**

Galina B. Bolden, Department of Communication, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J., USA

**Penelope Brown**, Language Acquisition Group, Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Maria Egbert, Department of Business Communication and Information Science, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark

Steven Fincke, Nuance Communications, Cambridge, Mass., USA

Barbara Fox, Department of Linguistics, University of Colorado, Boulder, Col., USA

**Andrea Golato**, Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Ill., USA

**Auli Hakulinen**, Department of Finnish Language and Literature, University of Helsinki, Finland

Makoto Hayashi, Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champagne, Ill., USA

Trine Heinemann, Department of Business Communication and Information Science, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark

Wilfrido Flores Hernandez, Department of Applied Language Studies and Linguistics, University of Auckland, New Zealand

Minna Laakso, Department of Speech Sciences, University of Helsinki, Finland

**Stephen C. Levinson**, Language and Cognition Group, Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen, The Netherlands



xiv Contributors

**Anna Lindström**, School of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences, Örebro University, Sweden

**Jeffrey D. Robinson**, Department of Communication, Portland State University, Oregon, USA

Federico Rossano, Department of Development and Comparative Psychology, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig, Germany

Emanuel A. Schegloff, Department of Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif., USA

Jack Sidnell, Department of Anthropology, University of Toronto, Canada

Marja-Leena Sorjonen, Research Institute for the Languages of Finland, Finland

Liang Tao, Department of Linguistics, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio, USA

Fay Wouk, Department of Applied Language Studies and Linguistics, University of Auckland, New Zealand

Ruey-Jiuan Regina Wu, Department of Linguistics and Asian/ Middle Eastern Languages, San Diego State University, Calif., USA

**Kyung-eun Yoon**, Department of African and Asian Languages and Literatures, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla., USA



# Transcription conventions (from Schegloff 2000)

### I. Temporal and sequential relationships

Overlapping or simultaneous talk is indicated in a variety of ways.

- [ Separate left square brackets, one above the other on two successive lines with utterances by different speakers, indicates a point of overlap onset, whether at the start of an utterance or later.
- Separate right square brackets, one above the other on two successive lines with utterances by different speakers indicates a point at which two overlapping utterances both end, where one ends while the other continues, or simultaneous moments in overlaps which continue.
- = Equal signs ordinarily come in pairs one at the end of a line, and another at the start of the next line or one shortly thereafter. They are used to indicate two things:
  - (1) If the two lines connected by the equal signs are by the same speaker, then there was a single, continuous utterance with no break or pause, which was broken up in order to accommodate the placement of overlapping talk.
  - (2) If the lines connected by two equal signs are by different speakers, then the second followed the first with no discernable silence between them, or was "latched" to it.

A single equal sign indicates no break in an ongoing piece of talk, where one might otherwise expect it, e.g., after a completed sentence.

(0.5) Numbers in parentheses indicate silence, represented in tenths of a second; what is given here in the left margin indicates 0.5 seconds of silence. Silences may be marked either within an utterance or between utterances.



xvi

### Transcription conventions

(.) A dot in parentheses indicates a "micropause," hearable but not readily measurable without instrumentation; ordinarily less than 0.2 of a second.

### II. Aspects of speech delivery, including aspects of intonation

The punctuation marks are not used grammatically, but to indicate intonation. The period indicates a falling, or final, intonation?

contour, not necessarily the end of a sentence. Similarly, a question mark indicates rising intonation, not necessarily a question, and a comma indicates "continuing" intonation, not necessarily a clause boundary. The inverted question mark is used to indicate a rise stronger than a comma but weaker than a question mark.

:: Colons are used to indicate the prolongation or stretching of the sound just preceding them. The more colons, the longer the stretching. On the other hand, graphically stretching a word on the page by inserting blank spaces between the letters does not necessarily indicate how it was pronounced; it is used to allow alignment with overlapping talk.

A hyphen after a word or part of a word indicates a cut-off or self-interruption, often done with a glottal or dental stop.

word Underlining is used to indicate some form of stress or emphasis, either by increased loudness or higher pitch. The more underlining, the greater the emphasis.

word Therefore, underlining sometimes is placed under the first letter or two of a word, rather than under the letters which are actually raised in pitch or volume.

WOrd Especially loud talk may be indicated by upper case; again, the louder, the more letters in upper case. And in extreme cases, upper case may be underlined.

 The degree sign indicates that the talk following it was markedly quiet or soft.

oword When there are two degree signs, the talk between them is markedly softer than the talk around it.

Combinations of underlining and colons are used to indicate intonation contours:

\_: If the letter(s) preceding a colon is/are underlined, then there is an "inflected" falling intonation contour on the vowel (you can hear the pitch turn downward).

intonation contour on the vowel (i.e., you can hear the pitch turn upward)



### Transcription conventions

xvii

$\uparrow$	The up and down arrows mark sharper rises or falls in pitch
$\downarrow$	than would be indicated by combinations of colons and under-
	lining, or they may mark a whole shift, or resetting, of the
	pitch register at which the talk is being produced.

- > < The combination of "more than" and "less than" symbols</p>< > indicates that the talk between them is compressed or rushed.
- Used in the reverse order, they can indicate that a stretch of talk is markedly slowed or drawn out. The "less than" symbol by itself indicates that the immediately following talk is "jump-started,", i.e. sounds like it starts with a rush.
- hhh Hearable aspiration is shown where it occurs in the talk by (hh) the letter h the more h's, the more aspiration. The aspiration may represent breathing, laughter, etc. if it occurs inside the boundaries of a word, it may be enclosed in parentheses in order to set it apart from the sounds of the word. If the aspiration is an inhalation, it is shown with a dot before it.

### III. Other markings

- (()) Double parentheses are used to mark transcriber's descriptions of events, rather than representations of them: ((cough)), ((sniff)), ((telephone rings)), ((footsteps)), ((whispered)), ((pause)), and the like.
- (word) When all or part of an utterance is in parentheses, or the speaker identification is, this indicates uncertainty on the transcriber's part, but represents a likely possibility.
- (lit/bit) Where alternate hearings are possible these are enclosed in parentheses and separated by a back slash.
- Empty parentheses indicate that something is being said, but no hearing (or, in some cases, speaker identification) can be achieved.

### IV. Multi-linear transcription conventions

Many of the transcriptions in this book are of talk in languages other than English and include one or two lines of glossing. In three-line transcripts the first line is a broad phonetic representation of the talk in the original language. The second line is a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss using a combination of word-for-word translation and abbreviations such as ASP to indicate particles and other functional items that do not admit of a direct translation into English. Authors who use these abbreviations in the transcripts they present include a key explaining them at the conclusion of the chapter. The third line presents an idiomatic English gloss – an attempt to get as close as possible to the contextual sense or meaning of the utterance. The following example from the chapter by Wu illustrates:



xviii

### Transcription conventions

01 L: wo dou hai mei jian guo ta.

I all still N see ASP he
'I haven't met him yet."

In two line transcriptions the morpheme-by-morpheme gloss is not included. The following example is from the chapter by Sidnell:

01 C: him mada biilongz tuu Hamilton. his mother is from Hamilton.