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Abstract

This study examines stories as they appear in everyday conversation, focusing on the high degree of parallelism observed in them. Such parallelism is shown to be a vehicle of stance taking in interaction. Stance taking is here viewed as a highly intersubjective and interactive, public, multi-layered activity, which involves words, linguistic structures, voices, the body and the surrounding environment, and is embedded in the sequential organisation of social interaction. Stance taking involves various types of resonance between two interaction participants and also between the interactional turns of one participant. The concept of resonance is treated as the process of activating affinity across dialogic turns of talk within a telling or a series of tellings.

The present study uses both audio and video recordings of naturally-occurring everyday interactions as data. The study first shows that voiced direct reported speech (DRS) utterances displaying a shared stance are an appropriate response to prior voiced DRS utterances and that a sequence of subsequent resonant voiced DRS utterances is an orderly phenomenon in interaction and a sequentially relevant practice of stance taking. Secondly, the study explicates the way in which participants use resonant words, structures, voicing and embodiment, and implicate the surrounding environment in constructing a reporting space. The reporting space enables and invites active participation in the form of multimodal enactments from all the participants of the telling event to the overall stance-taking activity within the storytelling sequence. Thirdly, the study details the use of resonating formal storytelling elements functioning as a resource for stance taking, e.g. the preface of a second telling by second tellers ties back to the preface and the high point of a prior telling. Finally, the study examines the way in which multiple actions, such as troubles telling, delivering news, giving an explanation and requesting advice, are accomplished via repeated tellings of a story in different interactional contexts. Similar structural units of such tellings resonate in form, whereas some lexi-co-syntactic details of these units vary according to the social actions that are being accomplished via the tellings, according to the engagement of the recipient in the telling and to the physical circumstances of the telling.

Keywords: direct reported speech (DRS), embodiment, enactment, intersubjectivity, multimodality, parallelism, recycling, reporting space, resonance, retelling, second story, stance taking, storytelling
Niemelä, Maarit, Resonanssi arkikertomuksissa: Asennoitumistoiminnan kielelliset, prosodiset ja keholliset käytänteet. Oulun yliopisto, Humanistinen tiedekunta, Englantilainen filologia, PL 1000, 90014 Oulun yliopisto

*Acta Univ. Oul. B 95, 2011* Oulu

**Tiivistelmä**


Ilmiöitä tarkastellaan vuorovaikutuslingviistiikkaa ja keskustelunalyysin menetelmän.


**Asiasanat:** arkikertomus, asennoitumistoiminta, intersubjektiivisuus, kehollisuus, multimodaalisuus, parallellismi, prosodie, referointi, resonanssi, roolissa toimiminen, roolitila, toinen kertomus
To my family
Acknowledgements

I started my dissertation project in Elise Kärkkäinen’s project Interactional practices and linguistic resources of stance taking in spoken English, which received its main funding from the Academy of Finland (2002–2005) and the Emil Aaltonen Foundation. After that my work has been funded by Langnet, or the Finnish Graduate School in Language Studies, and the Graduate School of Culture and Interaction of the Faculty of Humanities, University of Oulu. I have received grants from the Oulu University Scholarship Foundation and from the University of Oulu Apteekin rahasto Foundation. I am grateful for all the financial support to my work over the past seven years.

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis supervisor Elise Kärkkäinen for making it possible for me to start work on my dissertation, let alone finish it. For many, the word ‘thesis supervisor’ brings to mind an image of an unreachable, know-all academic with a stiff upper lip, who keeps themselves aloof from a PhD-student. But that certainly does not ring true with Elise. In fact, she is quite the opposite: easy to approach and talk to, always there to help, empathetic, compassionate and encouraging not only about work-related matters but about any life event in general. With insightful advice, comments and questions, Elise has enabled me to improve the quality of my research. In addition, she has painstakingly proofread my scribbling, and in doing so, helped me improve the quality of my writing. I would like to thank Elise for all the help, not to mention the hundreds, if not thousands, of commas, she has provided me with over the years.

Thanks to Elise, at the beginning of my dissertation project in 2004, I had a chance to make a two-month research visit to the University of Glasgow. The visit supplied me with plenty of data, practical knowledge of research work, sound advice and unforgettable experiences. I would like to thank my second supervisor, Dr Jane Stuart-Smith, for allowing me the use of her recordings of speakers of Glaswegian and for all her kind supervision during my stay in Glasgow; Claire Timmins for organising a data-recording out of the goodness of her heart and for a wonderful friendship; and Jean Anderson for making my stay in Glasgow such a pleasant one.

From the bottom of my heart I would like to thank Tiina Keisanen, Mirka Rauniomaa and Pentti Haddington for invaluable help and guidance in my research. Pentti also later officially became my third supervisor, and warm thanks are due for his support and encouragement also in that role. With Tiina, Mirka and
Pentti as project partners and colleagues, my dissertation project has certainly not been a solitary effort; it has been a challenging yet delightful journey filled with wonderful experiences, inspiring discussions, hard, rewarding work and a lot of laughs. One rarely gets to be in the presence of, let alone work with, such wonderful people. In addition, I would especially like to thank Mirka for co-writing an article included in this thesis.

I am deeply grateful for the Stance project partners John Du Bois, Sandra Thompson and Robert Englebretson for providing me with kind support and advice and for Eric Laurier (University of Edinburgh) for allowing me the use of his unique video corpus of interaction in cars.

I owe a debt of gratitude to my pedagogic mentor (and fellow sweet-tooth) Leena Kuure for all the help, advice and encouragement she has given me over the years and for regularly taking ‘the path of indulgence’ with me down the corridor to Humus Kuppila for something sweet to keep us going.

In addition, I have had the chance to participate in the activities organised by two graduate schools, Langnet and the Graduate School of Culture and Interaction. I would like to thank all the supervisors and fellow PhD students of both schools who I had the pleasure of co-operating with during that time.

I have had the great honour of having FiDiPro Professor Dr Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Dr Elizabeth Holt pre-examine the manuscript of my dissertation. I thank Professor Couper-Kuhlen for the insightful, precise and carefully detailed to-the-point comments to the manuscript, which have truly improved its quality. I am likewise grateful to Dr Elizabeth Holt for an encouraging and supportive review of the manuscript. All the incongruities, errors and misspellings that remain in the text are my own.

I am deeply obliged to my wonderful friends, especially Sanna, Jonna, Virpi, Sari, Marjo, Mikko, Liisa, Janne, Niina, Outi, Ulla, Elina, Anna and Juha-Pekka, for all the help, support and empathy they have extended to me over the years. Good times!

I have my friends and especially my darling Petri to thank for keeping me optimistic and confident about bringing my dissertation project to a successful close. My project had already advanced rather far when our paths met, but nevertheless his love and support have meant everything to me over the past few months <3.

Most importantly, my dear family, to whom I dedicate this study, deserve special thanks for the immeasurable amount of (material and immaterial) help and support that they have always given me. My parents, Eija and Kalle, and my
brother, Marko, have made it possible for me to concentrate on finishing my doctorate, and for that I am forever grateful. I am truly fortunate to have such a great family.

I would also like to extend a warm thank you to the (past and present) staff of English Philology, especially Richard Goymer and Liisa Bozkurt, and all other colleagues and friends near and far.
List of original papers

This article dissertation consists of the summary and the following four original publications. In the text, the articles are indicated by roman numerals in small letters in parenthesis.


# Table of contents

Abstract

Tiivistelmä

Acknowledgements 9

List of original papers 13

1 Introduction 17

1.1 Conversational storytelling as situated and intersubjective activity ................................................................. 17
1.2 The original papers ................................................................................................................................................. 19
1.3 Organization of the study ..................................................................................................................................... 23

2 Data 25

2.1 Audio data ......................................................................................................................................................... 25
2.2 Video data ........................................................................................................................................................... 25
2.3 Transcription method ......................................................................................................................................... 26

3 Theoretical and methodological framework 29

3.1 Conversational stories as interactional and multimodal accomplishments ......................................................................................................................... 29

3.1.1 Turn-taking, sequential organisation and recipient design in interaction ................................................................................................................................. 30
3.1.2 Conversational storytelling ......................................................................................................................... 33
3.1.3 Previous approaches to prosody and embodiment relevant for conversational storytelling ................................................................. 36

3.2 Stance taking and resonance in conversational storytelling ........................................................................... 39

3.2.1 The relevance of stance taking for conversational storytelling ................................................................................. 39
3.2.2 Resonance in stance taking ................................................................................................................... 43
3.2.3 The voice and body in stance taking ............................................................................................................ 46

3.3 The present contribution to the study of conversational storytelling ........................................................................... 48

4 Resonating verbal, prosodic and embodied practices of stance taking in conversational storytelling 51

4.1 Voiced and multimodal enactments in constructing the reporting space (Papers i and ii) ................................................. 51

4.1.1 Review of literature on DRS .................................................................................................................... 52
4.1.2 Voiced and multimodal enactments as displays of stance ............................................................................ 57
4.2 Resonance as a resource for stance taking in second stories
(Paper iii) ................................................................................................. 62
  4.2.1 Resonating structural units in first and second stories ............. 63
  4.2.2 Resonating embodied features in second stories .................... 70

4.3 Multiple social actions and stance taking in repeated tellings
(Paper iv) ................................................................................................. 73
  4.4 Summary ................................................................................................. 87

5 Conclusion 89
Bibliography 93
Appendices 103
Original papers 107
1 Introduction

Stories are fundamental units of human interaction and closely linked to our capacity to acquire, manage and communicate knowledge. Even the etymology, especially the Greek origin, of the word *story* hints at a meaning associated with the process of knowing; in fact, the Greek *historia*, ‘learning or knowing by inquiry, narrative, history’, is related to the Greek words *idein* ‘to see’ and *eidenai* ‘to know’. That meaning has since been lost, but the purpose remains. Stories allow people to recognize, evaluate, share and pass on to others knowledge of what it is to be human. In Ricoeur’s (1990: 54) understanding, narrative imitates human action and, therefore, allows the contemplation of human existence. People consequently engage in storytelling in mundane face-to-face interaction, constantly making sense of and sharing with others their everyday lives. This thesis examines stories as they appear in everyday conversation and in particular focuses on the high degree of parallelism observed in them. Such parallelism is shown to be a vehicle of *stance taking* in interaction, involving various types of *resonance* between two interaction participants and also between the interactional turns of one participant. The present thesis consists of this summary and the original papers (i-iv).

1.1 Conversational storytelling as situated and intersubjective activity

The growing body of research in the field of linguistics and sociology on storytelling and narratives constantly redefines and adjusts the understanding of what a story is, increasingly taking cognizance of the unfixed nature of stories in a discourse environment. The temporal fixedness, i.e. the temporal sequence of at least two narrative clauses (Labov & Waletzky 1967), is recognized by many scholars working with narratives as a central requirement of a story, but at the same time they acknowledge that conversational stories are a product of the unfolding interaction and designed with the recipient and the context and the environment of the telling in mind (see Sacks 1992a, Ochs & Capps 2001). In the present thesis, a conversational story is understood as an extended, structured turn of talk, which consists of a temporal succession of narrative clauses and is typically taken by one teller to give a report of a sequence of events to one or more recipients, in order to perform a social action, e.g. a complaint, an expression of solidarity or a solicitation of empathy. Furthermore, conversational
storytelling is here essentially viewed as collaborative activity that inevitably always involves two equally important participant roles, namely those of the teller(s) and of the recipient(s).

This study concerns resonance in conversation. First, it looks at the use of formal elements by recipients to tie back to prior storytelling elements by tellers. These resonating elements participate in the process of activating affinity across dialogic turns of talk within a telling or a series of telling. Such echoing between turns is called resonance (Du Bois 2001, 2003). Resonance is here treated as a process of activating affinity across any dialogic turns between different speakers, a process closely related to cross-speaker format tying (see e.g. Goodwin & Goodwin 1987a) in the unfolding interaction. In paper (iv) of this thesis, a story is told to different recipients by one speaker on different occasions. The concept of resonance also covers such process of the same-speaker recycling. The articles of this thesis suggest that the storytelling participants’ turns at talk display resonance on a lexico-syntactic, semantic, prosodic and embodied level both in more local linguistic practices, namely direct reportings, and in longer sequences of interaction, namely second stories and repeated tellings. In the former, resonance is shown to occur also in the embodied features of interaction, e.g. in resonating hand gestures. The cross-speaker and same-speaker resonating elements participate in the stance-taking activity between conversation participants. The definition and overall application of the concept of resonance is dealt with in more detail in paragraph 3.2.2 of the summary.

Secondly, the thesis shows that conversational stories are ultimately interactional vehicles of stance taking (see e.g. Du Bois 2003, 2007 Kärkkäinen 2003b), establishing a participant’s point of view on the subject matter at hand and inviting further stance taking from the other participants. In this thesis stance taking is regarded as a two-ended, intersubjective process. One participant first adopts a position in view of some aspects of the content of the telling and the interactional turns of other participants. The next interaction participant then has an opportunity to position himself, on one hand, in view of the stance displayed by the previous participant’s turn, and on the other hand, in view of the particular aspect in the content of the telling. Stance taking is thus carried forward by the participants’ displays of (dis)alignment and (dis)affiliation (Stivers 2008) within the flow of the turn-taking of face-to-face interaction. Alignment in the present study is understood to refer to the process of going along with and upholding the projected course of interaction whereas affiliation refers to the expression of a like-minded stand on the content of the present interactional activity. The social
actions that the tellers perform (e.g. complaints, troubles tellings and expressions of solidarity) involve taking a stance on something; a complaint story, for example, is a negatively-stanced statement of grievance or injustice suffered because of someone or something. By telling a complaint story, the teller thus takes a stance on and positions him/herself in view of that someone or something. It is not only the conversational story as a whole that displays a stance, but the stance-taking activity also takes place at different points within the storytelling structure. Direct reportings, for one, are instances of situated action that serve the purpose of taking a stance within the current telling event. Also the recipients produce them as responses to prior stance taking for the benefit of the ongoing interaction. The participants in the storytelling event constantly readjust their orientation to the surrounding social environment in an attempt to uphold social solidarity.

Thirdly, this thesis sheds new light on the multimodal aspects of conversational storytelling by exploring the resonating embodied practices of stance taking that the participants of the telling event employ in the tellings. The collaborative, interactive and intersubjective nature of multimodal direct reportings comes across in conversational storytelling, because the tellings contain a great deal of direct reporting, particularly at their high points. This study looks at the way in which the participants of the storytelling event use resonant words, structures, voicing, gestures and embodiment, and implicate the surrounding environment in direct reportings to take stances in the current telling event.

1.2 The original papers

This chapter outlines the resonating linguistic and embodied practices of taking a stance in conversational storytelling, summarizing the findings reported in the four (i-iv) original papers of this article dissertation. The aim of this summary is not only to provide a general survey of the articles, but also to illustrate the way in which my understanding of the central themes of this thesis, stance taking and resonance, has developed. This summary will also draw attention to potential progress in my treatment and analysis of the phenomena in question, especially in light of new video-based examples. At the same time, the summary will point out and discuss some incongruities in the understanding and application of the concepts of stance taking and resonance in papers (i)-(iv). Most importantly, in paper (i) voiced direct reported speech is somewhat misleadingly regarded as a
vehicle for stance taking that can induce similar conduct in others. Stance taking is an inherently interactive and intersubjective process between conversation participants, and referring to it as inducing similar conduct in others is stating the obvious. My present understanding of the process of stance taking is described in more detail in paragraph 3.2.1. Further, in papers (i-iii) resonance is essentially regarded as cross-speaker format tying; however, in paper (iv) the concept was extended to cover the process of same-speaker recycling of formal storytelling elements by one teller to several recipients on separate occasions. The concept of resonance is discussed in more detail in paragraph 3.2.2.

The first paper (i) discusses how voiced direct reported speech (DRS) can display a speaker stance in conversational storytelling and what kind of turns story recipients take in responding to the ones taken by the teller. The analysis consists of three examples that shed new light on the resonating use of what Couper-Kuhlen calls voicing (1999) in DRS sequences by the participants of a storytelling event. Voicing refers to the speaker’s use of a different voice quality from their own. In the first two examples, initial storytellers use voicing to animate the DRS sequences that convey a certain stance, first, towards the character to whom they assign the DRS and, second, towards some aspect of the story content, for example an evaluation of a story character’s appearance, temperament or conduct. In the first example, the teller first produces a voiced DRS sequence that puts forward a stance about the story characters and the issue under discussion. In the next turn, the recipient responds with a matching voiced DRS sequence\(^1\) to display agreement with and show an appreciation of the initial storyteller’s stance. In the second example, the recipient of the initial telling, adjusting the topic slightly, tells a matching second story and similarly animates it with a voiced DRS sequence. The resonating second story with a voiced DRS sequence thus establishes a shared stance with the initial teller. Contrary to the first two examples, in the third example the recipient of the initial telling, in the middle of it, initiates a voiced DRS sequence to parody the behaviour of the central character. The recipient thereby disaligns with the stance put forward by the initial teller. However, by producing a resonating voiced DRS sequence, the

\(^1\) At the time of writing paper (i) (2005), I used the notions of ‘matching’ and ‘resonating’ as terms that are equivalent in meaning, but in light of later research, I do not regard them as synonymous. Matching brings to mind an image of fitting two corresponding or similar elements together, whereas resonance refers to the quality of evoking a response or producing a recycling that closely resembles the element that is being tied back to or recycled. My current understanding of the process of resonance and the incongruence in the definition and application of the concept in the articles of this thesis are explicated in subsection 3.2.2 of this thesis.
initial teller subsequently aligns with the disaligning stance of the recipient and joins in the mock parody of the central character. In other words, the teller as a response produces a prosodically resonating voiced DRS sequence, even though this, to a certain degree, contradicts her initial telling. The teller then resumes the initial telling without delay, disregarding the somewhat discordant reception of her story. The analysis of the three examples indicates that a voiced DRS utterance displaying a shared stance appears to be one possible response to voiced DRS. The article itself states that DRS is a preferred response to voiced DRS, but with the benefit of hindsight this seems an over-statement. A sequence of subsequent matching voiced DRS utterances, however, appears to be an orderly phenomenon in interaction and a sequentially relevant practice of stance taking.

The second paper (ii) expands the examination of DRS, establishing that the process of reporting previous or imaginary speech and thought consists of a complex and elaborate sequence of actions that take place in several semiotic fields simultaneously. In conversational storytelling, *multimodal enactments* provide a format for assigning speech, embodiment and a virtual environment to a character in the telling for the purpose of stance taking. The term *direct reported speech* is not sufficient for this study since the analysis takes into consideration not only the speech and voicing but also the body and the environment. In fact, paper (ii) examines the participants’ actual physical stance and body movement as an integral part of the interactive and intersubjective process of stance taking. The bodies of the participants deliver the narrative as a vocal and embodied performance. However, the reportings are here examined chiefly as current actions in the ongoing interaction, as opposed to renderings of previous events or activities. Furthermore, paper (ii) deals with the orchestration of all semiotic channels in reported sequences as instances of stance taking. The choice of the term multimodal direct reporting here emphasises the wide range of modalities that are employed in taking a stance in the current flow of interaction.

Elaborating on M. Goodwin’s (1990) discussion on the framework of interaction within a story, paper (ii) further adds to previous research the notion of *reporting space*, which is also related to Kendon’s (1990) work on the coordination of movement in social interaction and the concept of F-formation. The participants in the storytelling event construct the reporting space within the ongoing storytelling by orchestrating not only the lexico-syntactic features of their talk but also their bodies to produce multimodal enactments. The teller, for example, engages in role shifting and, in a manner of speaking, ‘inhabits’ another body and space, enabling mimetic visitation into the character’s world. The other
participants in the telling event then have a means and an opportunity to take further stances within this reporting space. To take a stance on the prior reportings, they may tie their potential multimodal enactments to prior ones, resonating with the way in which words, structures, voicing, gestures and embodiment are used and the surrounding environment implicated. Such resonating multimodal enactments, assigned to characters in the current telling, are correspondingly produced as responses to prior stances.

The third paper (iii) proceeds to discuss longer sequences of storytelling, namely the phenomenon of resonating second stories, which is briefly touched upon in the second example of paper (i). The focus lies on story rounds, in which one participant tells an initial story and another responds immediately by telling a parallel second story. Resonating elements do not necessarily denote a shared stance, but they serve as a method of anchoring the second telling to the previous telling and as a resource for stance taking. The resonating elements that the second tellers recycle in their second stories illustrate the ways in which the formal elements of second stories tie back to elements in the initial (first) tellings. The second story is anchored to the first, back to front, by resonating lexicosyntactic, structural, prosodic and semantic elements in corresponding positions (in the first story–second story pairs). Moreover, parallelism is present not only in form but also in function. Resonance has been previously mainly treated as a resource that bridges over a relatively short distance in the unfolding sequence of turns. Paper (iii), however, shows that resonance can extend from one story to the next, serving an interactional purpose. Tellers legitimize, firstly, their tellings by tying back to the previous story and, secondly, their stance by positioning themselves in view of the stance displayed in the previous story. The resonating second story as such can manifest the recipients’ interpretation of what they make of the first story and provide a new angle on the first telling, either reinforcing or rejecting the gist of the initial telling. In other words, the second telling may provide a similar or a contrary experience of a similar series of events to the initial telling, in one way or another redefining the joint understanding of the experience.

Concentrating on the particulars of (re)tellings of a story, paper (iv) deals with yet a longer sequence of serial storytelling, in which one speaker mobilizes a telling of a story about the same event on separate occasions to different recipients, to perform multiple social actions, such as troubles telling, informing and requesting advice. The telling forms an integral part of each action. Paper (iv) further sheds light on this through a comparison of the corresponding recycled
structural elements of a story over a series of tellings. These recycled elements are
discussed as resonance across interactional turns by the same speaker to different
recipients on separate occasions. The stories are told to different recipients but the
teller has an unchanging audience during all three calls, namely the teller’s friend,
who is witness to all the (re)tellings of the story. These units tie back to one
another in form and also in semantic meaning (see Du Bois 2001 and implicit
segment resonance in Zima et al. 2009); nevertheless, some lexico-syntactic
details of these units vary according to the social actions that are being
accomplished via the telling. These actions are also seen as important
contributions to the overall stance-taking activity of the participants.

1.3 Organization of the study

The key terms used in this study have been discussed briefly in chapter 1,
introducing conversational stories as potential sites for resonance and stance
taking. The present chapter has further outlined the topical coherence of the
original papers and the organization of the study. The data and the method of
transcription used in this thesis are introduced in chapter 2. Chapter 3 consists of
a summary of the existing body of research on conversational storytelling,
resonance and stance taking and provides a detailed introduction of the
perspective and theoretical and methodological framework adopted in this study.
The methodological background of the present study is introduced in chapter 3.
The chapter outlines the turn-by-turn sequential analysis of talk-in-interaction
developed within the discipline of Conversation Analysis, discussing the method
as it is practiced in connection with prosodic and multimodal analysis of
interaction, in the field of Interactional Linguistics and within the study of stance
taking. Chapter 4 presents and evaluates the findings of this study and chapter 5
delivers the concluding remarks and suggestions for further study.
2 Data

The data in the present thesis come from several sources. They consist of audio and video recordings of naturally-occurring everyday interactions by native speakers of English and Finnish.

2.1 Audio data

The audio data used in this study consist of Scottish and American English and Finnish conversations. A large part of the audio data in papers (i) and (iii) comes from the Glasgow data, which is inclusive of recordings made by Dr. Jane Stuart-Smith and Claire Timmins at the University of Glasgow in 2003–2004 (Stuart-Smith, 2003). The tapes feature school children, colleagues, acquaintances and friends from the Glasgow and Edinburgh area discussing various topics, from work-related matters to personal life events. Paper (i) also makes use of data from the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English (Du Bois et al. 2000, 2003, Du Bois & Englebretson 2004, 2005), which comprise a selection of recordings made all over the United States. The recordings were collected in the beginning of the 1990’s by the researchers in the Department of Linguistics of the University of California, Santa Barbara, and represent a heterogeneous group of speakers from different regions and social backgrounds. Paper (iv) makes use of data from the Corpus of Conversational Finnish (Keskusteluntutkimuksen arkisto) maintained by the Department of Finnish Language and Literature at the University of Helsinki. The data consist of casual face-to-face and telephone conversations and some institutional talk. The recordings were for the most part made in 1988–1998.

2.2 Video data

In paper (ii) and the present summary I make use of video recordings of everyday social activity. Most of the examples in paper (ii) come from a 60-minute tape, Never in Canada (Haddington & Kärkkäinen, 2003), which was recorded in Oulu in February 2003. The recording shows three exchange students, native speakers of English from Canada and the United States. Paper (ii) and this summary make use of a tape, Australian Dinner (Keisanen & Kärkkäinen, 2009), a video that was recorded by Dr. Elise Kärkkäinen and Dr. Tiina Keisanen in Melbourne, Australia. The tape features three Australian friends having dinner at one of the friend’s
One example of this summary is taken from the Habitable Cars project video corpus (Laurier 2007), which was collected by Eric Laurier at the University of Edinburgh. The Habitable Cars data consist of video recordings of interaction in cars.

### 2.3 Transcription method

In conducting analyses of audio and video data it is useful to have as a textual reference a document that covers in written form more or less what is hearable and visible on the tapes. The audio or video tape is the object of analysis; however, in practice, a transcript of the data provides a practical and convenient tool for analysis. For the purpose of this thesis, I have compiled a transcription key from Tainio (1997) and Gardner (2001) which chiefly follows the notation that is based on the conversation analytic transcription system (Jefferson 1985). No capital letters have been used except in names and first person singular personal pronouns. The stream of speech has been transcribed into intonation units (IU) with one unit on each line (Du Bois et al. 1993, Kärkkäinen 2003a). Each line of the Finnish transcript is followed by an interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme gloss (see Appendix II) and a free English translation. The glossing and the translation were done by Mirka Rauniomaa for the purposes of paper (iv) of this thesis.

Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008: 232) argue that transcribing into IU’s is problematic for a CA-informed approach in that “it is not the participants’ own observable orientations to prosodic tone units that drives analysis, but the linguist’s intuitive hearing”. In contrast, the significance of IU’s as interactional units is articulated by Kärkkäinen (2003a: 30–32) in connection with the analysis of epistemic phrases such as I think and I guess in spoken interaction. She puts forward well-founded arguments on behalf of treating the IU, i.e. a single idea expressed in a block of speech that comprises a single cohesive contour, as the central unit of analysis. The visual representation of IU’s alone will make it easy to distinguish and analyse talk that according to Schegloff (1996: 55) is indeed produced “incrementally, through a series of “turns-so-far”.” This characteristic of intonation units has proven to be a visual aid and a valuable analytical tool for scholars working with the concept of resonance (Du Bois 2001, 2007, Kärkkäinen 2003b, 2007, Haddington 2005, Keisanen 2006, Rauniomaa 2007, 2008). Similarly in this study, transcribing into IU’s facilitates the tracking of resonating lexico-syntactic, semantic and prosodic features of interaction, an advantage that
outweighs the potential misinterpretations caused by the ‘transcriber’s best guess’ at determining the boundaries of an IU.
3 Theoretical and methodological framework

This dissertation sets out to examine the recurrent resonating linguistic and embodied resources of stance taking in conversational storytelling as carried out by two or more participants. The present chapter outlines the theoretical and methodological framework of this thesis by introducing relevant previous research on conversational storytelling. In section 3.1, I introduce the method adopted in this thesis and a relevant body of previous research on conversational storytelling. I will shed light on some basic principles of the conversation-analytic method that is adopted, in its broad sense, in this study. I will also present previous work on prosodic and multimodal features of interaction and on conversational storytelling as informed and inspired by the conversation-analytic and other relevant methods. In section 3.2, I will present previous research on stance taking and resonance and outline the approach adopted in this study. Finally, section 3.3 provides a summary of the theoretical and methodological framework of this study.

3.1 Conversational stories as interactional and multimodal accomplishments

The research in the present thesis is conducted within the conversation-analytic research tradition (Sacks et al. 1974, 1992, Goodwin & Heritage 1990, Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008). Sacks’ pioneering work on conversational interaction is introduced in his series of Lectures on Conversation (edited in 1992 by Gail Jefferson), which subsequently gave rise to the method of Conversation Analysis (CA). This thesis aims to contribute to the large body of work that originates, draws from and expands on the observations put forward by Sacks on naturally-occurring spoken interaction. The current section first briefly introduces the main aspects of interactional organisation distinguished in the conversation-analytic

---

2 This study applies the method of CA similarly to a recent approach, discursive psychology (Edwards & Potter 1992, Edwards 1997, Potter & Edwards 2003). This line of research focuses on establishing how cognitive processes are constructed and managed in everyday human social practices and thus observable in interaction. Moreover, LeBaron and Koschmann (2003: 120) note that, in their work on classroom interaction, they investigate cognitive phenomena, traditionally not considered in conversation-analytic research, and yet still comply with the empirical rigorousness of CA. The study of stance taking in interaction lends support to the discursive psychological studies of cognition: just as research in the field of discursive psychology, this study concentrates on the displays rather than the mental processes of interlocutors’ discursive activities (McLaughlin 2009: 58).
research tradition (section 3.1.1), proceeding to discuss relevant previous approaches to conversational storytelling (section 3.1.2) and to the prosodic and video-based analysis of multimodal interaction conducted within CA and other applicable fields of research (section 3.1.3).

3.1.1 Turn-taking, sequential organisation and recipient design in interaction

One of the most significant observations made in CA is that, as people engage in conversation with each other, they do so by complying with the principles of what is called the turn-taking system. In its simplicity, the system is founded on the observation by Sacks et al. (1974) that people generally tend to talk one at a time and take turns in doing so. Based on that notion, the authors devise a ‘context-free’ yet always ‘situated’ model of the turn-taking system that ultimately establishes the rules of allocating turns in conversation. What is more, the turns that people take perform social actions. In Schegloff’s (1995: 187) understanding, “[e]specially (but not exclusively) in conversation, talk is constructed and is attended by its recipients for the action or actions it may be doing”. He proceeds to claim that “[t]here is virtuall y always an issue (for the participants and, accordingly, for professional analysts) of what is getting done by its production in some particular here-and-now”. In other words, people ‘do things’ with their turns at interaction, keeping in mind the recipient and the social context (Drew 2005); i.e. talk is also organised into sequences of actions. Sacks et al. (1974: 13) further establish that turns consist of turn constructional units (TCU), which is a grammatically coherent unit of talk that performs a specific social action (cf. Ford et al. 1996). The closing of such a unit constitutes a prospective transition relevance place (TRP), a potential transfer point between further talk by the current or the next speaker.

Turns at talk are prototypically organised into adjacency pairs. An example of such a pair could be, for instance, an initial question, You are all coming, aren’t you?, and an adjacent response, Yes, we are. The question opens up a range of possible responses (e.g. an affirmative response Yes, we are, a negative response No, we’re not, a partially affirmative response, Only I’m coming, an uninformed response, I don’t know; or an indecisive response, We haven’t decided yet). Some of these responses are regarded as more ‘desirable’ than others by the speaker who introduces the question. S/he may project that desire in the design of the form and structure of the question, structurally inviting a specific response; this is
in CA referred to as the *preference organization* of social actions. It illustrates the way in which, structurally speaking, some first actions prefer particular second actions, the way an offer would prefer an acceptance, for example. In Schegloff’s (2007: 63) words, some turns “embody and implement preferred and dispreferred responses”. Here the question, *You are all coming, aren’t you?*, prefers an affirmative response, which thus aligns with the projection set forward by the question. A negative, disaligning response would be considered dispreferred.

However, not all talk consists of turn-by-turn adjacency pairs, and sometimes interlocutors do something in interaction that takes up more than one turn constructional unit. This thesis contributes to the study of such extended multi-unit turns. Conversational storytelling constitutes a sequential environment, i.e. a storytelling sequence (Schegloff 1992: 201), in which the alternating turn-by-turn turn-taking system is relaxed and accommodates to the requirements of such multi-unit sequences. Jefferson (1978: 220) shows that something in the flow of the conversation triggers a response from a co-participant in the form of a story; “[s]tories emerge from turn-by-turn talk, that is, are *locally occasioned* by it, and, upon their completion, stories re-engage turn-by-turn talk”. And in comparison to social actions typically viewed and discussed as inhabiting only one turn, a conversational story, as a whole, usually performs some social action (e.g. Mandelbaum 2003). It may mediate an invitation, a complaint, or a self-praise, for instance. On the other hand, it is possible to extend the principle of ‘adjacency’ to cover extended multi-unit turns. After all, other participants of the storytelling event are likely to produce an adjacent, preferred response to storytelling by somehow acknowledging, assessing, evaluating or commenting on it, or by producing a second story that is triggered by some aspect of the first telling. Instead of being composed of two utterances, an extended adjacency pair could be seen to comprise a first story and an adjacent evaluation from the recipient, or a first story–second story pair, for example.

That human interaction is sequentially organised and governed by a turn-taking system leads to the investigation of communication as an ongoing series of initiations and responses. In designing their initiations and responses, the interlocutors must adapt to the current interactional event and thereby keep the other participants in mind. Sacks *et al.* (1974: 272) refer to this as *recipient design*: “a multitude of respects in which the talk by a party in a conversation is constructed or designed in ways which display an orientation and sensitivity to the particular other(s) who are the co-participants”. That is, interlocutors deploy in interaction a number of resources that are designed to take into account the
recipient. These resources may involve word selection, topic selection, ordering of sequences and prosody. Embodied features are also a salient aspect of recipient design. For instance, body movement and gestures may be used to steer the recipient’s attention (Heath 1992, Streeck 1993), and false starts, repairs and pauses to attract the recipient’s gaze (C. Goodwin 1981).

Recipient design is embedded in the moment-to-moment flux of conversational storytelling. According to Schegloff (2007:38), recipient design puts specific constraints on storytelling. For instance, “one feature of the recipient design of telling is that the speaker should not, ordinarily, tell the recipient something they already know”. Jefferson (1978: 245) suggests that stories are not continuous “blocks of talk” but are constructed of smaller segments that allow recipient participation. C. Goodwin (1986b) further describes storytelling as a collaborative process dynamically shaped by audience input. The teller adjusts the telling, moment by moment, to accommodate the varied degrees of knowledge of multiple recipients.

All papers of the current thesis deal with the phenomena closely linked to recipient design but approach it from diverse angles. Papers (i), (ii) and (iii) concentrate on how the recipients respond to stance taking in storytelling, i.e. the recipient design of recipient contributions to the storytelling activity. They may produce resonating direct reportings and second stories, positioning themselves in view of the stance taken by the initial teller and the subject matter at hand. In other words, they adjust their current stance in view of the prior stance. Paper (iv), on the other hand, takes a closer look at the multiple social actions that a speaker accomplishes on separate tellings about the same event to different recipients. The tellings themselves are instances of stance taking. The recipient design of the tellings is thus affected by the caller’s displays of stance, i.e. the caller’s monitor trouble is presented to each call recipient in a certain light depending on what sort of a role they may have in the caller’s life. The (re)tellings contain a great number of affective, stance-laden statements about the trouble that the teller has had with his computer monitor and appeals for pity, sympathy and help in both legal and technical matters. Here, the process of resonance is extended to cover same-speaker recycling of some structural units of the telling. The resonating re-tellings of the monitor trouble are seen as a part of a socially wide-reaching stance-taking activity by the teller, the call recipients and the co-present hearer.
3.1.2 Conversational storytelling

The papers of this thesis each present a brief review of approaches to conversational narratives relevant to the particular line of investigation followed in them. This subsection summarises the content of those reviews, providing a general outline of the relevant research on storytelling in interaction in terms of the resonating linguistic and embodied practices of stance taking. The fundamentality of storytelling for humans is widely emphasised in the literature. For instance, Becker & Quasthoff (2004: 1) characterize storytelling as “a prototypical form of human communication”. It may be argued that we have an innate need to tell in order to facilitate our understanding and share our experiences of what it is like to be human. In general terms, the stories that we tell consist of an account of a series of events. The series of events may be presented, for instance, in verbal, written, pictorial or enacted form – or in a combination of any of the previous forms. Temporal fixedness is a central feature of a story for many of the scholars working with narratives. Much of the current work on narratives, stories and storytelling in various fields of linguistics rely on the definition put forward by Labov & Waletzky (1967), that a story is a chronological succession of at least two consecutive narrative clauses. In other words, a story consists of at least one temporal juncture. Schiffrin (2006: 4), for example, sees narrative as “a sequence of temporally ordered clauses that cluster together to report ‘what happened’”. The title of one of Sacks’ (1992a: 244) lectures provides an apt example of such a sequence: The baby cried, the mommy picked it up. He further acknowledges the recipient’s role in conversational storytelling by concluding that a story is something that is perceived as a story by the recipient, i.e. it is the recipient who gives the teller a time slot in the flow of conversation to tell a story.

Conversational stories are an interactive achievement usually produced in close collaboration by the interactants and can therefore differ dramatically from elicited life stories, for example. They are subject to recipient responses and a number of possible co-teller contributions or consociate turns (Mandelbaum 1987, Lerner 1992, Sacks 1992a). Goodwin & Goodwin (1992: 14) sum up C. Goodwin’s previous notion on storytelling as a “multi-party field of action in which alternative types of participants are differentially positioned, each with their own task to perform, as they collaboratively constitute the telling as a social event”. Ochs and Capps (2001: 54) propose that conversational storytelling is indeed “social activity that involves participants who position themselves as more
or less active tellers”. The current thesis emphasizes the active role of the recipient in the storytelling event. The telling is designed by the teller with the recipient in mind and the recipient responses contribute to the telling by influencing the flow and the direction of the telling. In conversational storytelling, the telling performs a particular social action highly dependent on the recipient and the telling context.

The notion of a story is subject to great diversity in interaction research. Thornborrow and Coates (2005), rightly, advocate an unrestricted understanding of stories by suggesting that they are designed for their local, situated telling, and the narrative form is inevitably shaped by the social context in which it occurs. Furthermore, Georgakopoulou (2007) draws attention to small stories that are in danger of being left out of the tradition of narrative research, because they do not meet certain traditional characteristics of a story; for example, they may be projections of potential future events and hence may not actually have happened yet. As was already stated in the introduction, in the present thesis, a conversational story is understood as an extended, structured turn of talk, which is typically taken by one teller, to give a report of an actual or invented social event. A conversational story contains a succession of narrative clauses in chronological order and the story is told to one or more recipients in order to perform a social action. The thesis also views stories as amoeba-like and perpetually changing, adjusting to the social context in which they occur. In fact, paper (iv) shows that the shape of the story is subject to change from one interactional task to another.

The current thesis combines selectively the views of Sacks (1992) and Labov & Waletzky (1967) for the purpose of analysing corresponding structural units between separate tellings. First, in a seminal article, Labov & Waletzky (1967) establish a structural frame for a story, which consists of an abstract, orientation, complicating action, climax, evaluation, resolution and coda. Abstract provides an anticipatory summary of the story to come. Orientation establishes the setting of the telling, introducing characters, the environment, and the situation. The succession of events leading up to the climax, or the high point of the telling, is regarded as complicating action. Evaluation constitutes the personal significance in a piece of conversational narrative and can be scattered within the storytelling structure. Resolution answers the question “what happened then?” Finally, the teller returns to the present moment via coda. Second, Sacks (1992a) provides a widely recognized structural outline of a story that consists of a preface sequence, a telling sequence and a reception sequence. A prototypical preface sequence
consists of a turn by the ‘intending speaker’, offering to tell or giving some other relevant comment on the content of the prospective story, and by the ‘intended recipient’, instigating the teller to tell (Sacks 1974: 340–341). Not all tellings have preface sequences (Jefferson 1978, Schegloff 2007) as they may arise within the unfolding conversation gradually without initiation or be told as a response to another telling. Lerner (1992: 248) further contributes to the understanding of the structure of interactive conversational storytelling by stating that ”[a]fter the preface sequence the continuing relevance of a story-in-progress is then maintained (or abandoned) moment-by-moment as an ongoing accomplishment of the participants throughout the course of the storytelling”. The *telling sequence* thus constitutes an interactive multi-party slot for delivering the plot of the telling. Finally, the recipient indicates what s/he makes of the tellings in the *reception sequence*. The reception sequence accommodates a wide range of possible recipient contributions to the storytelling, e.g. laughter, assessments and evaluations (Routarinne 1997). This thesis makes use of both models (Sacks 1992a and Labov & Waletzky 1967) and applies the overall structural units of the story, i.e. preface sequence; telling sequence, which includes orientation, complication or the plot of the telling, evaluation, high point (orig. climax) and resolution; and response sequence.

Articles (i) and (ii) of the current thesis highlight resonating voiced and multimodal enactments as recipient responses to storytelling. In the reception sequence, the teller–recipient roles may often be reversed, making the first teller a second recipient and the first recipient a second teller. In fact, a second story displays aspects of the recipient’s understanding of the first telling (Ryave 1978, Sacks 1992a, Schegloff 1992, Routarinne 1997, Ochs & Capps 2001, Norrick 2000, Arminen 2004). In the second story the teller may display this understanding by highlighting those features of the first telling that are relevant to him in his own telling. Article (iii) of the present thesis deals with such resonating second stories. It takes a closer look at the exact ways in which second stories are structurally affected by initial (first) tellings, by examining the resonating formal elements used by the second tellers to tie back to storytelling elements in the preface, telling and reception sequences of prior tellings. The two stories are anchored to each other, back to front, by resonating lexico-syntactic, structural, prosodic and semantic elements in corresponding positions in the first story–second story pairs, exhibiting parallelism not only in form but also in function.
3.1.3 Previous approaches to prosody and embodiment relevant for conversational storytelling

The rapid development of technologies in the past decades has resulted in a prevalent turn toward a more holistic auditory and visual analysis of social interaction. The progress in the quality of recording of digital sound enables a detailed measurement and analysis of a great variety of audio parameters. Auditory analysis is nonetheless the base on which the analysis of prosodic interactional elements is built. The conversation-analytic tradition sheds new light on the prosodic elements of talk-in-interaction, examining them in close connection with the concurrent lexico-syntactic elements (see Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 1996, 2007, Couper-Kuhlen 1999, Auer et al. 1999, Local 2003, Curl et al. 2004, Ogden 2006, Local & Walker 2008). Moreover, the line of investigation introduced by Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (1996) concentrates on determining the role of prosody in everyday conversation, taking into account the sequential organization of interaction in the analysis of prosody. More specifically, they show that it is essential to combine the conversation-analytic method with the study of prosody to unearth the subtle yet meaningful details of the prosodic elements in natural conversation. Auer et al. (1999) further take as their starting point rhythm and its significance in the basic processes of turn-by-turn interaction. Schegloff (1998: 236) concurs that the employment of prosodic features provides a partial input in the construction of social actions, focusing on “[prosody] as the featured element and set of practices which enter into [the organization of talk-in-interaction]”. Local (2003: 118) similarly advocates the importance of examining the phonetic details of talk in the sequential organization of talk as social action, which further enables the study of phonological contrasts that affect the ongoing interaction and are real for the participants. In fact, Couper-Kuhlen & Selting (1996) do just this by establishing that prosody has a more significant role in the management of turn-taking and floor-holding and in the negotiation of multiple conversational activities (e.g. repair, assessments, announcements, reproaches and news receipts) than was thought earlier.

Previous work that couples the study of prosody and the sequential analysis of talk-in-interaction (e.g. Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 1996, Couper-Kuhlen 1999, Günthner 1999, Ogden 2006, Clift 2006, Local & Walker 2008) also touches upon and illuminates the role of prosodic features in stance taking. Couper-Kuhlen (1999: 14–15), for example, shows that the design of the voicing in a reported speech utterance may not only assign a certain voice but also a specific stance to the
reported speaker. In fact, the prosodic features may serve as a signal to infer earlier ‘assigned stances’. The voices, and thereby also the stances, that are assigned by the current speaker to the reported one also display the current speaker’s ‘take’, or stance, on the reported speaker or the reported event. Günthner (1999: 686) argues that voicing plays an important part in the recontextualisation of reported speech. She shows that speakers produce voiced reconstructed dialogues and in doing so evaluate and comment on the content of those dialogues to achieve some personal communicative aim. In other words, they take a particular stance on the reported events and the reported speaker.  

In addition to the interactional-phonetic work, researchers pay an increasing amount of attention to various other communicative modalities of human expression. After all, interaction takes place between interacting bodies in certain contexts and spaces. The pioneering work of M. Goodwin (e.g. 1980, 1990) and C. Goodwin (e.g. 1980, 1984, 2000), also together in Goodwin & Goodwin (e.g. 1986, 1992), on the multimodal aspects of interaction, along with the phenomenal development of technologies over the past decades, has inspired scholars to engage in a detailed analysis of the embodied features of interaction. As previous research (C. Goodwin 1984, 1986a; Sacks and Schegloff 1984; Kendon 1990) suggests, embodied actions are an independent resource of turn-design in face-to-face interaction, not merely a supplement to speech. The work of Stivers & Sidnell (2005: 6) originates in the conversation-analytic tradition and shows that “face-to-face social interaction is necessarily multimodal and typically involves the cooperation of vocal and visuospatial modalities”. What is more, different modalities become relevant at different points in the interaction (Goodwin & Goodwin 1992, 1996, C. Goodwin 1994, 2000, Muntigl 2004, Norris 2004). Norris (2004: 2) among others suggests that from time to time the embodied features of communication may take precedence over language in interaction. The starting point for Norris’ research is the investigation of communicative modes and various levels of action, stemming from the research traditions of sociolinguistics, mediated discourse analysis and nexus analysis. She infers that the physical environment where a given interaction takes place, with all its objects, signs and artifacts, affects and steers the way human action develops (see also C. Goodwin 2000; McIlvenny et al. 2009).
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3 The papers by Couper-Kuhlen and Günthner do not focus on storytelling per se, but many of the examples of reported speech come from conversational narratives.
The embodiment of storytelling sequences is still a relatively little-explored area of study (cf. C. Goodwin 1984, M. Goodwin 1990, Schegloff 1992, Stivers 2008). C. Goodwin (1984: 229) describes the main characteristics of and shifts in the teller’s embodiment within a storytelling sequence, and further shows that the teller’s embodiment in the preface sequence differs from that in the telling sequence. The telling sequence is characterized by a distinctive teller’s position that is sustained throughout the main body of the telling, whereas the embodied features of the preface sequence “display preparation for some upcoming activity” (see also Schegloff 1992: 206). The way the speaker divides also the main body of telling into several units shows in the embodied features: hand movements, for example, are synchronized with concurrent, coherent units of talk. The body movement and gestures thus make visible the patterns of alignment and the sequential organization of the telling. Stivers (2008: 53) further shows that, by way of nodding, recipients “display an affective stance towards the event(s) the story reported”. Stivers uses the term stance on a more general level than is done in this thesis, but the broadly used term of taking a stance and the present concept of the interactive and intersubjective process of stance taking are closely related. The analysis in paper (ii) of this thesis of embodiment in conversational storytelling adds to the current knowledge of multimodal storytelling by covering a wide spectrum of modalities. It maintains that conversational storytelling entails particular moments in which prosody and embodiment become highly relevant. It shows that particularly the high points of tellings seem to be, in terms of both vocal and embodied activity, highly animated. The story high points are thus highlighted within the body of the telling via multiple modalities, and these “heightened dramatizations” indeed may function to particularly invite recipient responses (M. Goodwin 1990: 246). In the present thesis, most of the high points of the stories consist of direct reportings (discussed further in chapter 4), whose embodied features have also been discussed by M. Goodwin (1990), Streeck & Knapp (1992), Sidnell (2006) and Wilkinson et al. (2010).

The present section has outlined the methodological framework of CA, as well as relevant previous approaches to conversational storytelling and to the prosodic and visuospatial, video-based analysis of naturally occurring interaction. Next, I will present the approach adopted in this thesis for studying the resonating linguistic and embodied practices of stance taking in conversational storytelling.
3.2 Stance taking and resonance in conversational storytelling

The present section outlines the approach adopted in this thesis for locating recurrent, resonating linguistic and embodied patterns of stance taking in conversational storytelling, with the methods provided mainly by CA and multimodal interaction. Subsection 3.2.1 sheds light on previous studies on stance, first discussing briefly studies that concentrate on the expression of a single-speaker stance and proceeding to studies that treat stance taking as a multifaceted, interactive and intersubjective process. Subsection 3.2.2 further explicates the concept of stance taking and discusses the concepts of resonance, format tying, alignment and affiliation that are closely related to and relevant for the stance-taking activity. Finally, subsection 3.2.3 outlines an approach to stance taking as a phenomenon that is manifested both in the voice and the body of the interlocutors.

3.2.1 The relevance of stance taking for conversational storytelling

In general usage, stance carries the concrete meaning of a standing-place, station or position (see section 3.2.3), and the figurative meaning of an attitude, opinion or a position that a person adopts in relation to a particular object of contemplation. The figurative meaning is dealt with in a great deal of previous research that regards the expression of stance in interaction as a subjective phenomenon manifested in and ‘belonging to’ the speech of a single speaker. For instance, Biber & Finegan (1989: 92) view it as "expression of attitudes, feelings, judgements, or commitment"; an individual point of view captured by syntactic and lexical units and expressions that function as stance markers. Similarly, Martin (2000) identifies evaluative stance markers within lexical categories, such as adjectives and nouns. Conrad & Biber (2000: 58) further examine adverbials as markers of stance, treating them as “[g]rammatical devices used to frame a position”. In the same publication, Hunston and Thomson (2000: 5) underline the subjectivity of evaluation in their research by defining it as the “speaker’s own attitude or stance” towards the issue at hand. Field (1997: 800–801), similarly, studies factive predicates in the way speakers “index their own stance, or attribute stance to some other participant (even themselves at some point in the past)”. A rapidly growing body of research on stance has shifted the focus from single-speaker stance towards stance taking. This thesis, along with other previous studies on stance taking (Du Bois 2001, 2003, 2007, Kärkkäinen 2003, 2007, Wu 2004, Haddington 2005, 2006, 2007, Keisanen 2006, 2007,
Englebretson 2007, Rauniomaa 2007, 2008), views it as an interactive and intersubjective activity between the interlocutors of a given interactional situation, not as an ‘inner state’ of the conversation participant. In other words, stance taking is situated activity, a socially-relevant and public positioning of oneself in view of the object of contemplation and in view of potential prior interactional turns and events.

Some thought or emotion within the consciousness of the speaker, or some other stimulus in the surrounding environment, may potentially motivate speakers to produce certain social actions to achieve a desired goal. However, studying the motivation behind interlocutors’ actions may not be possible; nor is it easy to find out why we say the things we do. But it is possible to analyse the various displays of stance in the unfolding sequence of interaction. Such displays are commonly viewed as falling into three types: affective, evaluative and epistemic stances. Affective stances display speakers’ emotional positioning, feelings, desires and aspirations towards the previous speakers or their turns at talk, whereas evaluative stances deal with assessing and appraising them. Epistemic stances, on the other hand, involve expressing one’s degree of knowledge, as in Kärkkäinen’s (2003a) work on epistemic stance marker *I think*. This study specifically deals with affective and evaluative stances. Based on evidence from the interaction, we may analyse how and why interlocutors portray themselves and possibly others in a certain light in view of the subject matter at hand. In this study then, stance-taking activity is seen to comprise turns that display stances, i.e. contain a display of stance.

In Du Bois’ (2007: 163) words, stance taking “is a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means, of simultaneously evaluating objects, positioning subjects (self and others), and aligning with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field”. Kärkkäinen (2004: 49) concurs that “stance taking is an activity that is essentially dialogic, interactive and intersubjective in nature: it is oriented to by co-participants who frequently engage in jointly constructing and negotiating their stances across turns”. In a study of assessment activity, Goodwin & Goodwin (1987b) describe an identical, interactive process in which the participants organize their talk and embodiment in positioning themselves towards the issue at hand and towards other interlocutors. At the same time, they align with the others’ assessments. The authors further show that interlocutors respond to the affect displays of others by producing a corresponding affect display.

There is a consensus among the above researchers on the interactive and intersubjective nature of stance taking, but they hold somewhat differing views on
its pervasiveness and influence in interaction. They can thus be placed at different points along a continuum of commitment to the possibility that stance may shape and influence the unfolding interaction. One end of that continuum accommodates researchers (Du Bois 2003, 2007, Wu 2004, Englebretson 2007, Kärkkäinen 2007) who find stance taking a highly or moderately pervasive activity that potentially affects the form of language and the organisation of social actions, while the other end features researchers (Ford et al. 2004, Haddington 2005, Keisanen 2006, 2007, Raumio 2008) who do not treat stance as something that shapes interaction but as an emergent product of interaction embedded in the social actions and shaped by the given sequential position. This study identifies with the latter way of thinking and assumes that as interlocutors produce social actions, they are simultaneously taking stances. The stance-taking activity is organised by the concurrent social actions and the sequential organisation of the ongoing interaction. It is nevertheless possible to focus on the resources and practices of stance taking, discussing them as parallel phenomena to social actions and activities.

As mentioned above, some recent theoretically motivated explorations into stance taking focus on and emphasise its role as a socially significant process that affects interaction and even the form of language. Englebretson (2007: 69) assigns stance taking a rather pervasive role in interaction and in shaping language form. In Du Bois’ (2007: 141) understanding, “[s]tance both derives from and has consequences for social actors, whose lives are impacted by the stances they and others take”. That is, the sociocultural value that interlocutors mediate and respond to is organised by acts of stance taking. Wu (2004: 3) also adopts a similar way of thinking by stating that “like all other actions, stance is treated as an emergent product which is shaped by, and itself shapes, the unfolding development of interaction”. Kärkkäinen (2007: 184) adopts a more moderate view by arguing that the epistemic stance marker I guess acts as an intersubjective stance frame that organises the stance-taking activity between participants, momentarily inserting a new and modified stance in the middle of conversational storytelling, for example. Haddington (2005: 42) argues that the interlocutors produce practices and actions that ultimately organize the stance-taking activity, and considers some actions themselves as displays of stance and expressions of the stance-taking activity. In a study of negative yes/no interrogatives and tag questions, Keisanen (2006: 53) adopts a more CA-oriented view on stance taking, regarding it as an emergent product of interaction encoded in the current social action and sequential position, i.e. “any linguistic or paralinguistic
feature of language, or a linguistic construction for that matter, can function as a stance marker”. The sequential position of the interrogative constructions that she examines is crucial for the display of affective, evaluative and epistemic stances toward the other interlocutors and the issue at hand. These interrogatives are also innately inclusive of the recipient. Rauniomaa (2008: 215–217) similarly shows that recovery through repetition, i.e. repetition that is used to return to prior talk, may implement stance-taking moments as emergent products of the ongoing interaction, taking a stance towards an activity in progress, or taking a stance towards a recipient response. Ford et al. (2002: 26) examine unattached NP-increments functioning as displays of stance that guide the recipients’ uptake of the just possibly completed turn. They (2002: 32) also relate prosodic features, namely the reset of pitch, to the stance-expressing function of those extensions (see also Wu 2004 and Keisanen 2006).

The stance-related processes of alignment (Stivers 2008) and affiliation (Goldberg 1978, Jefferson 1979, Heritage 1984, Stivers 2008) are involved in developing and managing the interactive and intersubjective stance-taking activity. In fact, stance taking is a progressive activity governed by the processes of alignment and affiliation. Both processes are realised in interaction via recipient responses to particular actions. Alignment refers to the way in which turn-by-turn interaction is organised between participants: aligning turns follow the trajectory of interaction projected by prior turns, whereas disaligning turns do not fall in line with them. Affiliation reflects the demonstration of solidarity between interlocutors: affiliating turns adopt an empathetic point of view in relation to prior turns, whereas disaffiliating turns do not support the sentiments displayed in them.

In the present study, taking a stance and doing a social action are regarded as interlaced but distinct processes. The sequential analysis of the present data (chapter 4) allows a concurrent investigation of both stance taking and social actions as phenomena that describe different aspects of conversational storytelling. Mandelbaum (2003: 605) lends support to this view by showing that stories are interactively constructed by the participants in the storytelling event and that “there is often more than one ‘layer’ of action going on”. On one hand, storytelling undertakes a social action, such as complaining, blaming or troubles telling, and, on the other hand, it positions the teller in view of the reported events, for instance, displaying the teller’s level of interest in them and dis/affiliation with the characters of the telling. Stivers (2008: 31) postulates that “[w]hen someone tells a story, the teller provides the recipient with ‘access’ to an event and to the teller’s stance toward that event”. Although Stivers talks about stance on a more
general level, i.e. stance as the teller’s implied position with regard to the subject matter of the telling and not as an element of the stance taking process, her data nevertheless shows, along with Kärkkäinen (2003b), that there is a preference for the recipients to affiliate with the teller’s stance on the reported events. A story is not only in itself a display of stance, but a storytelling sequence may, and typically does, contain evaluations or reported speech, provided by both teller and recipient(s), which function as displays of stances that align with and support the main storytelling and the main stance-taking activity.

3.2.2 Resonance in stance taking

Participants recycle each others’ words, linguistic structures and prosodic and embodied practices in their own interactional deeds (see Tannen 1987, Johnstone 1994, Couper-Kuhlen 1999, Du Bois 2003; 2007, Laury 2005, Kärkkäinen 2006, Sakita 2006, Lempert 2008). Tannen (1987: 601), for example, suggests the possibility of viewing discourse as a system of pervasive parallelism. Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008: 137, 1998), among others, bring up Sacks’ notion of poetics in everyday talk, introducing the assumption that speakers “may rely on echoes of words produced moments earlier to cue other words and phrases”. This thesis applies the term resonance in examining parallelism in interaction, concluding that these resonant features are a salient aspect of interactive and intersubjective stance taking in conversational storytelling. Here, resonance as a process of activating “potential affinity across instances of dialogic language use” originates from Du Bois’ (2003: 1, 2007) theory in progress on dialogic syntax. Resonance is typically mapped out across speakers but also sometimes within the turns of one speaker (Oropeza-Escobar 2011). Goodwin & Goodwin (1987a) and M. Goodwin (1990) discuss a highly related phenomenon under the concept of format tying from a more conversation-analytic point of view. In a series of argumentative moves, “participants frequently tie not only to the type of action produced by last speaker but also to the particulars of its wording” (Goodwin & Goodwin 1987a: 216). For instance, the children in their data recycle the grammatical constructions of prior turns and, to promote the opposing view, substitute an item that needs correcting with a more appropriate one, and often employ a contrastive stress in delivering that item to emphasize the juxtaposition
between the turns.\(^4\) Format tying involves the recycling of formal elements, whereas the concept of resonance can be used to discuss semantic and functional similarity (Du Bois 2001). However, formal resonance is always present in semantic and functional resonance; for example, the high points of an initial and a subsequent telling may contain some resonating formal and semantic elements and they perform the same function in separate tellings. Laury (2005: 185) also discusses the recycling of the linguistic material of other’s talk in the process of maintaining topic continuity, showing that “syntactically resonating segments occurred in segments of conversation in which participants are ‘doing the same thing’”. The analysis of paper (iii) of this thesis also explores resonance in the corresponding actions (i.e. prefaces and high points of the tellings) of resonant second stories, examining the use of formal resonating elements by the second tellers to tie back to storytelling elements by prior tellers. The resonant lexico–syntactic, structural, prosodic and semantic elements (produced by the second tellers) in corresponding positions in the first story–second story pairs tie the two tellings together, exhibiting parallelism not only in form but also in function. The resonating second story as such can manifest the recipients’ interpretation of what they make of the first story. Moreover, by telling a resonating subsequent story, they take a stance on the first story, reinforcing or rejecting the gist of the initial telling.

The term resonance is applied here, not only because it is particularly useful for the description of the processes of stance taking, but also because it draws a practical allusion to the resonance of sound, i.e. “the reinforcement or prolongation of sound by reflection” (s.v. resonance, OED 1989), and the present study sheds new light on the phenomenon of ‘chiming in’ (Couper-Kuhlen 1999), the resounding of other’s voice. Couper-Kuhlen (1999: 8) suggests that conversation participants sometimes “participate in the voicing of a particular figure”. In other words, they respond to voiced reported speech produced by other interlocutors by chiming in, which is one way of indicating that “that they are orienting to a bit of talk as the reported speech of a figure rather than as current speaker’s own words”. Szczep (2001) gives a detailed account of how speakers do this, examining the way in which interlocutors repeat the prosodic parameters of other speakers, including intonation contour, pitch register, pitch jumps, volume and speech rate. Szczep (2001: 41) puts forward a claim that in some
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cases “[p]rosodic orientation thus seems to create a bridge between two turns that could not be achieved by verbal means alone”. Couper-Kuhlen (1999: 11) further shows that the prosodic chiming in of another conversation participant functions, on one hand, as a sign of understanding that the teller is speaking in some particular ‘other voice’ and, on the other hand, as a sign of co-alignment with the stance of the teller.

The present thesis lends support to the view that resonant voicing, and resonant embodiment for that matter, can function as a display of congruent stance. Resonating elements do not automatically indicate a congruent stance (Goodwin & Goodwin 1987b, Kärkkäinen 2003b); however, all the second stories in articles (i) and (ii) happen to be like-minded in relation to the first tellings. The articles discuss the sequential organization of resonating voiced and multimodal reported speech. Voiced and multimodal enactments by story recipients display a shared stance and constitute one appropriate response to voiced or multimodal direct reportings within a storytelling sequence. A resonant instance of voiced or multimodal direct reporting is therefore an orderly phenomenon in interaction and a sequentially relevant practice of stance taking. Article (iii) deals with resonant elements in second stories and regards them as formal elements used by the recipients to tie back to the previous telling. It supports the evidence provided by Arppe (2004) and Anward (2005) for tracking and identifying an active connection between resonating elements also in longer sequences of interaction (i.e. story rounds and other sequences of storytelling). Resonant voiced and multimodal enactments and resonating second stories can manifest the recipients’ interpretation of what they make of the telling and promote a shared, but potentially also a divergent, understanding of the issue at hand.

In terms of stance taking and resonance, paper (iv) deviates from the previous three articles, which deal with cross-speaker resonance in the reception of directed reported speech, multi-modal enactments and first stories. Paper (iv) affords a unique, contrasting view on the previous articles in that it shows which elements may change in (re)tellings by a same teller to different recipients, i.e. it examines the way in which retellings are designed for different recipients and the way in which recipients are ‘guided’ toward a particular interpretation and understanding of the issue at hand. For the benefit of paper (iv), the definition of resonance is extended to cover the process of activating potential affinity between same-speaker turns on separate but closely connected occasions. Same-speaker resonance involves the recycling of particular storytelling elements by one teller to different recipients on separate storytelling occasions. Same-speaker resonance
is thus not tied as closely to the intersubjective and interactive process of stance taking in dialogic interaction as cross-speakers resonance is; however, the separate storytelling occasions can all be seen as part of an overall stance-taking activity about the same issue at hand that bridges across separate telephone conversations and involves the teller, the call recipients and the co-present recipient/hearer. The teller takes a stance on a more general level by making telephone calls to several recipients about his trouble. These displays of stance are observed by the co-present participant, even though we unfortunately have no access to his talk and embodiment while the telephone calls are taking place. The teller also takes a stance by producing affective displays of stance within those telephone calls which are then responded to by the call recipients. Stance taking is thus seen as complex, multi-layered social activity that involves not only the immediate conversation participant but other co-present participants as well.

In the (re)tellings in paper (iv), some essential parts of the story, e.g. the elements that establish the temporal juncture of the story, are recycled by the teller every time. Thus, the story is recognized by the co-present recipient as a rendering of the same event. The less constant aspects of the story, e.g. the evaluations and the degree of detail in the telling, are shaped by, among other things, the social action that is achieved by telling the story and the teller’s stance. The paper shows that repeated tellings consist of layered social activity: on the one hand, they involve troubles telling that conveys a stance towards the reported event; on the other hand, the actions of seeking advice and delivering news display the teller’s stance and position him with regard to the recipient. With the benefit of hindsight, then, paper (iv) does not seamlessly fit the theme of papers (i)–(iii) in that it deals with same-speaker resonance, or rather recycling, instead of cross-speaker resonance, and stance taking is seen as a more complex, multi-layered activity involving more than the immediate conversation participants.

### 3.2.3 The voice and body in stance taking

The concrete meaning of stance, in general terms, as a standing-place, station or position is reflected in the studies on the prosodic and embodied features of interaction as dialogic, multimodal practices of stance taking. In other words, stance is manifested and grounded in a number of multimodal activities, involving the human voice, posture, body movement and the environment. Enactments comprise such conglomerates of complex and elaborate activities that take place in several semiotic fields simultaneously. Similarly, this thesis regards it as
essential to study embodied features together with the concurrent linguistic and interactional practices to make sense of the stance-taking activity. In regard to the relations between stance and prosody, Local & Walker (2008: 723) similarly postulate that “[t]he finding that stance does not inhere in any single turn at talk or any single linguistic aspect leads us to suggest that future investigations into stance and affect will need to pay attention simultaneously to matters of both linguistic-phonetic and sequential organization”. In order to study stance taking, then, one must take into consideration the verbal, prosodic and embodied elements and look at them in situ in the flow of the sequential organisation of interaction. The relations between stance and prosodic features of interaction have been previously researched, among others, by Ford et al. (2004), Wu (2004) and Keisanen (2006), who have highlighted the prosodic design of turns as a potential resource for displaying a particular stance. Haddington (2005: 80) investigates the role of embodiment, more specifically the direction of gaze with concurrent linguistic and interactional practices in stance taking: a congruent gaze point as marking the stance object, mutual gaze as a display of shared stance and a cut-off gaze as an antecedent of a divergent stance.

A number of previous studies on prosody and embodiment in stance taking concern reported speech, and many of the instances of reported speech analysed in those studies come from conversational storytelling. Couper-Kuhlen (1999: 1), for instance, shows that interlocutors may assign a particular voicing to a reported speaker, i.e. “[t]he ‘reporting’ speaker animates or voices a ‘reported’ figure without necessarily composing the words which this figure is made to utter or espousing the beliefs which the figure’s words will be heard as attesting to”. The analysis is conducted by way of combining detailed prosodic analysis with the methodology of conversation analysis (see Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 1996) and argues that the design of the voicing in a reported speech utterance may not only assign a certain voice but also a specific stance to the reported speaker (Couper-Kuhlen 1999: 10). Li (1986: 38–39) also observes the significance of the prosodic and embodied features, namely intonation, gestures and facial expressions, in conveying a certain emotional nuance via DRS, constituting a comment by the reporter rather than the reported speaker. M. Goodwin (1990: 244) discusses the process of reporting the talk of others in one example of children’s talk, referring to the reporting sequences as enactments. She discusses the stance that the teller takes in the enactments by concluding that “participants do not simply repeat what they have heard but also provide a commentary on that talk”. Sidnell (2006) studies such multimodal enactments as reenactments, providing a detailed
analysis of the way in which people construct them in interaction. In the concluding discussion, Sidnell (2006: 406) refers to one instance of reenacting as an “objectivized feature of the story that can be represented through the enactment”, touching upon their role as displays of stance. Also, the role of the recipient’s nods in mid-telling position (of a conversational story) have been shown to be vital in claiming access to the teller’s stance, and indicating that the telling is on track (Stivers 2008: 53). Papers (i) and (ii) of this thesis focus on the displays of stance in the form of enactments that the teller produces in the current unfolding interaction via multiple modalities. They show that voiced and multimodal direct reportings are instances of situated action that serve the purpose and are produced for the benefit of taking a stance in the current telling event. They highlight the social function of multimodal direct reporting as a holistic, ‘whole-body’ practice of taking a stance, involving verbal form, voice, the body and the surrounding environment.

Next, I will present a summary of the contribution of this thesis to the study of conversational storytelling in the field of CA, Interactional Linguistics and multimodal interaction.

3.3 The present contribution to the study of conversational storytelling

In the present thesis, the process of stance taking in conversational interactive storytelling is examined, using analytical tools provided by CA and multimodal interaction. The key concepts of this study, stance taking and resonance, introduced in subsection 3.2, provide a framework for examining the verbal, prosodic and embodied practices of conversational storytelling. As a linguist, in the papers of this thesis, I draw from and contribute to the field of CA-informed research in linguistics. Interactional Linguistics (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 2001, Ford et al. 2003) could also be defined as linguistically oriented, or indeed linguistics-informed, CA (Walker 2004: 18). It adopts as its starting point the (grammatical) form of language and its interlaced relationship with interaction. It “treats speech as an ongoing or emergent product in a social semiotic event and language as providing one set of resources for the accomplishment of goals or tasks within this event” (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 2001: 3). In other words, speech arises from and is grounded in social interaction. This thesis also makes use of previous studies on, and facilitates the understanding of, the multimodality of interaction. Research on multimodal interaction draws from a number of
theories and methods of study, e.g. CA, ethnography, cognitive linguistics, gesture studies and video-based study of language and gesture in interaction. The common interest within this field is to shed new light on the multimodal dimension of social interaction (Stivers & Sidnell 2005).

This study stands for the assumption that human beings tend to often communicate their experiences, perform social actions and take stances in the form of conversational stories. The data give evidence that stories are told to take a stance on various social phenomena: coping with the care of elderly parents, having trouble sleeping, being a witness to a shooting, buying organic meat for the first time, speaking in public, or some other unusual or troubling event or state of affairs. After all, the account and the stance must somehow prove worthy of a story, to offer something ‘new’ to the recipient (see ‘tellability’ in Sacks 1992a). The data suggest that tellers typically project themselves, in one way or another, in a good light and, to a varying degree, bad-mouth others not present. Tellers make use of manifold practices of stance taking to voice the incompetence of colleagues, the foolish behaviour of acquaintances or disappointing service at a restaurant, for instance. These stories themselves are instances of stance taking, and they are produced in order to perform some interactionally relevant social achievement, i.e. complaint, troubles telling or self-praise.

The articles in the current study highlight one prevalent tendency, namely that toward parallelism in interaction. Resonant multimodal direct reportings, second stories and repeated tellings all demonstrate that the interlocutors continually evoke affinity between interactional turns by recycling each others’ words, voice and embodiment. Active recipients contribute to the stance taking process by way of a resonant second story, making sense of the first telling and striving for mutual understanding of the issue at hand. Active recipients also engage in more local practices of stance taking, e.g. resonant direct reportings. The overall lexicosyntactic, prosodic and embodied resonance between tellers and recipients in papers (i)–(iii), and between the turns of one speaker in paper (iv), constitutes a wide-reaching and multifaceted intersubjective and interactive practice that is highly relevant to the stance taking process, because it establishes an affinity and highlights the relations between any resonating elements in the flow of interaction. On the other hand, this thesis sheds light on the recipient design of repeated tellings. That is, it examines the way in which tellers adjust and display stances over a series of tellings with a co-present recipient and the separate, individual recipients and telling context in mind. As was mentioned in section 3.2.2, the parallelism in retellings is not related to resonance as a means of stance-taking in
the same fashion as in papers (i)-(iii). Paper (iv) involves same-speaker resonance, the recycling of particular storytelling elements by one teller to different recipients on separate storytelling occasions. The analysis of this thesis also adopts as its starting point the idea that dialogic interaction is founded on the notion of striving for and upholding social solidarity (Clift et al. 2006), with which the process of stance taking is inherently intertwined. The recurrent patterns of stance taking presented in this thesis concern the ways in which tellers and recipients, in the design of their interactional turns, pursue and respond with congruent displays of stance to facilitate social solidarity.

I proceed to outline the topical coherence between the original publications of this dissertation in chapter 4.
4 Resonating verbal, prosodic and embodied practices of stance taking in conversational storytelling

Stance taking is indeed manifested in various verbal, prosodic and embodied practices and resources in the ongoing interaction. This chapter presents the analysis of voiced and multimodal reported speech as a resource for stance taking in conversational stories. The role of lexico-syntactic, prosodic and embodied resonance in stance taking is illustrated between a first and a second story. Finally, the chapter looks at recycling of reported speech and other storytelling elements between repeated tellings by the same teller to several recipients, discussing them under the concept of same-speaker resonance.

This chapter introduces the overall theme of the articles in this dissertation by analysing novel examples from video data of naturally occurring interaction. The analysis in section 4.1 provides a review of previous studies on direct reported speech in interaction and illustrates how the use of voiced and multimodal direct reportings in stance taking is discussed in papers (i) and (ii). Section 4.2 deals with resonating second stories discussed in paper (iii) and sheds light on the way resonating elements serve as a method of anchoring the second telling to the previous telling, and as a resource for stance taking. Section 4.3 illustrates the points made in paper (iv) by expanding the analysis of resonating elements to examine stance taking in repeated tellings by the same teller about the same event to different recipients.

4.1 Voiced and multimodal enactments in constructing the reporting space (Papers i and ii)

In discourse, reported speech is in general terms understood as the act of reporting the speech (or thought) of some prior speaker in the ongoing conversation. In the current thesis direct reported speech (DRS) refers to the linguistic construction in which the current speaker assigns imaginary or actual prior speech, with varying degree of accuracy, to a reported speaker. For instance, in the midst of delivering a conversational story about the weekend, one might produce a DRS utterance Joanna first said, “I’ll cook for you all on Saturday,” but later she had to cancel the plans. The utterance Joanna first said functions as a reporting clause and I’ll
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5 Also Quotation (e.g. Clark & Gerrig 1990) and Constructed Dialogue (Tannen 2007).
cook for you all on Saturday as direct speech, which is thereby assigned to Joanna, the agent of the reporting clause (Quirk et al. 1985). Subsection 4.1.1 provides a summary of previous research on direct reported speech in spoken interaction and introduces the concept of reporting space, which provides a frame for potential active involvement in the stance-taking activity by all participants of the telling event. Subsection 4.1.2 looks at voiced and multimodal direct reportings in stance taking as discussed in papers (i) and (ii) by way of analysing naturally-occurring video data.

4.1.1 Review of literature on DRS

DRS has been widely studied both in literature and in interaction, and its distinctive characteristics, especially in naturally-occurring interaction, have been carefully documented in previous research (e.g. Tannen 2007, Clark & Gerrig 1990, M. Goodwin 1990, Mayes 1990, Streeck & Knapp 1992, Besnier 1993, Holt 1996, 2000, Buttny 1998, Günthner 1997, Couper-Kuhlen 1999, Sidnell 2006, Clift 2006, Schiffrin 2006, Holt & Clift 2007, Wilkinson et al. 2010). Extensive research on reported speech may in part be explained by its prevalent role in human communication. In fact, Güldemann (2008: 286–287) affords good grounds for inferring that a universal sphere of mimetic activity exists in several unrelated languages of the world. He identifies four types of mimetic expression: representational gestures; imitation of non-linguistic sounds; ideophones and other linguistic signs; and direct reported discourse. In this domain, speakers perform, demonstrate, re-instantiate, imitate and replay a potential original event in an attempt to reproduce it to a contextually relevant degree of accuracy. The current thesis, among many others, claims that the accuracy of the connection between the reported event and the actual reporting varies from moment to moment and telling to telling.

The current summary emphasizes the significance that reported speech holds for the ongoing interaction. In Buttny’s (1998: 56) words,

[...]the conversational practice of reported speech takes a prior utterance situated in a particular context and unearths it and gives it a life again in the new soil of the reporting context. To fit into its new context, the reported speech often needs to be contextually framed so recipients understand it in the desired way.
Among the first to discuss this dialogic nature of direct reported speech, Bakhtin (1981, originally published in 1975 in Russian) introduced the concept of double-voicing, which refers to the way in which the current speaker intends the listener to hear the words that are spoken in the ongoing interaction as a quotation. He shed light on the way in which a single speaker may evoke a multitude of voices to create ‘dialogical oppositions’ (Goodwin & Duranti 1992: 20), i.e. the voice of the current speaker seeps into the speech of the reported speaker. The dialogic nature of DRS also shows in its prosodic delivery in a concrete manner. Couper-Kuhlen (1999), among others (e.g. Tannen 2007, Günthner 1997, Linell 1998), emphasize the role of prosody and paralanguage in taking a stance via DRS. The current speaker may produce a specific ‘voicing’ (Couper-Kuhlen 1999) to depict the voice and stance of the reported speaker (discussed further in section 3.2.2).

Early studies related to the pragmatics of DRS concentrate on determining the differences in meaning between direct and indirect speech. Wierzbicka (1974: 301) for instance, outlines the performative dimensions of the syntactically more ‘basic’ direct reported speech in comparison with the more complex indirect speech, concluding that the function of indirect speech is to tell, whereas the function of direct speech is to ‘show’ and tell something. Since then, an extensive body of CA-informed and other linguistic research has examined reported speech in face-to-face everyday interaction. Besnier (1993), for example, establishes the lexical and non-lexical framing strategies of direct reported speech, which include the prosodic contour of the reporting, in the interactional practices of Nukulaelae speakers. He shows that the display of affect is conveyed in a non-transparent fashion; affective content is implied rather than spelled out explicitly. Holt (1996: 230), similarly, presents an analysis of a DRS utterance within a ‘complaint’ storytelling sequence, suggesting that the use of DRS “enables the speaker to give an air of objectivity to the account”. Buttny (1998: 55) claims to provide an alternative interpretation of the use of DRS in that example, stating that the reporting is contextually framed to be heard in a certain way. In other words, the speaker produces a DRS utterance to implicitly take a certain stance on the issue at hand. However, Buttny in fact ends up repeating Holt’s original (1996: 226) argument: “although DRS is structured as though it were the repetition of an utterance or utterances made on a previous occasion, analysis shows that this is
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6 In computer science, reported speech has also been studied as a resource for conveying attitudes, and annotating text so that the computer can interpret the actual meaning of the reporting in the current context has proven especially challenging (Bergler 2006).
unlikely to be the case”. The ‘air of objectivity’ indeed refers to the seemingly objective, highly economical facility of DRS to display a speaker stance in interaction. Holt (2000: 438) later proposes that “direct reported speech can convey both the attitude of the reported speaker and, more implicitly, the attitude of the current speaker”. The stance taking process described in papers (i) and (ii) of the current thesis bears close resemblance and lends support to these findings. Moreover, the papers focus on the sequential position of, and resonating recipient responses to, voiced and multimodal direct reportings as displays of shared stance in conversational storytelling.

The sequential position of and recipient responses to DRS also define the role of reported speech as interactional evidentials in connection with assessments (Clift 2006). Clift (2006) shows that epistemic positioning with regard to others via reported speech describes yet another linguistic resource of defining social relations, i.e. a speaker’s stance of epistemic authority or subordination, and it depends on the recipient response whether that epistemic authority is accepted, matched or even exceeded by the recipient. Some more sociologically-oriented studies of reported speech have also examined the implications of the use of reported speech for social power relations. Tannen (2003, 2007), for instance, explores the process of ‘ventriloquizing’, which is a special case of assigning animated speech to another in the presence of that other. A family member may assign animated speech to the family pet, for example, to negotiate and manage social relations of power and solidarity. The display of power relations is also highlighted in a study by Buttny & Williams (2000) on reported speech in representing interracial discrepancy.

Since the general turn toward video-based analysis of interaction, several visuospatial analyses have also been conducted on multimodal aspects of reported speech. The orchestration of all semiotic channels in reported sequences is reflected in multimodal enactments. This expands the examination of DRS beyond speech and voicing, establishing that the process of reporting previous or imaginary speech and thought consists of a complex and elaborate sequence of actions that take place on several semiotic fields simultaneously. The reporting speaker utilises words, voice, body and the surrounding environment in the production of the reportings. As already mentioned in subsection 3.2.3, such reportings have been investigated as enactments by M. Goodwin (1990: 244–255) in children’s talk. She shows how children in her data vocally and nonvocally mimic each others’ actions. These enactments also present a possibility to evaluate and comment on the enacted actions. Sidnell (2006) similarly examines
the way in which participants of the telling event coordinate their gestures, gaze and talk to perform reenactments. Paper (ii) of this thesis adopts as its starting point the subjectivity of multimodal enactments, or direct reportings, and their role as providing commentary, or taking a stance on the storytelling. The paper shows that multimodal enactments are instances of situated action that serve the purpose of taking a stance in the current telling event, via multiple modalities, and that are produced for the benefit of the ongoing interaction. Thus, the study adds to the knowledge of enactments as an interactional resource of stance taking.

The paper further emphasizes that the accuracy of the connection between the reported event and the actual reporting varies from moment to moment and telling to telling. Being true to the actual event in producing the multimodal direct reporting may be of little importance to the current telling event unless it becomes the topic of negotiation (cf. Mandelbaum 1993). Some multimodal enactments might be meticulously accurate renderings of previous events, especially if the preciseness of the imitation holds some special significance in the reporting situation. In the opposite case, enactments are completely fictional and made up by the reporter to achieve some interactional goal in the current telling event. The kinesics of enactments has also been noted in some previous studies. Streeck and Knapp (1992: 18–20) present an example taken from the ‘Johnny Carson Show’, in which a comedian tells a story about his childhood and engages in a reenactment of a character in that telling. The comedian both reenacts an event and provides commentary on it by way of ‘laminating’ the reenactment and the current speech event. Wilkinson et al. (2010) further argue that, in aphasic talk, speakers with aphasia resort to enactments and other instances of iconicity within interaction as interactional methods which assist them in formulating actions and events in talk, using the limited lexical and grammatical resources at their disposal.

The collaborative, interactive and intersubjective nature of enactments comes across in conversational storytelling. Paper (ii) of this thesis introduces the concept of the reporting space, which provides a frame for potential active involvement in the stance-taking activity by all participants of the telling event. One of the participants, typically the main teller, sets up the reporting space by producing a multimodal enactment of a character in the telling, which takes a stance on the current telling event and the reported character. The reporting speaker may assign the character particular lexico-syntactic, prosodic and embodied features. All the participants in the telling event may then exploit the new participation framework (M. Goodwin 1990) created by the enactment and
produce subsequent enactments that fit the scope of the ongoing story, positioning themselves in view of the telling and the reported characters and aligning with the stance displayed by prior turns. The first reporting functions as the reference point for any subsequent turns that may be further enactments of the already introduced character or some other character of the telling (see also ‘constructed dialogue’ in Tannen 2007). They may tie their potential multimodal enactments to prior ones, resonating with the way in which words, structures, voicing, gestures and embodiment are used and the surrounding environment implicated to take a stance on the prior reportings, i.e. a number of the multimodal features of direct reportings may be recycled by other participants who model their turns on the first reporting. The reporting space constitutes a shift in footing (Goffman 1974), in which the speaker recontextualises the ‘speech of another’. In other words, the speaker gives an impression as if the character’s ‘original’ words were being reproduced in the current context (see also ‘contextualization’ in Goffman 1974, Gumperz 1989, Goodwin & Duranti 1992, Linell 1998). Within the reporting space the participants can mutually construct, organise and maintain an interdependent multimodal reporting activity that participates in the overall stance-taking activity. The surrounding environment, the available artefacts and interacting bodies (including motion, gesture, body orientation, speech and its paralinguistic features) comprise the means that are involved in the holistic interactive and intersubjective stance taking process. The bodies, voices and words of the participants display concurrent emotions and attitudes, facilitate mutual knowledge and understanding and manifest the participants’ level of engagement.

Kendon (2004) and McNeill (2005) argue that gesture and language hold an equal status in communication. McNeill (2005), who investigates the evolutionary development of language, further introduces the concept of *growth point* and postulates a theory that gestures and speech emerge out of the same process and that their origins lie in the same representation, granting them an innately equal status. He derives this idea from the Vygotskian minimal unit of the dialectic, which refers to the smallest unit that can be considered to retain the property of a whole (McNeill 2005: 85). McNeill’s (2005) growth-point theory gives reason to assume that language and embodiment are tightly connected and further lends support to the claim that stance taking is also tightly grounded in its physical and lexical representations. The reporting space is related to Kendon's (1990: 103) notion of F-formation, of setting up the axis of interaction. The participants in the storytelling event orient towards each other, constructing the reporting space
within the ongoing storytelling by orchestrating not only the lexico-syntactic features of their talk but also their bodies to produce multimodal enactments. The reporting speaker engages in role shifting and, in a manner of speaking, ‘inhabits’ another body and space, enabling mimetic visitation into the character’s world.

4.1.2 Voiced and multimodal enactments as displays of stance

The papers (i) and (ii) of the current thesis shed new light on voice and multimodal enactments in conversational storytelling. Before proceeding to the analysis of example (1), it is necessary to note that, as described above, voiced and multimodal direct reportings represent more or less the same phenomenon of interaction. However, voiced direct reportings are analysed in audio data, which puts special emphasis on the prosodic features in the delivery of DRS. The respective approaches of paper (i) and (ii) to direct reportings in stance taking ultimately complement each other in a practical way; the primary detailed analysis of audio data provides a basis for and lends support to the analysis of video data, which in turn allows a more wide-ranging investigation of direct reporting in conversational storytelling. That is, paper (i) depicts voiced DRS utterances displaying a shared stance as an appropriate response to voiced DRS and shows that a sequence of subsequent resonant voiced DRS utterances is an orderly phenomenon in interaction and a sequentially relevant practice of stance taking. In paper (ii), however, the focus is shifted towards investigating the conglomerate of speech, the body and the surrounding environment in accomplishing and making sense of social actions. The paper gives a detailed analysis of the coordination of speech and embodiment (e.g. gestures, gaze and facial expressions) in multimodal enactments, which provide a format for assigning speech, embodiment and a virtual environment to a character in the telling for the purpose of stance taking. All voiced DRS sequences are referred to as multimodal enactments, or simply enactments, in the analysis of example 1.

Example (1) shows Gwyneth, Rebecca and Lynne sitting at a dinner table, discussing the advantages of having access to locally produced foods. Gwyneth tells the other participants about her visit to the local wholesale butcher’s for the purpose of examining the goods exposed for sale and ultimately making a purchase. She gives an account of an inquiry that she made about the origins of the livestock used for meat production.
Example 1) Happy pigs (Australian Data).

| Gwyneth: | (TSK) so I’m chatting to the m- |  |
| Gwyneth: | . . . the main man there, |  |
| Gwyneth: | going. |  |
| Gwyneth: | (taps hand on the table)! |  |
| Rebecca: | hhm <g right, |  |
| Rebecca: | so where do your pigs c(h)ome [2t(h)om] &>. |  |
| Gwyneth: | I’m like, |  |
| Gwyneth: | <& are they happy pigs? |  |
| Gwyneth: | or what &>. |  |
| Gwyneth: | (leans forward, wrinkles eyebrows)) |  |
| Lynne: | [h h] |  |
| Rebecca: | [ha ha ha]a |  |
| Gwyneth: | which “they think is hi[larious]. |  |
| Rebecca: | [ They’re] like, |  |
| Gwyneth: | <& na: h. |  |
| Gwyneth: | they’re really s(h):d &>. |  |
| Gwyneth: | [ha ha ha ha] |  |
| Gwyneth: | [ha ha ha ha] ha hah |  |
| Rebecca: | .hh [they’re all Wilbur]. |  |
| Gwyneth: | (lowers her gaze down) |  |
| Rebecca: | (.) ah hah [hah hah hah] hhh |  |

Gwyneth’ account of her chat with the man in charge of the local wholesale butcher’s starts on line 1–2, so I’m chatting to the main man there. She then introduces a multimodal enactment as the high point of the telling, which, according to Holt and Clift (2007: 2), is a frequent site for reported speech. The reporting clause going on line 3 is followed by a snappy, inquisitive tap on the table described on line 4 (Figure 1a). The tap on the table could be seen to recreate, for instance, an imaginary counter top of the butcher shop at which the inquisitive customer is standing, adding a physical aspect to the reporting environment and thus constructing and developing further the reporting space.
The quotation content is then displayed in the multimodal enactment right, so where do your pigs come from on lines 5–6, in which Gwyneth, the story protagonist, inquires after the origins of the livestock that the wholesale butchers use in their meat production. Rebecca and Lynne respond by smiling as Gwyneth produces another reporting clause I’m like, on line 8, and a further enactment on lines 9–10, are they happy pigs or what, further asking whether the butchers deliver ethically-sustainable food. Upon uttering the report, her voicing slightly changes, becoming more nasal and inquisitive, and she leans forward, wrinkling her eyebrows (Figure 1b). Her embodiment and voicing, coupled with the inquisitive tap on the table, depict an exaggeratedly prying and somewhat confrontational inquiry. She thus takes a stance on what is an acceptable way to do business at a local wholesale butcher’s. The enactment gives an impression, on one hand, of a rather stern and unsympathetic customer, who, on the other hand, rather naively endows pigs that are reared to serve as food with characteristics that are typically associated with domestic pets or humans. The voicing, embodiment and semantic content of the enactment give an impression that Gwyneth’s inquiry is out of place and thus characterized by humour. Also, her inquiring after the happiness of the pigs contradicts the stern impression that the enactment creates, which adds to the comical effect of the enactment.

The recipients display affiliation with Gwyneth by joining in on her self-initiated laughter on lines 12–13 (Jefferson et al. 1987: 160, Glenn 2003: 128), taking a congruent stance on the issue at hand. Gwyneth then gives an assessment of the reaction to her inquiry by the people working at the butcher’s on line 14, which they think is hilarious, which further emphasizes the hilarity and misplacement of her enacted behaviour. Although the multimodal enactment is used to enact and give evidence of a prior event, in the examples presented in the present thesis it primarily serves the purpose of taking a stance in the current telling event and is produced for the benefit of the ongoing interaction (see also Günthner 1997, Couper-Kuhlen 1999: 15). Moreover, enacting her original inquiry and describing the reactions of the participants of the enacted ‘scene’ to her inquiry, Gwyneth takes a stance in the current flow of interaction on the subject matter at hand, namely the appropriate way to inquire about the origins of meat at the butcher’s. At the same time, she presents herself in a good light by positioning herself as someone who prefers locally and ethically produced foods. She also takes a stance on the character to whom she assigns the multimodal enactment, namely herself as a ‘city dweller’, who is perhaps unaware of the practicalities of rearing pigs for meat production and unaccustomed to the matter-
of-fact reality of farm life, and, on other hand, as a demanding customer, who asks direct and potentially rather difficult questions.

Upon producing an enactment, Gwyneth engages in role shifting and sets up a reporting space. In a manner of speaking, she ‘inhabits’ another body, namely her own historical self, and another space, namely the business transaction at the wholesale butcher’s, thus enabling the recipients of the telling event to make further mimetic visitations into that world. These reportings represent quite apparent shifts in footing (Goffman 1981). The speaker aligns herself in a new way in view of the ongoing interaction by ‘becoming’ one of the characters in a story, which is manifested in her lexico-syntactic, prosodic and embodied features. All participants then have a means and an opportunity to take further stances within that reporting space. In the next turn, one of the recipients of Gwyneth’s telling, Rebecca, does just that by producing an aligning response to Gwyneth’s inquiry. She assigns a multimodal enactment to a generic representative of the wholesale butcher’s via a reporting clause They’re like on line 15, followed by the quotation content on lines 16–17, naaah, they’re really sad. Rebecca ties her enactment to prior talk by producing an appropriate response that is in alignment with Gwyneth’s turn. The exaggerated lengthening of na.:h on line 16 and the somewhat bleak and desolate voicing of the utterance they’re really sad on line 17 indicate that Rebecca adapts her voicing to fit the prior turn. In other words, she joins in on the enacting by manipulating her voicing to produce an ‘other voice’ for another character in the telling. Rebecca takes part in the enactment of the ‘scene’ at the butcher’s. Her enactment of another character in the telling is related to the concept of chiming in (Couper-Kuhlen 1999), in which the participants may join in the enactment by making use of the prosodic characteristics of the voice that has been assigned to a particular character in a telling. However, the voicing and embodiment, along with the sequential position and the semantic content, of the reported speech reveal that the current speaker is not chiming in to produce the same voicing introduced by the initial teller, but constructing the dialogue further by enacting another character in response to the character enacted by the initial teller. She also delivers the turn with a suppressed laughing voice, indicating a shared, congruent stance on the fact that Gwyneth’s inquiry is indeed comical and impractical. After all, the people working at the butcher’s shop would be unlikely to declare that their pigs are unhappy, let alone that they have been reared in cramped conditions. Rebecca’s turn displays alignment with and shows an appreciation of the stance taken by Gwyneth.
All participants respond by laughing on lines 18–19, and Rebecca continues her enactment by producing yet another matching turn on line 20, *they’re all Wilbur*, elaborating on the well-being of the pigs.7 At the offset of her turn on line 20, Rebecca lowers her gaze down as if to look at the pigs (Figure 1c), making use of the reported space that is set up by Gwyneth at the onset of the enactment on line 4. This iconic gesture resonates with the gestures and the facial expressions that Gwyneth produces at the high point of her telling: Rebecca assumes the role of the generic person working at the butchers shop (e.g. the man in charge of the place) and adjusts her voicing and embodiment to fit that role. She makes use of and further develops the reporting space that is collaboratively constructed by the participants who engage in enacting the events. The reporting space provides a frame for active involvement from all participants (cf. M. Goodwin 1990). Hypothetically speaking, the third participant in the telling event, Lynne, could also have produced a resonating turn within that reporting space and assumed the role of any known or new character.

The analysis of this example, firstly, supports the finding brought forward in paper (i) that a voiced DRS utterance displaying a shared stance is an appropriate response to a preceding voiced DRS. A sequence of resonant voiced DRS utterances is therefore an orderly phenomenon in interaction and a sequentially relevant practice of stance taking. This phenomenon seems to be particularly extensively used in humorous stories, which merits future study (see also Oropeza-Escobar 2011). Secondly, the analysis lends support to the concept of reported space introduced in paper (ii). Rebecca not only produces a voiced DRS sequence but also employs her embodiment to enact the business transaction at the wholesale butcher’s. Rebecca’s multimodal enactment is completely fictional and made up by her to achieve an interactional goal in the current telling event. She aligns and displays a shared stance with Gwyneth’s prior turn, by participating in the enactment of the reported event. In an analysis of narratives that are designed to do instigating, Goodwin & Goodwin (1992: 179) indeed show that events that are reported in a story are, on one hand, invoked and, on the other hand, shaped by the current, ongoing interaction. This example concurs with those findings, showing that being true to the actual event in producing the multimodal enactment may be of little importance to the current telling event.

---

7What exactly is said on line 20 is unclear, but the turn could possibly refer to the fictional character, Wilbur the Pig, who is indeed in danger of being slaughtered in E.B White’s novel *Charlotte’s Web*. The content of the turn is not relevant in every respect, because the sequential position and the other participants’ reaction to the utterance imply that the recipients treat the turn as appropriate.
unless it becomes the topic of negotiation, e.g. the accuracy of the rendering is challenged or questioned. Hence, multimodal enactments are instances of situated action that serve the purpose of taking a stance in the current telling event. The bodies of the participants render perceptible and observable the narrative as a vocal and embodied performance. Moreover, the enactments are used to explicitly mark speaker stance both on a concrete and a representational level: both the speaker’s physical stance and movement of the body as well as their verbal, interactional and prosodic displays of stance are highly relevant to the interactional stance-taking activity.

Next, I proceed to present findings and some more recent observations on the resonating features of first story–second story pairs. I will explore the role of resonance in stance taking in an example consisting of an initial story and a resonating second story.

4.2 Resonance as a resource for stance taking in second stories (Paper iii)

The vast body of research on conversational stories in interaction conducted within the conversation-analytic tradition calls stories that are told as a response to any initial story second stories. Previous research (see e.g. Ryave 1978, Sacks 1992a, 1992b, Schegloff 1992, Routarinne 1997, 2003, Ochs & Capps 2001, Arminen 2004) shows that people tell second stories, firstly, to show their understanding of the first telling and, secondly, to contribute a further point of view to some aspect of the subject under examination in the first telling. Second stories are related to and arise from some aspect of the prior telling. According to Ryave (1978: 127) the connection between the tellings is established by way of a significance statement that resonates with some central feature of the prior story. Moreover, second tellers model their tellings to fit the previous telling using a wide range of methods (Ochs & Capps 2001). In a study on second stories in a mutual help group, for example, Arminen (2004: 321) states that one of the ways of modelling the second telling to match the first is echoing and amplifying in the second tellings the experiences described in the first tellings. The present section takes a detailed look at the ways in which second stories are structurally affected by initial tellings, i.e. some structural elements are used by the second tellers to tie back to the initial tellings. Thus the section focuses on the symmetry of verbal, prosodic and embodied elements between the stories told by conversation participants. The main findings of paper (iii) are briefly illustrated in subsection
4.2.1, which examines voiced DRS, storytelling prefaces and high points in the first story–second story pairs. Subsection 4.2.2 briefly introduces some more recent observations about the resonant embodied features between the first and second tellings by making use of a new, video-based example.

4.2.1 Resonating structural units in first and second stories

In section 4.1 of this summary, resonating voiced and multimodal direct reportings were discussed as an orderly phenomenon within a single telling. The present section sheds light on the dialogic resonance between the reported speech utterances of the first and second tellings. One of the main findings of paper (iii) of the current thesis is that some features of voiced DRS in the first tellings are recycled in the second tellings. In other words, the instances of voiced DRS in first and second stories match each other on a functional level, i.e. they appear in the story high point, and on a formal level, i.e. they share matching lexico-syntactic and prosodic features. The following example (2) from paper (iii) shows a first story–second story pair with resonating elements in the high points of the tellings. In the extract, Stephen and Carrie are discussing Stephen’s difficulty to sleep on Sunday nights and Stephen gives an account of such an occasion. He explains how he tries to prepare himself for bed but nevertheless has difficulty falling asleep and finds himself time and again still wide awake in the early hours of the morning.

Example 2) I can’t sleep (The Glasgow data 2004).

A) Stephen’s story high point

71 STEPHEN: and so I’m sitting going,  
72 (1.3)  
73 @I can’t believe,  
74 (.) it’s half past four in the morning,  
75 → and I have got to get up,  
76 → to go to work tomorrow/@.  
77 (0.5)  
78 STEPHEN: uhuhh,  
79 (.) uh [huh].

(83 lines omitted)

B) Carrie’s story high point

162 CARRIE: ((SCREAM))  
163 and it was like,
Throughout the telling, Stephen evaluates insomnia as a reoccurring trouble that he faces every Sunday night. Towards the end of his telling, on lines 73–76, Stephen produces a voiced DRS utterance, *I can’t believe it’s half past four in the morning and I have got to get up to go to work tomorrow*. It constitutes the high point of the story and serves as an iconic animated representation of his desolate condition. The animated voicing (Couper-Kuhlen 1999) of his utterance depicts utter irritation and disbelief. The articulation of the DRS utterance separates it from the surrounding turns: it is clearer, more distinct and slower in pace. By telling the first story, Stephen portrays himself as someone who suffers from not being able to fall asleep at night.

It is notable that in her subsequent story Carrie first of all evaluates sleeping trouble from her point of view by describing a similar event of having her sleeping pattern disrupted by a nightmare (not shown in example (2) above but included in paper (iii)). Towards the end of her telling, she also produces a resonant turn to Stephen’s DRS sequence. She recycles some of the features in Stephen’s DRS by producing a similar but shorter and slightly reformulated version *argh I have to get up for work* on lines 164–165. Her voicing is slightly panicky and also depicts frustration and irritation. The DRS utterance is higher in pitch and louder than the surrounding talk. Both tellers thus take a stance on the difficulty with sleep, finding it a frustrating problem. The second teller ties her telling to the previous by establishing the similarity between the tellings with resonating elements. The like-minded second story with a resonating voiced DRS further establishes a shared stance with the initial teller. The present example further shows that the voiced DRS of the first speaker does not only echo in the immediately following turns of the recipient(s), as demonstrated in section 4.1 of this summary, but also in the second story provided by the second speaker. Paper (i) of this study shows that co-conversationalists often respond to voiced DRS by producing a subsequent DRS sequence that applies voicing that is either similar to or somehow congruent with the previous sequence. Whether this is a unique feature of humorous storytelling needs to be studied further.

---

8 Resonating features do not automatically denote a shared stance. As Goodwin and Goodwin (1987a) show, resonating turns (format-tying) are used as a resource also in arguments. A resonating story may thus also be disagreeing.
Example (3) below, which is not included in paper (iii) but a more recent video-based example included in my research, provides two subsequent stories that are part of an extended story round (see Tannen 1987), dealing with the way people on TV or on the radio eventually ‘forget’ about their audience. Here Gwyneth’s initial telling, which in itself is a response to a prior telling by one of the conversation participants, is followed by a resonating second story by Lynne. Both tellings, a first story–second story pair, deal with the teller’s personal experiences of being on air. In the first story, Gwyneth, who has been studying radio work, describes her fellow students and the differences in personalities between the more introverted people, who “did radio”, and the more extroverted people, who “did TV and film”. She suggests that even the radio people, who to her appear more introverted in comparison to the TV and film people, get so fully immersed into the ongoing activity that they soon forget about their own nervousness and the audience that is listening to them. She further describes her own experiences of being ‘on air’.
Example 3) *The radio group* (Australian Data).

A) Gwyneth’s story **preface**

1  GWYNETH: hm
2       anyway,
3   the thing about being on radio was,
4       (.)
5   → you “did `forget,
6  LYNNE: yeah.
7  GWYNETH: Well I think actually,
8       I have a theory that,
9       (.)
10  → cause in my media studies course,
11  → the people who did TV and film,
12  LYNNE: mhm
13  GWYNETH: were quite different to the people who did radio,
14  LYNNE: (.)right.
15  GWYNETH: [and] we actually had a study group one night,
16       when we noted that,
17       (.)
18  → it was virtually all women doing radio,
19  LYNNE: mhm
20  GWYNETH: except for one guy,
21       (TSK)
22   and all of us,
23       (.)
24   → we were quite similar types of people,
25   including physically,
26   lots of us were tall s(h)kinn(h)y g(hhh)irls,

(53 lines omitted)

B) Gwyneth’s story **high point**

89  GWYNETH: it’s just-
90   it was very funny,
91   because (..) we had a study group,
92   (0.9)
93   And we actually got talking about the fact that we were
94       all these-
95   (0.6)
96   similar types of people who were quite happy to hide
97       behind the microphone in the radio studio.
98  LYNNE: mhm.
99   (0.5)
100  GWYNETH: → but you “did actually `forget,
101   (0.6)
102   like you did get used to the idea that you were just
103       standing there talking with your microphone,
104   and,
you know,
not.

you didn’t really think about [the people] that were listening,

REBECCA: [no].
LYNNE: yea:h.

C) Lynne’s story preface

REBECCA: didn’t you do work experience in (       ).
LYNNE: yeah,
well I did a bit of like,

radio (and managing),
REBECCA: [right].
LYNNE: [since] I got back at uni,

GWYNETH: to write your dissertation],
LYNNE: [dissertation],

[yeah],
GWYNETH: [yeah].

and you can’t help but don’t forget,
like you’re in a pretty small room,

REBECCA: mhm
LYNNE: and um,

and (.) even though you’re being like,

broadcast like,
in the-

um,

café and stuff,
lik[e] everyone’s just walking past,

like no [one] was gonna give a crap,

REBECCA: [mhm].
LYNNE: (and so you’re just like),

<@ well I don’t care,
blaaaaa =>.
REBECCA: beh beh bee
GWYNETH: mh hh hh
REBECCA: w[ell you can]-
GWYNETH: [yeah.

The first telling by Gwyneth emphasizes, on one hand, the radio presenters’ tendency to eventually ‘forget’ about the listeners and to get comfortable in speaking on air and, on the other hand, the radio presenters’ position as being less exposed to the audience than a TV presenter. Gwyneth delivers the story preface
(Sacks 1992a: 226) of the first telling on lines 3–5, *the thing about being on radio was, you did forget*. After that Gwyneth gives a lengthy account of her experiences of participating in media studies, comparing the personalities of the more outgoing and ego-driven people specialising in film and TV, to her fellow students of radio broadcasting, who according to her are *happy to hide behind the microphone in the radio studio*. Towards the end of the first story, Gwyneth repeats the gist of the telling *but you did actually forget* on lines 100, evaluating the way in which the radio presenter becomes so deeply involved in the ongoing activity that she forgets about the listeners. On lines 110–111 she further describes the state of immersion into the task at hand, *you didn’t really think about the people who were listening*. Rebecca shows understanding of Gwyneth’s story by uttering an overlapping *no* on line 112, which displays Rebecca’s alignment and affiliation with Gwyneth’s telling. Similarly, Lynne delivers an aligning display of understanding of the story *yeah* on line 113. Rebecca then turns her torso and gaze towards Lynne, directing the question *didn’t you do work experience in* (uncertain hearing) at her on line 114. Her turn functions as an initiation of a second story, or a consociate entry device (Lerner 1992: 250) into prospective second telling from Lynne. Lynne indeed gives an affirmative response, *well I did a bit of like, um, radio (and managing), since I got back at uni*, but does not launch into storytelling straight away. During the following 1.1–second pause on line 121, Gwyneth and Rebecca nevertheless maintain their listening stance with their gaze and torso directed towards Lynne. Gwyneth further produces a preemptive completion (Lerner 2004:242–243), *to write your dissertation* on line 122, which also functions as a request for confirmation. Lynne utters an overlapping completion, *dissertation*, on line 123, confirming that they are talking about her dissertation work. She then launches into storytelling via a resonant story preface, which also functions as a significance statement that describes an aspect of the prior story (Ryave 1978), *and you can’t help but not forget* on line 127. The significance statement initiates a like-minded second story, although its complex syntactic construction, involving a double negation, is slightly misleading.9 The evaluation resonates in terms of its lexico-syntactic, prosodic and embodied features with Gwyneth’s initial story preface on line 5, *you did forget*, and with her resonating evaluation, or the gist of the telling *you did

9The complex negation, ‘can’t help but’ and ‘not forget’, contradict each other, creating a meaning ‘you inevitably don’t forget’, which is not in line with the following story. This appears to be a slip of the tongue on Lynne’s part.
actually forget on line 100.\textsuperscript{10} The resonating lexico-syntactic features are best represented in the form of a diagraph (Du Bois 2007), which efficiently illustrates the syntactic similarities between turns at talk:

**Diagraph 1)**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GWYNETH:</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>^did</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>GWYNETH:</td>
<td>but you</td>
<td>^did</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>LYNNE:</td>
<td>and you can't help but ^not</td>
<td>^forget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preface of the second story *and you can’t help but not forget* on line 127 resonates with the preface of the first telling *you did actually forget* on line 5 and the high point of the first telling *you did actually forget* on line 100, anchoring the second telling to the first and displaying alignment, affiliation and a shared stance. All three utterances have as subject the pronoun *you*. Similarly all turns share the lexical verb *forget*, which also bears a secondary stress. The main stress falls on the auxiliary *did* in Gwyneth’s turns on lines 5, *you did forget*, and on line 100, *but you did actually forget*, and on the negator *not* in Lynne’s turn on line 127, *and you can’t help but not forget*. The stress patterns of both prefaces and the high point are similar in that the main stress is on the item preceding the lexical verb *forget*.

\textsuperscript{10} This telling contains same-speaker resonance, i.e. the resonating turns are produced by one speaker: Gwyneth recycles her own words that she uses in the preface later on in the high point of the telling.
4.2.2 Resonating embodied features in second stories

Paper (iii) of this study does not include video-based visuospatial analysis of second stories but only discusses resonating lexico-syntactic, semantic and prosodic features in first story–second story pairs. The present chapter, however, also analyses the resonating embodied features in first and second tellings. The structural and rhythmic similarities in example (3) between the prefaces and the high point of the tellings of Gwyneth and Lynne were presented in section 4.2.1. It is significant that these utterances also have in common a similar gesticulation, as the rhythmic organisation of the utterances is reflected in the speakers’ embodiment. Gwyneth’s story preface on line 5, you did forget, is accompanied by a hand gesture; the single arrows in figures (2b) and (2c) below represent the overall vertical movement of the gesticulating left hand. The peak of that gesture coincides with the accented syllable of her intonation unit, did (Kendon 1980, Sacks & Schegloff 1984). Her left hand is initially clenched, with the edge of the hand facing down (figure 2a), but at the onset of the intonation unit, she raises and opens her hand, spreading her fingers slightly so that, at the acme of the stroke, the thumb points up and the index finger forward (figure 2b). The hand returns to home position (Sacks and Schegloff 1984) and becomes clenched again by the end of the intonation unit (figure 2c).

Figure 2a  Figure 2b  Figure 2c.

005 GWYNETH: you "did "forget
The embodiment of the subsequent high point of Gwyneth’s story on line 100, *but you did actually forget*, resonates with that of her story preface *you did forget* on line 5. This time, it is her right hand that performs the more extensive gesture. In fact, it is a mirror image of the gesture that coincided with the preface. However, her left hand also rises and falls slightly in unison with the right hand. Her right hand is initially clenched, with the edge of the hand facing down (figure 3a). The gesture starts at the onset of the intonation unit, and she raises and opens her hand, and spreads her fingers only slightly, so that, at the acme of the stroke which coincides again with the accented syllable *did* (figure 3b), the fingers remain slightly bent in a claw-like position, and the palm of the hand faces up. The hand returns to home position and becomes fully clenched again by the end of the intonation unit (figure 3c). The two arrows in figures (3b) and (3c) represent the vertical movement of both gesticulating hands. The larger arrow illustrates the more significant movement of the right hand and the smaller arrow the more subtle movement of the left hand.

The embodiment of Lynne’s resonant story preface *and you can’t help but not forget on line 127* bears an uncanny resemblance to Gwyneth’s preface and high point. However, Lynne’s home position is different in that she is leaning against the dinner table in a rather relaxed pose, with her right elbow on the table and the palm of her right hand supporting her neck (figure 4a), while her left arm is resting on top of the table. It is Lynne’s right shoulder that performs the resonant, accentuating gesture. Two gestures coincide with Lynne’s utterance. First, at the
onset the intonation unit, during the first two words *you can’t*, she shakes her head slightly from side to side. Second, her shoulder starts rising towards her ear at the onset of the next word *help*, and the stroke of that gesture reaches its acme at the accented syllable *not* (figure 4b) The shoulder descends back to home position by the end of the intonation unit (figure 4c). The single arrows in the figures (4b) and (4c) represent the vertical movement of the shoulder.

The resonant turns also share resonating embodiment in that the accentuating hand and shoulder gestures co-occur with the stressed items of the intonation units. The hands and shoulder makes slight rhythmic baton-like movements, or simply ‘batons’ (see Efron 1942 in Streeck & Knapp 1992), which punctuate the speaker’s speech rhythm and emphasize the stressed items within a unit of speech. The main stress of the batons falls on the stressed syllable of the tone group, and the acme of a movement falls on the stressed syllable. In this example, the movements are all vertical, i.e. the hands and shoulder are first raised up and then lowered down as if to ‘raise’ the accented syllable to stand out from the surrounding speech. The resonances between the story preface and high point in Gwyneth’s telling and the story preface in Lynne’s telling, respectively, is manifested in the lexico-syntactic, prosodic (in the speaker’s suprasegmental stress pattern) and embodied features. In sum, the resonating gestures and stress patterns coupled with the resonance in syntax between the tellings illustrate well parallelism in these particular instances of interaction. The parallelism in the actions within a storytelling sequence merit further study, especially the
resonating embodied activities within first story–second story pairs and in interaction in general.

The third paper (iii) of the current dissertation describes the resonating elements between the first and second tellings, displaying how second stories echo the prior telling (Ochs & Capps 2001). In his study on second stories in AA-meetings, Arminen (2004: 320) suggests that, as displays of affiliation, second tellings become a relevant therapeutic tool for the participants. By the time the participants reach the end of the second story, they share a wider understanding of the social phenomenon being assessed. Resonance in second stories manifests the fundamental social cohesion that conversationalists uphold, among other ways, by tying back to each others’ words. Here, in example (3), the second story is also told to display the second teller’s interpretation of and a congruent stance with the first telling. Both accounts offer a congruent view on the phenomenon of conquering stage-fright and forgetting about the audience in the course of some activity performed in public. The accounts reinforce the participants’ understanding of stage-fright and possibly also offer a beneficial point of view that will help them deal with potential future public appearances.

In section 4.3, I will discuss the multiple social actions and stance taking in repeated tellings. I will examine the resonant and non-resonant features of retellings by the same teller to different recipients.

4.3 Multiple social actions and stance taking in repeated tellings
(Paper iv)

Paper (iv) of the current study deals with the way one teller tells the same story about a recent event to three different recipients over the course of three consecutive telephone calls. The paper shows that the teller mobilizes the tellings to accomplish certain actions both across the three calls and within single calls. Furthermore, the (re)tellings form an integral part of each accomplished action; i.e. they provide a basis on which the actions can be constructed. The analysis of the data explores recycled elements between the tellings by the same teller to several recipients. In other words, similar structural units of these tellings are recycled but some lexico-syntactic details vary according to the social actions that are being accomplished via the tellings. These recyclings are subsumed under the concept of same-speaker resonance (as discussed in section 3.2.2). The paper sets out to examine how the teller’s awareness of the recipient manifests in recipient design and how the social action that is accomplished via the telling affects its
structure. The individual features of the tellings make visible their recipient design (e.g. type of relationship, common interests) and the way in which the teller takes into account the telling context (e.g. the timing and order of the tellings). The actions are also important contributions to the overall stance-taking activity of the participants. The tellers take stances by (re)telling a particular story. Stance taking then involves the teller(s), the co-present participants and the individual recipients.

Moreover, the paper examines a feature of retelling that occurs in the data, i.e. reference to prior renderings of the same story, which highlights the importance of a telling and guides recipients towards a relevant response. The paper discloses how the participants, especially the teller, orient to the tellings as retellings by way of making references to the previous and possible subsequent tellings to other recipients about the same events.

Repeated tellings are rarely caught on tape, and previous research on retellings consists of case-studies or incidental observations (e.g. Polanyi 1981, Ferrara 1994, Chafe 1998, Norrick 1998, Fox 2001, Günthner 2005). Paper (iv) presents three examples of rather exceptional data in which the story is (re)told over the phone to different recipients for different reasons. In all three calls, which Vesa, the teller, makes to Jore, Mirkku and Jukka, he gives an account of trouble with a broken computer monitor. He has received his monitor back from the service, but after using it for only a short period of time, it has broken down again. Some parts of the story are (re)told by the teller in more or less the same way in all three tellings; for example, the story plot leading up to the high point contains a reference to the amount of time that the computer monitor was on. However, the degree of detail varies considerably between the tellings depending on the recipient and the reason for the call. In the first call, the telling functions as an instance of troubles telling and a prelude to a request for legal advice from a legal expert concerning the teller’s monitor trouble. Vesa not only asks Jore, the recipient of the call, for legal advice but takes a highly affective stance on his troubles and vents his frustration during the telephone call. In fact, he explicitly states during the call that he needs to give free course to his feelings of frustration. Jore supports Vesa by explicit, affiliative displays of empathy during the telling, which encourage Vesa to elaborate on his trouble. A microanalysis of the recycled structural units of the tellings reveals some small but significant differences between the tellings.
Example 4) Call 1: troubles telling to request advice from a legal expert (HY SKL sg122_a2).

23 VESA: ja nyt se tul-i tänne, and now 3SG arrive-PST:3SG here 'and now it arrived here'
24 .hh paketi-ssa tänän, parcel-INE today 'in a parcel today'
25 .hh mä h- kytk-i-n se-n konee-seen, 1SG hook-PST-1SG 3SG-ACC machine-ILL 'I hooked it up on the computer'
26 se ol-i nyt tunni-n käytö-s, 3SG be-PST:3SG now hour-ACC use-INE 'it was now in use for an hour'
27 nyt se hajos now 3SG break.down:PST:3SG 'now it broke down again'

The first telling, to Jore, is different from the other two in that it claims the monitor was in use rather than simply on, se oli nyt tunnin käytös ‘it was now in use for an hour’ on line 26. As the first telling acts as a prelude to a request for legal advice, the adverbial käytös ‘in use’ (which describes a more active process compared to the adverbial päällä ‘on’) correlates with the social action in question. The use (or indeed non-use) of the monitor is a highly relevant aspect in a potential lawsuit over warranty service.

The second instance of troubles telling is utilised to inform a recipient who as the teller’s flatmate is entitled to know about the trouble.

Example 5) Call 2: troubles telling to inform a flatmate (HY SKL sg122_a3).

16 VESA: se ol-i tunnin tai puoltoist päällä, 3SG be-PST:3SG hour-ACC or one.and.half on 'it was on for an hour or an hour and a half'
17 täs-št on nyt jo vähän aika-a, this-ELA be:3SG now already a.little time-PTV 'it’s been a while now'
18 mut mä just tajus-i-n et but 1SG just realize-PST:1SG that 'but I just realized that
Vesa discloses the troubling events to Mirkku in a more subdued manner. He nevertheless takes an affective stance towards his troubles with the monitor, although the troubles telling and the news delivery serve a more practical purpose in this call (i.e. inform a flatmate of trouble at home), as opposed to the seeking of legal advice in the first call. Mirkku’s responses to Vesa’s telling are quite subdued and not highly affiliative, and, in the end, Vesa’s telling remains rather cropped. The comparison between the recycled structures of the tellings reveals that the telling in the second call contains a less specified and more relaxed time-span that correlates with the non-urgent nature of the call, which is also manifested in Vesa’s subsequent realisation, *mut mä just tajusin, et mä en vielä sulle soittanu*, ‘but I just realised I didn’t call you yet’ on lines 18–19. It appears that these lexico-syntactic differences support the overall design of the tellings with regard to the recipient and the accomplished action.

Finally in the third call, to Jukka, the social action that the telling is used to accomplish is again slightly different than in the first two calls.

**Example 6) Call 3: troubles telling to solicit sympathy from a fellow player (HY SKL sg122_a4).**
The teller provides a detailed technical description of the monitor trouble to a technically-oriented fellow game-player, spicing up the telling with plenty of profanities. By way of troubles telling, the teller solicits sympathy from a friend who understands how frustrating monitor trouble can be. Jukka’s replies embody astonishment and empathy, and they are produced in a similar ‘laddish’ register, upholding the friendly relationship between Vesa and Jukka.

A comparison between the high points of the tellings which describe the breaking down or switching off of the monitor yet again reveals differences in them. In the first call, Vesa provides Jore, the legal expert, with details of the way in which the monitor has broken down, *nyt se hajos ihan samal lailla uuestaan*, ‘now it broke down again in exactly the same way’ (Example 4: Call 1, on line 27). Importantly, the adverbial phrase *ihan samal lailla* ‘in exactly the same way’ is embedded within the same intonation unit. Vesa’s wording indicates that he claims to know that the exact same fault has reappeared. By contrast, in the high point of the third telling to technically-oriented Jukka, Vesa first merely provides him with the description of the monitor trouble, *sit yhtäkkii se vaan sammu*, ‘then suddenly it just died’ on line 35, and then further describes the symptoms with *ihan samalla lailla* ‘in exactly the same way’ on line 36 in a separate intonation unit. It is noteworthy that Vesa does not provide Jukka with a diagnosis of the monitor break-down as he does in the calls to Jore and Mirkku (the monitor ‘broke down again’; Example 4: Call 1, on line 27 and Example 5: Call 2 on line 25). In other words, he provides Jukka with the symptoms and leaves the actual diagnosing to the expert. These examples show that the lexico-syntactic details of specific structural units of the tellings correspond with the social action that is accomplished via the telling. The design of the telling for a particular purpose is manifested even in the smallest details of each unit within the telling.

The actions that are accomplished by these (re)tellings are also seen as important contributions to the overall stance-taking activity of the participants. It has earlier been argued that a teller’s need to present the reported characters and the issue at hand in a certain light is manifested in the use of code-switching, prosody and other modifications, for example. All the calls in paper (iv) contain layered social activity: on the one hand, they involve multiple social actions such as troubles telling, seeking advice and informing; on the other hand, the actions display the teller’s stance and position him even more strongly with regard to the recipient and the reported event. An examination of these layered social activities reveals the complex constellation of relationships, objects and events within
which participants position themselves, which an analysis of individual social actions alone cannot unravel.

The examples in paper (iv) are recorded telephone conversations, whereas example (7) below presents a new video-based, chance case of repeated tellings caught on tape. The example further illustrates the points made in article (iv) of this thesis and shows that a couple (see also Mandelbaum 1987) may also mobilize a repeated co-telling to achieve multiple social actions and take a stance on the reported event. The two co-tellings are told by a couple, Mandy and Steve, of the same event to different recipients for the same reason, namely to provide an excuse for being late and to deliver a disturbing but at the same time dramatic piece of news. Here, the differences in the recipient uptakes and changes in who the primary teller is affect the structure of the tellings. The couple is in a car on their way to pick up another passenger, Tommy. Their daughter Jess is already in the back seat of the car. The man, Steve, is driving and the woman, Mandy, is sitting in the front seat of the car during the first call. During the phone call, they arrive at Tommy’s house and park outside to wait for him. The tellings are collaboratively produced by the couple, although in the first call, Mandy is speaking on the phone with the recipient of the first call, who is inside the house with Tommy. The recipient of the first call is thus able to deliver to him a message from Steve and Mandy that they are now waiting for him in the car outside.

Example 7a) Serious Incident– first telling (Habitable cars).

1 MANDY: (#hi th-) ((talks on phone))
2 no it's me actually,
3 h(h)iya,
4 can you ask -Tommy to come out,
5 if [he's ready.
6 STEVE: [we're running late].
7 MANDY: we're] running late.
8 (1.1)
9 STEVE: [yeah],
10 MANDY: [oh] yeah,
11 sorry about that,
12 w- we'll< we'll explain later,
13 but we've had a serious incident,
14 [near where we (have)],
15 STEVE: [someone's been shot].
16 MANDY: we've had [a sho]oting.
17 STEVE: [
18 MANDY: ye{ah,
19 STEVE: [(--)]
20 MANDY: down] Half Moon Crescent,
and, ~Jess and ~Steve,
.hhh heard the gunshots,
so when we was leaving,
we was just telling the coppers,
.hhh what time we heard a gunshot,
I mean they didn't confirm it,
..hhhh but they did say they was <@ dealing with 
a serious incident @>,
(0.6)
and they were quite interested in what
~Steve and ~Jess had to say,
so they took our details,
.hhhh and I said,
36 STEVE: [we're outside].
37 MANDY: [you know,
look I've gotta] go,
39 (.)
40 STEVE: [(we're outs-)]
41 MANDY: [yeah,
we're out]s(h)ide,
43 ..hhh uhm I said,
44 we've gotta go,
45 I said,
46 but,
47 you know,
48 they said they'll f- contact us later.
(1.9)
50 Half Moon Crescent.
51 (1.0)
52 STEVE: Maygood Street.
53 MANDY: near Maygood Street.
54 (1.0)
55 ..tsk it's all sealed off.
56 (0.8)
57 but,
58 so yeah,
59 if ~Tommy's ready,
60 tell him to pop out and,
61 uhm
62 (0.7)
63 excellent,
64 and we'll see you later.
65 (0.7)
66 alright then,
67 (0.5)
68 bye.
69 (.)
70 bye.

Mandy is using Steve’s cellular phone to make the call, because Steve is occupied with parking the car. Mandy thus identifies herself to the recipient no its me actually on line 2. The call recipient, a person who knows both Mandy and Steve,
is in a position to deliver their message to Tommy, who is the recipient of the second instance of the telling (example 7b below). The first recipient is not identified but may possibly be Tommy’s partner. On lines 4–5 Mandy urges the recipient to tell Tommy to come out if he is ready. Steve offers an assessment \textit{we’re running late} on line 6 and Mandy produces the exact same assessment in overlap on line 7. Mandy further offers an apology on lines 10–11, \textit{oh yeah, sorry about that}, and informs the recipient on line 12 that s/he will be filled in on the events later. The story here functions as an account of why Mandy and Steve are late to pick up Tommy. The story preface is jointly produced by them on lines 13–16. Mandy first proceeds to give a reason for their delay, \textit{but we’ve had a serious incident, near where we (have) on lines 13–14, which gets recycled in the high point of Mandy’s current telling on lines 29–30 and in the high point of her consecutive second telling, or the retelling, (example 7b) on lines 23–24. Her turn takes a stance on their delay, suggesting that they indeed have a legitimate reason to be late. The turn also prefaces a dramatic story, a serious incident. On line 15, Steve offers a consociate story prompt, which explicates the nature of the incident, \textit{someone’s been shot}, employing their shared knowledge of the events and assisting the storytelling (Lerner 1992). He thus takes a congruent stance on the legitimacy of their reason for being late. Steve’s participation in the telling is restricted by the fact that Mandy is the one speaking on the phone. After all he cannot be sure that the recipient of the call will hear his consociate contributions. Mandy however facilitates this by repeating a reformulation of Steve’s turn on line 16, \textit{we’ve had a shooting}. Mandy acts, on one hand, as a go-between in displaying Steve’s, and on the other hand, her own congruent stance and emphasizes further the seriousness of the incident that caused them to be late.

She then responds to what appears to be an inquiry from the recipient by disclosing the location of the shooting, \textit{down Half Moon Crescent} on line 21.\footnote{The speech of the call recipient is not available.} She goes on to give an account of the events that took place before they left to pick up Tommy. She discloses that Jess and Steve had to give a statement to the police on lines 23–27, taking a stance on the significant role that Jess and Steve have as witnesses to the potential shooting. She further clarifies that the police actually did not confirm the assumption that there had been a shooting but that the incident was serious nevertheless, \textit{I mean they didn’t confirm it}, on line 28. The following turn is an instance of voiced \textit{indirect reporting}, which consists of a reporting clause, \textit{but they did say}, and a voiced indirect speech utterance, \textit{they was...}
<@ dealing with a serious incident@>, on lines 29–30. The preface of the telling, but we’ve had a serious incident, on line 13 gets recycled in this high point of the telling. Mandy has delivered the preface in broad dialect, but the latter part of the indirect speech, dealing with a serious incident, is produced with a voicing that depicts a formal register and mimics an official-sounding standard form of British English. Her turn takes a stance on their knowledge, or ‘inside information’, of the seriousness of the incident, implying epistemic certainty that they are in fact dealing with a shooting but that they are also aware of the fact that the police cannot officially disclose that information. Mandy further emphasizes the central role of the family in the serious incident by declaring that the police are keen to interview Jess and Steve as potential witnesses to the shooting: and they were quite interested in what Steve and Jess had to say on lines 32–34. Mandy’s declaration, together with the indirect speech on line 29–30, comprises the high point of the telling, which gets recycled in the retelling a few minutes later.

In the current telling, Mandy further produces a reporting clause, and I said on line 35, but her reporting is interrupted by Steve, who indicates that Mandy should cut the telling short and inform the recipient that they are waiting for Tommy, we’re outside, on line 35. Steve’s turn is produced in overlap with Mandy’s direct speech on lines 37–38, you know, look I’ve gotta go. Steve produces a cut-off repeat of his turn were outs-, on line 40, and Mandy utters in overlap a recycled turn on lines 41–42, yeah, we’re outside, informing the call recipient that she is about to terminate the call soon. She nevertheless resumes her telling on line 43 by recycling the reporting clause, uhm I said, and the call recipient appears attentive, judging by the way in which Mandy and Steve provide further information about the location of the alleged shooting on lines 50–55.

The first telling arises from a practical need to give an explanation for being late to Tommy, and, by proxy, to the recipient of the call. After all, Tommy relies on Steve and Mandy to give him a ride. It can be argued that the story needs to be retold in the car, because Tommy has not yet heard it, or at least he has not been the primary recipient of the telling. Also, intuitively, the couple in the car seem rather keen to deliver the dramatic news and display a stance on their role as significant witnesses of a shooting; the telling is highly tellable (Sacks 1992a) because of its newsworthy content related to the potential shooting and the police investigation. The retelling takes place only minutes after the first telling when Tommy gets in the car. Mandy has moved to the back seat, allowing Tommy to be seated in the front. This time Steve first acts as the primary teller.
Example 7b) Serious Incident – retelling (Habitable cars).

1  STEVE: right.
2  ready?
3  we’re gonna,
4  (let’s get that in gear),
5  no we’re only late cause,
6  I mean,
7  we’ve got so much (heck going at where we are,
8  dole),
9  drug dealings,
10  (this and that),
11  lots going on,
12  but then last night it was a shooting,
13  and we heard it,
14  so we had to just tell the coppers like.
15  (1.0)
16  JESS: we’re witnesses.
17  (1.3)
18  MANDY: w- well,
19  you- you may or may[not],
20  STEVE:                    [yeah].
21  MANDY:    they haven’t confirmed,
22  but they didn’t deny
23  → but basically the: y (0.5) are dealing with <@ a
24  serious incident @>,
25  (0.5)
26  TOMMY: mh
27  MANDY: and they was quite [interest]ed in what these two had
28  to say,
29  STEVE:                     [(well)].
30  (0.7)
31  MANDY: so what does [that t]ell you,
32  STEVE:              [mhm]
33  mhm
34  MANDY: phahhah
35  basically confirming what our suspicions [are],
36  JESS:                     [look],
37  when we went [over t--
38  MANDY:              [that there’s] -
39  a shooting.

Steve initiates the retelling by giving a lengthy preface to the reason for their delay on lines 5–11, and goes on to produce the actual reason in a form of a telling, but then last night it was a shooting, and we heard it, so we had to just tell the coppers like on lines 12–14. Steve’s turn displays a stance on their central role in the incident and the newsworthiness of the telling by portraying Steve and Jess as witnesses in the police investigation. Tommy provides no response, and after a 1.0–second pause, Jess, in the back seat, takes a congruent stance on and explicates the nature of their role in the investigation, we’re witnesses on line 16,
which also upgrades Steve’s prior turn. Tommy still remains unresponsive, disaligning and disaffiliating with the previous turns. For one reason or other, he resists the telling, displaying an incongruent stance on the newsworthiness of the telling. After another 1.3−second pause, Mandy takes over the telling, downgrading the prior turns and readjusting the certainty of the status of Steve and Jess as witnesses, well, you- you may or may not, on lines 18−19. Steve produces an aligning response on line 20, yeah, and Mandy proceeds to give a reason for the uncertainty, they haven’t confirmed, but they didn’t deny on lines 21−22. Her resumptive expression of doubt allows the telling to continue despite the lack of response from the main recipient, Tommy. She further recycles the voiced indirect reporting, the high point of the first telling on line 23, but basically they are dealing with <@ a serious incident @>. The utterance functions as part of the high point also in the retelling, and although it is not delivered in the form of (in)direct speech, the formal, official-sounding voicing gives the utterance an air of quotation quality. Her turn takes a further congruent stance on the significant role of the family in the serious incident. Finally Tommy acknowledges the telling by producing a hardly hearable mh on line 26. Mandy proceeds to extend the high point that highlights the role of Jess and Steve as potential witnesses to the shooting, and they was quite interested in what these two had to say on lines 27−28. The turn is highly resonant with the first instance of the telling, since, in the first telling, she has displayed a similar stance with a similar turn, and they were quite interested in what Steve and Jess had to say on lines 32−33. Tommy offers no recipient uptake on the high point of the telling, and Mandy then proceeds to produce the recipient responses herself by delivering a rhetorical question, so what does that tell you, on line 31 and a response to it, phahhah, basically confirming what our suspicions are, that there’s a shooting, on lines 35−39. Such ‘online’ recipient design enables her to finish the story, disclosing the most central pieces of the telling. With no recipient uptake, the telling quickly draws to an end, and she directs her attention to Jess.

Similarly to the three calls in article (iv) of the current thesis, the tellings here contain layered social activity. On one hand, the tellings involve multiple social actions; that is, the tellers mobilize the tellings to provide an explanation for being late and to deliver a highly tellable, dramatic piece of news. On the other hand, the actions display the tellers’ stances: the tellers position themselves as significant figures in a serious incident and work towards elevating their status as key witnesses in the eyes of the recipient. Both tellings are told for the same reason to different recipients, who are more or less in an equal position in relation
to the relevance of the telling. The tellings contain a great deal of similarities. The teller roles are affected by the fact that in the first telling Mandy is the one talking on the phone, i.e. in direct contact with the recipient of the first telling, whereas in the retelling Steve is sitting closest to Tommy, the recipient. Although Steve is driving and not speaking on the phone, and thus cannot be the primary teller in the first telling, he initiates the ‘remote approach’ (Mandelbaum 1987: 150) by uttering *we’re running late* on line 6 audibly enough to make sure that the recipient of the call hears him. Although we cannot hear the recipient’s talk, it appears that the recipient of the first telling is more active. There are pauses in Mandy’s speech that indicate that the recipient is requesting further information about the alleged shooting. For instance, on line 21 of the transcript of the first telling, Mandy provides a response that seems to follow a request for information about where exactly the potential shooting took place, *down Half Moon Crescent*, and again on line 48, *Half Moon Crescent*, whereas the repeated telling contains empty pauses and only the ‘bare necessities’ of the story structure. The unresponsive recipient of the repeated telling affects not only the structure of the telling (see diagraph 2 below) but also who the primary teller is. Steve first initiates the telling, possibly because of his convenient location right next to the recipient. He introduces the incident and his and Jess’s role in it as a potential witness. Jess then gives a consociate contribution to the telling, and finally Mandy, the primary teller of the first instance of the telling, takes over the telling and makes up for the lack of recipient responses by providing them herself.

Example (4) indeed provides a supplementary view on the differences between the recycled units of the tellings to what was discussed in paper (iv) of this thesis. It shows that differences may also depend on the (un)responsiveness of the recipient and the physical circumstances of the telling in addition to the differences in the social action that is being accomplished. Here too some parts of the story are (re)told by the teller more or less in a fixed form (Polanyi 1981) in both tellings; the tellings contain recycled references to the fact that the police have disclosed that they are dealing with a serious incident. Diagraph (2) portrays the recycled elements in the high points of the first story (line 29) and the retelling (line 23) provided by Mandy.
The formulation ‘a serious incident’ is already introduced at the beginning of the
telling and the official wording is later recycled in the voiced part of this indirect
report on line 29, but they did say they was dealing with a serious incident. The reporting clause and the first two words of the indirect report are
produced with a thick dialect which is also manifested in the non-congruent verb
form was. Coupled with the official-sounding voicing and highly formal
pronunciation, the latter part of the indirect report, dealing with a serious incident,
gives an impression that the teller quotes the exact words of the police. The same
wording, syntax and voicing are recycled in the retelling on line 23, but basically
they are dealing with a serious incident. Although highly resonant, there
are differences between these turns.

The tellers appear quite eager to tell the story about the potential shooting at
any appropriate moment. The piece of news that they disclose appears awful and
dramatic at the same time. After all, Steve and Jess are potential witnesses to
something as severe as a shooting. The first telling appears to elicit inquiries
about where the shooting has taken place, but the retelling to Tommy fails to
solicit almost any reaction at all, let alone an excited one. In the first telling, the
high point leaves more room for interpretation and is less certain, because it is
presented by way of a reporting clause but they did say and an indirect report they
was dealing with a serious incident. The high point of the repeated telling on the
other hand presents the case in a more certain light: the adverbial basically and
the statement form of the utterance they are dealing with a serious incident give it
an air of certainty. It may be argued that the unresponsive recipient must be made
convinced of the seriousness of the incident by providing a more firm take on the
issue at hand, and thus the (un)responsiveness of the recipient affects even the
finer details of the design of the telling.

Diagraph (3) illustrates the second part of the resonating high points in the
tellings delivered by Mandy.
The first story high point contains the grammatically correct form ‘were’, which may not be significant. However, the prior turn contains an official-sounding voicing and formal register, which may leak over to the current turn. The teller may also make an effort to deliver the telling in more formal terms to appear more credible, because the recipient is attentive. Also the names of Steve and Jess are mentioned, likely because the recipient of the telling is not present, whereas in the retelling Mandy refers to as Steve and Jess as these two, identifying the driver sitting in front of her and the other passenger in the back seat sitting next to her.

There are more modalities available for interaction in the second than in the first instance of the telling because the first telling is done over the phone. During the repeated telling, the recipient additionally has access to the tellers’ embodied actions and physical location, which is manifested in the lexical choices that the teller makes. Contrary to the examples in article (iv) of this thesis, the differences in the recycled units of the (re)tellings here arise from the constellation of the participation framework (M. Goodwin 1990), i.e. the seating arrangements and the recipient’s access to the tellers’ embodied actions and physical location, and from the (un)responsiveness of the recipient, i.e. the recipient-design of the telling, in addition to the differences in the social actions that are accomplished via the tellings.

The examples in paper (iv) of this thesis contain several references by the teller to the previous and possible subsequent calls to other recipients about his current troubles. Such metacommentary aid the recipients in interpreting the story as troubles telling and, furthermore, in putting the trouble into proper perspective: it is serious and urgent enough to require the attention of the teller’s friends and to elicit displays of sympathy and consolation. However, the current telling does not solicit empathy from the recipients, cutting it short, nor do the tellers make any references to the previous and possible subsequent tellings of the story to other recipients.

The analyses of the three chance telling, which were caught on tape, do not disclose a ‘core’ story but nevertheless highlight some similarities between the tellings. A more detailed look at the similarities has revealed subtle differences
within them that are part of the overall design of the telling. In comparing the structural units of the tellings, it has been shown that some units (e.g. the high points of the stories) resonate in form but that some lexico-syntactic details of these units vary according to the social actions that are being accomplished via the tellings. They may also vary depending on the constellation of the participation framework and the channels of interaction that are available. In other words, the lexico-syntactic details of specific structural units of the tellings correspond with the social action that is accomplished via the telling and are shaped by the physical circumstances of the telling and the (un)responsiveness of the recipient. The design of the telling for a particular purpose in a particular place and time is manifested even in the smallest details of each unit within the telling.

The analysis of data shows that the instances of (re)tellings caught on tape or on video and presented in the current thesis contain layered social activity: on the one hand, they involve multiple social actions such as troubles telling, delivering news, giving an explanation, seeking advice and informing; on the other hand, the actions display the teller’s stance towards the recipient and the reported event. An examination of these layered social activities reveals the complex constellation of relationships, objects and events within which participants position themselves that an analysis of individual social actions alone cannot unravel.

I proceed to give a brief summary of the analysis presented in sections 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 on the resonant voiced and multimodal direct reportings and second and repeated tellings.

### 4.4 Summary

Chapter 4 provided a summary of the central themes of the articles in this dissertation. Articles (i) and (ii) were discussed in connection with an example that introduced a collaboratively constructed reporting space for stance taking. The participants use resonant words, structures, voicing and embodiment, and implicate the surrounding environment in constructing the reporting space, which enables and invites active participation from all the participants of the telling event to the overall stance-taking activity within the storytelling sequence. Article (iii) was introduced by presenting an example of resonating voiced DRS utterances in a first story–second story pair and by analysing a resonating second story, which comprises elements that resonate within and across tellings. The data showed that the use of resonating formal storytelling elements, e.g. the preface of
the second telling, by second tellers to tie back to formal storytelling elements, e.g. the preface and the high point of a prior telling, may function as a resource for stance taking. The points made in paper (iv) were illustrated by presenting a new example in which a couple tells a story about the same event to two different recipients. The data provided a new perspective on accomplishing multiple actions, such as troubles telling, delivering news, giving an explanation and requesting advice, via repeated tellings of a story in different interactional contexts. Similar structural units of such tellings resonate in form but some lexico-syntactic details of these units vary according to the social actions that are being accomplished via the tellings and the engagement of the recipient in the telling and the physical circumstances of the telling. These tellings also contain layered social activity: on the one hand, they involve multiple social actions such as troubles telling, seeking advice and informing; on the other hand, the actions display the teller’s stance towards the recipient and the reported event.

Next, I proceed to present the concluding remarks of this thesis in chapter 5.
5 Conclusion

In general terms, stories accomplish manifold tasks and social actions in human interaction. People share and deal with experiences and knowledge of the world by telling stories. In Sacks’ (1992: 260) apt words, “[t]he way you find out you’re not crazy is that people who you figure aren’t crazy tell you that they’ve had exactly the same experience you had”. People indeed have a means to evaluate and reflect their personal viewpoint with other people’s experiences and knowledge. In other words, conversational storytelling is communicative not only of personal experience but also of the participants’ positioning in view of that experience and the displays of stance of others.

This study shows that the concepts of stance taking and resonance enable the explorations of the complex nature of conversational storytelling. Stance taking is a highly intersubjective and interactive, public, multi-layered activity, which involves words, linguistic structures, voices, the body and the surrounding environment, and is embedded in the sequential organisation of social interaction. At the early stages of my dissertation project, not in line with the methodology of CA, I treated alignment, affiliation and stance taking as comparable activities, proceeding from the intentions of the conversation participants. I set out to examine the role of sequential, interactive storytelling in conversational stance taking with the preconception that conversation participants negotiate a certain stance and that a certain stance at a given moment of interaction affects the trajectory of that interaction. Combining this line of thought with the conversation-analytic method proved problematic, and, for a moment, I abandoned the concept of stance taking altogether, concentrating on the affective and evaluative qualities of speech on a more general level. However, redefining stance taking as activity that does not shape interaction but is an emergent product of interaction that is embedded in the social actions and shaped by the given sequential position, enabled me to apply the theory of stance taking in my study. In other words, stance taking is seen as situated activity, socially-relevant positioning of oneself in view of the object of contemplation and in view of potential prior interactional turns and events. This study has thus assumed that as interlocutors produce social actions, they are simultaneously taking stances. The stance-taking activity is organised by the concurrent social actions and the sequential organisation of the ongoing interaction. Alignment and affiliation are processes that manage the interlocutors’ interactive and intersubjective stance taking activity. It is therefore possible to discuss and analyse the stance taking
process concurrently with the CA-oriented analysis of social actions and activities. The conversation-analytic method can be used to discern the resources and practices of stance taking that are displayed in interaction. Further, it is possible to focus on those resources and practices and discuss them as a parallel interactional process, bearing in mind that the stance-taking activity is grounded in social interaction.

On a more personal note, I cannot help but wonder if I had been able to carry out the present research without the concept of stance taking in analysing the affective and evaluative aspects of human interaction in storytelling. Nevertheless, the theory of stance taking has guided me, personally, into exploring and analysing the complex, multi-layered constellation of human interaction in an attempt to go beyond simply studying a series of verbal, prosodic and embodied actions in a sequence of interaction. This surely could be and is done without involving stance taking in the analysis, but for me it has been a valuable yet challenging and somewhat problematic implement.

The parallelism of interaction, which is manifested in the features that resonate within and between conversational stories and turns by the tellers, has clearly been shown here to be relevant for stance taking. In taking stances, interlocutors position themselves in view of the stance object and the stance taking of others, which is manifested, among other things, in the parallelism between the actions of the storytelling participants. Conversational storytelling is a particularly rich activity for studying the orchestration of the resonating verbal elements, the voice and the body and the way they are implemented in the current telling environment to take stances. The high points of tellings have been shown to be hotspots of direct reportings, which comprise a wide range of activities that are displayed via various modalities. The use of words, linguistic structures, voicing and embodiment by second tellers to tie back to the high points, and other structurally significant points of the telling (e.g. the preface) is an emergent online activity that is discussed in this thesis under the concept of resonance. Despite the parallelism in the telling, they contain small but significant differences depending on the social actions that are being accomplished, the participants and the physical circumstances of the telling event. The recipients not only tie back to prior turns, delivering resonating turns, but their turns also differ from the turns in prior telling and influence the trajectory of the telling as well as the ongoing stance-taking activity. The lack of recipient responses may influence the teller’s commitment to the telling and bring a telling to an end, for example.
The use of lexico-syntactic, prosodic and embodied elements to tie back between the story preface and high points of story rounds, and small differences between these resonating units would provide an interesting avenue for future research. After all, these resonating turns seem to be especially significant in that they often carry the gist of the tellings. Also, (re)tellings offer another fascinating line of investigation in that they provide a unique window into examining the parallelism in language use and help the researcher to get to the core of how conversational stories are shaped by the interactional task at hand. Additionally, the intricacies of humorous interaction provide one possible complex yet tremendously intriguing course for further research. Especially the use of the teller’s reporting space for the production of further enactments merits further study. In addition, more specifically, examining resonating work-related narratives in problem-solving, task-management and decision-making, for instance, would shed new light on the significance of conversational narratives at the workplace.

The current study draws from and contributes to the field of CA, CA-informed linguistics and to the study of multimodal interaction. The thesis sheds new light on the role of resonance and stance taking in conversational storytelling. The resonating embodied features of conversational storytelling offer a little-explored, exciting area for further study, potentially providing insights for the 3D computer modelling of naturalistic human embodiment, for example. Studying the parallelism in conversational stories may be of use to various fields of research from the study of grammar of interaction to the neurolinguistic studies on the mirroring mechanisms of the human brain.
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Appendix I: Transcription Key

Based on Tainio (1997) and Gardner (2001).

.  terminal contour: falling
?  terminal contour: strongly rising
?  terminal contour: slightly rising
;  continuative contour: slight fall
yes_  continuative contour: level pitch
,  continuative contour: slight rise
!  strongly animated tone, pitch movement in any direction

[ ]  overlapping
=  latching
( . )  micropause (less than 0.2 sec)
(2.0)  length of pause in approximate seconds
(3.0)  length of pause in approximate seconds
ye:s  stretching of sound
ye-  truncated word
yes  contrastive stress or emphasis
YES  increased volume
°yes/°  decreased volume
hhh  audible breath
.hhh  audible in-breath
↑  A marked upward shift in pitch, high pitch has sudden onset but gradually wanders down
↓  A marked downward shift in pitch, low pitch has sudden onset but gradually wanders up
ye(hh)s  within-speech aspiration, laughter
((cough))  untranscribable sounds, transcriber’s comments or description of voice
anneloughy e.g. ((angry))
(yes)  uncertain hearing, transcriber’s best guess
( )  uncertain hearing
-.yes  yes - higher, lower than surrounding speech
£yes/£  smiley voice
#yes/#  creaky voice
>yes< faster than surrounding speech
<y> slower than surrounding speech
@yes/@ change in voice quality, usually reported speech
Appendix II: Gloss Abbreviations

Compiled by Mirka Rauniomaa based on Bickel et al. (2008)

- morpheme boundary in the original and the gloss when morphemes are segmented in both

: morpheme boundary in the gloss when morphemes are not segmented in the original

. morpheme boundary in the gloss when one morpheme in the original corresponds with several in the gloss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG, 2SG, 3SG</td>
<td>first person singular (ending or personal pronoun), etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL, 2PL, 3PL</td>
<td>first person plural (ending or personal pronoun), etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>passive person ending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablative (‘from’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADE</td>
<td>adessive (‘at, on’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>allative (‘to’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLI</td>
<td>clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>elative (‘out of, from’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL</td>
<td>illative (‘into, to’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INE</td>
<td>inessive (‘in’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTR</td>
<td>instructive (‘with’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


PST  past tense
PTV  partitive ("part of")
Q    question clitic
TRANS translative ("into, for")
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