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Abstract

This dissertation studies emotional displays in talk-in-interaction, especially focusing on conversational argument, storytelling and teasing. The aim is to understand how verbal expressions, prosodic cues, and embodied actions interact with each other in emotional expression. The main analytic approach and methodology is conversation analysis and multimodal interaction analysis, applied to interactional sequences from everyday conversations. The research data comes from three different video recordings and their transcripts.

First, the dissertation reveals two broad types of frustration in conversational argument. The findings suggest that combined verbal and nonverbal expression of frustration involves a complex interplay of prosodic cues and embodied actions. Nonverbal expression of frustration is displayed by embodied actions alone.

Second, the dissertation shows how shared joy is conveyed between storytellers and recipients in storytelling. They can achieve shared joy because the recipients express willing participation and active recipiency in two main ways: they display verbal appreciation of the story, or they join in the storytelling through laughter, smiles, head nods, and gaze exchanges. The recipients may also offer summaries or interpretations of events in the story by comparing their own experiences to events in the story.

Third, the dissertation analyzes playful teasing activity, showing how teasing activity can bring about a shared experience of amusement for both teasers and their “targets.” The study argues that recipients of teasing are active contributors in the social interaction. The transient embarrassment felt by the teased participants does not prevent the exchange from reaching a shared experience of amusement.

Keywords: amusement, argument, conversation analysis, embarrassment, embodied actions, frustration, joy, prosodic cues, storytelling, teasing, verbal expressions
Yu, Changrong, Tunteiden osoittaminen väittelyssä, tarinankerronnassa ja kiusoittelussa: multimodaalinen analyysi.
Oulun yliopiston tutkijakoulu; Oulun yliopisto, Humanistinen tiedekunta, Englantilainen filologia, PL 1000, 90014 Oulun yliopisto
Oulu

Tiivistelmä
Väitöskirja tutkii tunteiden osoittamista arkisissa keskustelutilanteissa ja erityisesti väittelyn, tarinankerronnan ja kiusoittelun kulueissa. Tutkimusmetodi on pääasiassa keskustelunanalyysi, jonka avulla tutkitaan, miten kielelliset ilmaukset, prosodiset vihjeet sekä keholliset toiminnot yhdessä tuottavat tunnelmakkia. Tutkimusaineiston muodostaa kolme videoitua keskustelua ja niiden litteraatiot.


Toiseksi väitöskirja osoittaa, miten jaettu ilon tunne syntyy puhujien ja vastaanottajien välisenä toimintana. Tarinankerronnassa saavutetaan ilon hetkiä, koska vastaanottajat ovat halukkaasti mukana kerronnan saavuttamisessa ja osoittavat aktiivita vastaanottotoiminnassa kahdella tavalla: he osoittavat arvostusta kertomusta kohtaan verbaalisin keinoin, tai he liittyvät kerrontaan mukaan nauramalla, hymyilemällä, nyökkälemällä, vaihtamalla katseita keskenään, referoimalla tai tulkitsemalla kertojan aiempaa puhetta formulaatioillaan ja vertailemalla omia kokemuksiaan tarinan tilanteeseen.
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1 Introduction

Emotion is everywhere in our daily interactions and has been a hot topic in many fields of psychology and related disciplines. Over the past 30 years there have been growing numbers of empirically based studies on emotions from the perspective of social interaction. Yet there is still no consensus on a definition of “emotion” (Izard 2010).

This dissertation looks at emotion as an intersubjective and interpersonal phenomenon in conversation. Emotional interchanges among speakers involve coordinated verbal (linguistic) features, nonverbal cues (e.g. laughter), and embodied actions (e.g. gaze, nods, and gestures). When people talk in daily life, their conversation can express emotion through a complex combination of these features, as described in the Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English (Biber et al. 1999). However, we usually give little thought to how we express and display our emotions, or to how we understand the emotion displays of others in the conversations of our lives. This study seeks to bridge this gap.

This dissertation investigates how we express and display our emotions through verbal and nonverbal cues. It explains how our verbal and nonverbal cues (i.e. facial expressions and hand gestures) can signal our emotional states and attitudes. It shows how we use these cues to communicate interpersonal relations, and to influence the perceptions and behaviours of others. The dissertation does not explore the definition of emotion as a concept. Instead, it focuses on the study of everyday conversation, especially emotional display in conversation.

To address this question of emotion display, this study starts with a brief recorded example, to illustrate the importance of both verbal and nonverbal cues in the sequential organization of a conversation. The example will also introduce the analytical tools and the conversation analytical framework used in this study.

In Example 1, Viola finds that Jenny has taken a candy offered by Cassandra (who is seen standing on the left camera), and has hidden it under her hand. Viola responds by teasing Jenny as a “cheater.” This recorded interaction shows how gesture and laughter synchronize with verbal expression to generate shared amusement in teasing activities. Teasing activities and their responses are shown in italics, and the transcribing conventions are given in Appendix 1.

Example 1. Cheater (From “Always in Oulu”)

```
1 JENNY: [2(H) Not2] @sure @.
2 @C- (H) @language @barrier @can @be @@used (H).
3 X: (H) (H)
```
4 VIOLA: (2.1) @@ What are you @doing. 

[(((POINTS AT JENNY’S HAND ON THE TABLE)))]

5 JENNY: [@@]

6 JENNY: [2000000002]

Fig. 1. Frame in lines 4, 5, and 6.

7 VIOLA: [200000002]

8 JENNY: (H) [3003]

9 VIOLA: [3@Cheater3]

[3((POINTS AT JENNY WITH THE INDEX FINGER IN THE AIR))3]

Fig. 2. Frame in line 9.

10 JENNY: (H) <HI> I’m @sorry @it’s @so [@gross]</HI>. 

[(((TAKES HAND OFF FROM COVERING THE SWEET SHE WAS TRYING TO HIDE WITH HER HAND, MOVES IT TO COVER HER FACE)))]
In line 4, Viola looks down and finds that Jenny is covering the candy under her hand. She teases Jenny by asking what she is doing. Viola does this with a laughing voice while closely pointing at Jenny’s hand (Fig. 1). Jenny and Viola both burst into laughter, but Jenny still covers the candy tightly, while under the gaze of the other participants (Fig. 1 and Fig. 2). After their shared laughter, Viola teases Jenny again by calling her a cheater. While saying cheater with a laughing voice, Viola points a condemning finger at Jenny (Fig. 2). However, Jenny takes the accusation as a playful remark, because it occurs following the joyful laughter they had just exchanged.

Jenny goes along with this teasing through her own laughter and humorous verbal explanations. The other two speakers look in Jenny’s direction while laughing. The conversation’s third party, Edith, is very amused, judging from her laughter (Fig. 3).

In this kind of teasing activity, the collective laughter from both the teaser and tease recipient occurs before the actual teasing begins, and this shared laughter provides a relaxed environment for the teasing activity. The pointing
finger accompanied by a laughing voice (line 9) communicates amusement rather than disapproval (Fig. 2). This example illustrates how talk-in-interaction uses coordinated displays of verbal and nonverbal cues to convey amusement. In reviewing the conversation transcripts and its video recording, it appears that the word “cheater” and the pointing finger are displays of criticism. However, upon a close examination of the sequential placement of these actions, it turns out that they convey amusement rather than condemnation. As a result, the actions can be interpreted only when they are analyzed within their interactive contexts. I offer this instance as an introductory example. A further detailed analysis on this same recording will be given in later sections of the paper.

This dissertation examines the expression and display of emotions in three social settings: argument, storytelling, and teasing. The study analyzes these social settings in terms of interactional organization, verbal expressions, prosodic cues, and embodied actions. The first chapter introduces the research objectives, presents the data and methodology used, summarizes the main contributions, and presents the structure of the dissertation.

1.1 Research objectives

Little is known about the relationship between verbal expressions, prosodic cues, and embodied actions in the display of emotion during everyday conversation. Furthermore, there are very few studies on how verbal and nonverbal channels interact in expressing emotions, or how they arise and are organized in actual conversations. Therefore this dissertation intends to document the ways emotion is displayed in interpersonal relationships and conversations. In particular, it focuses on the multimodality of social interaction. This research investigates the emotional interchanges between speakers through observing their coordinated verbal expressions, prosodic cues, and embodied actions in the rather long conversational sequences chosen for security.

More specifically, the research will explore how frustration is displayed in argument, with special emphasis on how verbal expressions for emotion are intensified by prosodic cues and co-occurring embodied actions, and on how embodied action alone can display strong frustration. The study also shows how storytellers and story recipients collaborate through emotion-laden cues to achieve a shared experience of joy, and how teasers and tease recipients interact through verbal and nonverbal messages of amusement, which transfer the meaning behind their words.
In short, this study will contribute to our understanding of verbal expressions, prosodic cues, and embodied actions for expressing emotions in English conversation. I will be exploring whether there are any general patterns or general practices which are related to the display of frustration, joy, or amusement, respectively. My focus is to investigate how the display of frustration in arguments, of joy in storytelling, and of amusement in teasing activity are all interactional, multimodal accomplishments. Section 1.4 will provide a detailed discussion of how this study will accomplish the research objectives from a multimodal point of view.

1.2 The data

The conversations analyzed in this dissertation are collected from three video-recordings of face-to-face everyday conversations in multi-party interaction. Each of these recordings is around 60 minutes long. These conversations occur among both same-gender and mixed-gender groups. The speakers are university students who are chatting, getting to know each other, and having tea together in the kitchen of the students’ dormitory. The recordings are made by the participants themselves, and the researchers are not present in the room. The researchers have merely invited the participants to make these recordings. All names of the participants are changed to render them anonymous.

The first recording, called “Never in Canada,” (Haddington & Kärkkäinen 2003) shows a conversation held in 2003, in Oulu, Finland. The three speakers are around 23 years old at the time of recording, and are all exchange students at the University of Oulu in Finland. Jason is on the right, sitting opposite to Sophie, while Mary sits between them. Jason and Mary are from the United States, and Sophie is from Canada. These three exchange students are native speakers of English.

The second recording, called “Always in Oulu,” was recorded in 2008, in Oulu, Finland. Here, the four speakers are all women: Jenny (from the United States), Edith (from Australia), Viola (from Hungary), and Cassandra (from Spain). Edith is on the left, sitting opposite to Viola, while Jenny sits between them. Cassandra stands by the table, and joins the conversation late in the recording. It is worth mentioning that this study does not explore whether the practices of emotion display by non-native English speakers could be different from that of native speakers.
The third video recording, “Oh my God,” was recorded in 2010, also in Oulu, Finland. The three speakers (Guy, Rukmini, and Robert) are exchange students at the University of Oulu. Guy and Robert share the student apartment in which the recording takes place, while Guy and Rukmini have not met before this recording. Rukmini is from South Africa, sitting on the right. Robert is from the United States, sitting in the middle, and Guy is from Australia, sitting on the left.

This corpus of recorded data is transcribed using transcription conventions proposed in Du Bois et al. (1993, see Appendix 1). The data is transcribed into intonation units, or stretches of speech uttered under a single intonation contour, such that each line represents one intonation unit (Chafe 1994). Embodied actions are mainly shown through screen shots and marked by arrows, but some key embodied actions are also included in the transcripts in small caps. The next section will describe the methodology.

1.3 Methodology and process

The dissertation investigates how we express our emotions in spontaneous English conversation through two kinds of cues: verbal and nonverbal. For instance, we use facial expressions and an array of other nonverbal signals to communicate emotions. Specifically, this research aims to explore how frustration, joy, and amusement are displayed and exchanged in social interaction. This is done through careful analysis of video-recorded everyday conversations and by employing conversation analytical methodology. Here I introduce the key points in this methodology.

Conversation analysis originated with Sacks (1974, 1992), who began studying recorded telephone calls to a suicide research centre where he was employed in 1963. Sacks’s insights provided a good starting point for incorporating grammar into a theory of social action, and also for an analysis of social interaction (e.g. Sacks et al. 1974, Goodwin 1981, 1986, Heritage 1984a, 1984b, Jefferson 1984, Sacks 1992). The basic contributions of conversation analysis include the concepts of sequence organization, turn-taking, recipient design, adjacency pairs, and repair.

Concerning “sequence organization,” Schegloff & Sacks (1973) indicated that utterances sequentially implicate a range of possible next actions. Each utterance sets certain conditions on the utterances to follow, so the sequential turns of exchange carry implications for the range and direction of the ongoing conversation. The participants negotiate or renegotiate the terms of their exchange
on an ongoing, turn-by-turn basis. This “sequential implicativeness” takes its strongest form in what Sacks terms “adjacency pair organization” (Sacks 1972).

“Adjacency pairs” refer to paired social actions such as greeting-greeting, question-answer, invitation-acceptance, or blame-denial. An adjacency pair can lead to another such pair of exchanges, as when an apology exchange can suggest which sort of mutual exchange is preferred next.

“Repair” refers to communication concerned with correcting or revising previous interactions. The terminology of repair involves a very wide set of interactional practices, which can be studied in terms of sequences of actions (Schegloff 1997: 504). These actions of repair are organized sets of practices through which participants in conversation are able to address and potentially resolve problems of speaking, hearing, or understanding (Sidnell 2010: 110). The sequence of repair activity is composed of three main parts. First is the repairable, or the trouble source (that is, the exchange that causes a difficulty or misunderstanding). Second comes the initiation, or an indication of recognition that the previous exchange has caused a problem. Third comes the repair itself, in which the participants deal with the problem in some way (Schegloff 1997: 503). A repair might be initiated by the speaker of the repairable, or by any participant. Self-initiated repair refers to repairs initiated by the speaker of the problematic phrase. Other-initiated repair refers to repairs initiated by anyone else in the conversation. Considering the sequential positioning of a repair, self-initiated repair may happen in the same turn as the trouble-source, or in a different turn. Other-initiated repair must sequentially follow the repairable speaker’s turn (Schegloff 1997).

In the sequence organization of conversations, any actions taken in the first exchange project a possible range of response actions from the participants. As Sacks and colleagues explained, “[g]enerally, a turn’s talk will be heard as directed to a prior turn’s talk, unless special techniques are used to locate some other talk to which it is directed” (Sacks et al. 1974: 728). Sequence organization includes both the selection of each response action, and a choice of how the words and actions of a response are ordered (Drew & Heritage 1992: 36).

Conversation analysts also distinguish two main elements in the patterns of turn-taking between speakers. First, a turn consists of one or more “turn constructional units” (TCUs). These turn constructional units can be words, phrases, clauses, sentences, etc., which form units of meaning and expression. Second, each turn contains a “transition relevance place” (TRP). The end of a turn constructional unit is potentially the transition relevance place, where a new
speaker may initiate a new turn. Speakers indicate the ends of their TCUs using a combination of cues involving content, grammar, intonation contour, and nonverbal cues such as gaze. These clues indicate that the turn is ending, or that a certain recipient should speak next. The recipients use such cues to judge the turn transition relevance place, where a response can begin. In general, a clear falling intonation signals the end of the turn constructional unit, while a slight rise or fall of intonation signals a continuation of the turn and of holding the floor. However, the recipients may find it complex to judge where a turn constructional unit ends, and when they should step in to take the floor. They have to judge where one turn ends and another begins according to the context. If the speaker makes eye contact with one recipient, it might indicate an exchange of opinion rather than selection of the next speaker. As used in this dissertation in the field of conversation analysis, the terms “speaker” and “recipient” suggest sequential roles, locally negotiated through turn-taking rules (Glenn 1991/1992). The following example gives an illustration of the turn-taking system in conversation.

Example 2. *It’s not competitive at all? (From “Never in Canada”)*

80 JAS: [S]o I walk
81 MAR: So it's not competitive?
82     [at all]?*Fig. 4. Frame in line 82.*

83 JAS: [N]o.
84   So I walk up,
85   and I turn around,
86   and I look at it,
87   cause I'm really drunk,
88     .. cause,
89   I'm in [Finland again],
90 SOP:     [(h)@]
91   {O.B}
This excerpt is from a conversation transcript given more fully as Example 10 in Chapter 5. As Jason is telling his story, Mary cuts in and asks him a question in lines 81 and 82. Jason then stops talking and listens to Mary. Here, Mary takes the floor without waiting for the completion of Jason’s turn constructional unit. Jason immediately answers Mary’s first question with No (in line 83). This happens because Mary’s utterance in line 81 is a grammatically complete question, whose prosodic cues of rising intonation requests confirmation from Jason. As a result, Jason takes this question to be the completion of the turn. However, Mary’s increment (line 82), at all? is the real transition relevance place. She projects the end of her turn by turning her head to Sophie and exchanging a gaze with her (Kendon 1967). This exchange of gaze indicates the end of her turn (Sacks et al. 1974). After giving an answer to Mary’s first question, Jason reinitiates his story. The above example nicely illustrates how the turn-taking system allows for speakers to interact systematically with each other, rather than “simply acting individually in an uncoordinated manner” (Cameron 2001: 94). Prosody, gesture, grammar, semantics, and sequential ordering work together to communicate possible turn completions (Fox 1999: 57).

The other important principle pointed out by conversation analysts (Sacks et al. 1974: 727) is “recipient design.” This involves “the 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.” Sidnell (2010: 5) also stated that “[t]his is an obvious yet absolutely crucial point, that speakers design their talk in such a way as to make it appropriate and relevant for the persons they are addressing.”

The turn-taking system and the feature of recipient design in conversation demonstrate that conversation is an interactive activity. As Heritage and Atkinson pointed out, “[c]onversation analysts have tended to present their findings by showing regular forms of organization in a large variety of materials produced by a range of speakers. For conversation analysts, therefore, it is sequences and turns within sequences, rather than isolated sentences or utterances, that have become the primary units of analysis” (1984: 5). Utterances, therefore, need to be analyzed within conversational sequences.

In conversation analytical methodology (Heritage 1984a, Pomerantz & Fehr 1997), the flow of communication involves a series of discrete “actions,” and the “action” is a basic analytic concept. Actions are central to the way conversation participants express themselves, and how others interpret their conduct. The actions themselves are fundamental to the meaning of any spoken words.
Schegloff (2006: 2) pointed out that the organization of actions enacted through turns at-talk is coherent and orderly, and consists of meaningful successions or “sequences” of actions, or “moves.”

The present dissertation mainly investigates the sequential positioning of displays of frustration, joy, and amusement. This study starts by studying five interactional features of conversation, including lexical choice, syntactic form, prosody, embodied actions, and sequential analysis. This analysis involves verbal and nonverbal activities used in expressing emotions, and builds on previous studies. Some previous conversation analysts have examined these four facets of emotion interchange (of turn-taking, sequential positioning, linguistic features, and verbal/nonverbal actions), such as the studies by Besnier (1990), Gardner (2001), or Wu (2004). The findings on emotion expression in English by these and other researchers are summarized in the following table.

### Table 1. Study of Emotion in English Conversation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactional Features</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Emotion Cues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexical choice</td>
<td>The use of emotion lexical terms can be associated with emotion types in conversation.</td>
<td>e.g. dislike, like, pleasure, displeasure, joy, distress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic form</td>
<td>Word order variation can be associated with the display of a speaker’s emotions.</td>
<td>e.g. word order, question design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosody</td>
<td>Prosody interacts with the verbal components with respect to a speaker’s emotions.</td>
<td>e.g. pitch, intonation, duration, and intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential analysis</td>
<td>The expression of an emotion is an interactional phenomenon that is associated with the organization of turns and sequences.</td>
<td>e.g. sequence organization (sequences of actions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embodied actions</td>
<td>Emotions and attitudes can be conveyed through a number of nonverbal means.</td>
<td>e.g. facial expressions, gaze, smile, hand movements, and body posture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One possible reason why conversation analysts make such little use of grammatical rules is due to “indexicality.” These analysts argue that any given utterance acquires its meaning in the context of use, and so they have been reluctant to make any systematic connections between grammatical rules and meaning. For example, the utterance *why were you late* appears in interrogative form, but does not necessarily have the force of a question. It may instead, or additionally, convey blame or concern. This study seeks to incorporate grammar,
function, and meaning together in an analysis of social interaction, by regarding expressions of emotion as a series of actions which are subject to sequential analysis. I believe that through turn-by-turn analysis of conversation, we can uncover how participants display emotion to accomplish interactional tasks. Below are the four steps I apply in analyzing conversation data.

1. **Selecting a sequence**: Choosing a sequence of conversation which starts when one participant initiates a topic that is taken up and responded to by co-participants. The sequence ends when the participants are no longer specifically responding to the prior action/topic (Pomerantz & Fehr 1997).

2. **Analyzing the action in the sequence**: Considering the relationship between the actions performed by speakers and recipients in each current turn, compared with the actions taken in the prior and subsequent turns.

3. **Studying emotional display through the actions**: Noting how speakers display their emotions through sequence organization, verbal features, prosody (pitch, intensity, duration), and embodied actions.

4. **Exploring concurrent verbal expressions, prosodic cues, and embodied actions**: Observing how verbal expressions for emotion are accompanied by embodied actions.

To summarize, emotional interchanges among speakers involve coordinated verbal features (e.g. linguistic expressions and prosodic cues), nonverbal cues (e.g. laughter), and embodied actions (e.g. gaze, nods, and gestures). This study regards all these expressions of emotion as a series of actions, subject to sequential analysis. This study involves simultaneous analysis of sequences of actions, context management, and intersubjectivity between speakers and recipients in the course of casual social interaction (Drew & Heritage 2006).

The present thesis explores how verbal expressions of emotion are unavoidably accompanied by embodied actions, and how both verbal expressions and embodied actions work together as causes and effects in intersubjective emotional display. The dissertation uses the video and audio annotation software Elan (Borovanský et al. 1998), and the special video annotation software Anvil (Kipp 2003, 2004) to enable this data analysis. Video-recordings are particularly important, because they capture the non-vocal actions that characterize most interaction (Heath & Hindmarsh 2002). The vocal and nonvocal activities in conversation are interconnected (Kendon 2004, McNeill 2005), and the Anvil annotation software is especially helpful for finding relationships between verbal expressions, prosodic cues, and embodied actions. Also, the Praat program
(Boersma & Weenink 2001) is used for pitch and intensity analysis. By use of these three tools, I track the display of emotion based on several cues, such as lexical items, syntax, prosodic features, laughter, facial expressions, gestures, and sequential positioning. Fig. 5 shows part of the interface for emotion analysis and annotation as seen in Anvil.

Fig. 5. User interface for emotion analysis and annotation in Anvil.

All these modes of analysis are embedded in a close examination of how emotions are interactionally generated, turn by turn, within specific sequential contexts. Thus, the dissertation analyzes the sequential organization involved in conversational displays of frustration, joy, or amusement. The dissertation’s main analytical chapters represent the application of conversation analytical methodology in a somewhat different way. As the process of writing of this dissertation was a long one, the earliest chapter, (Chapter 4), though it makes use of conversation analytical concepts, does not yet apply the CA method rigorously, but represents a more general discourse-analytical approach. A case study approach is applied in this chapter, because the early recording used provided wonderful examples of emotional displays in an
argument, which are clearer than those captured in any other recordings from my data. The discourse-analytical approach used for the analyses will be further specified in Chapter 4. Chapter 4 is based on an already published article of mine, but since the publication I have become much more familiar with the CA methodology. The later chapters (5 and 6) thus apply this methodology more meticulously.

1.4 Contributions of the dissertation

Although emotions are widely studied in several disciplines, the interplay of different multimodal cues with linguistic cues is still poorly understood in actual conversation, especially concerning how different kinds of cues coordinate to convey emotions. A more holistic examination of communication requires the analysis of sequences of actions. Therefore this empirical analysis sheds light on the coordinated use of verbal expressions, prosodic cues, and embodied actions in everyday interactions.

So far, most researchers on emotion in discourse have focused their studies on well-organized social settings and workplaces, especially in the service fields (Hochschild 1983, Toerien & Kitzinger 2007). In the past, such research has focused on situations of counselling (Edwards 1999), medical consultation (Heath 1989, Li & Arber 2006), emergency 911 call centres (Whalen & Zimmerman 1998), situated activities (Goodwin & Goodwin 2000), or institutional meetings (Sandlund 2004). This dissertation, however, takes a more extended approach, by studying emotional display in everyday conversation, and by involving multimodal cues. In the empirical analyses, I go through sequences of recorded conversation to understand and analyze how emotion displays are occasioned and interactively organized in three different social settings (of argument, storytelling, and teasing).

Naturally occurring conversation is a special setting for understanding how the processes of embodied cues and verbal cues interact. This dissertation aims to articulate the ways people convey emotion in interpersonal relationships, and thus contribute to our understanding of how verbal and nonverbal cues combine to express emotion in English conversation. Chapters 4, 5, and 6, as summarized below, will present the detailed findings of this research.

Chapter 4 explores how participants display their frustration in conversational argument. The findings show that both verbal and nonverbal expressions of frustration can be strong forms of emotional display. The nonverbal expression of
frustration is a strong response to the oppositional party’s assertive verbal arguments.

Chapter 5 studies the joint accomplishment of joy through storytelling. It explores how storytellers and recipients interact to create shared meaning and enjoyment. This study indicates that emotional cues displayed by the recipients’ embodied actions have a major influence on the process of storytelling. Also, the exchange of such cues between the storyteller and recipients stimulates a reciprocal relationship of joy.

Chapter 6 deals with teasing activity, and explores how amusement arises as an interactive achievement in teasing activities. The chapter examines actions involved in teasing activity by both teasers and teased participants, and shows the special meanings these actions convey. This study proposes that the different degrees and types of involvement by the teased parties decide whether the teasing will become an amusing activity. This portion of the dissertation contributes to the understanding of the role of embodied actions in connection with the verbal expressions of teasing.

The empirical analyses of these three different social settings also yield another distinct finding, concerning self-initiated recycling. The study as a whole demonstrates that speakers not only recycle their verbal expressions, but also tend to reinforce verbal expressions by recycling the gestures used in the first expression. The recycled comments may diverge from the original ones in various respects, e.g. by heightened stress, or markedly raised pitch accompanied by more dramatic gestures. In general, the speakers recycle their lines to put more emphasis on them and the recycled messages can be more persuasive and compelling.

### 1.5 Structure of the dissertation

The first chapter of this dissertation has briefly discussed the research objectives, the data, and the methodology, as well as offered a brief overview of the contributions made by the findings.

Chapter 2 reviews the theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of emotions, with an emphasis on the study of emotions in linguistics and social interaction.

Chapter 3 reviews previous research on prosodic cues, laughter, and gestures, with a special focus on the interactive operation of prosodic cues, paralinguistic features, verbal cues, and embodied actions for the expression of emotions.
Chapter 4 examines the causes of frustration, and how speakers display their frustration in conversational arguments through interactional organization, verbal expressions, prosodic cues, and embodied actions. This chapter shows how groups of people co-construct expressions of emotion by using verbal cues, nonverbal vocal cues, and bodily behaviour. The data presented here reveals two broad types of frustration. In the first type, verbal and nonverbal expressions of frustration are combined. In the second, frustration is displayed through nonverbal expression alone. The findings show how the combined uses of verbal and nonverbal expressions of frustration take place, with certain characteristic verbal cues being used in conjunction with specific prosodic features and embodied actions.

Chapter 5 consists of two parts. The first part analyses how storytellers and recipients accomplish mutual joy in the course of personal storytelling. The second part compares a different example, of a story which starts with a similar level of joy, but then fails to fully engage the recipients. This failure to connect emotionally is also revealing of how emotional cues work in storytelling.

Chapter 6 examines how teasing activities are conducted via verbal and nonverbal activities, which involve both the teasers and the tease recipients. The study focuses on analyzing the playful exchanges between teasers and tease recipients. The teasing activity may lead to a display of embarrassment, but also to mutual amusement.

Chapter 7 discusses all the findings and their implications for future work, and concludes the dissertation.
2  Approaches to the Study of Emotions

This chapter reviews the relevant emotion theories and the empirical studies on emotion developed to date. Over the course of human history, people have commonly lived rich emotional lives, but have seldom stopped to ask core questions such as “Are emotions special mental states that can be acted upon by other processes? Are emotions themselves caused by distinct and specific processes?” (Gross & Barrett 2011: 9). Only recently has social science considered such questions. In this review of recent research on emotional expression, I bring no preconceived notions concerning the sources or processes of emotion. Instead, the study begins with a comparison of different perspectives or theories on emotion, the different approaches to studying emotions, and their rich, fascinating results to date. Section 2.1 gives an overview of previous study on emotions. Section 2.2 presents approaches to this study from the perspectives of philosophy and psychology. Following this, Sections 2.3 to 2.7 present perspectives, approaches, and insights from the study of emotion in several other fields: from the cognitive approach and discursive psychology (Section 2.3), from social psychology (Section 2.4), from social constructionism (Section 2.5), from the study of emotion in linguistics, sociolinguistics, and anthropology (Section 2.6), and finally from the study of emotion in social interaction (Section 2.7).

2.1  An overview

Emotion is a subject of interest to scientists in a wide variety of disciplines, e.g. biology, philosophy, psychology, cognitive science, anthropology, sociology, social psychology, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, and conversation analysis. Yet the study of how emotion is expressed in social settings and through talk-in-interaction is still a new and challenging field.

James (1884) treated emotions as bodily changes, proposing that we perceive and interpret specific physical changes as certain emotions. Darwin (1872) studied emotion from an evolutionary view, asking why specific emotions should take characteristic forms of expressive behaviour, such as facial expression, posture, and gesture. He believed that emotional expressions have an evolutionary history. He also emphasized the nonverbal rather than the verbal aspects of emotional expression, particularly in research that emphasized the biological and evolutionary aspects of human emotion.
Freud, as the founder of modern psychoanalysis, has naturally had a great influence on the study of emotions in psychology. In his view, emotions involve underlying forces and drives which directly influence outward behaviour (Freud 1975).

Anthropologists have, quite naturally, given precedence to cultural aspects of emotions. Anthropological work has challenged the Darwinian view of emotions as “natural” in humans, by indicating that emotions are dependent on socio-cultural conditioning (Lutz 1988, White 1993).

Izard (1993) provided evidence that using cognitive processes alone to explain emotion activity is an incomplete approach. A discursive psychologist, Edwards (1999), then emphasized that we need to approach discourse and emotions as social practice, rather than as personal expressions of an individual’s mental state. Researchers who studied emotions in social interactions proposed that emotional display is interactively achieved through “talk-in-interaction.” Whalen & Zimmerman (1998) studied the emotional display of “hysteria” in emergency 911 calls, while Wilkison & Kitzinger (2006) studied “surprise tokens” in naturally occurring conversation, by using conversation analytical methodology. All these findings indicated that emotional display is achieved in an interactional context.

This literature review focuses mainly on research concerning emotion in social communication, since that is the field most relevant for my study. I will mainly review the study of emotion examined through discourse, and the empirical evidence of how emotions are actually expressed in social interaction.

2.2 Approaches to emotion in philosophy and psychology

Researchers from the fields of philosophy and psychology have commonly focused on the question of whether our emotion displays come before bodily change, or if bodily changes lead to emotional displays. Philosophers have considered whether emotions are causes or effects, often observing that emotions are responses to certain sorts of events, which seem to trigger bodily changes and motivate characteristic behaviours.

Dating back to 500 BC, philosophers started to connect emotion with physiological changes. Various great classical philosophers such as Plato, Aristotle, Spinoza, Descartes, Hobbes, and Hume have discussed the basic passions in human life. In his treatise On the Passions of the Soul, the French philosopher Descartes (1989), proposed that six “primitive” passions—wonder,
love, hatred, desire, joy, and sadness—are the basic emotional ingredients in a
good life. Later, other thinkers developed this notion of basic emotional
ingredients, till people commonly spoke of the five universal emotions (happiness,
anger, disgust, sadness, and fear) which are now commonly used for emotion
labelling in social science. Studies of emotion in speech frequently use these five
categories of emotion (e.g. Fairbanks & Provonost 1939, Fairbanks 1940,
Fairbanks & Hoaglin 1941, Davitz & Davitz 1959, Lieberman & Michaels 1962,
Kramer 1964). However, some researchers outside the profession of psychology
have questioned the usefulness of these labels, especially those who studied
emotion in language, or in naturalistic speech taken from television and radio
programs. Greasley *et al.* (2000) argued that using free-choice in labelling
emotion allows for understanding a greater range of emotional intensity and
contextual relevance. These researchers recommended that future studies in
language and speech should include wider options for coding of emotions.

The work of classical philosopher David Hume (1711–1776) also had a major
influence on studies of emotion, since he was an inspiration for Darwin’s
evolutionary psychology, and for the development of cognitive science during the
Hume proposed to distinguish the physiological (“animal spirit”), from the merely
sensational (“impression”) aspects of emotion. He especially emphasized the
essential place of “ideas” in emotion, claiming that “ideas” cause our emotional
impressions, and that ideas in turn are caused by impressions. Hume’s explanation
of “ideas” in emotion was the origin of an emphasis on the cognitive dimension of
emotion in much of current psychology.

Over a century after Hume, in 1884, William James combined the disciplines
of physiology, psychology, and philosophy in his study of emotion. James
proposed that emotions are a class of feelings specifically caused by physiological
conditions in relation to autonomic and motor functions. He thus maintained that
“[w]e feel sorry because we cry, angry because we strike, afraid because we
tremble, and [it is] not that we cry, strike, or tremble because we are sorry, angry,
or fearful, as the case may be” (James 1884: 190). In contrast with the views of
classical philosophy, James emphasized that emotions are simply effects of
physical changes in the body. However, his student, Cannon (1929), criticized this
by saying that the visceral reactions characteristic of distinct emotions such as
fear and anger are identical, and so these outward reactions cannot be what allow
us to tell emotions apart. Ronald de Sousa (2003) pointed out another problem
with James’s theory, showing that physical causation alone is inadequate to
account for the differences between emotions. These various theorists have disagreed on how to link physiological changes and emotions, or to judge which comes first. Researchers from the fields of philosophy and psychology are still seeking to answer the question of whether our emotional displays come before our bodily changes, or if bodily changes lead to the emotional displays.

Magda Arnold (1960) was one of the first psychologists to devote herself to the study of emotion, and her work also raised the problem of defining emotion. Partly in response to Arnold’s work, a range of different views on the nature of emotion arose within psychology. Levenson (1999: 481) gave an overall definition of emotion, explaining that emotions are short-lived psychological or physiological phenomena that represent efficient modes of adaption to changing environmental demands. Psychologically, emotions alter attention, shift certain behaviours upwards or downwards in response hierarchies, or activate relevant associative networks in memory. Physiologically, emotions rapidly organize the response of disparate biological systems, including facial expression, somatic muscular tonus, voice tone, autonomic nervous system activity, and endocrine activity. All this tends to produce a bodily milieu that is optimal for effective response to particular situations. Gross and Barrett (2011: 9) recently pointed out that researchers studying emotion have reached agreement on these points.

In the field of modern psychology, Ekman & Oster (1979) proposed that the most common means of expressing emotions is through facial expressions. Thus they developed the facial measurement system, or Facial Action Coding System (FACS) (Ekman 1994, Ekman & Friesen 1982). FACS provides a comprehensive scheme for distinguishing visual facial movements. It is based on visible muscle actions on the face, omitting those that are too subtle for reliable distinction by humans. Ekman’s facial measurements are called Action Units (AUs) and there are 46 altogether, each of which can involve more than one muscle change. This code system is too complex to apply in the facial analyses given in this dissertation, due to two factors. First, FACS allows the measuring of facial asymmetries usually observed during deliberate rather than spontaneous expression (Hager & Ekman 1983). Second, the resolution in the video camera used in this study is not high enough for the required micro-analysis of facial muscles.

To conclude, researchers in many disciplines have explored the connection between emotions and physiological changes, and still the question of what emotion is remains unsettled. Still, there is broad agreement that emotions are both a psychological and physiological phenomenon, and the study of how these
factors relate can proceed. The following section will discuss the study of emotion through cognitive approaches and discursive psychology.

2.3 Orientation towards emotion in cognitive approaches and discursive psychology

This section briefly introduces the cognitive approach to emotion, whose appraisal theory plays an important role in affective science. It then gives an overview of the research contributions from discursive psychology, which is derived from cognitive approaches, but takes a different orientation towards emotion.

2.3.1 Cognitive approach to emotion

The concept of “appraisal” in emotion research was first introduced by Arnold (1960), and later developed by Frijda (1986, 2004), Lazarus (1991, 2001), and also Roseman and Smith (2001). All these researchers proposed that emotions are mental states which are unique in form, and are caused by “appraisals,” or specific cognitive antecedents of emotion by which we make meaning from our encounters with the world. In this understanding, the specific nature of each individual’s emotions is a function of their appraisal of a situation and its significance for themselves.

This cognitive perspective, unlike a psychoanalytic approach, proposes that emotion is not “there” in any meaningful psychological sense until we appraise, or try and make sense of, what we see or hear. Feeling and emotion follows the appraisal process. Thus, emotions are the result of how we perceive and appraise a situation, and the meaning we ascribe to events. In this view, emotions require thought, and each individual’s perception of an event leads to an appraisal, which in turn leads to an emotion (Cornelius 1996). Emotions are not formed until there is an appraisal of objects and events, and the relevant emotions are activated only after the appraisal has occurred.

An important feature of the cognitive approach is that emotions are classified by the kinds of appraisal and stimulus involved. Thus emotions are classified into event-based, agent-based, object-based, or compound categories (Ortony 1988, Clore & Ortony 2008). In an example of a compound-type appraisal, the interpretation may be as follows: “I am really angry because my friend is half an hour late for our date, without even giving me a call in advance.” In this case,
anger is the result of two elicitations: reproach and distress. Due to interpretations
drawn from past experience, I experience a combination of disapproval for my
friend’s blameworthy action, and displeasure with the undesirable result. The
physical and verbal expressions of such emotion will offer clues to the appraisal
involved.

2.3.2 Discursive psychology

Kitzinger (2006) regarded discursive psychology as a post-cognitive paradigm. This approach goes beyond exploring the function of emotion signs, to study
interactional data. Discursive psychology was developed in the 1990s, largely
through the work of Potter and Edwards at Loughborough University. Their
approach was profoundly influenced by conversation analysis (CA), which
explores interactional data in all forms of discourse (Edwards 2004). By applying
CA to empirical materials, discursive psychology explores the situated,
occasioned, and rhetorical uses of common-sense psychological lexicon terms,
such as “angry,” “jealous,” “know,” “believe,” “feel,” “want,” or “soon” (Edwards 1995, Potter 1998). Rather than starting with the assumption that what
people say is an outward expression of what they internally know, intend, or think,
discursive psychology examines the ways in which intentionality, states of mind,
motives, thoughts, and emotions are matters under negotiation through discourse

The discursive approach involves studying evaluative expressions in naturally
occurring interaction, as part of varied social practices. The question here is what
these expressions are doing in the present interaction, and how evaluation is
situated sequentially and rhetorically (Wiggins & Potter 2003). As Hepburn and
Wiggins explained this discursive approach to studying social interactional data,
“discursive psychology is the broad title for a range of research done in different
disciplinary contexts—communication, language, sociology and psychology. It
moves the theoretical and analytic focus from individual cognitive events and
processes to situated interaction” (2005: 595).

Edwards built on the discursive approach in his article “Culture &
Psychology” (1999) by examining the rhetorical contrasts in emotion talk. He
proposed that emotional metaphors, for instance, “biting one’s head off,” are
considered more action-oriented than “boiling with anger” (1999: 280).
Furthermore, Edwards emphasized that we need to approachdiscourses and
emotions as social practices rather than mental expressions (1999: 288). He
defined discursive psychology as the study of how people describe and invoke emotions in everyday speech or text (1999: 271).

In conclusion, practitioners of discursive psychology define and illustrate their approach in terms of how people convey and invoke emotions in everyday social intercourse. This discourse-centred approach to psychology involves interpreting the words and emotions of human interaction as a vocabulary of social practices.

2.4 Approaches to emotion in social psychology

The social psychology approach originates from the cognitive approach, but involves an extended understanding of emotion. In social psychology, emotion is an interpersonal reality, influenced by social, moral, cultural, and psychological factors. Practitioners of social psychology challenge the validity of experiments done in a laboratory. As Whalen & Zimmerman explained, “[i]t is difficult in laboratory environments to induce arousal and emotional expression that closely resemble the intensity of expression and the constraints of the activity systems routinely found in sites of naturally occurring activities” (1998: 142).

Social psychologists also view psychology itself as part of the discourse to be examined. These psychologists propose that emotions are constructed in discourse, partly as a means to communicate perceptions and intentions to others. Through such discourse, emotions can be contagious, spreading from one person to another (Gottman & Levenson 1992, Hatfield et al. 1992, Fridlund 1994). Gottman et al. (1995) proposed to demonstrate affective reciprocity in emotional interaction by studying audio-recorded data from marital conflicts of dissatisfied couples. These recordings illustrated how emotion can be transmitted directly from one person to another.

Other social psychologists (Fehr & Russell 1984, Scherer & Wallbott 1994) studied emotion in discourse and social life through eliciting the prototypes of emotions from written reports. Subjects filled out questionnaires concerning emotional episodes in their lives, giving detailed descriptions of the causes of their emotions—how they felt, what they thought, what words they used, or what physical actions they took.

From such descriptions of emotional interaction, social psychologists have specified prototypes for six basic emotions—love, joy, surprise, anger, sadness, and fear (Fehr & Russell 1982, 1984, Shaver et al. 2000). In a more detailed analysis, Gottman et al. (1995) proposed the specific affect coding system
(SPAFF) for observing emotional communication in marital and family interaction. This system defines ten emotion prototypes.

In sum, social psychologists propose that emotions are reciprocated in conversation, and are contagious. In conversation, people automatically and continuously mimic and synchronize their movements to accord with the facial expressions, voices, postures, movements, and instrumental behaviours of others.

2.5 Social constructionist approach to emotion


Many social constructionists have proposed that emotions arise out of the normative context of each culture, and some also emphasized that emotional norms are reflected in our speech patterns, through a linguistic denomination of emotions (e.g. Averill 1980, Coupland et al. 2008). Harré (1986) argued that two social factors impinge on the personal experience or expression of emotion: local language, and the local moral order. This suggests that emotions cannot be studied without attention to the local moral order. The moral order and the measures used in judgment become visible through an examination of people’s emotional vocabulary.

In recent years, social constructionist researchers have applied their perspective to the study of emotional experience in the workplace (e.g. Coupland et al. 2008). They analyzed the speech of teachers, managers, and administrative employees. These researchers sought to remedy the weaknesses of laboratory studies by merging the analysis of emotion language with close observation of the social and organizational context. Their studies assumed that discourse—language used in speech and writing—is a form of social practice that both shapes, and is shaped by, social structures (Coupland et al. 2008: 333).

In sum, the social constructionist approach views emotions as social actions. This approach shares some basic ideas with discursive psychology and conversation analysis, and argues that emotions cannot be reduced to purely physiological or even psychological states. The key point of constructivism, however, is that emotions arise out of the normative context of each culture, which is reflected in our manner of speech and our linguistic denomination of
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emotions (Averill 1980). Constructivists have tended to interpret all emotions as emerging from a specific culture and time, or as the products of culture rather than of individual psychology (Cornelius 1996). However, constructivists have also generally focused on spoken or written language, while usually ignoring embodied actions or other nonverbal forms of emotional display.

2.6 Approaches to the study of emotion in linguistics and sociolinguistics

The connection between emotion and language has also been addressed by many different schools and scholars of linguistics (e.g. Niemeier & Dirven 1998, Wierzbicka 1999a, 1999b, 2009, Fussell 2002, Weigand 2004, Junker & Blacksmith 2006, Potts 2007). For example, Wierzbicka (2009) argued that language is a key issue in understanding human emotions, while Junker and Blacksmith (2006) emphasized that emotions cannot be defined purely in terms of eliciting conditions and physiological responses. Ultimately, these scholars argued that it is only through language that we can know what is experienced. Disparate emotion experiences can only be linked conceptually when they are given the same label by language (Junker & Blacksmith 2006: 277).

From her cross-cultural and cross-linguistic research on emotions, Wierzbicka (1999b: 275–276) proposed eleven working hypotheses as the universals for language in linguistics. For example, all languages have a word for “feel,” and all languages describe some feelings as “good,” others as “bad.” Junker & Blacksmith (2006) tested these hypotheses on emotion universals by examining the East Cree language, a Native American language from the Algonquian family, spoken in the Eastern James Bay region of Canada by about 13,000 people living in nine different communities. According to Junker and Blacksmith’s findings, some of Wierzbicka’s hypotheses were not strongly supported by the East Cree data. At least for East Cree, it was not the case that “[c]ognitively-based feelings can be described with reference to bodily sensations” or that “[c]ognitively-based feelings can be described via figurative bodily images” (Junker & Blacksmith 2006: 297).

Other linguistic researchers have explored phenomena such as the links between figurative language and emotion. The findings of Gibbs (1996) and Kövecses (2000) suggested that figurative language (e.g. irony, metaphor, overstatement, understatement) can be used strategically to express subtle nuances of emotional states. In a study of the connection between metaphor and
emotion, Kövecses (2000) proposed that concepts concerning emotion generally evoke content relating to all aspects of experience, including its social, cognitive, and linguistic content. He explored the importance of metaphor and its contributions to the conceptualization of emotion. Gibbs (1996) has also suggested that speakers may use metaphor to convey a variety of subtle meanings, and these meanings allow speakers to describe their emotional experiences in more detail that would be possible using terms in the direct emotional lexicon.

Another alternative approach in linguistics is the framework for appraisal in discourse. This functional view of language was first proposed by Halliday (1972). Later, his student Martin (2000) proposed the appraisal framework, which is an approach to exploring, describing, and explaining the ways that language is used to evaluate, to adopt stances, to construct textual personas, and to manage interpersonal positioning or relationships. More specifically, appraisal is organized by the interpersonal metafunction, and involves three sub-systems: affect, judgement, and appreciation (Martin 2000). The subcategory of affect was understood as relating to the speaker's emotional response (Martin 2000, Martin & Rose 2003). Martin (2000) summarized that his term “appraisal” referred to the semantic resources used to negotiate emotions, judgments, and valuations, alongside the resources for amplifying and engaging with these evaluations. Martin argued that use of evaluation language by writers or speakers indicates either a positive or negative assessment of people, places, things, happenings, or states of affairs. Martin & Rose (2003) studied how feelings and attitudes are negotiated, by using the appraisal framework.

In general, linguists consider the interrelations between emotions and language, and also how emotions influence lexicon and grammar in conversational behaviour. Their work has contributed greatly to our understanding of how emotions are communicated.

According to studies from sociolinguists, Ochs & Schieffelin (1989), emotions are an interactional achievement in conversation, which can be expressed by “affect keys.” These authors argued that linguists have underestimated the extent to which grammatical and discourse structure serves affective ends. Ochs and Schieffelin proposed that there are features in languages which speakers use to affect others. They also took “affect” as a broader term than emotion, explaining that affects include feelings, moods, dispositions, and attitudes associated with persons and/or situations.

In addition, these authors explored the links between affects and speech in many different languages. They investigated whether verbal expressions of
similar meanings are associated with the same nonverbal cues (like facial expressions, gestures, postures, etc.) in each language. They also asked which parts of our linguistic systems can serve affective functions. The authors’ particular concern was with the conventional display of affect through linguistic means. Thus they illustrated some linguistic resources used to express affects across languages, and coined the term “affect keys” to describe linguistic features that intensify or specify affect functions. As Ochs & Schieffelin explained it, “[a]ffect keys may index anger, sarcasm, disappointment, sadness, pleasure, humour, or surprise, coarseness, and gentleness, among many other affective meanings” (1989: 15).

In conclusion, both linguists and sociolinguists have proposed that linguistic forms can express emotions, and the patterns of emotional display can be understood through the study of lexicon, grammar, and nonverbal cues such as intonation.

2.7 Approaches to the study of emotions in social interaction

Scholars from a range of other disciples have engaged in the study of emotions in social interaction, using many different methodologies. This section reviews those approaches in the fields of sociology, interactional linguistics, discourse analysis, and conversation analysis. In these studies, emotion displays are regarded as primarily communicative.

2.7.1 Approaches to emotion in sociology and conversation analysis

The study of emotions in sociology started in the 1970s (e.g. Collins 1975, Hochschild 1975, 1979, Kemper 1978a, 1978b, Heise 1979, Scheff 1979, Shott 1979). Like other researchers, these sociologists did not really define what emotions are. However, Thoits (1990) offered a list of elements incorporated in emotion, and regarded emotion as a complex mixture of causal effects such as situational cues, physiological changes, emotion labels, or expressive gestures. Kemper (1993: 42) affirmed this understanding, adding that emotions arise in response to real, anticipated, imagined, or recollected outcomes of social relations. Collins (1990) developed social emotion models which emphasized how social relationships or interactions are “antecedents of emotion.” Still, in recent years some sociologists such as Turner argued that major problems remain in defining emotion, since “[e]motions operate at many different levels of reality—biological
and neurological, behavioural, cultural, structural, and situational; and depending upon which aspects of emotions are relevant to a researcher, a somewhat different definition will emerge” (2009: 341).

Goffman (1967) was a pioneer in claiming that talk and interaction both play an important role in understanding social institutions, social behaviour, and action. He argued that “[t]he proper study of interaction is not the individual and his psychology, but rather the syntactical relations among the acts of different persons mutually present to one another” (1967: 2). Goffman’s most influential study on emotion focused on embarrassment. He proposed that embarrassment does not occur at random, or for psychological reasons, but that it occurs at certain places in a social establishment where incompatible principles of social organization prevail. He (1967: 97) also clearly pointed out that embarrassment is reflected by verbal and nonverbal cues: an individual may recognize extreme embarrassment in others and even in himself by the objective signs of emotional disturbance: blushing, fumbling, stuttering, an unusually low- or high-pitched voice, quavering speech or breaking of the voice, sweating, blanching, blinking, tremors of the hand, hesitating or vacillating movement, mindedness, or malapropism. However, Goffman’s claims on how embarrassment functions were basically anecdotal, and lacked empirical examples or analyses.

Not until the 1980s did sociologists begin to systematically study emotions in real-life social activities. And those sociologists who studied emotion in social interactions have developed a conversation analytical approach for understanding how emotions are interactionally achieved.

The approach of conversation analysis (CA) is related to that of discursive psychology and ethnomethodology, with a shared concern for the study of talk in social interaction, and talk as social practice. Conversation analysis, however, does not permit introspection or mentalistic analysis of the speakers. Emotions are not directly addressed in conversation analysis, though some CA researchers study the display of emotion by analyzing the sequential organization of conversations.

For instance, some sociologists have explored “emotional labour” in service work, such as in-flight service (Hochschild 1983), emergency 911 telephone call centres (Whalen & Zimmerman 1998) or beauty salons (Toerien & Kitzinger 2007). Others have examined shame and anger in marital conflict (Schef 1990, Retzinger 1991). Hochschild’s (1983) cultural analysis of emotions in social settings, especially her research in the flight service field, had a major impact on sociology. In analyzing emotion management among flight attendants, Hochschild
proposed that societies contain an emotion culture, which consists of a set of expectations as to what people are to feel (feeling rules), and how they are to express those feelings (display rules) in various situations. Hochschild (1983) was the first to use the term “emotional labour” in referring to emotion management in the paid workplace, especially in service fields.

Toerien & Kitzinger (2007) examined a related case from recorded beauty salon interactions, by using conversation analytical methodology. In this situation, the therapist was conducting two actions at the same time—engaging in conversation, while threading the client’s right eyebrow. In her “multiple involvement,” the therapist delayed hair removal several times in favour of chatting with the client. The authors referred to this action as “emotional labour” in salon work. They (2007: 657) also gave an important implication for conversation analysts, that research topics should not be assumed to be independent of the “official businesses of the institution.”

Retzinger’s work (1991) on shame and anger in marital quarrels supported much of the previous empirical analyses of discourse. She used recorded video data from marital quarrels in a novel way—by applying sequential analysis on the conversations. This study closely examined the verbal behaviours and paralinguistic cues for displaying shame or anger. Retzinger argued that shame appears to be the most social of emotions, and proposed a relationship between the social bonds of shame and conflict. Shame, she explained, is generated when social bonds are broken off. As the conclusion of her book, Retzinger demonstrated five major tactics people use for repairing the bond between conflicted couples: face-saving by showing respect, acknowledgement and levelling for restoring the bond, understanding the emotion sequence, using complex systems (such as extended social networks) to help manage or decrease conflict, and establishing a secure base for exploration. Retzinger took the perspective that anger in itself breeds anger, and leads to conflict escalation. Both the expression and withholding of anger can lead to escalation. The distinct point she emphasized was that conflict involves continued successive feedback from both parties, and that construction or destruction of a relationship is a joint process.

Whalen & Zimmerman (1998) and Kidwell (2006) studied the emotional display of “hysteria,” and Wilkinson & Kitzinger (2006) studied the emotional display of “surprise” in naturally occurring conversation. In both these cases, the researchers used conversation analytical methodology. The key points in their findings were that emotional display is embedded in the interactional context, and
is collaboratively achieved. Both of these studies demonstrated that emotion can be analyzed in social action, without looking into the aspect of personal psychology.

Whalen & Zimmerman (1998) studied telephone calls to 911 emergency centres, using a combination of ethnography and conversation analysis. These authors found that the strong expression of sorrow, distress, or grief in one social context may seem “hysterical” in another context. Thus “hysteria” is as much interactional as emotional, and it is treated differently in different institutional or work settings. Whalen and Zimmerman’s analyses of four emergency phone conversations clearly demonstrated that emotional display is embedded in local contexts of social actions, and that the study of emotions in social construction is “anchored in the interactional matrix in which the expression occurs: its form, its placement, its response, and the organizational and interactional terms of its accountability” (1998: 141–159).

Kidwell (2006) studied the role of gaze in the interactional management of hysteria by police officers. Her findings indicated that when police officers seek a mutual gaze, this can help the “hysterical party” to calm down. Persistent, sustained gaze withdrawal, or refusal to meet the current speaker’s gaze, indicates significant trouble in an interaction. In that case, the officer needs to seek direct gaze with the hysterical person. Moreover, Kidwell identified a number of embodied actions which are associated with hysteria in situations where people have just lost a loved one due to crime. These behaviours included sobbing, crying, breathing heavily, talking in a loud, anguished way that is almost incomprehensible, screaming and wailing inconsolably, or avoiding the gaze of investigators. In the field of health research, Li & Arber (2006) applied such study of embodied actions to explore how doctors and palliative care nurses use their understanding of emotion signals to interpret a dying patient’s behaviour. These authors argued that using the tools of conversation analysis to analyze emotion talk enables us to unpack how practitioners make sense of patients’ behaviour, and how they characterize patients as troubled (difficult) or credible (on the ball). The patients’ disease status is part of this characterization, but so are their interactions and demands in relation to staff (Li & Arber 2006: 43).

Kitzinger (2006: 72) examined the sequential positioning of “surprise tokens” in conversation. She pointed out that the conversation analytical method can develop a systematic empirical understanding of how surprise is organized interactionally. In their further and more detailed studies on the analysis of “surprise tokens,” Wilkinson & Kitzinger (2006) showed that displays of surprise
are performed by means of reaction tokens, such as *wow, gosh, oh my god, ooh!, phew*, in the midst of talk-in-interaction. The key contribution of these studies was to detach the psychology of surprise from its social expression, by showing how co-conversationalists collaborate to bring off an interactionally achieved performance of surprise. Considering the sequential positioning within talk-in-interaction, these researchers observed that surprise and surprise tokens are immediate responses to their source stimuli, and are produced promptly—either immediately after, or in terminal overlap with the source turn.

The term “surprise token” is akin to Goffman’s term “response cries” (1978). Response cries, according to Goffman, are “a form of behaviour whose meaning is that it is something blurted out, something that has escaped control” (1978: 799). These cries include cries of pain (*ow, ouch*), accident cries (*oops, whoops*), revulsion sounds (*eeuw*), surprise sounds (*eek, yipe*), and lexicalized expressions drawn from religion (*hell, heavens*) or from taboo domains of bodily function (*shit, fuck*). According to Goffman (1978: 794), response cries all have a common function, in that they “externalize a presumed inward state,” and convey the sense of being blurted out spontaneously. They represent an involuntary exuding of a psychological state, rather than an intentional piece of communication. Goffman suggested that response cries might work socially, but they arise from internal emotions. However, Wilkinson & Kitzinger’s work (2006: 152) showed empirically that surprise is also an interactional achievement. Expressions of surprise, conveyed through surprise tokens, are not simply involuntary spontaneous emotional eruptions, but are interactionally organized performances.

Sandlund (2004) studied conversations conducted in academic seminars examining the participants’ talk-in-interaction from a conversation analysis approach. She analyzed the conversations in terms of sequential environment, interactional elicitors, and management of emotions. In doing this she focused mainly on three emotions: frustration, embarrassment, and enjoyment. Within each of these, Sandlund found an assortment of practices for the interchange of emotions. She proposed that frustration is primarily located in the context of violations to activity-specific turn-taking norms. Enjoyment is collaboratively pursued within and between institutional activities. Embarrassment can serve multiple interactional functions in contexts of repair, teasing, or culturally delicate matters. Sandlund’s findings indicated that emotion displays can be viewed as transforming a situated action, as opening up alternative trajectories for sequences-in-progress, or they may function as actions in themselves.
Turner (2008) broadened the picture of social interaction by theorizing that emotional interaction happens between various levels of social organization. In Turner’s view, there are three different levels of practice in sociology—micro, meso, and macro. The micro level is the smallest level, and deals with the daily interactions of individuals in society—among friends, family members, or other personal associates. The meso-level deals with the human interaction among groups, communities, or organizations. The macro level is the largest sphere of social action, where whole societies or nations interact. Turner proposed that macro-level and meso-level structures affect the arousal of emotions at the micro-level, and in turn, that emotional arousal at the micro-level affects meso- and macro-level structures.

To summarize, sociologists have provided several approaches to understanding how emotions are interactionally achieved in social communication. These researchers have also applied the conversation analytical approach in their empirical analyses, and this has proved useful for research on emotion in other fields. Conversation analysis views speakers as capable of displaying all kinds of emotions or affects within certain sequential contexts. Conversation analytic research examines how recipients manage the unfolding of interaction, and it describes the highly patterned sequential structures of communication. Conversation analysts identify the expressions for an emotion, for instance surprise (Kitzinger 2006), by carefully analyzing several conversations with basically similar cues and sequential positions, or actions (such as requesting, blaming, presenting a question, assessing, countering, criticizing, etc.). The analysis always emphasizes actions, so the conversation analysis researcher investigates, turn by turn, how emotions are interactionally generated in view of actions (Sandlund 2004). The sequential analysis involves close attention to actions and sequences of actions, such as adjacency pairs, as well as turn-taking, repair, and recipient design.

2.7.2 Approaches to emotion in interactional linguistics

Studies in interactional linguistics view grammatical forms and prosodic structures as greatly affected by interactions among participants in social situations. Interactional linguists (Ford et al. 2002, Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 2001) take an interdisciplinary and cross-linguistic perspective on language. Their goal is to gain a better understanding of how languages are shaped by social interaction, and how interactional practices are moulded through specific
languages. For instance, Ford (1993) examined how “because clauses” are regular formats for extensions of already finished turns, which arise in contexts where the next speaker hesitates or begins to disagree. “Because clauses,” therefore, must be considered products of interaction, rather than simply as products of a single speaker’s organizational strategy. This approach to linguistics treats speech as an ongoing or emergent product in a social semiotic event, and it treats language as providing one set of resources for the accomplishment of goals or tasks within a social situation.

Interactional linguistics involves the study of turn construction and turn-taking in spoken language, and therefore combines the tasks of linguistics with those of conversation analysis (Ford et al. 2002, Ford 2004). Thus, the main analytical tools in interactional linguistics involve the methodologies of conversation analysis. Ford (2004) studied contingency and units in interaction from a multimodal point of view. Her observations suggested that “[a] central function of language for collaborative action is the management of simultaneously unfolding facets of action, sound production, gesture and grammar—produced by multiple participants” (2004: 27). Taking a discourse-functional view, she proposed interrelated tasks for studying interaction by both linguists and conversation analysts: 1) research on how interactants simultaneously produce and monitor unfolding lexico-grammatical, prosodic, and gestural forms, in order to coordinate social interaction; and 2) research on how the interactants apply all these forms of communication as resources for managing opportunities for next-speaker turn-taking in conversation (2004: 29).

Another focus of interactional linguists has been the interrelations between prosodic cues and emotions (Selting 1996, Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 2001). These authors’ analyses from everyday conversations clearly indicated that prosodic elements, such as stress and intonation, can convey information about emotions or attitudes. Selting (1996) showed that prosody can be used to distinguish normal repair initiations from astonished repair initiations in German conversational data. Also, repair initiations voiced with a high pitch and increased loudness indicate problems with conflicting or contrasting expectations.

In sum, studies in interactional linguistics have examined the relationship between grammatical forms and prosodic cues, finding that both are greatly affected by interactions among participants in social actions, and especially that prosodic cues can display emotions.
2.7.3 The study of emotion in discourse analysis

In linguistics, discourse is often defined as “languages above the sentence or above the clause” (Stubbs 1983: 1). Schiffrin (1994) suggested that there are two main approaches to the linguistic study of discourse. One is formalism (or structuralism), which involves focus on the abstract form and structure of language. The other is functionalism, which is mainly interested in what language is used to do.

Discourse analysts have taken a mainly functionalist approach, while drawing on a wide range of theoretical and methodological tools. These analysts study language use beyond the sentence boundary, and prefer to analyze naturally occurring language rather than artificial examples. They view both speech and writing as types of social practice (Brown & Yule 1983: 1, Fairclough 1992). The main focus of their discourse analyses is the persistent linguistic patterns of speech, which reveal how interaction is done, and uncover the rules for accomplishing goals through speech (Fairclough 1992: 28).

Instead of regarding emotions (such as sadness) as internal mental states, discourse analysts are concerned with studying what people are doing with emotion while they talk, and how they make claims about their emotions or thoughts. Quite a few discourse analysts have investigated how prosodic elements can express emotional interaction (Chafe 2002, Yu 2011). Chafe (2002) proposed that emotions and attitudes can be expressed prosodically in live conversation, and that researchers should study the relationships between prosody and affect in ordinary conversation. He felt that such studies were conspicuous by their absence in previous research. Chafe argued that the naturalness and ubiquity of conversational language suggests that there are important things to learn from it with respect to emotions, and prosody seems to be the main channel for emotional expression. Yu (2011: 2968–2972) applied this view in pointing out that the heavy, contrasting stress on certain words in conversational argument indicates that the participants are displaying frustration or showing anger. Norrick (2000: 67–104) studied how evaluation is communicated in spontaneous conversation among multiple participants. In his study, “evaluation” was a disruption of the temporal order of events by the narrator, in order to reflect upon and express the significance of the narrative. By interrupting the temporal sequence, the narrator communicates something more important than a mere recapitulation of the events. Norrick’s intent was to point out the elements of conversation that were expressed
in a valenced or non-neutral manner, indicating the speakers’ emotions in response to exchanges regarded as strange, dangerous, judgmental, or contentious.

Weigand (1998) and Maynard (2002) explored the relationships between language, intonation, emotion, and cognition in conversation, as applied to discourse analysis.

In general, discourse analysts study language as it is used, and what it is used to accomplish. They seek to study language as it is produced and interpreted in a real-world context. The data in discourse analysis can range from small units (sentences or turns) to much larger and more abstract discourses, either spoken or written. But still, the usual emphasis for discourse analysts is on the meaning of language, while the direct study of nonverbal emotion display in everyday talk remains rare.

2.8 Summary

An overview of all major approaches to the study of emotion indicates that there are four main understandings of emotion: emotion as a biological function, emotion as a cognitive appraisal, emotion as a social construct, and emotion as an interpersonal creation. In the work of sociology, interactional linguistics, discourse analysis, and conversation analysis, the study of emotion is increasingly moving towards a focus on its interpersonal and communicative aspects. Researchers on emotion are increasingly investigating the social aspects of emotion, and viewing emotion as arising in social interaction (Sandlund 2004). There is broad agreement that there are many channels for understanding and expressing emotions, and that the most effective way to study the display of emotion is by close observance of naturally occurring conversations.

Concerning the approach of discourse analysis and conversation analysis, Wooffitt (2005) gave a sociologist’s view, indicating that there is a key difference between discourse analysis (DA) and conversation analysis (CA). Some discourse analysts argue that descriptions and analyses of the actions involved in a conversation analytical approach are non-neutral interpretations of social actions. To minimize the scope for subjective interpretation, they try to restrict themselves to noting the functional orientation of language use. In contrast, conversation analysts seek to collect all the details of talk-in-interaction, focusing on the participants’ actual communicative activities. Conversation analysts can thus offer an account of social interaction which captures the complexity and sophistication of actual conduct, and resonates with the lived reality of the people whose
activities we study (Wooffitt 2005: 210). My practice in the analyses of this data is conducted by the conversation analytical approach, which involves a close examination of how participants manage interaction and how emotions arising in social interaction through the sequential organization of speech.
3 Prosodic Cues, Paralinguistic Features, and Embodied Actions in Emotional Display

Many researchers who study interpersonal communication have pointed out that emotional messages can be recognized on the basis of different cues (Bowers et al. 1985, Ekman 1992, 1994, Edelmann 1994, Planalp 1998, 1999). These cues can be facial, vocal, or physiological. They may involve gestures and body movements, action cues (e.g. throwing things, banging things around, slamming doors, bringing gifts), and finally, many cues are verbal. Sociolinguists generally argue that the verbal cues, vocal cues (e.g. pitch, speed) and facial expressions are all equally important. This study finds that verbal and nonverbal cues are most often combined to express our emotions. However, in some cases, our verbal expressions and gestures can be dissonant. Our words say “good,” but our gestures say the opposite—or our gestures and facial expressions may expose our emotions, while our words conceal them. This is another reason why the close analysis of emotional cues from sequential interactions is crucial for understanding the emotional display.

This chapter reviews earlier studies of prosodic cues, paralinguistic features, and embodied actions in emotional display. First, Section 3.1 presents the main findings on how prosodic cues and paralinguistic cues can express emotions. Section 3.2 reviews findings on the relationship between embodied and verbalized actions. Section 3.3 surveys insights concerning the display of emotion by laughter in interaction. Last, Section 3.4 gives a short summary.

3.1 Expression of emotion through prosodic cues and paralinguistic features

In their 1998 study, Roach et al. gave an overview of the distinction between prosodic cues and paralinguistic features. Their research incorporated descriptions of prosodic and paralinguistic transcriptions devised by Crystal & Quirk (1964), who classified paralinguistic features into two types: voice qualities, and voice qualifications. In this view, voice qualities vary due to different modes of phonation, such as normal voice, falsetto, whisper, creaking voice, huskiness, or breathiness. Voice qualifications, on the other hand, are non-linguistic vocal effects which run through or interrupt speech. These include laughing, giggling, tremulousness, sobbing, or crying. Arndt & Janney (1991) showed how speech interpretation depends crucially on the subtle interplay between verbal, prosodic,
and kinesic choices. Thus, meaning in face-to-face conversations must be understood as encoded, and it needs to be interpreted on all three levels of verbal, vocal, and kinesic information. Crystal (1969: 128) made a distinction on phonetic and functional grounds between prosodic features (being characterized by variations in pitch, loudness, duration, and silence), as opposed to paralinguistic features (which are vocal, but independent of pitch, loudness, or duration for their meaning).

Emotion can also be displayed by prosodic cues, as is demonstrated in many studies. According to Chafe (2002), particular prosodic phenomena express a generalized heightening of emotional involvement, and also sometimes express specific affective attitudes. Chafe (2002) further pointed out that prosody would seem to be the main channel for emotional expression, considering the naturalness and ubiquity of conversational language. He therefore proposed that examination of prosodic cues should include: (1) fundamental frequency, which is perceived as pitch; (2) intensity, perceived as loudness; (3) duration, or tempo, lengthening, pausing, etc.; (4) voice quality (creaky voice, whispering, laughing, etc.); and (5) intonation, meaning the patterns in pitch or direction of pitch—which may be simple (as in a single fall, rise, or level pitch), complex (fall-rise or rise-fall), or compound. This dissertation makes use of Chafe’s distinctions, which involve voice quality as one type of prosodic cue.

Among these various prosodic cues, it is undisputed that intonation has an important role to play in the expression of emotion and attitude (Couper-Kuhlen 1986: 173). Also, stress and intonation can create impressions, convey information about emotions and attitudes, or alter the salience of linguistically-possible interpretations (Wilson & Wharton 2006).

Overviews of phonetic-phonological research on prosody and emotion in discourse appear in several works, such as Arndt & Janney (1987, 1991), Couper-Kuhlen (1986), or Selting (1994, 1996). In studying everyday German conversation, Selting (1994: 375) observed that speakers use prosodic cues in co-occurrence with syntactic and lexical cues, in order to contextualize turn-constructional units as emphatic speech. Emphatic speech signals heightened emotive involvement in conversation, and recipients commonly treat it as a call for displays of alignment in response to storytelling.

Goodwin & Goodwin (2000) examined a video-recording of young girls playing hopscotch, finding that the girls effectively displayed an emotional “stance” towards actions of their co-participants. These displays involved precise coordination of pitch elevation, intonation, syntactic choice, timing, and gesture.
Similar prosodic features such as markedly raised pitch, vowel lengthening, or raised volume in oppositional turns, can display the speaker’s strong emotional stance. Selting (1996) also showed that prosody can be used to distinguish “normal” repair initiations from “astonished” repair initiations in German conversational data. The repair initiations with high pitch and increased loudness indicate problems of conflicting or contrasting expectations. Prosodic cues can also be important in conveying the oppositional character of a turn and its level of intensity in argument. Such cues include increased volume, rapid tempo, contrastive stress, and exaggerated intonation contours (Schiffrin 1985).

As was documented by Günthner (1997) and Couper-Kuhlen (1998), speakers often utilize prosodic cues in comments or personal evaluations within reported speech, in order to signal emotions. In reporting the speech of others, through strong increases in volume, heightened pitch, lengthening, or tensing of the voice, the speakers show a stance of disapproval towards the “out-of-proportion, exaggerated, and hysterical” reactions displayed in the original dialogue (Günthner 1997: 269). According to Couper-Kuhlen (1998), the prosodic cues in voiced direct reported speech are hints of stance. These cues signal that the speaker is doing something beyond simple reporting of other people’s statements.

In sum, prosodic cues play an important role in the expression of emotion for particular interactional purposes. These cues often coordinate with the verbal cues and embodied actions for a multi-layered emotional display.

### 3.2 Expression of emotion through embodied actions

Another important dimension of communication is the relationship between embodied actions and the verbal expressions. In this review, I briefly introduce studies in several different fields (i.e. psychology, interactional linguistics, sociology, conversation analysis, anthropology, and discourse analysis). As Biber et al. noted, “[e]motive and attitudinal stance meanings can be conveyed through a number of non-linguistic means, such as body posture, facial expressions, and gestures” (1999: 967).

Gestures in conversation can display speakership (Schegloff 1984), and are often closely related to the meaning of concurrent speech. Kendon (2001: 193) described gesture as the range of visible bodily actions that are, more or less, generally regarded as part of a person’s willing expression. Gestures can be used for providing additional or supporting information about the content and the
meaning of an utterance. Gestures and talk tend to co-occur and support each other. They can contribute to the total effect of speaking, and add levels of meaning to speech (Kendon 1995, 2001). For instance, the Open Hand Supine gesture is used in a context where the speaker is offering, giving, showing something, or requesting the reception of something (Kendon 2004). Yu (2011) studied how hand gestures display emotions in argument. It is evident in argument that the speaker reinforces speech, and conveys an active attitude for persuading others through Open Hand Supine gestures. However, the Open Hand Oblique gesture is also used for making negative comments in an argument. In general, gestures are an integral component of language. McNeil (1992, 2005) argued that gestures are dialectical components of speech and active participants in speech. According to him, “[t]wo core features of gesture are that they carry meaning, and that they and the synchronous speech are co-expressive” (2005: 22).

Embodied practices and their roles in social interaction have received growing academic attention since the 1970s, but even so, fairly little attention has been given to embodied practices and their relationships to language, sequential organization, or other expressions of talk-in-interaction. Goodwin (1980, 1986, 2000) was a forerunner in the field of anthropology, who paid special attention to the study of relationships between embodied practices and verbal expressions in conversation. Goodwin & Goodwin (1986) analyzed the head, face, and hand gestures that research subjects made while they searched for words during conversation. The researchers indicated that a speaker’s averted gaze or brooding expression may indicate “simply adjustment to the cognitive demands that a word search imposes” (1986: 58). In response to such cues or gestures, the recipients commonly tried to help the speakers by actively suggesting the missing words. In addition, Streeck & Knapp (1992) proposed that facial expressions are used to provide “metacommunicative commentary” on the unfolding talk.

Gaze is another important emotional cue in interaction (Sandlund 2004, Peräkylä & Ruusuvuori 2006). Gaze can do the social action of building emotional contact, sharing, and exchanging ideas. For instance, gaze can be projected to seek for confirmation, or to observe the recipient’s stance after proposing an idea (Kendon 1967, Bavelas et al. 2002). Studies on gaze suggest that gaze direction and facial expression are combined in the processing of emotionally relevant facial information. Also, gaze aversion is another visual indicator of emotions (e.g. disliking, embarrassment, shame, frustration). Psychologists Reginald et al. (2003) suggested that gaze direction and facial displays of emotion share an information value as signals of approach or
avoidance. Experimental psychological studies demonstrate that direct gaze facilitates the processing of facially communicated, approach-oriented emotions (e.g. anger and joy), whereas averted gaze tends to facilitate the processing of facially communicated, avoidance-oriented emotions (e.g. fear and sadness). The timing of gaze aversion is also a key element in the display and perception of emotions (Sandlund 2004). Bowers et al. (1985: 524) suggested that increased eye contact is connected with liking, while gaze avoidance is connected with disliking. The ending of eye contact signals rejection in a relationship, and constant gaze from near proximity increases anxiety. The empirical analyses from Bowers et al. (1985: 524) and Yu (2011) indicated that gaze avoidance may signal frustration in argument.

In the study of infant–caretaker interaction, Robson (1967) noted that distance regulation happens through eye contact. Infants use gaze to initiate, maintain, or avoid social interaction with caregivers. While turning towards and looking at the caregivers initiates emotional contact, looking away breaks the contact. Kendon (1967) showed that the moments when the interactants’ glances meet tend to relate to the speaker’s seeking whether their message is being understood. Bavelas et al. (2002: 576–577) called these brief moments of mutual gaze “gaze windows.” These authors showed that listeners tend to produce backchannels, or nods, when speakers look at them and the gaze window is open. After the listener has produced a response, the speaker shifts gaze, and the gaze window closes. In a study of marital conflict, Retzinger (1991) noted that gaze aversion, or lowering of one’s gaze, is a visual indicator of shame. Furthermore, gaze aversion and shifting eye movements in conversation are signs of embarrassment (Heath 1988, Keltner & Buswell 1997: 255, Sandlund 2004).

To conclude, embodied actions such as facial expressions, gestures, and postures can express emotions in conversation, and should be noted along with verbal cues in the study of emotion interaction.

### 3.3 Laughter and its functions in interaction

Conversation analysis has produced significant findings on laughter, based on detailed analysis of audio or video recordings of naturally occurring interactions (Jefferson 1979, Jefferson et al. 1987, Glenn 1991/1992, 1995, Gavioli 1995, Haakana 1999, 2001, Glenn 2003). These studies reveal that laughter is an orderly, structured, and systematically positioned activity, which performs a range of tasks in the process of talk-in-interaction. Though laughter is routinely invited by prior
speakers, the recipient can, at will, produce or decline to accept laughter, or produce other responses. Sacks (1974) proposed that laughter is expected immediately upon completion of a punch line in narrative jokes. Jefferson (1985), a pioneer in the study of laughter, demonstrated that the placement of laughter is important for the understanding of the organization of conversation.

Several researchers have employed conversation analytical methodology to study how speakers signal their intent to evoke laughter in speech. Heritage and Greatbatch (1986: 143) examined how politicians evoke laughter from audiences in terms of the degree of stress. Stress was evaluated by taking note of (1) whether the speaker was gazing at the audience at or near the completion of a message; (2) whether the message was delivered more loudly than surrounding speech passages; (3) whether it was stated with greater pitch or stress variation; (4) whether the speech was marked by speeding up, slowing down, or some other rhythmic shift; or (5) whether it was accompanied by the use of gestures. In the absence of any of these features, the message was coded “no stress.” If one of these features was present, Heritage and Greatbatch gave the lines an “intermediate stress” coding, whereas the presence of two or more features resulted in a coding of “full stress.”

Greatbatch & Clark (2003: 1529) performed similar research on management gurus, to explicate the verbal and nonverbal practices these speakers engage in to invite audience laughter. Apart from using the above mentioned “stress” devices, the management gurus used additional techniques, such as announcing that they are about to say something humorous, taking initiative in smiling or laughing, or using “comedic” facial expressions, gestures, and prosody. These facial expressions may involve, for example, exaggerated displays of disgust, disbelief, anger, horror, or amazement, which may index either their own reactions, or the reactions of others towards the topic being discussed.

Laughter often occurs at specific points in the sequential positioning of a conversation. Jefferson (1984) pointed out that speakers may weave laughter into their own utterances to signal amusement and invite laughter from other recipients. Norrick (1993) and Glenn (1995) offered similar findings, showing that shared laughter immediately after a teasing remark can help overcome potential interactional difficulties. In joking, the co-participant’s laughter often overlaps the joke teller’s lines (Jefferson 1979). According to Jefferson’s study (1979: 80–83), the onset of laughter by a current speaker can initiate “laughing-together” with the co-participant, which can lead to an expanded joke-laughter series. However, Jefferson also found that in more serious “trouble-talks,”
laughter by the speaker often fails to win affiliation by the listeners. A trouble-teller produces an utterance and then laughs, and the trouble recipient does not laugh, but produces a recognizably serious response (Jefferson 1984). From her studies, Jefferson concluded that the onset of laughter can occur in three different places in the sequential positioning of interaction. These three are “laughter initial” (occurring before the utterance), “laughter completion” (as a conclusion to an utterance), and “laughter internal” (laughter which interrupts utterances). Lerner (1996) noted that a current-speaker’s laughter commonly appears as a turn-yielder.

Many researchers in psychology-related fields have examined the function of laughter. Laughter also appears to function as a social signal of openness to new, friendly interactions, or a broadening of relations which can lead to lasting social bonds and attachment building (Gervais & Wilson 2005). Shared amusement and smiles serve many of the same functions. By reciprocating each other’s humorous contributions with laughter and appreciation, or by engaging in brief activities of conversational play, the interactants create an environment of rapport. Psychologists have also explored the functions of laughter. Bachorowski & Owren (2001) argued that although laughter often conveys positive, happy, playful feelings, it can also be an expression of negative feelings such as anxiety, self-deprecation, or derision.

In studying the relations between emotion, laughter, and other expressive actions, some researchers employing conversation analytical methodology have proposed that laughter is an emotion-involving activity. Edwards (2004) demonstrated that in everyday domestic telephone conversations, expressions of laughter and irony while making complaints provide the complaint recipients with response cues. Laughter during complaining can either strengthen or undermine the complaint’s seriousness. Kangasharju & Nikko (2009) analyzed instances of joint laughter in leader-member meetings, noting the different functions laughter can play in a meeting. Where laughter is initiated by those leading the meeting, joint laughter can improve the task performance. Where laughter is more spontaneously shared by the whole group, it can reduce tension in challenging situations. When laughing together is related to the completion of a statement, it displays mutual understanding. In sum, meeting participants use laughter in strategic ways to create a good working atmosphere.

West (1984) and Haakana (1999, 2001) studied laughter by patients and doctors in medical interaction. They shared the same finding—that patients do most of the laughing, and on most occasions the laughter is not reciprocated by doctors. In West’s analysis (1984), laughter is a sign of humour and amusement.
Haakana drew on evidence from a Finnish database (1999, 2001), and proposed that patients mostly use laughter to deal with delicate aspects of medical interaction. The patient’s laughter typically occurs following the doctor’s statements of prognosis, especially if the doctor explains that the patient’s condition is less serious than it appears. Thus the patient’s laughter functions to remedy the delicacy of the situation.

In all these cases, researchers who study laughter by conversation analytical methodology have proposed one common insight: that laughter is an organized interactional device, and its sequential positioning within an interaction is crucial in determining its meaning within each interactive exchange.

### 3.4 Brief summary

This chapter has reviewed the main findings of research concerning expression of emotion thorough prosodic cues, paralinguistic cues, and embodied actions. Such research from different fields has explored how speakers express various emotions through verbal cues, prosodic cues, and bodily gestures. What is still largely missing in these studies is how exactly the verbal cues and nonverbal cues interact and arise in the contexts of actual conversation. The following chapters will seek to fill this gap in understanding.
4 The Display of Frustration in Arguments: a Multimodal Analysis

This first case study focuses on the expression of frustration in argument. It is an analysis of a recorded conversation and makes use of CA concepts, but does not yet apply the CA method rigorously. This first study represents a more general discourse analytical approach. From the CA respect, the actions in the chosen sequence are characterized in the analysis because they are a fundamental part of the meaningfulness of conduct (Heritage 1984, Pomeranz 1997). In accordance with a discourse analytical approach, this study looks at what the linguistic patterns are actually doing at each point in the interaction. Moreover, the study pays special attention to prosodic cues. However, unlike the conversation analytical methodology used in chapters 5 and 6, this initial study does not involve a close examination of how participants manage interaction through the sequential organization of talk.

This recorded argument is one of the first conversations that caught my attention after I decided to study the expression of emotion from video data in social interaction. Without closely watching for the embodied actions and listening to the prosodic cues, we may miss the richness of emotion conveyed by the participants’ verbal and bodily expressions. The analysis of this conversation started my journey in studying how emotions are expressed via multimodal cues. However, I found that this type of argument is rarely captured in recorded data collections and frustration is not easily found in data, mainly because the participants know they are being recorded and that their behaviour will be studied. In this situation, the participants may restrain their emotions. They may display frustration and constrained anger.

4.1 Introduction

Our conversational arguments generally involve expressions of differences of opinions. Such expressions may evoke emotional reactions in others, even though we may not intend that to happen. People in arguments may display a variety of negative emotions, e.g. distrust, disappointment, frustration, shame, confusion,

---

1 The present chapter is based on my article published in Journal of Pragmatics, see Yu (2011). I gratefully acknowledge permission by the journal editors to include it here in a slightly revised form.
worry, anger, or fear. This chapter explores the display of frustration in connection with various actions in a conversational argument.

“Frustration” is the noun of “frustrate,” and the Collins COBUILD English Dictionary (CCELD 2000) describes this condition as follows: *if something frustrates you, it upsets or angers you because you are unable to do anything about the problems it creates.* This explanation tells us that a frustrated person can be upset or angry. There is overlap between the two emotions of frustration and anger. But these two emotions remain separate and distinguishable. However, no empirical studies have indicated differences in how these two emotions are interactionally placed and expressed.

The data presented in this study illustrates how the expression of emotion is co-constructed by verbal cues, nonverbal vocal cues, and bodily behaviour. It also reveals two broad types of expressions signalling frustration. In the first type, verbal and nonverbal expressions of frustration are combined. In the second, frustration is displayed through nonverbal expression alone. Moreover, this study tends to uncover the connection between the expression of frustration and its specific types of embodied actions, verbal expressions and prosodic cues. And specifically, the study seeks to explore what specific gestures might involve in nonverbal expressions of frustration.

### 4.2 Earlier approaches to emotional expression in argument

Chafe (1994) emphasized that emotion is present in everyday conversation, and that emotion is what gives communication life. Coordination between partners in conversation occurs at many levels, which are all grounds for emotion. Emotion is thus identified as intersubjective.

Scholars who study arguments or conflicts in naturally occurring data from the conversation analytical perspective put their focus on the sequential organization of discussion, and on turn-taking in interaction (Goodwin 1983, Pomerantz 1984, Schiffrin 1985, Goodwin & Goodwin 2000, Sandlund 2004). Pomerantz (1984) suggested that agreeing is indicated through a minimization of the gap between the prior turn’s completion and the agreement turn’s initiation. But a disagreeing assessment is frequently delayed within a turn, or over a series of turns. Disagreement is also often indicated by a preface or pauses, questioning repetitions, requests for clarification, or repair initiators. Schiffrin (1985) proposed that turn taking becomes more competitive during verbal conflict. Overlaps and interruptions are more frequent. She suggested that absences of
forthcoming agreements or disagreements by recipients, with gaps, requests for clarification, and the like, are interpretable as instances of unstated, or as-yet-unstated, disagreements. Furthermore, Schiffrin argued that verbal conflict puts participants in jeopardy of losing face and esteem, as well as losing concrete benefits that may be at issue in dispute.

Scheff & Retzinger (1991) proposed that there is a high frequency and prominence of shame cues in marital quarrels. In general, quarrels begin with shame and separation rather than anger. Also, the quarrels contain rapidly alternating sequences of escalating shame and anger. There are two dispute styles in marital disputes: impasse or quarrel. An impasse can be likened to a cold war, in which there is little or no overt anger, but withdrawal, avoidance, and coldness instead. In a quarrel there may be shouting, name-calling, and other overt signs of conflict. Retzinger (1991) indicated that the expressions of shame are evident in paralinguistic cues, such as vocal withdrawal, overly soft volume, irregular speech rhythm, stammering, rapid speech, mumbling, hesitation, or long pause. By contrast, anger can be evident in staccato speech, loud volume, heavy stress on certain words, increased tempo, a whiny tone, or in a singsong pattern for ridiculing. Anger and competition is commonly signalled by very loud overlapping talk, or overlapping talk at a higher pitch (Schegloff 2000: 17).

From her data on academic seminars, Sandlund (2004) observed that frustration is primarily located in the context of violations of turn-taking norms, such as expectations that students are not allowed to interrupt while their work is being criticized. The students display sensitivity to interactional norms in seminars, but commonly seek to violate these norms, thus triggering aggressive displays of frustration. In her study (2004: 154–157), Sandlund observed frustration arising in problematic activities, and found that its expression involves a variety of embodied actions, turn constructions, and turn designs as devices of interactional management. Speakers can display their frustration through changes in prosodic cues, such as pace, pitch, or increased loudness. Other vocal cues such as sighing or dismissive laughter can also demonstrate frustration. In considering the embodied actions for expressing frustration, Sandlund found that the gestures and gaze accompanying speech can change suddenly, and facial redness is also a sign of frustration. In terms of turn construction and turn design, the frustrated students insist on justifications despite being reminded of interactional norms. The frustrated speakers might make shifts in who they are addressing, or defend their actions with self-deprecation. As already noted in section 3.1, earlier
literature indicates that increased loudness, rapid tempo, contrastive stress, and heightened pitch in argument show a stance of disapproval.

The above literature review mainly focuses on the expression of emotion in argument. The findings indicate that people can demonstrate their emotion in arguments by initiatives in turn-taking, prosodic cues, paralinguistic cues (i.e. sighs) or embodied actions. In this chapter, I will study how the verbal cues and nonverbal cues interact with each other in emotional expression.

4.3 Data and organization

The data for this study consists of a video-recording called “Never in Canada” (Haddington & Kärkkäinen 2003) which has been introduced in section 1.2. The analyzed excerpt is a part of that recording.

The argument analyzed here is around four minutes long, and concerns whether or not President George Bush will be re-elected in 2004. Jason holds the opinion that he will be re-elected, because a war always gets politicians re-elected. Mary is strongly against this opinion. Prior to this point in the conversation, the two had laughed about Bush and shared their dislike of him. The excerpt is named “He will get re-elected” and it is separated into two parts. The first part starts from line 10 and continues to line 71. In this part, Jason argues that Bush will be re-elected, and that wars always get politicians re-elected. The second part of the argument starts from line 72 and continues to the end of the recording. In this second part, the participants argue over whether Bush was a properly elected president. The three participants talk with each other while sitting at a round kitchen table inside an apartment (see Fig. 4 in Chapter 1). Jason is on the right, sitting opposite Sophie, while Mary sits between them.

As is introduced in detail in section 1.3, the focus of the analysis is on the interactive activities and display of emotions through variously employed verbal expressions, prosodic cues, and embodied actions. In what follows, section 4.4 shows how the speakers display their frustration by active emotional cues and through the coordinated use of verbal and nonverbal interaction. Section 4.5 examines the display of frustration by nonverbal expressions alone. And section 4.6 compares the interactional organization of each type of expression. Conclusions are drawn in section 4.7.
4.4 Combined use of verbal and nonverbal expressions of frustration

This section will uncover how speakers display their emotions through interactional organization, verbal features, prosody, and embodied actions. Let us first go through the segment from line 10 to line 44, which includes the proposition of the argument point by Jason, and the first emotional defence by both parties. Example 3 is a transcript of this first segment of the recording, and it is named Cause he'll get re-elected. The linguistic expressions most relevant to the analysis are shown in italics.

Example 3. Cause he'll get re-elected. (From “Never in Canada”)
10 JAS: I think I'm going to move--
11 to Finland.
12 for at least,
13 two more years.
14 (0.9)
15 MAR: [Why].
16 JAS: [cause] he'll [2 get re-elected 2],
[2((SWEEPS THE RIGHT HAND LATERALLY ABOVE THE TABLE)) 2]
17 so then I have to stay [2(there)XXX (years)2].
18 MAR: [2No,
19 he's not going2],
20 to get re-elected.
21 ..
22 JAS: He is.
23 MAR: No,
24 He's not.
25 JAS: He is.
26 MAR: No.
27 .. Why are you saying that.
28 JAS: I study politics.
29 [It's my life].
[{{(RAISES OPEN HAND FROM THE TABLE, THEN PUTS IT DOWN)}]
30 MAR: [I study politics] too man,
31 And he's not getting re-[2elected2].
32 JAS: [2It's2] my life.
[{{(RAISES HAND HIGHER FROM THE TABLE, AND HITS IT ON THE TABLE)}]
33 (0.7)
We will first analyze the actions appearing in the excerpt.

Jason announces that he is going to move to Finland for at least two more years. The recipients show no response for a 0.9-second inter-turn gap. Then Mary asks for the reason, and Jason explains that he has to stay in Finland because President Bush will be re-elected. While Jason is speaking, Mary states her disagreement (in lines 18–19). Jason asserts his standpoint in line 22, but it is denied by Mary a second time. Jason then re-asserts his opinion in line 25. Mary still objects, but she also raises questions about Jason’s standpoint and requests clarification in lines 26–27. Jason attempts to legitimize his claim by saying that he studies politics, and that politics are his life. This claim is also opposed and challenged by Mary, in lines 30–31. Jason emphasizes his authority to make his judgment by asserting that wars always get politicians re-elected (in lines 32–35). Mary opposes the preceding turn, putting forward her standpoint in lines 36–39. In what follows, Jason casts doubt on Mary’s reasoning, and takes a definite stance in lines 40–42. Mary reaffirms her objection, saying you have no idea. Then she tries to soften her criticism by an objective evaluation, nobody knows.

In the segment above, only Jason, the argument elicitor, uses an epistemic stance (Kärkkäinen 2003), using I think to make a statement about his future plans. His declaration receives no immediate uptake, and there is a 0.9-second inter-turn gap, because Mary and Sophie do not react quickly enough to Jason’s topic shift. Mary’s query in line 15, why, with a falling contour, is still calm. Obviously, she does not relate Jason’s announced plans to his subsequent opinion on Mr. Bush’s re-election. In line 16, Jason tells the recipients his reasoning simultaneously with Mary’s query, presenting an opinion, [Cause] he’ll get re-elected, so then I have to stay [2(there) XXX (years)2]. In using I think, Jason suggests confidence and
factuality to his upcoming opinions. Thus, his proposition is put forward as if from his own personal experience, and his objective observation of the world (Schiffrin 1990). The function of I think as a booster emphasizes his strength of belief. The phrase is therefore a device which helps by “strengthening rather than weakening the force of the utterance” (Holmes 1995). Also, Jason’s “extreme-case formulation,” have to, implies more certainty and confidence concerning his judgment on Mr. Bush’s re-election.

Jason’s firm stance is unexpectedly opposed by Mary, and the argument becomes fairly heated in lines 18–26. The conflict exchanges begin with the objection no in line 18, where Mary’s dissenting utterance opens up a justificatory sequence. This sequence consists of repeated assertion–objection sequences, and it goes on for three exchanges. Jason and Mary argue and strongly oppose each other’s preceding turns, using the negation no without any further elaboration. The uptake happens so quickly that neither party is able to defend their opinion by reasoning. Taking the conversational floor has become competitive, so it leads to overlaps. But this straightforward opposition and repetition cannot resolve the argument, or reach any conclusive result.

In Mary’s third opposition turn, the extension of the negative word no is followed by the Wh-interrogative, with a falling intonation contour in lines 26–27: No. .. why are you saying that. The words are expressed with higher pitch than that in her prior arguments. The fundamental frequency of this intonation unit is shown in Fig. 6.
In the above pitch track, the markedly raised pitch is on two syllables, *saying* and *that*. The baseline starts from 167.4Hz on *why*, and the pitch on *you* rises to 188.7Hz. Then there is a wider pitch span (from 188.7Hz on *you* to 366.8Hz) on the syllable [sei] in *saying*, for a total pitch difference of 178.1Hz. When Mary says *that*, her pitch first rises to the peak, 373.9Hz, then drops to 145.6Hz. Her heavy stress and markedly raised pitch on certain words such as *saying* and *that* indicates that Mary is in conflict with Jason (Selting 1996), and is evidently displaying frustration because Jason does not give in (Retzinger 1991). The louder volume in Mary’s speech may aim to “shout the other down” (Schegloff 2000: 12). Moreover, the *Wh*-clause with the falling in tonation contour does the action of criticizing the other rather than asking a real question.

Mary’s negative response and markedly raised pitch serve to upgrade the argument. Jason legitimizes his claim by giving Mary a reason in lines 28–29: *I study politics. [It’s my life]*. This objection exerts a claim of power or authority over Mary. It displays Jason’s assertive stance, and suggests that he cannot be wrong, considering his rich knowledge in politics. Assertions like this can be invoked directly in “positional” self-attributions (Bernstein 1971), (e.g. “because I’m your mother”), or in the claims of superiority made by children (“I’m smarter, stronger, taller, etc.”). But such a power display by Jason invokes mockery from Mary, who obviously does not submit to this power pressure. Mary’s turn in line
30, [I study politics] too man, is done in overlap—with higher pitch than her prior and subsequent turns. The overlapping disagreements become outright interruptions, as each party tries to claim the floor from the other (Schegloff 2000). Such overlaps and interruptions are the emotional cues of competition and frustration (Schiffrin 1985). The primary stress is on study, and then the utterance ends with a fall-rise pitch contour on man, which can be observed in the pitch track. In Fig. 7, the markedly raised pitch is on study, with 447Hz, and Mary’s pitch reaches a peak on the syllable [stʌ] in study. The second markedly raised pitch is on too, with 384.6Hz.

![Fig. 7. F0 of [I study politics] too man.](image)

In challenging Jason’s power wielding, Mary earnestly emphasizes the fact that she also studies politics in line 30. She does this through counter-argument by using Jason’s words, and expressing them with prosodic cues such as loud intensity, markedly raised pitch, and heavy stress on certain words. All these are signals of strong emotional stance (Goodwin & Goodwin 2000).

After failing to convince Mary, Jason reinforces his reasoning in lines 34–35, *A war always gets- - .. politicians re-elected*. He emphasizes his judgment again by using the extreme-case formulation, *always*. And in opposition to Mary’s
defence (in lines 36–39), Jason argues (in lines 40–41) that the war in Iraq would never cause that many casualties. The word, never, is an extreme-case formulation as well. He uses an extreme-case formulation each time his opinion is challenged by Mary, in order to claim his authority in the subject under dispute.

In this segment, both parties move towards trying to persuade the other by gradually giving more reasoning. They often search for words, as can be seen in the several pauses, a false start in line 36, and truncated intonation units in lines 34 and 38.

Jason’s assertive stance is displayed by his lexical choices in the conversation, such as at least (in line 12), have to (in line 17), always (in line 34), and never (in line 40). Pomerantz (1986) suggested that interactants use such extreme-case formulations when their claims are undermined. Edwards (2000) argued that such phrases may be used for displaying a speaker’s certainty and commitment towards some state of affairs. Sidnell (2004) remarked that extreme-case formulations such as “there’s risks in everything” are ways of referring to an object or event that invoke its maximal or minimal properties, often employing such words as “never,” “always,” “brand new,” “forever,” and “everyone.” The extreme-case formulations in Jason’s talk express a conviction that his argument is objective and justified, and as a result, there is no way to argue with him.

The following analysis is especially focused on the argument’s embodied actions. Gestures are often closely related to the meaning of concurrent speech (Schegloff 1984, Keltner & Buswell 1997), and can be used to provide additional or supporting information for the meaning of an utterance (Kendon 1995, 2001).

Mary’s hands, in their home position (Sacks & Schegloff 2002), are in her lap. During the argument, Jason’s right hand performs gestures parallel with his speech, while his left hand stays in his lap without assisting his speech. According to Sacks & Schegloff (2002: 137), a home position is part of the sequential organisation of the body in interaction. The main embodied actions, in parallel with verbal speech, are presented in Table 2. The embodied actions and the verbal expressions catching our attention are shown in bold and italics.
Table 2. Embodied Actions in Parallel with Speech.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utterances</th>
<th>Mary's embodied actions</th>
<th>Jason's embodied actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lines 10–13, Jas: I think I’m going to move to Finland.</td>
<td>Turning head to Jason</td>
<td>Leaning head forward towards the recipients and knocking on the table with two fingers while uttering for at least, two years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For at least, two more years.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moving head and shoulder horizontally when uttering he’ll get re-elected while moving his hand laterally above the table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines 16–17, Jas: Cause he’ll get re-elected, so then I have to stay there...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines 18–20, Mar: No, he’s not going to get re-elected.</td>
<td>Shaking head and looking at Jason</td>
<td>Nodding head towards Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 22, Jas: He is.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nodding head towards Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines 23–24, Mar: No, he’s not.</td>
<td>Shaking head and looking at Jason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 25, Jas: He is.</td>
<td>First shaking head, then looking straight at Jason with upper body bending forward towards him</td>
<td>Nodding head towards Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines 26–27, Mar: No ... why are you saying that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines 28–29, Jas: I study politics. [It’s my life].</td>
<td>Looking straight at Jason, shaking head with greater frequency; bending upper body forward towards Jason</td>
<td>Leaning head slightly forward, raising open hand from the table, then putting it down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines 30–31, Mar: I study politics too man, and he’s not getting re-elected.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaning head forward, raising hand from the table higher than in lines 28–29, hitting it down when uttering it’s my life, then making a longer sweep of his hand above the table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines 32–35, Jas: It’s my life. A war always gets ... politicians re-elected.</td>
<td>Slightly turning body orientation away from Jason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines 36–39, Mar: not I - if there’s so many body bags, that - it - covers the White House.</td>
<td>Looking straight at Jason while shaking head</td>
<td>Touching nose by left hand and returning to the home position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines 40–41, Jason: the war in Iraq would never cause that many body bags.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines 42–44, Mary: You have no idea. Nobody knows.</td>
<td>Looking at Jason while tiling upper body backwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The embodied actions in this argument emphasize the speech, upgrade the expression, and display emotion. One common feature is that the speakers tend to lean their bodies forward, towards the oppositional party when making objections. Further, Jason and Mary repeat their gestures in parallel with their self-repetition of words. Mary’s strong opposition leads Jason to legitimize his claim in lines 28–29: *I study politics. [It’s my life]*. In this first saying, Jason leans his head slightly forward, then in line 29 *[It’s my life]*, he opens his right hand, raises it from the table, and puts it down (see Fig. 8). The gesture of putting down the hand co-occurs with the word *life*. When he recycles *It’s my life* (line 32), Jason uses the same posture and gesture as before, but with the distinct difference that he raises his hand higher from the table, and hits it down with an even stronger motion while finishing his recycling on the word *life* (see Fig. 9). Note that the apex of the hand rising in Fig. 9 is higher than that in Fig. 8.

Table 3 extracts Jason’s self-repetition, and its parallel hand gestures corresponding with *It’s my life*, from Table 2.

**Table 3. Jason’s Self-repetition and Its Parallel Hand Gestures.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jason’s self-repetition</th>
<th>Hand gestures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lines 28–29, <em>I study politics. [It’s my life]</em>.</td>
<td>Leaning head slightly forward, opening right hand and raising it from the table, then putting it down (see Fig. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 32, <em>It’s my life</em>.</td>
<td>Leaning head forward, raising hand higher from the table, and hitting the right hand down on the table (see Fig. 9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 8. Raising hand from the table in line 29.
Jason’s stronger gesture concurrent with the saying in line 32 illustrates that emotive and attitudinal stance meaning can be conveyed through the embodied actions (Biber et al. 1999: 967).

When I compare the verbal production with the embodied actions, I find that self-repetition is not only a linguistic phenomenon, but it is also shown by hand gestures to varying degrees. Speakers repeat their hand gestures when they repeat their utterances. And the phenomenon is the same with recycling. Mary challenges Jason’s sense of authority by stating that she studies politics too (lines 30–31). This challenge triggers a stronger defence from Jason, and forces him to recycle his argument in a reinforced manner. In lines 34–35, Jason uses both a stronger verbal expression (with extreme-case formulations) and stronger hand gestures. To make his argument more persuasive, he recycles the lexicon of his main argument points: *it’s my life* and *gets re-elected* (lines 32–35). However, the second time around, he applies the intensifier *always* to modify *gets re-elected* (line 34). This syntactic variation of the recycling makes Jason’s stance stronger. While defending his standpoint with extreme-case formulations and supportive reasoning, he reinforces these expressions with enhanced hand gestures. In his first expression of *get re-elected* (line 16), Jason sweeps his right hand laterally above the table. But on the second saying, he sweeps the right hand with a much longer and faster sweeping motion (lines 34–35). Table 4 and Fig. 10 (a and b) and Fig. 11 (a and b) show comparisons of Jason’s recycling on *get re-elected*, with the parallel hand gestures.
Table 4. Recycling in Verbal Expression and Parallel Hand Gestures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jason’s recycling</th>
<th>Hand gestures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Line 16, he’ll get re-elected,  
| Lines 34–35, A war always gets— politicians re-elected. | sweeping the right hand laterally above the table  
(see Fig. 10)  
| moving the right hand above the table with a much longer sweeping motion (see Fig. 11) |

Fig. 10. (a and b). The right and left side peaks of Jason’s sweeping motion in line 16.

Fig. 11. (a and b). The right and left side peaks of Jason’s sweeping motion in lines 34–35.

The above screen shots display the different lateral ranges of Jason’s sweeping motion in line 16, and in lines 34–35. Based on the previous empirical analyses, I argue that the speakers here repeat and recycle not only their words, but also their
hand gestures. However, the same hand gestures with corresponding linguistic expressions recur with greater emphasis, increased frequency, and wider range as self-repetition continues.

For a better understanding of this phenomenon, we will have a close look at an excerpt from three different speakers in the recording “Oh my God.” Though this piece of conversation is not an argument, it shares some similar features of coordination between verbal cues and nonverbal cues. Moreover, the speakers’ stance in both cases becomes more and more assertive as shown by their more forceful verbal expressions, prosodic cues and embodied actions in the recycling. And the increased assertiveness is the display of frustration. In this excerpt, Rukmini describes her room as ice cold, accompanying the words with gripping gestures. However, her recipients do not respond with any emphatic remarks she has expected. Thus she feels she must recycle her claim with an even stronger gripping gesture for dramatic effect and bringing her complaints to full attention.

Example 4. *My room is ice cold. Freezing.* *(From “Oh my God”)*

```
1 RUKMINI: .. no </F>].
2 GUY:   Yeah,
3       [yeah].
4 RUKMINI: [I can]not understand [2this2],
5 GUY:      [2Yeah2].
6 RUKMINI: you know [3what3],
7 GUY:      [3#3].
8 RUKMINI: my room,
9 GUY:     Yeah.
10 RUKMINI: .. [is ice cold].
   ((Gripping gesture))
11 GUY:   Yeah,
12 mine is ice cold [as well].
13 RUKMINI:  [Freezing].
   ((Gripping gesture))
14 GUY: Mine[2is2] --
15 RUKMINI:  [2It’s2] like goes with a personality,
16       I suppose,
17       but I mean,
18       it’s so,
19       it’s[1cold1],
   1((Gripping gesture))1
20 ..  [2freezing2].
    2((Gripping gesture))2
```
21 GUY: [Yeah],
22 mine --
23 The heating doesn’t work,
24 for some reason.
25 I think the heating’s on this side,
26 (0.5) and like for some reason,
27 [##### [2##2]]
28 RUKMINI: [I will[2um=2]] --
29 ROBERT: [2A=h yeah2],
30 my room’s warm all[3time3].
31 GUY: [3But3],
32 [4mine,
33 RUKMINI: [4So I have to invite people to4] sleep with me,
34 GUY: mine’s cold4].

At first, it appears that Rukmini’s complaint in line 10, though accompanied by a
distinct gripping gesture and a quite exaggerated facial expression, fails to evoke
any sympathy (Fig. 12).

Fig. 12. Frame in line 10.

Guy replies to Rukmini, saying that his room is the same while pointing at the
direction of his room in lines 11–12 (Fig. 12). Here, Guy tries to match Rukmini’s
troubles with his own experience. Guy’s minimal affiliation towards Rukmini’s
complaint does not satisfy her. Since she fails to gain the sympathy she expects,
Rukmini shifts her wording, stressing that her room is really freezing, while
recycling her tightly gripped hand gestures in line 13 (Fig. 13).
Here, the word *freezing* conveys a stronger degree of coldness than the former phrase *ice cold*. At the same time, Rukmini recycles her gripping gestures to strengthen her complaint. Again she fails to receive the sympathy she wants. Guy also emphasizes that his room is cold with the same pointing gesture from line 11 (line 14) (Fig. 13). However, his response is interrupted by Rukmini’s overlapping talk, in which Rukmini competes with him for the third time (lines 14 and 15). In order to receive more attention, she recycles *cold* and *freezing* (lines 19 and 20) with a markedly raised pitch accompanied by upgraded embodied actions. Rukmini first uses the intensifier *so* to emphasize the coldness (line 18), but then she abandons this intensifier, and emphasizes the coldness by exaggerating her facial expressions and making a much more emphatic gripping gesture (Fig. 14 and Fig. 15).
Besides the fact that the gestures used in this recycling get stronger and more expressive, the pitch gets higher as well. The pitch peak on Rukmini’s first saying of *ice cold* is 384.1 Hz, and in the recycle, her peak pitch on *cold* is even higher, reaching 470.8 Hz. We do not consider the F0 of *Freezing*, because it happens in overlapping speech and we cannot get an accurate pitch contour. Here, however, the expression of coldness is upgraded by a markedly raised pitch, a more exaggerated facial expression, and more dramatic hand gestures.

These examples of Jason’s and Rukmini’s efforts show similarity, in that their recipients do not display understanding or acknowledgement towards the speakers’ prior statements. And both speakers respond to this lack of affiliation, or sufficient affiliation as expected by making a second try, with a more forceful expression. They both employ self-initiated recycling accompanied by stronger hand gestures and markedly raised pitch. Their stance of assertiveness increases in the recycling, and clearly displays frustration. These two cases demonstrate that when facing a frustrating situation, the speakers’ stance becomes more assertive and forceful.

The repetition and recycling of gestures is not only related to argument but is also a generic practice. This phenomenon happens in the recording given in Chapter 5, concerning storytelling, and in Chapter 6, concerning teasing. In Example 11, Jason recycles a statement from his story’s climax, using the same syntax with voiced direct reported speech, but with a more emphatic hand stretching motion. In Example 16, Guy teases Rukmini’s for adding one of her students to her Facebook because he is “fit,” and recycles the lines with much more dramatic hand gestures. We will encounter these two examples in the later detailed analyses.

We now resume our analyses of Example 3. In Mary’s speech, her emotive stance is conveyed through a number of verbal expressions, embodied actions (such as body postures, facial expressions, and gestures) and prosodic devices.
(such as pitch and intensity). She displays her frustration by coordinating all these cues of facial expression, hand gesture, words, and posture. During her disagreement in lines 18–21 and lines 23–24, she keeps constant eye contact with Jason while shaking her head continuously. Table 5 illustrates and summarizes the main features of the prosodic features and embodied actions that accompany her verbal expressions.

Table 5. Expression of Active Frustration by Mary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional cues</th>
<th>Syntax</th>
<th>Prosody</th>
<th>Embodied Action</th>
<th>Emotion display</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lines 26–27, No …</td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>Markedly raised pitch, raised loudness, heavy stress on saying and that, falling intonation contour</td>
<td>Looking straight at Jason, head shaking, bending upper body forward towards Jason (See Fig. 16)</td>
<td>Combined use of verbal and nonverbal expressions of frustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why are you saying that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines 30–31, [I study politics] too man, And he's not getting re[2elected 2].</td>
<td>Overlap, other-repetition</td>
<td>Markedly raised pitch, raised loudness, heavy stress on study and man, fall-rise intonation contour</td>
<td>Looking straight at Jason, head shaking, bending upper body forward towards Jason</td>
<td>Combined use of verbal and nonverbal expressions of frustration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 16. Mary leaning upper body forward towards Jason in lines 26–27.
During her utterances of lines 26–27 and lines 30–31, Mary looks straight at Jason while leaning her upper body forward towards him. Then her posture returns to home position at Jason’s turn in line 32. Her home position while talking with Jason at the beginning of the argument is shown as Fig. 17. When we compare Fig. 16 with Fig. 17, we can notice Mary’s distinct posture of leaning forward.

This study proposes that emotional expression in interaction is not isolated; it is co-constructed using all available emotional channels. Emotion in interaction is the combination of the verbal cues, prosodic cues, and embodied actions. In the above-illustrated case of combined verbal and nonverbal expressions of frustration, the frustrated person “lashes out” verbally at the oppositional party. For instance, Mary defends her opinions by verbal expression with markedly raised pitch, increased loudness, and stress on certain words. All this is coordinated with embodied actions such as the tendency to lean her upper body forward towards the target. As Retzinger (1991) observed, the tendency to lean forward in a challenging stance is usually combined with other cues for anger. Jason in turn recycles his gestures in a more distinct manner to amplify his statements. And these heightened gestures in verbal recycling upgrade his own display of frustration. As a result, the prosodic cues and the recycled gestures fit with the words concerned. Frustration, however, can also be conveyed by embodied actions alone. The next section examines the nonverbal expression of frustration.

4.5 Nonverbal expression of frustration

The second segment of the argument runs from lines 46 to 75, which record the continuation of Jason and Mary’s argument. In this segment, Mary displays her
frustration by embodied actions, which form a strong but less-verbalized response to Jason’s arguments. This section analyzes how Jason’s objections lead Mary to display her frustration by embodied actions alone.

The transcript of this second segment, named *It's a technological war, so it wouldn't be a problem*, starts with Jason’s utterance, as follows:

**Example 5. It's a technological war, so it wouldn't be a problem. (From “Never in Canada”)**

46 JAS: I think it would be--
47         It’s a technological war,
48         so it wouldn’t be a problem.
49         ..
50 MAR: I- [if - -]
51         [((points at Mary with an Open Hand Oblique gesture))]
52         [if - -]
53         [((points at Mary with an Open Hand Oblique gesture))]
54 JAS: If,
55         [((points at Mary with an Open Hand Oblique gesture))]
56         [if].
57         [((points at Mary with an Open Hand Oblique gesture))]
58         ..
59 MAR: They lost a lot of casualties.
60 JAS: He would have to,
61         go against,
62         his own policy,
63         and then pull out,
64         and then he'd be a hero for pulling out,
65         he'd still get re-elected,
66         but the odds of him,
67         even having a body bag problem,
68         before his reelection occurred,
69         would be,
70         slim.
71         (2.7)
72 SOP: When's the next elections?
73 JAS: Two Thousand Four.
74 MAR: [Two Thousand Four,
75         (1.6)
A successful argument needs convincing reasoning, and in the first segment, the strategy of simple denial does not resolve the conflict. Jason’s efforts to persuade Mary via his authority over the topic fail, and meanwhile, the argumentation is aggravated. As a consequence, the two disputants start supporting their opinions by different reasoning. Jason first argues, in lines 46–50, that the casualty problem would not be an issue, because this is a technological war. Mary does not take up Jason’s objection about the casualty problem. Instead, she argues that the current situation is different from the 1991 war, in terms of general support for the U.S.-led alliance. Jason’s previous claim was that wars always get politicians re-elected, but he does not go back to defend his previous claim. Instead, he continues pursuing his argument about casualties in lines 54–70. As Jason gives a long monologue from lines 54 to 72, Mary does not argue with him verbally. Instead, she displays her disagreement and emotion through a cluster of embodied actions, which come in sequences.

As Jason concludes his monologue, nobody takes the conversational floor for a 2.7-second inter-turn gap. Then Sophie breaks the impasse by asking a question in line 72. Jason and Mary both try to answer it at the same time.

Mary and Jason are both searching for words. This can be seen in the syntactic changes, such as the several pauses in lines 49, 55, 57, and 66, the restarts in line 46, and truncated intonation units in line 46 and 50. The lines 46–48 (I think it would be- - it’s a technological war; so it wouldn’t be a problem) illustrates a self-initiated repair (Schegloff et al. 1977). The phrase would be indicates the possibility of a technological war, but then Jason changes would be to a stronger statement—it’s. The high point of the argument comes on one of Jason’s turns, when he uses the syntactic structure “if/then” starting in line 54. Grammatically, an “if/then-structure” connects and produces a conditional sentence, which asserts that whenever the antecedent is true, so is the consequent. First, Jason makes a partial concession by referring to Mary’s point that the war will cause lots of casualties starting in line 54: If, (1.3) If. .. They lost a lot of casualties. He would have to, go against, his own policy, and then pull out, and then he’d be a hero for pulling out, and he’d still get re-elected, but the odds of him, (1.2) even having a body bag problem, before his re-election occurred, would be, slim. (2.7). It turns out that using the other party’s reasoning, or respecting the other party’s opinion to support his/her own opinion, can be a powerful way to negotiate. But this is only the first of three stages in Jason’s “If/then” turn. The three stages are:
1. Assuming: He makes a partial concession by using *if* to presume that Mary’s opinion is correct.

   *If, (1.3) If. .. They lost a lot of casualties.*

2. Overthrowing: Next he states that Mary’s opinion is incorrect.

   *He would have to, go against, his own policy, and then pull out, and then he’d be a hero for pulling out, and he’d still get re-elected,*

3. Re-emphasizing: Then Jason restores his own opinion by using *but*.

   *but the odds of him,(1.2) even having a body bag problem, before his re-election occurred, would be, slim.(2.7).*

Jason repairs his *if* twice when he makes the “if/then” utterance (in lines 54, 56). The first *if* is in line 50. And there is a distinct pitch difference between the second repair (line 54) and the third one. Jason repairs *if* the third time after a pause, with a markedly higher pitch along with hand gestures pointing at Mary (line 56). The pitch peak of the second *if* is 200.8 Hz, while the pitch peak of the third *if* is 326.8 Hz. In brief, the lexical and syntactic choices from Jason’s lines in example segments Example 3 and Example 5, such as *always, never,* and the “*if/then structure,*” have left Mary little room for argument. The closing of Jason’s argument drives Mary to a strong display of frustration by embodied actions alone. In what follows, I will analyze Mary’s nonverbal expression of frustration during Jason’s “*if/then*” argument.

As Jason states his “*if/then*” lines, Mary is verbally quiet. She yields the conversational floor, but still replies to Jason’s argument by her embodied actions. Tannen (1984) argued that silences and pauses may actually display tension and high emotion. During Jason’s turn, starting from line 63, Mary first shakes her head twice. Then she puts one hand under her chin and starts avoiding eye contact with Jason. Her embodied actions include the following consecutive withdrawal actions: shaking her head, putting one hand under her chin, bending her head down, blinking her eyes, turning away, and ending eye contact with Jason. She moves the finger of her right hand randomly over the table while she looks quite frustrated (see Fig. 18 and Fig. 19).
Bower et al. (1985: 524) explained that ending eye contact signals rejection in a relationship, and gaze avoidance may signal appeasement to aggression. Retzinger (1991) concluded that a partner in marital quarrelling can express shame by silence and withdrawal, or by hiding behaviours like gaze aversion, false smiling, fidgeting, or vertically wrinkling the forehead. Such withdrawal can be interrupted as passive-aggressive—as a hostile gesture of cutting off emotionally from the opponent. Retzinger’s findings support my claim that Mary’s nonverbal expression of emotion in argument is actually a strong emotional stance.

Judging from her passive-aggressive embodied actions (Retzinger 1991), Mary is not willing to show listenership during Jason’s “if/then” turn, and she displays frustration. Table 6 presents the main embodied actions in parallel with the verbal lines from Example 4.
Table 6. Embodied Actions in Parallel with Speech.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utterances</th>
<th>Mary’s embodied actions</th>
<th>Jason’s embodied actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lines 46–50, Jas: I think it would be--It’s a technological war, so it wouldn’t be a problem. .. I- -if- -</td>
<td>Opening right hand and moving it over the table when uttering It’s a technological war, …</td>
<td>When saying “if,” Open Hand Oblique (Kendon, 2004) gesture pointing at Mary and looking at her (Fig. 20).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines 51–53, Mar: It’s not like, &lt;HI in ninety-one, when they had all the support. HI&gt;</td>
<td>First opening mouth without speaking anything, then abruptly turning head towards Jason.</td>
<td>Looking at Mary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines 54–56, Jas: If, (1.3) &lt;HI If HI&gt;</td>
<td>Looking at Jason calmly.</td>
<td>Open Hand Oblique gesture pointing at Mary twice, raising from the table higher the second time (see Fig. 21).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas: from line 57 to line 72</td>
<td>Eye blinking, avoiding eye contact and ending eye contact. Frustrated facial expression, head shaking and facing down the table, right hand moving randomly on the table. Turning her body orientation away from Jason, supporting her chin with left hand.</td>
<td>Doing different gestures with right hand on the table all the time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 20. Jason’s Open Hand Oblique gesture while speaking the first if, in line 50.
In contrast to Mary’s nonverbal expression of frustration, Jason’s emotional stance is conveyed by the combined use of prosodic cues and hand gestures. When he recycles *if* the third time in line 56, he produces the word at a markedly higher pitch than the first or second times. The same phenomenon has been pointed out by Schegloff (2009), that when previously articulated talk is recycled, the second saying may diverge from the first in various respects, such as change of pitch. In Jason’s argument in lines 54–71, he lifts his hand from the table and points at Mary with an Open Hand Oblique gesture when he utters *if* three times. According to Kendon’s study (2004), when this gesture is used as a form of pointing, it often accompanies a comment about the relationship between the interlocutor and the object. Commonly, the object indicated is a person, and the comment being made is negative. Here Mary is the object. Jason lifts the Open Hand Oblique gesture higher when he repeats the third *if* along with a markedly raised pitch (Fig. 21). By recycling the word with markedly raised pitch and a more demonstrative gesture, I argue that Jason is asking Mary to pay special attention to his argument (Selting 1996, Goodwin & Goodwin 2000).

The nonverbal expression of frustration from Mary is characterized by fidgeting actions like touching her nose as Jason speaks in line 40, or other expressions of tension. However, these nonverbal expressions of Mary’s frustration do not have a visible impact on Jason as he continues his argument. Though there is an impasse in the exchange, and an obvious tension between him and Mary, Jason keeps arguing actively in this segment. Mary’s nonverbal expressions of frustration last until Jason finishes his turn with a long inter-turn gap after line 70.

At this point, there is a 2.7-second gap without anybody taking the conversational floor. During this gap, Mary changes her hand gesture. She stops her fidgeting actions of moving the fingers of her right hand randomly over the table. Instead, she plants her elbows on the table and extends her forearm upward with fingers across under her chin. She then raises her head slightly upwards.
towards Sophie. This action is termed as a cocked position by Schegloff (1984). It is a holding or prepared position, and such a held position can be sustained or broken at various points. This change in hand gestures has quite a significant function in her emotional display in the upcoming argument.

4.6 Mary’s combined use of verbal and nonverbal expressions of frustration versus Jason’s nonverbal expression of frustration

This section will examine Mary’s combined use of verbal and nonverbal expressions of frustration from the perspective of interactional organization, and also show Jason’s nonverbal expressions of frustration.

The third phase of this argument starts after the 2.7-second inter-turn gap in line 76, and it finishes when one party, Mary, withdraws from the discussion. This chapter examines several excerpts of the argument selectively, and in this portion of the recording, the verbal conflict is even tenser after Mary’s strong nonverbal expressions of frustration. Mary resumes defending her opinion again starting in line 79. Her strong arguments, with concurrent embodied actions, lead Jason to his own nonverbal expression of frustration. This part of the transcript, continuing with line 76, is shown as Example 6.

Example 6. *He wasn’t really elected the first time. (From “Never in Canada”)*

076 JAS: And besides,
077 the Democrats,
078 don't have a strong ca[ndidate],
079 MAR: [And we c][2an't2],
080 JAS: [2because2][3their
Alread3],
081 MAR: [3really say e3][4lected again4],
082 JAS: [4XX (two thousand4) [5and eight5].
083 MAR: [5since he was5]n't,
084 really elected,
085 the first time,
086 He took office,
087 but he wasn't elected.
088 (0.8)
089 JAS: But he was elected,
090 according to the Supreme Court.
091 and the court,
092 [(voted)] [2him elected2].
093 MAR: [That--]
094  [They don't--]  
095  But they are not,  
096  who gets to decide,  
097  who's elected].
098 JAS:  [They had] [the right],
099 MAR:  [The pe2] [3ople],
100 JAS:  [3at that time],
101 MAR:  are electing.
102 ..
103 JAS:  [But] [we're not a dir--]
104 MAR:  [The--]
105 JAS:  [2people are the e2]lector [3ate].
106 JAS:  we're not a direct democracy.
108 ..

Jason supports his claim by providing more reasoning in lines 76–78. Mary then shifts the argument from whether Bush will be re-elected, to he was not really elected the first time. This part of the argument (covering lines 79–81) is done in competitive overlap, in which the disputants compete for the next turn to speak (Schegloff 2000). Mary argues that if Bush was not really elected the first time, then we cannot say that he will be elected again, and, therefore Jason's opinion that he will be re-elected is wrong. Mary's line of argument makes concessions to some extent. But Jason does not make concessions so easily. In lines 89–92, he argues that Bush was elected properly according to the Supreme Court.

Considering the interactional organization of these statements, there are lots of “troubles” in this discussion, including competitive overlaps, hesitations, recycling, word searches, repetitions, and so on.

For the rest of the discussion, the two argue over whether the Supreme Court can decide the presidential election, and most of these excerpts are not printed in this chapter. But to summarize, Jason defends his opinion with the following reasons: the Democrats do not have a strong candidate; Bush was elected according to the Supreme Court; and Americans are not a direct democracy. Mary opposes Jason’s opinion with three reasons as well: Bush was not really elected the first time; the Supreme Court cannot decide who is elected; and the people should be the electorate.

Taking the conversational floor has become strongly competitive in lines 79–108. In general, verbal expression of emotion is often associated with competitive turn-taking (Schiffrin 1985). In the resulting overlaps in speech, Mary talks
louder than Jason. It seems she tries to win by a show of acoustic force (Schegloff 2000).

The most distinct emotional cues in this section include Mary’s release of the cocked position she took in line 71, and then her use of an Open Hand Supine gesture (Kendon 2004). Before line 63, both of her hands are in her lap under the table. Then, after Jason’s “if/then” turn, Mary starts to express her emotion by the coordination of prosody, facial expressions, and hand gestures (see Fig. 22 and Fig. 23). Mary looks in Jason’s direction and makes eye contact with him again when she says, [And we c/2an’t2] in line 79. In line 81, while saying [3really say e3]/[4lected again4], Mary turns her head towards Jason, while slightly opening her two hands under her chin. Afterwards, starting in lines 93–94, she releases her hand gestures from the cocked position, and speaks with the assistance of an Open Hand Supine gesture for around one minute and 58 seconds. In general, she maintains this hand gesture with small modulations, following the pitch variation of her speech (Fig. 22 and Fig. 23).

The Open Hand Supine gesture is used in contexts where the speaker is offering, giving, or showing something, or requesting the reception of something (Kendon 2004). Mary’s open hand gestures, accompanied by her loud voice, convey an active attitude for persuading Jason to accept her opinions.

Fig. 22. Mary’s Open Hand Supine gesture for presenting her argument, starting in line 94.
Jason’s confidence in persuading Mary gradually decreases after Mary’s turn in line 107. The most distinct syntactic feature in Jason’s utterance is his use of *but* as a connective for opposing Mary’s argument at the beginning of sentences in lines 89, 103, and 106. The turn-initial *but* expresses his disagreement and presents his evaluation at the same time. But it also functions as a concession. Starting from line 108 to the end of the discussion, Jason’s verbal argument is not as strong as before. Mary takes even more of the conversational floor. Thus, she has gradually become the dominant party.

When Mary becomes more dominant, Jason conveys his disagreement by embodied actions during Mary’s turn in line 158 (Example 7). He shakes his head firmly during the 0.7-second pause when Mary looks at him with her Open Hand Supine gesture in line 159.

**Example 7.**  *We should have just voted again. (From “Never in Canada”)*

```
126 MAR: Did they--
127   It was a travesty,
128   what happened with the Supreme Court,
129   because never,
130   had there ever been,
131   (1.2)
132   a partisan,
133   ..
134   Supreme Court like that,
135   Never had,
136   the Supreme Court split,
137   on partisan lines.
138   so--
139   decisively.
140   ..
141   em--
```
142 I mean,
143 they totally ruined,
144 the Supreme Court,
145 i-- it was.
146 it w--
147 I think it was,
148 one of the most,
149 (0.6)
150 the saddest days,
151 in American History,
152 was when that happened.
153 We should ha[ve just],
154 JAS: [uh'uh] [CREAK]
155 MAR: [voted again,
156 like,
157 why not.
158 (0.7)]
159 JAS: {((SHAKES HIS HEAD FIRMLY TWICE))}.
160 MAR: We—spend--
161 three or--
162 four hundred,
163 billion dollars a year,
164 on military,
166 can't we spend,
167 a few million dollars,
168 so that everybody,
168 votes again,
169 so that the person,
170 that we want,
171 to be the president,
172 is really the president?
173 like,
174 since when does the Supreme Court,
175 have any say in it,
176 whatsoever.
177 (0.6)

In Mary’s long monologue of lines 126–177, she still tries to persuade Jason that the Supreme Court does not have the right to decide the president, and the people should vote again. Jason’s embodied action, namely head shaking, happens during the 0.7-second inter-turn gap in line 159. Before the impasse in line 158, Mary invites Jason to agree with her argument—why not vote again. Jason does not
respond to this. Instead, he directs his orientation away from Mary and shakes his head firmly twice. I argue that the firmness of the headshake and verbal withdrawal from the conversation both suggest Jason’s rejection of Mary’s argument, and display his frustration. This rejection of Mary’s argument does not stop her from continuing. But finally she withdraws from the argument in line 301, when she concludes her statements, pushes her chair backwards, and leaves the table to get tea. Example 8 is the transcript of this section.

Example 8. *Do you guys want tea too.* (From “Never in Canada”)

296 MAR:  Even though it wasn't,
297   the will of the people,
298   and everybody knows that,
299   that wasn't--
300 MAR:  (2.2) {{footsteps}}
301 JAS:  [Do you guys want tea too],
302 JAS:  {{{SIGHS AND LOOKS AT SOPHIE WITH A SMILE}}}.  
303 MAR:  this is a lot of water.
304   ..
305 JAS:  No I--
306   thank you.
307   ..

Fig. 24. Jason’s sigh and smile in line 301.

When Mary withdraws from the argument in line 301, Jason looks at Sophie with a smile, then sighs (Fig. 24). Sandlund (2004) indicates that sighing may demonstrate frustration.

In brief, the significant feature of Mary’s embodied action is that she brings out her two hands, using an Open Hand Supine gesture (see Fig. 22 and Fig. 23). Mary argues with Jason through the coordination of her embodied actions and verbal expressions, using a loud voice. In general, Mary fights to win the
argument through speaking louder than Jason, and by occupying most of the conversational turns, which prevents Jason from making further arguments. Still, neither of the parties is able to win agreement from the other.

The third party, Sophie, does not take part in the argument or show sympathy for either side. Instead, she keeps silent, making somewhat awkward facial expressions while looking at Mary and Jason alternatively. After Jason stops arguing, he displays his disaffiliation and frustration by embodied actions alone (e.g. leaning his body against the wall behind, shaking his head, and sighing). These bodily displays are similar to those we have already seen in Example 5, when Mary displayed her frustration through embodied actions alone.

4.7 Summary

The data from this recorded conversation enable us to closely study the display of frustration in conversational argument. In the exchanges between Jason and Mary, the argument results from differences of opinion, which lead to challenging of statements, disputing of facts, verbal interruption, criticism, and questioning. Thus, the argument leads to displays of frustrations which make reaching an agreement almost impossible.

Argumentative talk, however, shows order and organization no matter how heated it becomes. The argument sequence in this data is consistent with what Retzinger (1991) shows in marital quarrels, where one party takes an aggressor role, the other party becomes defensive, and the quarrellers often switch their roles. In this argument too, the speakers often change their roles, and the defensive party displays his/her aggressive emotional stance by embodied actions.

When we study these verbal and nonverbal means of expressing emotion, we should examine them in context, not in isolation. Emotional expression is a collaborative action of both verbal and nonverbal cues. It is an interaction that is interwoven with all the emotional channels. Though it is hard to link physiology and emotions (Cacioppo et al. 1993), I argue that speakers can convey their frustrations by embodied actions alone. The two channels they use for expression of frustration are verbal cues in conjunction with embodied actions, and embodied actions alone.

Combined verbal and nonverbal expressions of frustration are closely related to competitive turn-taking, competitive overlaps, and interruptions of preceding turns. Frustration is often displayed by the increased assertive stance in the conversation (e.g. the use of extreme case formulations, power wielding). Also,
frustration is often conveyed by a wide pitch span, and high pitch within intonation units. Considering the accompanying embodied actions, speakers use quite serious facial expressions with looking straight at the oppositional party, leaning-forward postures, and reinforced hand gestures to display their frustration. I thus argue that combined verbal and nonverbal expression of frustration is displayed directly by verbal features in conjunction with prosodic features and embodied actions. Speakers also tend to recycle their hand gestures to varying degrees, corresponding with recycling their verbal expressions.

Speakers can also convey strong messages by embodied actions alone. The speakers yield the conversational floor, but display disagreement and emotion through a cluster of withdrawing gestures (e.g. turning away from the oppositional party, ending eye contact, fidgeting movements). Embodied action is thus a significant part of the interactional organization. The nonverbal expression of frustration is a strong response to the oppositional party’s assertive verbal arguments.

The next chapter discusses the accomplishments of shared joy in storytelling, which is another interactional activity shown by recorded data. In the recording of an argument, there were two parties who objected to each other, whereas in the storytelling recording, the storyteller and the recipients collaborate in a joint activity. They affiliate with each other’s emotional displays in order to bring about shared enjoyment. Chapter 5 will present the collaborative activities and the different sequential organization of storytelling compared to that in an argument.
5  Joint Accomplishment of Joyful Moments in Storytelling

This chapter explores how shared joy is conveyed between storytellers and recipients, which is a relatively little investigated phenomenon. It does so by closely examining the interaction of storytellers and recipients in several recorded storytelling conversations. First, the chapter investigates how storytellers try to engage their recipients in entertaining exchanges, using both verbal and nonverbal cues. This shows why these efforts lead to different responses from the recipients. Second, the chapter explores how shared joy in storytelling is enabled through specific verbal expressions, prosodic cues, and embodied actions. The focus here is to explore how joyful moments in storytelling occur as a joint accomplishment between the storyteller and the recipients.

5.1 Introduction

In conversation, we often communicate life experiences drawn from events we have witnessed ourselves, or from stories reported by others. This sharing of experience involves interpreting the meaning of events, or of reported experiences. Naturally, the interpretation of events is open to disagreement. And storytelling can emerge in relation to particular social or political backgrounds, which the recipients may or may not share.

Storytellers can receive a range of responses from recipients, and affiliating responses may be shown through displays of interest, contentment, or joy. A disaffiliating response can involve signals of boredom, dissatisfaction, or even blame. Disaffiliation can also manifest itself in the absence of relevant displays. For instance, a simple absence of an affiliating response of a moment when it would be due is also understood as disaffiliation. These various responses of affiliation or disaffiliation can be expressed by verbal expressions co-occurring with prosodic cues, or simply through embodied actions.

This chapter examines two kinds of experiences in storytelling. The main focus is on storytelling which produces a joyful shared experience. Joyful, according to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, is the state of experiencing, causing, bringing, showing or expressing joy. In general, joyful experiences involve interaction with others. We are joyful because we bring happiness to other people, or gain joy in response to other people or events. In one type of storytelling event
in the date, the storytellers and recipients cooperate to achieve an outcome of mutual joy.

However, it is worth pointing out that there is an overlap between the emotional displays of joy, pleasure, happiness, and amusement. Interactional research so far has not made a clear distinction between these emotions via empirical analyses of actual conversations. In my work and based on my empirical analyses, I regard pleasure as basically synonymous with happiness in general. “Joy” usually represents a higher degree of happiness and the source of joy comes from the gradual expansion of experiencing pleasure and happiness. The display of amusement studied in Chapter 6 of this dissertation reveals that amusement mainly refers to the appreciation of humour.

The jointly shared experience of joy is analyzed in section 5.4. But in a second type of storytelling experience, the recipients avoid participation and distance themselves from the story. This second type is briefly analyzed in section 5.5. Concerning both types of storytelling outcomes, I argue that the recipients’ interactive participation plays an essential role in creating or blocking the shared experience of joy.

5.2 Earlier approaches to the study of storytelling

Researchers in social sciences have contributed much to understanding the structure of oral storytelling. The terms “narrative” and “storytelling” both refer to the relating of stories. “Narrative” is the term most commonly used in sociolinguistics (e.g. Labov & Waletzky 1967, Labov 1972), while “storytelling” is commonly used in conversation analysis and related fields (e.g. Sacks 1992, Goodwin 1996).

Labov & Waletzky (1967) exposed the narrative construction of stories for researchers. They indicated that past experiences are remembered as sequences of events, and these events are verbalized as the primary sequences in storytelling. Stories are generally introduced by an orientation, to set a context, which is accompanied by evaluations of various kinds. In Labov’s model (1972), a fully formed narrative structure tends to unfold through a series of stages. These stages include the Abstract (or brief summary of the upcoming story), the Orientation (the setting of the story), the Complication (the main events leading to a crisis), the Evaluation (an interpretation of the crisis), the Resolution (the conclusion), and the Coda (or explanation of the story’s relevance). According to this
understanding, narrative is a particular way of reporting past events, in which the sequence of independent clauses is interpreted as the order of the events.

Chafe (1994) followed the narrative prototype proposed by Labov, but simplified the structure slightly, to summarize the phases as orientation, complication, climax, denouement, and coda.

Many studies on storytelling have focused on the role of storyteller. Researchers show that the storyteller’s evaluation of events is significant in the storytelling. Evaluation is an element that weaves in and out of the story constantly, indicating why the story is worth listening to or reading (Tannen 1984).

Storytelling is also an emotion-involving activity, and the storytellers’ emotional tone is a crucial part of the presentation. Norrick (2000: 2–5) pointed out that people tell stories as a means of giving cognitive and emotional coherence to experience, or of constructing and negotiating their social identity. He thus shows that storytellers do far more than simply recapitulate their past experiences. They often seem to relive, re-evaluate, and reconstruct remembered experience. In Norrick’s study, evaluation is a disruption of the temporal order of events, performed by the narrator. The storyteller disrupts events in order to reflect upon and express their significance in hindsight. By departing from the temporal sequence, the narrator communicates something more important than a mere recapitulation of events. Norrick (2000) proposed that reported events are most often accompanied by expressions of emotion when they involve personal attitudes, challenges, dangers, or other valenced and non-neutral statements.

Ochs (2004), a linguistic anthropologist, focused on the activity of composing stories. Her research indicated that narrating personal experience consists of two main practices. The first is storytelling practice, which involves presenting experiences in a sensible order. This usually involves explaining how a problem arose, and how it was resolved in some way. The second practice involves a re-considering or evaluating of the experience. Through these practices, narrators can also bring their experiences into moral focus. They may elicit and receive supportive feedback from other participants, which may strongly influence the outcome of their storytelling.

Jefferson (1978) and Sacks (1992) then went beyond analyzing story composition, and focused on storytelling as a social interaction between storytellers and recipients. According to Sacks’s observations, storytellers actively design stories for their recipients, and then the recipients, in turn, collaborate in shaping the stories by their participative responses (Sacks 1992: 230). A great number of researchers have looked at storytelling as a contextualized and
contextualizing activity (i.e. Mandelbaum 1987, Goodwin & Goodwin 1992, Lerner 1992, Sacks 1992, Niemelä 2011). These studies further confirmed that conversational stories are an interactional achievement, usually produced in close collaboration by the interactants (Niemelä 2011: 33). According to Lerner (1992: 248), storytelling is an ongoing accomplishment of all the participants throughout the course of storytelling.

Storytellers often perform enactments of the events they describe, and these enactments may involve the multimodal aspects of reported speech through verbal expressions, prosodic cues, gaze directions, embodied actions, or creative use of the surrounding environment (Goodwin & Goodwin 1990, Sidnell 2006, Niemelä 2011). Niemelä’s study (2011) also proposed that voiced and multimodal enactments in reported speech display the storyteller’s emotional stance.

5.3 Data and objectives

The data for this study comes from two different video recordings and their transcripts, which include four stories.

One story is from “Never in Canada” (Haddington & Kärkkäinen 2003), which was recorded in Oulu, Finland, in February in 2003. In this recording, most of the conversation reflects the current (2003) political and social background, in which a coalition of countries led by the US and the UK had invaded Iraq. The invasion made some Americans living in Finland feel awkward, because many Finnish people opposed the military action. In his first storytelling effort, Jason, an American exchange student, claims himself to be “Canadian” after making a scene in public in Finland. His dramatic retelling of this incident receives excited laughter and compliments from his two recipients. Then Jason further recounts how this unexpected event brought a series of consequences. Then, in a second story, Jason makes fun of himself as an American. One story appears in the recording “Always in Oulu,” recorded in 2008, which happened just as Facebook became popular around the world. In their interactions, the young students tell stories related to social media.

Overall, this chapter shows how the storytellers first set a stage to involve their recipients. Then it examines the sequential positioning of interactions between storytellers and recipients, as they collaborate to enhance their enjoyment. Finally, the chapter offers conclusions as to why different stories, which aim for the same goals of enjoyment and sharing, receive different emotional responses.
5.4 Participants accomplishing joyful moments in two stories

This section will analyze two stories which share many similarities in their interactional organization. In both cases, the storyteller and recipients are able to achieve a powerful experience of shared joy through their story creating exchange. To achieve such joyful moments, storytellers generally try to involve their recipients in the exchange. The recipients join in the storytelling through collective laughter, smiles, head nods, gaze exchanges, questions, comments, collaborative completions of unfinished lines, or by comparing their own experiences to the situations in the story.

5.4.1 First story: Taxi line-up

In the first example, Jason, an American student, is the storyteller. Of the two recipients, Sophie has heard the story once, but she still encourages Jason to re-tell it to Mary. The story is new for Mary. Jason tells about a time he claimed to be a Canadian as a deception. It happened while he and some other exchange students were waiting for a taxi in a long queue at four o’clock in the morning, and the temperature was minus twenty degrees. Instead of waiting in the long queue, Jason and his friends walked up the road to hail a taxi. As Jason relates this story, his two recipients respond with laughter and compliments, contributing to the exchange. This storytelling event can be roughly broken down into four stages, based on the structure of naturally occurring spoken narrative as proposed by Labov (1972) and Chafe (1994). These parts of the event are the preface, the development, the climax, and the denouement with evaluation. According to Chafe (1994), narrative tends to basically follow this prototypical structure, and this determines how the topic is developed.

As this first story is fairly long, I will analyze it in four excerpts, according to Chafe’s structure. First we will analyze the stages of preface and development.

Interactive activities in the story preface and development

According to Sacks (1992: 222), stories are initiated with an introductory preface, which sets a context for the story. The preface offers an invitation to the recipients, suggesting that a story be told, and soliciting the recipients’ approval. The storyteller then sets the stage for the story, describing the time, place, and people
involved. With this type of utterance, the storyteller asks for the right to produce the story in full.

In the following Example 9, we present Jason’s preface and development of his story, and examine the interaction between storyteller and recipients. In the transcripts given below, the utterances which correspond directly with the frame shots in the analysis are shown in italic font.

Example 9.  *Oh, this is great ... The greatest Saturday night, of my life.* (Part one, from “Never in Canada”).

1  SOP:  *This is [coming from Jason who's],*
2    ..<HI> <VOX I’m Canadian VOX></HI>
3  MAR:  *
4  MAR:  *You told people[you were Canadian]?*
5  SOP:  *
6  JAS:  *Oh you didn't hear about that story?*
7  SOP:  *You gotta,*
8    tell the story.
9    ..
10  JAS:  *Oh,*
11    this is great.
12    .. *The greatest Saturday night,*
13    of my life,*
14    by the way,*
15    ..
16  JAS:  *[This]--*
17  MAR:  *[In Fin]land?*
18  JAS:  *Yeah.*
19    So much,*
20    random stuff happens,*
21    to all of us,*
22    that--
23    like you could--
24    make a movie,*
25    like,*
26    [like go out of it,*
27    you know],*
28  SOP:  *
29  JAS:  *it's that random.*
30    (0.7)
31    but it's like,*
32    four thirty in the morning and like,*
33    there are a hundred people,
in a line for a taxi,
(1.2)
and like,
me and Mark,
oh no not Mark,
.. it was me,
[and Marco,
and Jave,
and Tim.]
SOP: [((NODS HEAD))].
JAS: (0.9)
Like so a German,
an American,
a [Spaniard],
MAR: [Spaniard],
SOP: [((NODS HEAD))].
JAS: and an Italian,
right?
.. And we all went[to this]--

Sophie initiates the topic with an announcement to Mary in lines 1–2. She does this by quoting Jason, using voiced direct reported speech (Couper-Kuhlen 1998), trying to produce the voice quality that mimics Jason’s style. According to Couper-Kuhlen (1998: 14), the prosodic cues in voiced direct reported speech are hints of a different stance, and of taking another voice. Sophie says <HI> <VOX I’m Canadian VOX></HI> with a markedly raised pitch. In this utterance, the minimum pitch falls on who’s, with 99.945 Hz before the voiced direct reported pitch. The maximum pitch falls on the word Canadian, with 242.467 Hz, while the mean pitch of the utterance is 158.03 Hz. The special stress on Canadian projects that Jason’s story is specially connected to this word.

In such performances, facial expressions and gestures may also accompany the prosodic cues, in order to intensify the rendition. Sophie speaks with a broad and happy smile, and raises her head towards Mary while uttering Canadian. Her facial expressions and her markedly raised pitch have attracted Mary and Jason to listen with full attention. Mary turns her head to Sophie with a smile after hearing Sophie’s utterance “this is,” and Jason smiles towards Sophie at the same time (lines 1–2), as displayed in Fig. 25.
Mary is possibly surprised by the news that Jason has announced himself to be Canadian, because there is a 1.3-second silence before she turns her head to Jason with a smile.

She asks for his confirmation with a questioning intonation on Canadian in line 4. Heritage (2010) proposed that a declarative question asserts a possible answer to the question with some degree of certainty.

Here, the way Mary designs the question displays curiosity about Jason’s apparent deception.

Also, in line 4, Mary looks at Jason with a big smile and seeks a gaze exchange with him. Then Sophie moves her chair closer to the table (Fig. 26). These gestures and smiles display that the recipients are eager to hear the story.

Sophie responds to Mary’s declarative question by her overlapping laughter (line 5), though Mary is addressing this question to Jason, and looking at him for confirmation (See Fig. 27).
Jason replies to Mary with another declarative question containing the “surprise token,” Oh (in line 6). Here, Jason formulates the question as an assertion to be agreed with. The maximum pitch in this utterance is on the prefacing oh, with a pitch of 294.809Hz, while the mean pitch in the sentence is 142.509Hz. The prefacing oh, conveys some degree of surprise, because it is characterized by markedly raised pitch and extra loudness compared to surrounding units (Selting 1996). Moreover, “oh” marks that the story is newsworthy (Button & Casey 1984: 178). This use of a negative declarative question (an invitation to agreement), together with the expression of surprise, indicates that Jason is eager to share the story with Mary and Sophie.

Without waiting for Mary’s reply, Sophie pushes Jason to retell the story she has heard before (lines 7–8). And in reply to Sophie’s strong request (You gotta tell the story), Jason starts his storytelling in line 10. First he evaluates his upcoming story, saying Oh, this is great. The greatest Saturday night, of my life. This brief preface contains rich prosodic cues and embodied actions, which emphasize the importance of the story. Jason starts the story with the free-standing “oh,” plus more introductory talk (lines 10–15), which signals that he is telling of an unexpected event (Heritage 1998). In contrast to the surprise token “oh” in line 6, this free-standing “oh” starts the story preface with a low pitch of 121.8Hz. Jason then evaluates his event by describing it as the greatest Saturday of his life. In this preface, his markedly raised pitch falls on the word greatest with 212Hz, and the prosodic cues emphasize the importance of the story.

Researchers have shown that story prefacing often contain an evaluative item like great and greatest (Sacks 1992, Goodwin 1996). By delivering such a preface or announcement, the storyteller proposes its importance. As Sacks (1972) demonstrated, moderately positive assessments (for example, “fine”) are understood to indicate that the tellers have nothing important to report, while
markedly positive or negative assessments indicate that the tellers have significant experiences to relate. Norrick (2000) argued that conversationalists tend to expect that stories on new topics should have prefaces constructed to sell them as particularly interesting. Highly evaluative and emotionally loaded words or phrases fill this need.

Jason’s vivid hand gestures which accompany his storytelling start from the beginning of the word *greatest*. I demonstrate his series of motions when he utters the word *greatest* in Fig. 28. In their home position (Fig. 28a), Jason’s two hands are held quite closely together. When he starts the word *greatest*, he lifts his right hand from the table and starts stretching it out (Fig. 28b). While uttering the word *greatest*, he lifts the hand higher, and puts it down on the table (see Fig. 28c and Fig. 28d). At the end of the word, he retrieves his hand to the home position (see Fig. 28e). This gesture draws special attention.

Fig. 28. a) Frame before the word *greatest* starts.

Fig 28. b) Frame in line 10, as Jason starts the word *greatest*.
Fig 28. c) Frame during the utterance of the word greatest on the syllable [ti].

Fig 28. d) Frame during the utterance of the word greatest on [st].

Fig 28. e) Frame after completion of the word greatest.

When Jason utters, *of my life*, the same series of motions happens again. In the whole process, Jason’s specific gesture of lifting his hand from the table and then putting it down is closely related to the prosodic emphasis on special words or sentences. Moreover, this preface performance brings the story closer to the recipients by using the demonstrative pronoun “this,” and using the present tense
(this is great . .. The greatest Saturday night, of my life), which turns the past event into a live broadcast.

Sophie turns her head to Mary with a smile, seeking a gaze exchange, while Jason uses his hand gesture to put special emphasis on of my life in line 13 (Fig. 29). Sophie’s gaze-seeking displays that she is concerned with Mary’s response to the story, because she is the one who called for Mary to receive it.

Mary next joins in the activity by asking Jason about the location of the story (in line 17), which shows her interest. Jason confirms the location, and starts introducing his story with more vivid hand gestures while uttering the word so in line 19, and by further dramatizing the upcoming tale with another evaluation—like you could make a movie. Sophie affiliates with this by smiling and head nodding during Jason’s turn, in lines 25–27.

Jason tells the recipients that he and his friends met a surprise, in which they encountered a hundred people waiting in line for a taxi at four thirty in the morning (lines 31–34). As Jason introduces the people in his story, who are from different nationalities (lines 44–47), Mary cuts in with an overlap repetition (line 48), and Sophie nods her head in support of Jason.

Jason finishes the detailed description of the story’s orientation with the response elictor, Right? (in line 51). Here, he checks whether the recipients are still attentive to his story. The preface and the piling up of unusual orientation details is an effective strategy for generating anticipation in the story recipients. Then, Jason continues with the story itself. Example 10 records how the storytelling develops.
Example 10. What the hell are you doing. (Part two, from “Never in Canada”)

53 MAR: [It sounds like] a joke.
54 JAS: Yeah,
55 [we]--
56 SOP: [8] [@@@@@]
57 MAR: [@@@@@] [((TURNS HER HEAD TO SOPHIE AND EXCHANGES GAZE WITH HER.))]
58 JAS: @@Yeah, (0.6)
59 but we all look at this like,
60 gigantic line,
61 and we're like,
62 what the hell is going on.
63 like eh,
64 this is stupid.
65 and Leena,
66 my kummi,
67 goes to the back of the line,
68 (1.3) and we look at her like,
69 you know,
70 <VOX what the hell are you doing VOX>. (1.3) and it’s customary,
71 in Finland to,
72 wait in a taxi queue,
73 at four in the morning,
74 at negative twenty degrees,
75 .. for like two hours,
76 for a cab,
77 MAR: So,
78 everybody just takes their turn?
79 JAS: Yeah,
80 SOP: [Right]. (CREAK)

Mary looks at Jason with a smile, then jestingly comments on the storytelling with a playful remark on the multinational cast (the three participants in the story are from different nationalities) as though in a stereotypical joke, saying It sounds like a joke (line 53). At first, Sophie goes along with this remark by initiating laughter. Then, Mary joins the laughter, turns her head towards Sophie, and exchanges a gaze with her. Jason responds to Mary’s remark by saying Yeah, and then laughs (Fig. 30). Sophie’s initiation of laughter at this point displays that she affiliates with Mary, and at the same time confirms that the story is funny.
By responding to Mary’s comment with yeah, in line 54, Jason builds a continuation with her preceding sequence, and shows that he recognizes it as a friendly remark.

The event and conflict of the story gradually unfold as Jason’s live-action telling weave in recipients’ evaluations of his story. Some comments are indexed by “like” in lines 60–65, as he describes his shocked reaction towards the gigantic but orderly line of people. In the story, the Finnish girl from his group goes to the back of the long queue (lines 66–68). Jason conveys the surprised reaction of his other group members by quoting their words and voice quality in line 71: (<VOX what the hell are you doing VOX>).

Jason explains that it is a custom in Finland to do this. Here, he depicts a distinct contrast between the peaceful taxi queue at four in the morning at minus twenty degrees, and the shocked reaction of his whole group of friends. Thus, the conflict and the climax are developed in the storytelling. This conflict in the story attracts the attention of the recipients.

Mary suggests a conclusion by asking a question (in lines 79–80): so, everybody just takes their turns? This “so”-prefaced formulation not only extends and summarizes the story’s action, but also, with its rising intonation on the word turns, displays some surprise. Mary uses the well-known convention of displaying surprise with prosodic marking on questions and repeats of prior turns (Jefferson 1972, Selting 1996). Besides displaying surprise, Mary shows her active recipiency by summarizing Jason’s account. According to many studies (Heritage 1985, Drew 2003, Antaki et al. 2005, Hutchby 2007, Danby et al. 2009), such summarizing formulations elaborate or continue the preceding story line,
while also showing or checking that the story recipients understand the teller’s message. Jason confirms that Mary’s summary is correct in line 81. And though Mary’s question is directed only to the storyteller (because Mary turns her head to Jason and exchanges a gaze with him when asking it), Sophie also confirms Mary’s summary following Jason’s confirmation, and overlapping with his continuation in line 83.

In Jason’s technique of storytelling, his perspective switches between “I” and “we,” which shows that the story is not only a personal experience, but also an experience that Jason shares with the others. Moreover, Jason embarks on real-time reporting with phrases like “(be) like,” which helps direct the recipients’ attention to the upcoming illustrations of events (Miller & Weinert 1998, Adolphs & Carter 2003). Such phrases as “be like” can indicate quoted speech, gestures, facial expressions, or mimicry of sounds, which provide speakers a wide range of demonstrative acting-out effects (Buchstaller 2003, Barbieri 2005, Fox Tree & Tomlinson 2008, Jones & Schieffelin 2009). Such devices can re-enact the thoughts, feelings, or attitudes presented, rather than just describing them (Streeck 2002, Fox & Robles 2010).

Table 7 summarizes the main features involved in displaying active recipiency and emotional participation which lead to the accomplishment of shared joy in this case of storytelling. I summarize the coordinated embodied actions and linguistic features involved, because these play a crucial role in the development of storytelling. The summary in the following table indicates that smiles and the exchange of gazes feature in all the exchanges between the recipients, and in most expressions by the storyteller. The only place that Jason drops his smile is between lines 22 to 42, because here he is acting an unsmiling part in the story, and wants to make his account more convincing.
Table 7. Embodied Actions Coordinated with Speech in the Preface and Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utterances</th>
<th>Linguistic features</th>
<th>Embodied actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lines 1–2</strong></td>
<td>Voiced direct reported speech with higher pitch and special stress on Canadian</td>
<td>Smiling towards Sophie and Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smiling and raising her head when uttering Canadian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Line 4, MAR: You told people [you were Canadian]?</strong></td>
<td>High rising intonation on Canadian</td>
<td>Looking at the recipients with a smile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Line 5, SOP: [(h)@@]</strong></td>
<td>Speaking oh with markedly raised pitch</td>
<td>Smiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Line 6, JAS: Oh you didn’t hear about that story?</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrative pronoun: this; Superlative assessment: greatest, of my life</td>
<td>Smiling towards the recipients, upper body is slightly rocking when saying greatest, and special emphasizing hand gestures accompanying the word greatest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Line 7, SOP: You gotta, tell the story.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lines 10–13, JAS: Oh, this is great. The greatest Saturday night, of my life,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smiling towards the recipients, upper body is slightly rocking when saying greatest, and special emphasizing hand gestures accompanying the word greatest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lines 18–47</strong></td>
<td>Dramatic evaluation by “like,” like you could-- -- make a movie</td>
<td>Jason’s smile stops in lines 22–42, using vivid illustrative gestures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smiling and nodding her head constantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Line 53, MAR: [It sounds like] a joke.</strong></td>
<td>Playful joking</td>
<td>Smiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lines 54–78</strong></td>
<td>Jason’s dramatic voiced direct reported speech with a markedly raised pitch</td>
<td>Laughing, smiling, using vivid illustrative gestures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>exchanging gaze with Sophie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAR: So, everybody just takes their turn?</strong></td>
<td>Displaying recipiency and surprise by the formulation</td>
<td>Smiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Line 82, SOP: [Right]. (CREAK)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smiling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, the storytelling is driven largely by the two recipients. Sophie invites Jason to tell the story, while Mary’s display of curiosity and surprise encourages Jason as well. In this storytelling, both the storyteller and the recipients all display their surprise and pleasure by combined use of verbal and nonverbal cues. Jason’s preface introduces the story’s special features, and explains why it is of special value to him. But in this account, both the storyteller and recipients interact with each other, with both verbal and nonverbal exchanges. Their mutual talk is accompanied by constant smiling, which contributes to making the story enjoyable. By smiling, the recipients convey their interest, while the storyteller’s smile indicates that he enjoys sharing the story with them. According to Goodwin & Duranti (1992), facial expressions function as an important resource for framing and organizing a story. The embodied actions such as smiling, laughing, and nodding can express group affiliation and alignment in the joint activity.

Sophie, the story initiator, plays a very supportive role. She actively encourages Jason in verifying the story when Mary questions it. And she initiates laughter when Mary displays disbelief. Sophie affiliates with Jason’s storytelling by nodding her head constantly as he speaks. Stivers (2008) stated that head nods show affiliation with the teller’s stance towards events in the story. Moreover, the recipients join each others’ laughter promptly, and freely exchange opinions on incidents in the story. With all this interactive activity, the storytelling becomes a shared experience.

The next section analyzes their participation in the story’s climax.

**Joint accomplishment of joyful moments in the story’s climax**

The story reaches its climax during Jason’s turn in lines 83–109. In the previous excerpt, Jason described the situation of disagreement between himself and a Finnish girl from his group over the long queue. This disagreement leads to the story’s point of highest drama. The punch line of the story is greatly enjoyed by all, and the recipients display their joy with shared laughter. We will analyze how the speaker and recipients interactively push the story to a climax, and achieve a mutually joyful outcome.

**Example 11. We just don’t do that in Canada. (Part three, from “Never in Canada”)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>JAS:</td>
<td>[S]o I walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>MAR:</td>
<td>So it’s not competitive?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td>[at all]?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>JAS:</td>
<td>[No].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

107
So I walk up,
and I turn around,
and I look at it,
cause I'm really drunk,
.. cause,
I'm in [Finland again],
SOP:  [(h)@]
(0.8)
JAS: and um,
(1.1)
I just look at them,
and I'm like,
(0.9)
<VOX this is the dumbest,
fucking thing,
I have ever seen,
in my entire life VOX>,
(1.1) and everyone turns,
and I'm like,
[<VOX no offense,
(0.7) we just don't do that,
in Canada VOX>.]

((RAISES HIS ARM FROM THE TABLE, STRETCHES IT OUT TOWARDS MARY AND SOPHIE AND SHAKES IT IN FRONT OF THEM WHEN UTTERING DON'T)))

MAR:  @@@@@@@@@ [h]
SOP:  [@@@@@]
JAS:  [And then,
Marco's like],
(0.7) Marco's like,
[<VOX no we don't do that in France VOX>],
((RAISES HIS ARM FROM THE TABLE, STRETCHES IT OUT TOWARDS MARY AND SOPHIE AND SHAKES IT IN FRONT OF THEM WHEN UTTERING DON'T)))

and Tim's like,
[<VOX yeah we don't do that in Austria VOX>],
((RAISES HIS ARM FROM THE TABLE, STRETCHES IT OUT TOWARDS MARY AND SOPHIE AND AND SHAKES IT IN FRONT OF THEM WHEN UTTERING DON'T )))

MAR:  [@@@@@]
SOP:  [@@@@@]
MAR:  ..(h)@@@@@
(0.7) So did you get in li--
Did you jump in line for the cab?
No,
We walked up a road, and hailed one.
.. [Nice].
[(((nod head))]
Took us like,
fifteen minu(h)tes.

Though Mary has already asked whether everybody takes their turn in the taxi queue (lines 79–80), she further builds on Jason’s account by expressing surprise with a second “so”-prefaced formulation in lines 84–85—So it’s not competitive? at all? These recurrent comments display her active recipiency and interest. Her embodied actions also display her active participation. For instance, while she is asking the question, she turns her head to Sophie, exchanging a smile and gaze with her (Fig. 31).

In reply to Mary’s question, Jason tries to give a reasonable explanation for the upcoming turning point—that he was really drunk, being in Finland again (lines 86–92). Sophie gives a gasp and a short laugh following Jason’s explanation (line 93). The story itself is much dramatized, as shown by Jason’s playful and cheerful re-enactment. His punch line (lines 100–108), <VOX this is the dumbest, fucking thing, I have ever seen, in my entire life VOX>, (1.1) and everyone turns, and I’m like, <VOX no offense, (0.7) we just don’t do that, in Canada VOX>, is delivered more loudly than the surrounding lines, and is accompanied by a dramatic gesture. Jason raises his arm from the table and reaches towards the recipients (Fig. 32). And in his voiced direct reported speech (line 100), the superlative adjective phrase, dumbest fucking thing, is delivered, not in anger, but with an amused
facial expression. Jason live-broadcasts this remark in a non-serious but mocking way. Then he reports his apology for this offensive phrase, saying that he explained *we just don’t do that, in Canada.* This mischievous deception makes Mary and Sophie burst into laughter immediately (Fig. 32).

In the story’s next act, Jason describes how his dramatic apology received an immediate series of matching responses from his friends, who delivered the same *we don’t do that* remarks respectively in lines 114 and 116. He does this while recycling the same syntactic structure, direct reported speech, and hand gestures (of raising his arm from the table, stretching it out towards Mary and Sophie, and then shaking his hand in front of them while uttering *don’t*) (see Fig. 33 and Fig. 34). Here, Jason performs what the characters in his story did, rather than just telling what they said (Sternberg 1992, Holt 2000). The story’s two recipients burst into laughter again as Jason mimics the words of the other exchange students and acts out their embodied actions (in lines 111–116, see Fig. 33 and Fig. 34). His recycling of both the first saying and its associated hand gestures enhance the dramatic aspect of the story, and bring the group to a peak of shared joy and amusement. Niemelä (2011) discussed Jason’s enactments from the point of view of resonance (of both verbal and bodily means).
After their collective laughter, Mary encourages the storytelling again by asking a third reciprocal inquiry—of whether Jason and his friends jumped the queue for a cab (lines 120–122). Jason replies with another unexpected line, saying that they walked up the road and hailed a taxi. In a laughing voice, Mary nods her head in affirmation, saying *Nice* in line 126. Sophie affiliates with Mary’s assessment by nodding her head until Jason finishes his turn in line 129 (Fig. 35).
This enjoyable exchange has achieved the collaboration of speaker and recipients. A pleasurable storytelling event must succeed in attracting the recipients, and Jason manages this very well. Up to this point, his storytelling runs smoothly. He places the entire activity in the present tense, and embarks as if in a real-time report, using direct reported speech to bring the story to life while acting out the original scenes.

In the story’s climax stage, the recipients actively participate in the storytelling. They support the storyteller by listening attentively, and displaying their emotional involvement through loud laughter, smiles, nods, gaze exchanges, and direct verbal compliments. The interactive communication between the teller and recipients helps the story to become an event of shared pleasure, thus reaching a joyful conclusion.

The active collaboration from recipients gives the storyteller support, and Jason responds with greater emotional involvement, as shown by the combined use of verbal and nonverbal cues. At the story’s punch line (see Fig. 32 above) in line 107, he portrays a surprised facial expression, with eyebrows raised and eyes widened. His raised voice and hand gesture coordinate with his verbal expression of voiced direct reported speech. This distinctive technique in delivering direct reported speech has been widely studied by researchers who analyze talk-in-interaction using conversation analysis (Goodwin 1990, Holt 1996, 2000, Couper-Kuhlen 1998, Sidnell 2006, Clift 2006, Holt & Clift 2007, Niemelä 2011). Several scholars, including Holt (1996, 2000), Holt & Clift (2007), and Niemelä (2011), have proposed that directed reported speech is not only a repetition of an utterance made on a previous occasion, but also conveys the attitude or stance of the current speaker. Here, the stance conveyed in Jason’s storytelling is ‘amused’.
Moreover, the storyteller intensifies the significance of events in the story by using extreme case formulations like the greatest, gigantic, hell, completely, all, dumbest.

**Reciprocal confirmation in denouement**

The storytelling event does not finish with the story’s conclusion, but continues with a denouement. As previous researchers point out, the participants continue commenting and reflecting on the story after it ends. They discuss the meaning of the recounted event, and thus evaluate it, as shown in Example 12.

**Example 12. You fight for your cab. (Part four, from “Never in Canada”)**

130 MAR: That’s funny.
131 ...Yeah,
132 [I guess I wouldn’t--
133 ...stand in a line like that].
134 [((EXCHANGES GAZE WITH SOPHIE))]
135 [I would]
136 JAS: [It’s so] [2cold2].
137 SOP: [2That would2][3not happen back home3].
138 MAR: [3go to a different3]--
139 JAS: No.
140 MAR: No.
141 You have to--
142 You have to get out there and
143 SOP: and fight for your--
144 MAR: You fight for [your cab],
145 JAS: [Exactly].
146 MAR: @@@
147 JAS: It’s a--
148 It’s a much nicer system,
149 if it wasn’t like,
150 negative twenty degrees,
151 and you’re drunk,
152 and you have to use the bathroom,
153 and everything,
154 cause you’re,
155 you know,
156 (1.2)
157 MAR: [Yeah].
158 SOP: [{(NODS HEAD TOWARDS MARY)}]
159 JAS: [X]
160 (1.7)
161 MAR: Yeah.
162 (1.2)
164 SOP: @@
165 JAS: But—
166 SOP: Good story.

The story recipients discuss what would be a proper response to the situation of a long taxi queue at minus 20 degrees. They both align with Jason, agreeing they would walk up the road and hail a taxi rather than wait in the line.

Mary makes an assessment, *That’s funny* in line 130, as Jason tells them it took only fifteen minutes to get a taxi. The short period for getting a taxi on the road makes the Finnish custom of waiting in line for more than two hours sound pedantic, though the speakers do not say so directly. As happens in the preceding interactions (such as line 85), Mary shares her opinion with Sophie while exchanging a gaze with her (lines 132–134) (Fig. 36).

**Fig. 36. Frame in lines 132–134.**

Without waiting for Mary to complete her statement, Jason supports her opinion by giving another reason for his actions in the story (in line 135). Sophie and Mary agree (in lines 136–144) that they would get out of the queue and fight for a cab. Jason affiliates with their stance, and displays his appreciation in line 145 by saying *exactly*. In return, Mary displays her agreement with laughter. In all these sequences, the three participants affiliate with each others’ statements by collaboratively completing the prior speaker’s turns.
Jason provides a summary for the story’s events in lines 147–153. Mary and Sophie express their understanding, and the storytelling event completes with Sophie’s direct verbal compliment in line 166, *Good story*.

In these exchanges, the speaker and recipients exhibit reciprocal acceptance and appreciation for each others’ points of view throughout the exchanges. They actively complete each others’ statements (in lines 143–144). And the recipients use formulations to display their active recipiency. Without such active collaboration from the recipients, the story could not reach its intended effect of shared joy. But with such participation, the story becomes far more humorous. Jason masters the sensitive topic of declaring himself to be Canadian rather than American in Finland. In doing this, he strikes a confident balance between humour and seriousness.

**Summary**

As has been established in earlier research and as shown in this survey, storytelling is not a monologue. Without close collaboration from the recipients, the story cannot reach a mutually joyful outcome. The emotional displays of the storyteller and of the recipients are closely connected. Jason’s use of superlative assessment in the preface and his extreme-case formulations in the story dramatize his recounting, and attract the recipients’ interest. In addition, the voiced direct reported speech and real-time enactment, co-occurring with a markedly raised pitch and amusing gestures, further dramatize the telling. The two recipient’s emotions are expressed by direct verbal compliments (lines 126 and 166), but far more often they participate through embodied actions, mainly smiles, laughter, interested facial expressions, and head nods, which accompany their own verbal expressions or overlap the words of other speakers.

Now let us summarize how the recipients help to push the story to a climax. We first look at Mary’s emotional participation in the storytelling.

Mary shows her curiosity starting with her first declarative question, asking for confirmation in line 4: *You told people [you were Canadian]?* She becomes quite cheerful while making the playful remark in line 53—*[It sounds like] a joke.* Her immediate subsequent laughter, which is joined by Sophie, tells Jason that they enjoy his storytelling. In the climax lines, Mary’s emotion becomes quite lively and positive, which is shown by her spontaneous laughter, formulations of the story, and direct compliments. She later initiates an evaluation (lines 130–134), where she looks back on the event and offers her empathy: *That’s funny. .. Yeah, I*
guess I wouldn’t--.. stand in a line like that. [I would] [3go to a different3]- -. She conveys her close personal involvement with an “I” message, here and in line 134.

Sophie also plays a very important role as the supporting actor, and an active story recipient. She initiates the story by mimicking Jason’s voice and facial expressions. In what follows, she attracts Mary to become the story recipient. By playing her dual role, Sophie shows great interest in the storytelling, though she has heard the story before. Her laughter aligns with Jason’s as he recounts the story. She joins in the telling through active embodied actions such as gaze exchanges with the other recipient, showing affiliation by joining in the laughter, and nodding her head in affirmation of the current speaker. A similar case is shown in Example 13, which gives further support for my argument.

5.4.2 Second story: Grandma and Facebook

To further illustrate how storytelling reaches a joyful conclusion for both tellers and recipients, I briefly analyze another story which is told by different speakers.

This second story is taken from transcripts of a video-recording called “Always in Oulu.” In this series of recordings, four girls are discussing whether they would like people to put up their photo albums on Facebook. The Spanish girl (Cassandra) tells her grandma’s reaction when she saw Cassandra’s pictures on Facebook. The preface and the punch lines are shown in italic font.

Example 13. Example 5–5: We were talking by a Skype, and my grandma begin to say like, Niña. What the hell are you doing. (From “Always in Oulu”)

1 JENNY: I don’t really have problem with people seeing <CREAK> my albums </CREAK>,
2 or pictures,
3 [I mean] I wouldn’t put anything up,
4 EDITH: [Yeah].
5 JENNY: that I’m like ashamed [<CREAK> o=f </CREAK>].
6 CASSANDR: [You=] don’t have problems till your grandma see your pic [2tures2].
7 EDITH: [2## #grandma2] --
8 JENNY: [2Why does your2] grandma have a Facebook?
9 CASSANDR: Because my sister has a Facebook,
10 and she was showing my family.
(H) How much @fun, and how [beautiful is Oulu].

[((HANDS SLAP AGAINST THIGHS))]

(0.4) So=, [they went] @to a picture=,

VIOLA: [Oh=].

CASSANDR: where I’m fighting with my #ma=n.

And it’s looking like whatever.

1.1) % [So] my grandma just --

EDITH:

CASSANDR: we were talking by a Skype,

and my grandma begin to say like,

(H) (0.9) {<F><L2>VOX Niña </L2>}. What the hell are you doing </F>.VOX>

(H) I didn’t educate you to be @such @a --

[((FLIES HER ARMS IN THE AIR, MAKES GRIPPING GESTURE, THEN LANDS HANDS ON THIGHS.)).

EDITH: (0.9) @Friendly [8girl].

CASSANDR: [{(FLIES ARMS IN THE AIRS THEN LANDS HANDS ON THIGHS)}]

EDITH: [2000002]

JENNY: [2Friendly girl12].

VIOLA: [2000002]100

CASSANDR: [2000 @Yeah2]

[{{STRETCHES HER ARMS FORWARD IN THE AIR, AND HANDS SLAP THIGHS}}

@0].

JENNY: @0

VIOLA: @H)

JENNY: Oh,

the things Face[book] will do to you.

CASSANDR: [{(HAND SLAPS THIGH)}]

JENNY: They say that like it’s so bad,

when you’re looking for a job?

(0.3) That every|one li)ke,

EDITH: [Yeah].

In lines 1–5, Jenny and Edith affiliate with each other, agreeing that they would not put up any photo albums in Facebook. Cassandra joins the discussion with a smile, and proposes a story in line 6: Her preface is provocative, and contrary to Jenny’s statement in line 1 that she does not really have problems with people seeing her albums or pictures in Facebook. It immediately arouses the curiosity of the recipients, because it clearly implies a story involving both a grandmother and
Facebook. This event is unexpected in general, because we do not often connect elderly people with Facebook.

Cassandra’s story starts with a marked repetition (line 6) that cites Jenny’s comment (from line 1): [You=] don’t have problems till your grandma see your pic[2tures2]. Jefferson proposed that such “an ‘embedded repetition’ locates, but does not explicitly cite, the element of prior talk which triggered the story” (1978: 221). Cassandra repeats and also adds to Jenny’s line, by delivering her surprising comment concerning her grandmother.

Before Cassandra can even complete her sentence, Edith and Jenny simultaneously inquire (with markedly raised pitch) why Cassandra’s grandma has a Facebook page. The primary stress in their lines is on the word grandma (lines 7 and 8). Their lines not only overlap each other, but also overlap with the completion of Cassandra’s announcement. In response to such interest, Cassandra immediately tells the story behind her comments. While mimicking her grandma’s voice with extra-loud, voiced direct reported speech, Cassandra acts out her grandma’s comments vividly. Her enactment involves waving her arms in the air, making a gripping gesture, and then clapping her hands against her thighs several times (lines 23–25). The same kind of dramatic acting has happened in the first story told by Jason, in which he acts out the scene from his taxi event as well.

In line 23, Cassandra mimics her grandma’s shouting voice in calling her by name, Niña. This shouting is concurrent with the arm waving gesture shown in Fig. 37.

![Fig. 37. Frame on the word Niña (line 23).](image)

Closely following this waving gesture, Cassandra dramatises her mimicry of her grandma’s words by acting out a gripping gesture on the word didn’t (in line 25), as shown in Fig. 38.
The story reaches its climax point with the storyteller’s dramatized acting and the collaboration of the recipients. Cassandra is searching for words to describe her grandma’s accusation, when Edith collaboratively completes her turn with a laughing voice (line 27)—(0.9) *Friendly [@girl]*. Edith’s collaboration becomes the punch line of the story. The other speakers all join the laughter. And Jenny re-emphasizes the joke by repeating Edith’s exact words in line 30. Cassandra welcomes this completion of her story by laughing, and making an accepting gesture of stretching her arms in the air, then taking them back, turning palms towards her face, and confirming Edith’s conclusion by saying “Yeah” (Fig. 39).

This storytelling event, though short compared with the first one, shares many of the same features. In both events, the tellers act out the scene in the story through coordination of voiced direct reported speech and dramatic embodied actions. The tellers and recipients join in, creating a joyful exchange. They respond to the
story’s preface with some surprise, participate through shared laughter, add expansions to the story, and raise questions for the storyteller to answer. The teller coordinates with the recipients’ responses. And all the participants evaluate the story actively, displaying appreciation of each others’ points of view.

The following section will compare these two successfully told stories with two other stories, in which we experience a failure of participation.

5.5 Recipients’ withdrawal from active participation

The next set of examples show a different situation, where the storytelling does not achieve such participatory enjoyment. This sequence involves two related stories, both shared by Jason, Mary, and Sophie in 2003. One story leads to the next. As Sack (1992) describes it, storytelling often leads to a “second story,” which is triggered by the first one, and shares some point of resemblance. In this case, both of these stories fail to gain the acceptance or participation of all recipients.

The first story of this series is told by Mary, as a means of criticizing Jason for his wrongdoings. Prior to this transcript (in lines not included here), Mary and Jason had an argument because Jason had used three washing machines in the laundry room, all at the same time. This broke a laundry room rule, and made other students wait to use a machine. Mary points out Jason’s wrongdoing in lines 2–4 *(That’s- - Yeah , That’s <HI two.. times too many HI>*). Jason, however, objects to this criticism in a playful manner. Mary then tells a story which I call *The American way stinks*.

After Mary’s story, Jason gives a critical reply, and then proposes to tell a second story, hoping to amuse the recipients. Both of these stories involve commentaries on signs which read “The American way stinks.” Mary saw such signs at a protest meeting, while Jason saw the same message written in a public washroom. He responded to the sign by turning to the other people in the washroom and saying, *I’m American, and it kinda does stink*. Example 14 is a record of the first story told by Mary. Then Example 15 presents the story told by Jason.
Example 14. The American way stinks. (From “Never in Canada”)

01 JAS: I've only done it twice.
02 MAR: That's--
03 Yeah,
04 That's <HI two..times too many HI>.
05 SOP: [((GIVES JASON AN AMUSED LOOK))]
06 [(1.5)] ((CRINKLING OF WRAPPER BEGINS))
07 MAR: Careful.
08 SOP: @@
09 JAS: It is not,
10 two times too many.
11 (0.6)
12 X: X
13 MAR: ((SHAKES HEAD))
14 MAR: The American way.
15 You know I saw,
16 at the protest this weekend,
17 there was--
18 one of the signs--
19 these ladies were--
20 .. they had these signs pinned .. to their--
21 back of their coats,
22 and it said uh,
23 (1.5) The American way stinks.
24 ..That's what it said
25 JAS: Those are everywhere,
26 Actually,
27 I have a great story about that,
28 [(CRINKLING OF WRAPPER ENDS)]
29 Can I--
30 ..
31 uh..
32 no thank you.
33 SOP: I'll have one later.

Mary initiates this conversation with a critical comment on Jason’s earlier transgression with the washing machines. She produces her opening remark with a markedly raised pitch (lines 2–4). Sophie then endorses Mary’s commentary by giving Jason an amused look (Fig. 40).
Jason objects to Mary’s critical remarks by using a combination of verbal and nonverbal cues. He responds to her teasing by a partial repetition of Mary’s words and syntax, using a disapproving tone. This is accompanied by a defensive gesture of folding both arms together across his chest, during lines 9–10 (Fig. 41).

Mary responds to Jason’s objection by shaking her head. Then she tries to make Jason understand that his behaviour was wrong by telling a story. She tells her recipients that she saw a sign at a protest meeting (lines 14–15). Her punch line reveals what the sign said: *The American way stinks*. She looks at Jason while giving the punch line, which clearly indicates that Jason is the recipient of this message (Fig. 42). By implication, Jason’s behaviour in the laundry room gives credence to this protest sign.

At this turn of events (in line 23), Sophie responds with a typical display of surprise, with widened eyes, raised eyebrows, opened mouth, and a gasp (Plutchik 1980) (Fig. 42). Jason responds to Mary’s story first by holding a defensive folded-arm posture—from line 4 until Mary finishes her story (Fig. 40, Fig. 41, Fig. 42). This gesture puts a barrier between him and Mary. He defends himself in
two ways—by treating Mary’s criticism as a joke, and by holding his self-protective arms-crossed posture.

Next, Jason replies to Mary’s story of the protest sign, saying *Those are everywhere*. Compared with Sophie’s surprised reception of Mary’s story, Jason treats it as utterly unsurprising. He claims that signs saying “The American way stinks” are quite common. By this evaluation, Jason downgrades the novelty of Mary’s story to the commonplace. Also, his use of the deictic “those” seems to suggest that the protest sign’s message does not apply to him—as if to say, “I don’t belong to that category.”

Jason then proposes to reply with a story of his own (in lines 26–27), which is given in Example 15. His preface implicitly indicates the story’s significance in the same manner as his preface in Example 9. Here, his preface leads to a “second story.”

**Example 15. I’m American, and it kinda does stink. (From “Never in Canada”)**

34 JAS: At Kaarle (/kareli/),
35 or whatever,
36 the bar (/<L2>baari</L2>/) in town?
37 SOP: [Yeah].
38 JAS: [I was],
39 just completely drunk.
40 like my second weekend here,
41 and I had gone to the bathroom,
42 (0.7) and I'm like,
43 (0.8) looking around you know
44 and I’d--
45 ((KNOCKS FINGERS ON THE TABLE))))
I'd look at the faucet, and it says <vox the American way stinks vox>, and I laugh. I'm like, ha ha, and all the like, guys look at me you know, <VOX I'm American,>
And it kinda does stink VOX>, And I swear to you, I'm like, they all stop using the bathroom, and like, just turn to me, when I say I'm American, I thought I was gonna get my ass kicked.

MAR: You're [kidding].
JAS: No.
MAR: [Maybe] they just thought it was weird, that somebody was speaking in the bathroom.
JAS: Yeah, And I made eye contact with everyone.
SOP: @(h) [@(hx)]
MAR: [Yeah],
SOP: [2while they were peeing?2]
SOP: [2@2] [3@3]
MAR: [3That probably freaked them out3].
SOP: @(h)
(1.4)
JAS: I don't know.
(2.9)
Wh[atever].

In this storytelling, Jason gives a detailed description of his encounter with an anti-American sign in the men’s washroom. He tells the story and delivers his punch lines with dramatized acting. He sets up the story by painting a situation in which he was completely drunk, and stumbled into a confrontation in a bathroom.
Jason acts out the punch line using voiced direct reported speech, with a markedly raised pitch, and he vividly performs the actions of various other figures involved in the story through direct reported speech, using phrases such as “be like.” He conveys both the verbal and nonverbal interactions between himself and other people in the bathroom, demonstrating the qualities of laughter, gaze, and other embodied actions which took place. Grammatically, Jason pulls the recipients closer to the action by using the present tense. In general, the story is laughable, and the technique Jason uses is similar to that in his first story we analyzed.

However, in contrast to Jason’s first story (of the taxi line-up), this time the recipients do not start to laugh or ask questions, either before or after the completion of the punch line (lines 54–56). Without receiving any show of understanding or appreciation, Jason continues the storytelling. He offers the recipients more opportunities to respond, and upholds the reliability of the story by giving evidence of its factuality (lines 57–63). Unfortunately though, this storytelling does not occasion laughter or any appreciation from the recipients. Instead, there is a 0.9-second inter-turn gap after the completion of the tale.

Mary then questions the reliability and seriousness of this story in line 65, saying *you’re kidding*. She suggests that the events Jason relates are unlikely. After Jason tries to confirm the story’s veracity, Mary offers a reasonable guess (in lines 68–69) that the men in the story were just reacting to the oddness of Jason speaking in a public washroom. This guess downplays the novelty and humour of the story, by suggesting the event was just a misunderstanding. Jason insists that the story is serious, and he really did tell people, *I’m American, and it kinda does stink*. He insists that the men in the bathroom reacted strongly to his declaration.

Though Jason admits that Mary could be right about a misunderstanding (line 71), he rejects Mary’s explanation in lines 68–69. Instead, he further defends his account by emphasizing that he really spoke to the others and made eye contact with everyone in the washroom (line 72). This detail seems to confirm the authenticity of the story.

Only one recipient, Sophie, laughs—not after the immediate completion of the story’s punch line, but in the course of the exchange between Jason and Mary. Sophie’s laughter occurs well after the completion of the story. And Mary rather pointedly declines to join Sophie’s laughter. Though the story sounds quite comical, Mary casts doubt on the real reason why Jason got such treatment.

Jason’s second story does not reach the level of participation and enjoyment he hopes for. In his preface, he claims to offer a “great story,” but cannot deliver
this, largely due to lack of collaboration from his recipients, even though he acts out the fun aspect of the story very well. Mary has several reasons for declining to join Sophie’s laughter. First, Jason’s persistent defensive arms-crossed gesture and his verbal objections have already displayed that he refuses to accept Mary’s criticism. This has already shown that he does not want to collaborate with Mary. Also, Jason tells his story as a counter to Mary’s criticism. As a result, he fails to involve his audience in creating an event of shared pleasure or joy.

In contrast to this study’s first and second stories, the recipients in the third and the fourth stories respond by distancing themselves from the storyteller. This negative response is shown in two main ways: 1) by remaining silent as the story unfolds, even if some other recipients laugh at the story, and 2) by actively showing non-participation through embodied actions or critical comments.

5.6 Summary

This chapter sheds new light on how storytellers and recipients interact to achieve shared joy through a coordination of verbal expressions, prosodic cues, and embodied actions. It especially shows that joyful moments in storytelling depend on gaining the willing participation of recipients. In successful storytelling, the recipients display affiliation and enjoyment by giving direct positive verbal assessment, by collaboratively adding to the story, laughing supportively, nodding their heads, exchanging gazes, or by smiling. But when the story fails to involve the recipients, it cannot reach its goal of shared joy. The recipients do not join in the laughter initiated by others, and do not collaborate with the telling, either verbally or nonverbally. In the first storytelling by Jason, we have a special “supporting actor,” Sophie, who has heard the story before, but still encourages the storyteller to tell the story. Sophie plays a subtle role as both a teller and recipient, even though, she does not tell the story on behalf of the storyteller. She only takes part in the telling by head nodding and offering encouragement while the speaker is telling the story, in order to demonstrate that she knows and approves of the story.

This study also indicates that the device of voiced direct reported speech, with accompanying re-enactment of gestures, tends to produce the maximum effect of shared joy in storytelling.

The prefices of these four stories share similar characteristics. Here I illustrate all the four prefices from the four stories:
1. JAS: Oh, this is great . . . The greatest Saturday night, of my life.
2. CASS: [You=] don’t have problems till your grandma sees your pictures?
3. MARY: The American way. You know I saw, at the protest this weekend.
4. JAS: Actually, I have a great story about that.

These prefaces all project the nature of the forthcoming story, and indicate how the storyteller wants the story to be understood. The preface of a story indicates how the teller wants the story to be received, and whether the story is intended as serious, or for amusement. Moreover, the specifics of the story preface tell the recipients what types of response will be appropriate at the story’s completion (Sacks 1992). The prefaces to stories 1, 2, and 4 clearly show an expectation of reciprocal enjoyment, or surprise. The storytellers show rather than tell the recipients what was happening through voiced direct reported speech and reported speech (e.g. “(be) like”). In doing so, they give the recipients direct access to the scene being described (Holt 1996, 2000). The tellers reenact their own conduct and that of others through the deployment of direct reported speech, prosodic cues, and embodied actions. These reenactments create “moments of heightened co-participation” (Sidnell 2006: 390).

The first two stories in this study reach their goals of shared pleasure and joyful moments because the recipients duly receive the story with surprise as designed by the preface, and collaborate in displaying their appreciation. They express their joy by interactive activities like laughing, smiling, gaze exchanging, or giving positive evaluations. In the first story (of the taxi line-up), all the recipients collaboratively evaluate the story, either verbally or nonverbally. Their responses match the teller’s expectations as stated in the preface. They join each other’s laughter, or affiliate with the laughter by head nodding. The recipients engage in the storytelling, for instance, with “so”-prefaced formulations for inquiring and for demonstrating understanding. The same phenomenon happens in the second story (Grandma and Facebook). In both of these cases, the recipients not only interact with the storyteller, but also with each other.

The third story (of the anti-American protest meeting) is designed to point out the wrongdoings of the recipient, and the recipient responds defensively. Finally, the fourth story (of Jason in the washroom) generates some interest from recipients, but fails to achieve shared joy, because one of the recipients withdraws from active participation. This suggests that a story cannot achieve the joyful moment without the collaboration of all, or at least most of the recipients.
In conclusion, these examples of storytelling conversations offer detailed insight into the ways storytelling becomes an interactive exchange between the speakers and recipients. In the multiparty activity of storytelling, the different degrees of involvement from recipients can decide if the story communicates, or if it fails to create a shared experience of joy.

Chapter 6 will study another interactive activity—teasing.
6 Embarrassment and Amusement in Playful Teasing Activities

We all unavoidably experience being teased and also teasing others for various reasons in our everyday lives. It is fascinating to study how teasing operates and how the teased person responds by using a variety of combined verbal and nonverbal cues. Since teasing can be hurtful, it is interesting to observe why it often brings about shared amusement instead. Though both the teaser and the teased person may experience embarrassment in some circumstances, the complex interaction of teasing can also become a means of mutual amusement.

6.1 Introduction

The verbal activity of teasing usually involves mocking but playful and humorous jibes against others (Drew 1987: 219). Teasing activity is artful work, which often conveys messages in an incongruent way. It generally involves saying things that might seem improper or negative towards the recipient, but in a way that expresses an opposite message of amusement and shared humour.

Teasing varies in different social settings (Pawluk 1989), and this study explores diverse teasing activities as people talk informally in daily life. The study uses video-recordings where teasing occurs among several groups of people. The data reveals that teasing plays a significant role in social interaction, because it brings about a shared experience of pleasure and amusement. Teasing also involves multiple potential interpretations and tends to involve close interaction between teasers and tease recipients.

In this data collection, the playful humorous jibe is often a pun or play on words, with a personal target. The tease recipient often plays along with the jibe, so the teasing is reciprocated by a series of jesting responses.

In playful teasing, teasers deploy humorous tactics which signal that the remarks should not be taken as seriously negative criticism. The nonverbal activities often coordinate with the verbal expression, which helps remind the tease recipient that the remarks are aimed for amusement.

Very often, such teasing activities provide amusement or entertainment in social activities. Amusement is the state of being entertained or pleased. It is usually associated with enjoyment, laughter and pleasure. The sequential development of expressions for amusement can be slightly different from emotional displays of pleasure, or joy. Amusement is more related to funny or
comedic events. Amusement arises in many situations in daily life—when someone tells a funny joke or a story, while playing a game, watching a comedy, or when an amusing accident unexpectedly happens. However, very rarely have researchers into teasing paid attention to the amusement side of this activity. This empirical study explores this almost untouched field.

This chapter studies the complex messages used by both teasers and tease recipients. It examines how teasing activities are conducted via the coordination of verbal and nonverbal actions, from the perspective of both the teasers and the teased persons. The findings show that laughter, hand gestures, and other embodied actions not only enrich the verbal expression, but also play an essential role in the teasing activity. The nonverbal cues contribute to greater amusement of the verbal activity. In such a multi-levelled exchange, jointly achieved amusement can overcome feelings of embarrassment in the teasing activity.

6.2 Literature relevant to teasing

In this review, I focus on the empirical study of teasing as a social interaction and briefly introduce related studies in psychology. These social science disciplines share a great deal of common understanding about teasing.

Teasing has been investigated in a range of social settings. Researchers have analyzed the content of teasing that arises in everyday adult conversations (Drew 1987, Straehle 1993, Haugh 2010), in parent-child interactions (Schieffelin & Ochs 1986, Dunn & Brown 1994), teasing in different cultures (Eisenberg 1986, Schieffelin 1990), teasing among female adolescents (Eder 1991, 1993), children’s teasing (Langevin 1997, Voss 1997), and teasing in institutional discourse (Partington 2008, Geyer 2010). All these studies reveal that the recipients of teasing respond in a wide range of possible ways, depending on the social context.

Most researchers have studied teasing in terms of its social functions across cultures. Also, they have focused on the positive functions of teasing. Schieffelin (1986, 1990), who has analyzed adult-child interaction from tape-recorded and transcribed spontaneous family interactions in Kabuli, Papua New Guinea, pointed out that teasing and shaming are ways to teach social norms. For instance, parents tease children in order to prohibit them from committing violations (e.g. possessiveness and selfishness in food distributions).

Teasing activities play an important social role among American high school girls. These activities give girls ways to display sympathy, discuss social norms,
and release embarrassment (Eder 1991, 1993). Eder (1993) defined teasing activity as follows:

Any playful remark aimed at another person, which can include mock challenge, commands, and threats as well as imitating and exaggerating someone’s behaviour in a playful way. While the content of teasing would often be negative or hostile if taken literally, the playful meaning is determined in part by cues from the teaser indicating that the remark should be taken in a playful manner (p. 17).

Drew (1987) has studied teasing in telephone conversations and in face-to-face conversations among people who are close with each other, and finds that the sequential positioning of teasing remarks is typically second/next positioned. They come as responses to some prior talks/turns. Straehle (1993) and Drew (1987) both suggested that teasing occurs in response to deviations from social norms. Their analyses of spontaneous conversations indicate that teasing occurs in response to a speaker’s violation of communication standards, such as improbable claims, boasts, overly formal utterances, descriptions of impossible events, or exaggerated storytelling. The trouble source for most teasing involves minor conversational transgressions. The continuum of responses to teasing analyzed in Drew’s data (1987) include six types: 1) initial serious correction/rejection, followed by a subsequent laughing acceptance; 2) simultaneous correction/rejection and laughing acceptance; 3) initial laughing acceptance followed by a subsequent serious correction/rejection; 4) genial going along or playing along with the teasing; 5) solely serious correction/rejection; 6) dismissive ignoring of the teasing. Thus, Drew (1987) concluded that the recipients of teasing rarely accept the implied criticism completely, and they usually resist the teasing by making a po-faced response.

Straehle proposed that there are two contrasting sides of teasing: “[a]s a form of humour or play, teasing is a language ‘nip’ that can signal and enhance speaker enjoyment and rapport. At the same time, however, teasing is thought to be closely bound to real antagonism; the playful nip may easily be mistaken for a hostile bite” (1993: 221).

Margutti (2007: 624) demonstrated in Italian family gatherings that when the first speakers make self-oriented declarative statements which reveal specific or delicate information of him/herself, the other family members often respond by employing third-person references (e.g. he/she/they, or category terms in the domain of family relations such as mother, father, etc.). They enact two specific
verbal activities such as teasing and clarifications by employing third-person references. In general the speaker designs the teasing activity to make it clearly recognizable as humorous.

Haugh (2010) explored a particular type of teasing, known as jocular mockery, as it appears in spoken Australian English. In this type of teasing, the participants are oriented to fostering solidarity, rapport, or affiliation. Haugh interpreted such teasing by combining the framework of conversation analysis with Arundale’s Face Constituting Theory (1999, 2006, 2010). Haugh’s study indicates how participants align or disalign their responses towards previous actions through jocular mockery in conversation. Jocular mockery, as an interactionally achieved activity, can express affiliative or disaffiliative stances between participants.

Partington (2008) analyzed press briefings held at the U.S. White House, and indicated that teasing activity is largely face work. Both officials at the podium and the assembled press representatives experience teasing and being teased. When responding to teasing, the tease recipients often calibrate their expressions to show an appropriate mixture of competence and affective face.

Considering gender differences in teasing, Lampert & Ervin-Tripp (2006) noted that men may be more receptive than women to being teased. Their study examined teasing and self-directed joking in everyday conversation in mixed- and same-gender groups of educated, young European American friends. These researchers’ work indicates that gender differences and gender relationships affect the types of humour used in sociable conversations among friends. In the mixed groups, men tease less and make more self-directed wisecracks than they do in a same-gender group. Women tease more, but tell fewer humorous stories about themselves. But exaggeration as a mode of flagging humour occurs equally in teasing by women, in mixed groups, and by men in all-male groups.

These studies show that teasing is an interactional activity between two parties—the teaser and the target, which is often prompted by norm deviations. It is a specific type of social interaction, but the specific actions involved vary in different social settings.

In the field of psychology, Keltner et al. (2001) saw teasing as indirect and playful provocation. These researchers defined teasing as an intentional provocation, accompanied by playful off-record markers, which together comment on something relevant to the target. A provocation can be verbal (a sarcastic comment) or nonverbal (a gesture). The off-record markers can also be verbal (exaggeration, metaphor) or nonverbal (gesture, prosodic variation). Teases
that involve few off-record markers tend to evoke more negative and less positive emotion than those that involve numerous off-record markers. All these studies have also suggested that teasing is prompted by norm deviations. However, most of these psychological studies are not based on actual interactional data.

In this study, teasing is considered an activity in which one speaker makes fun of, or mocks another in a playful way. The central question I address in this chapter is how teasing can bring about shared amusement to a conversation, through the coordination of verbal and nonverbal cues in talk-in-interaction.

6.3 Data and objectives

The people who appear in this study’s recordings are talking together simply for the sake of socializing. The three recordings used for this study: “Never in Canada”, “Always in Oulu”, and “Oh my God”, have been introduced in the data section of 1.2. In all these conversations, lots of interesting topics appear due to differences between language, culture, and custom.

This study not only takes the individual actions of teasers into account, but also explores how teasing develops and is received by the teased person. The study will first characterize the actions involved in teasing, and then explore how these actions are conducted in both verbal and nonverbal ways. More specifically, the chapter studies the sequential development of teasing, the emotions displayed in teasing, and how the recipient’s responses affect the ongoing social interaction. In studying teasing and responses to teasing, the chapter analyzes the sequential organization, verbal features, prosodic cues, and accompanied embodied actions. The role of third parties in teasing activities is also studied. All in all, the chapter shows how teasing activity can bring about a shared experience of pleasure and amusement. Though this chapter contributes a special section on the role of laughter and hand gestures in teasing activities, observations on laughter and gesture will be combined in all the data analyses as well.

In what follows, section 6.4 discusses how teasing activity often causes embarrassment for the teased person, but at the same time provides shared amusement for all participants in the teasing activity. Section 6.5 focuses on the distinct role of hand gestures and laughter in teasing. Section 6.6 discusses teasing activities reciprocated by playful jokes, with an emphasis on how the teased person reciprocates by echoing the tone of voice of the teaser. Section 6.7 draws conclusions from the research.
6.4 Embarrassment in teasing activities

This section examines how teasers and tease recipients may show embarrassment in the teasing activity, but still convey a growing sense of amusement through the exchange. The displays of embarrassment typically occur when the teased person’s transgressions of social norms are revealed to other participants.

6.4.1 Brief introduction to embarrassment in social interaction

Goffman proposed that “embarrassment occurs in a social establishment where incompatible principles of social organization prevail” (1967: 264). Also, people’s experiences and displays of embarrassment play a critical role in socialization practices, such as teasing (Kelner & Buswell 1997: 250).

The display of embarrassment in teasing interaction has been discussed in several special social settings, such as medical interactions (Heath 1988), marital conflicts (Scheff 1990, Retzinger 1991), and academic seminars (Sandlund 2004).

Heath’s analysis of doctor-patient interaction (Heath 1988) focused on the relationship between embarrassment and interactional organization. The important finding he proposed is that embarrassment turns out to be sequentially organized and coordinated by both doctor and patient in the course of medical interaction (e.g. the medical examination procedure). Heath’s study (1998) showed that the embarrassing events were reflected in shifting degrees of interactional involvement by the doctor and the patient. For example, their speech and actions may become fragmented and dysfluent; their gaze may shift back and forth, and their embodied actions display precise coordination and sensitivity to the actions of the other when they temporarily lack a focus of mutual attention in the procedure of medical examination.

The sociologist, Retzinger, who studied embarrassment in special social settings such as marital quarrels, has found that embarrassment behaviours serve an appeasement function. By showing embarrassment, people can appease those they have offended in a social transgression. Based on an analysis of videotapes of marital quarrels, Retzinger (1991) suggested that the intensity of embarrassment is conveyed by the number and size of the gestures involved. According to her study, expressive behaviours in embarrassment consist of gaze aversion, smiling with smile suppression, head bending, and reducing one’s apparent height. These actions can make the subject appear as nonaggressive or submissive, and are apt to appease those they have offended in the quarrel.
Sandlund (2004) has treated displays of embarrassment as social practices in the course of talk-in-interaction. In analyzing her data from social interaction at academic seminars, she (2004: 205) showed that embarrassment is appropriately displayed in the slot where the trouble source has been revealed. She found that such “[e]mbarrassment-relevant episodes were identified across a variety of sequential environments: teasing, delicate topics, ‘mock’ embarrassment, repair initiations, and public praise” (Sandlund 2004: 305).

Through discourse analysis, Chafe (2002) showed that there is overlap between self-deprecation, regret, and embarrassment. These emotions occur because one is sorry for some aspect of one’s behaviour. Also, psychologists Keltner & Anderson (2000: 187) indicated that “embarrassment serves an appeasement function, reconciling social relations.” These authors also proposed that the consequences brought by embarrassment can “lead to increased forgiveness, trust, and liking” (Keltner & Anderson 2000: 191). Laughter or smiling is frequently seen in the context of embarrassment (Edelmann 1994, Keltner & Buswell 1997). However, these authors did not base their studies on examination of everyday conversations.

This section indicates that people display their embarrassment through a coordination of verbal expressions, prosodic cues, and embodied actions (facial expressions, gesture, and posture). It analyzes the sequential position of embarrassment within teasing activity, and its outcomes for the ongoing conversation. These observations aim to show how embarrassment is systematically elicited, managed, and built into the sequential progression of talk-in-interaction. The study shows that the display of embarrassment does not necessarily hinder further exchanges in the teasing activity. The teaser and the teased person can still display amusement as well. Furthermore, this section argues that teasers, teased people, and third parties in an embarrassing moment may all experience a complex blend of mixed emotions, including amusement, awkwardness, foolishness, and surprise.

### 6.4.2 Tease recipient's embarrassment

In moments of teasing, teased persons typically display their embarrassment through verbal expressions, laughter, and embodied actions. However, they also try to cover their embarrassment. Their actions for simultaneously showing and covering the embarrassment help make the teasing activity amusing.
In the following Example 16, Rukmini is teased for putting one of her students on her Facebook page, because he looks “fit.” The teasing she receives and her responses to it are shown in italics, and the distinct hand gestures accompanying her words are indicated by red arrows on the screen shots.

Example 16. She said, one of her students is fit. (From “Oh my God”)

1  GUY:  Do you have Facebook?
2  That would be [1hard1].
3  RUKMINI:  [1Yeah1],
5  GUY:  [2Mm2].
6  RUKMINI:  The [3only guy3] that’s on my Facebook,
7  GUY:  [3Yeah3].
8  RUKMINI:  that I taught?
9  was the head boy of the school,
10  that I taught.
11  And that was it.
12  [And that’s because he’s kinda] fit.
13  GUY:  [Oh,
14  I see,
15  so you].
16  RUKMINI:  But,
17  GUY:  Kinds fit.
18  RUKMINI:  [Yeah,
19  GUY:  [@That’s @such @a @British] @expression.
20  RUKMINI:  that was .. “it].
21  (H) Yeah,
22  [##] --
23  GUY:  [I don’t] think the camera caught --
24  r-recorded that.
25  RUKMINI:  No no no,
26  @(@x) @ [@@]
27  GUY:  [“Fit],
28  she said,
29  one of her students is “fit.
30 RUKMINI: @@[20000]}
31 ROBERT: [<F> @@[200000 </F>2]}
32 RUKMINI: [@@((covers her face with hands and bends down her head))]

33 GUY: [That means,  
34 that means] hot.
35 @@
36 (0.8)
37 RUKMINI: (H) [Oh my]2God2].
38 ROBERT: [@@]
39 GUY: [2That’s2]fucked up.
40 RUKMINI: [301h3].
41 ROBERT: [303]@@
42 GUY: (H) That’s on camera,
Rukmini says that, though she never adds any of her school kids to her Facebook, she did add one because he was fit (lines 8–12). The recipients tease her because her conduct is inconsistent with her professional identity as a teacher in a primary school (which was discussed in the prior conversation, not included in this transcript).

Guy starts the teasing with the surprise token *oh* in lines 13–15. This signals that the subsequent remarks are a response to Rukmini’s prior lines (Button & Casey 1984). At first, Rukmini does not recognize she is being teased, and is not aware of the transgression she has made by adding one of her male students to her Facebook page. She simply confirms that the boy is fit in line 18. Guy then further hints that the expression is inappropriate, with the laughingly produced
expression (line 19), *[That's such a British expression]*. Though the tone of voice in this implication sounds amused and playful, Rukmini still does not recognize that she is being teased. She confirms Guy’s remarks again in line 21.

After giving two hints, Guy decides to make the teasing explicit in lines 23–24: *[I don’t] think the camera caught-- r-recorded that*. Rukmini now realizes her mistake, and that she is being teased. She admits making a mistake, without making an apology—by saying *no* three times in line 25. This suggests that Guy has made his point, and the teasing activity can be halted. According to Stivers (2004: 260), the same word, phrase, or sentence can be said multiple times under a single intonation contour, and this multiple repetition suggests that the preceding action should be halted. In this case, Rukmini shows her embarrassment, admits her transgression, and proposes that her teaser halts the teasing. Rukmini’s multiple *no* is given in a soft, laughing voice. Still, Guy pursues the teasing further, and repeats her words with a facetious tone of voice, pointing at her with his index finger and looking at the video camera with a smile (Fig. 43) in lines 27–29. He pretends that he is revealing her inappropriate behaviour to everyone watching through the camera. He teases and clarifies Rukmini’s transgression by using the third-person reference *(she)* and repeating her words about the boy is fit in lines 27–29 (Margutti 2007).

Following Guy’s teasing, Rukmini’s laughter in line 30 displays her embarrassment and shows that she understands the non-seriousness of the teasing. Glenn (2003: 127) indicated that “when laughter is produced on its own without other verbal response, its stance towards the laughable is equivocal, e.g. a recipient’s laugh might be derisive, appreciative, or embarrassed.” In this situation, Rukmini’s laughter seems to be both hiding and displaying her embarrassment (Edelmann 1994, Keltner & Busswell 1997, Sandlund 2004). While laughing, she covers her face and bends her head during lines 31–32 (Fig. 44). Such a facial expression and posture is often clearly related to embarrassment (Keltner et al. 2001).

Though Rukmini shows embarrassment by her laughter and embodied actions, and then by her exclamation in line 37, *Oh my God*. Guy, however, keeps on with his teasing. His verbal jests are concurrent with the comic hand gestures (Fig. 45 and Fig. 46). While uttering, *that’s on camera*, with a playful tone of voice, he points his index finger at the camera (line 42) (Fig. 45). Then he further heightens the amusement by recycling his first saying with a more excited tone of voice: *[that’s] on two cameras* (line 43). He says the line faster in the recycling, with a
markedly raised pitch, and a special stress on the word two. While putting the stress on two, he also recycles his hand gesture, but in a stronger form: he points at the camera while raising his hand much higher in the air (Fig. 46). His verbal and nonverbal expressions convey heightened involvement. Guy puts pressure on the tease recipient and builds the humour over several turns. The teaser pays explicit attention to the tease recipient’s transgression. Rukmini replies to the heightened mood by another exclamation in line 45, oh God. She demonstrates that she acknowledges her slip-up and displays embarrassment. In line 49, Rukmini tries to circumvent the teasing activities and escape from the embarrassing moment by the repetitive singsong pattern, tiit tiit tiit (Stivers 2004).

This example demonstrates that the tease target’s laughing response, embodied action (e.g. bending down the head, covering the face), and verbal expression (e.g. multiple sayings, exclamation, repetitive singsong pattern) can indicate embarrassment. Meanwhile, these actions and the laughter responses from the third party, Robert, bring about greater shared amusement in the teasing activity. The teaser and the third party relieve the tease target’s uneasiness with laughter.

In Example 17, we have another case which shares similar features. This recording excerpt follows a previous conversation (not included here), where Jenny accepts a candy offered by Cassandra. However, Jenny does not eat it because she thinks it is “so gross.” And to be polite, she secretly covers the candy under her hand during the conversation.

Viola discovers that Jenny is hiding the candy and responds by teasing that Jenny is a cheater. Though Jenny displays embarrassment, the laughter accompanying the teasing helps to generate amusement.

**Example 17. Cheater. (From “Always in Oulu”)**

```
1  JENNY: [2(H) Not2] @sure @.
2    @C- (H) @language @barrier @can @be @#used (H).
3    X: (H) (H)
4  VIOLA: (2.1) @@ @What @are @you @@doing
```
JENNY: [88]
JENNY: [200000000002]
VIOLA: [999 . . 999902]
JENNY: (H) [3003]
VIOLA: [3@Cheater3]

JENNY: (H) <HI> I’m @sorry @it’s @so @gro[ss]<HI>.
((ON “GROSS,” TAKES HAND OFF FROM COVERING THE SWEET SHE WAS TRYING TO HIDE WITH HER HAND, MOVES IT TO COVER HER FACE))
In line 4, Viola looks down and finds that Jenny is hiding the candy under her hand. She asks Jenny what she is doing in a laughing voice, while leaning forward and closely pointing at Jenny’s hand (Fig. 47). The moment of embarrassment starts after line 4. Jenny immediately averts her gaze from Viola and looks downwards at her hand with a smile. The hiding behaviour of embarrassment is frequently accompanied by smiling and smile control (Edelmann 1994, Keltner & Busswell 1997). Furthermore, Sandlund also found that “[e]mbarrassment is most evidently displayed and oriented to in timely gaze aversion exactly in the slot where embarrassment is made relevant” (2004: 224). It seems possible that Jenny is trying to hide her embarrassment here. Jenny and Viola burst into laughter simultaneously, but Jenny still covers the candy tightly under the gaze of all recipients (Fig. 47 and Fig. 48). It is only after the shared laughter that Viola teases Jenny by calling her a *cheater*, with a laughing voice. While saying *cheater*, Viola points her index finger at Jenny. At the same time, the other two speakers look at Jenny and smile, in line 9 (Fig. 48).
Jenny takes the pejorative word, *cheater*, as a playful remark, mainly because Viola’s action occurs in a sequential position following the joyful laughter they had just exchanged, and because Viola’s tone of voice combines laughter with a markedly raised pitch. The shared laughter before the pejorative word indicates clearly that the remark is meant in fun (Drew 1987). Haugh (2010: 2107) also indicated that the local sequential environment is crucial in establishing that the mockery is jocular rather than aggressive.

In this kind of teasing, collective laughter from both the teaser and the tease recipient displays amusement in the teasing activity. And the pointing finger accompanied by the laughing voice (line 9) occasions amusement rather than disapproval in the conversation.

After the truth about the candy is revealed to the participants, Jenny apologizes and explains that the candy is so “gross.” She does this with a laughing voice, then lowers her head and covers her face (Fig. 49). By implication, she expresses embarrassment for telling the truth, because the candy giver, Cassandra, had claimed it was very nice when she offered it to everyone at the table (in prior conversation not included here).

One of the third parties, Edith, is very amused with Jenny’s frank confession and display of embarrassment. Edith’s laughter and hand clapping overlap with the comment “gross” in line 13. As everyone laughs, Jenny explains her reason, in a laughing voice, for hiding the candy and makes a jesting complaint concerning the teaser, Viola (lines 19–21).

In this instance, the collective laughter and laughingly produced talk prior to the teasing bring a comfortable atmosphere for the unfolding conversation. The embarrassment shown during the teasing activity is not the cause of amusement in the subsequent conversation, but it is followed by amusement afterwards. The teaser, the tease recipient, and other participants jointly overlook the moment of embarrassment.

**6.4.3 Summary**

To sum up, this section observed how embarrassment is occasioned and displayed in two episodes of teasing. Though the teased people experience embarrassment, they still actively participate in the subsequent teasing activity. In contrast to Sandlund’s findings (2004), the multi-party teasing activity shown in these recordings suggests that displays of embarrassment by tease recipients do not disrupt the smooth flow of interaction. Instead, the teasing activity leads to both
displays of embarrassment and enhanced amusement for all participants in the
conversation.

In Example 16 (She said, one of her students is fit.), the teaser makes fun of
the target’s conversational transgression across several turns, and builds the
humour with each turn. The teasing is performed with vivid facial expressions,
laughingly produced speech, a playful tone of voice, and jestingly recycled
gestures. The increasingly expressive hand gestures match the heightened
involvement in Guy’s tone of voice. The tease target is placed in an embarrassing
situation, and seeks to put the teasing behind her by muttering a repeated phrase,
Titi titi titi. In Example 17 (cheater), the tease recipient’s frankness and
embarrassment over her evasion, as clearly shown in her embodied actions, help
bring the conversation heightened laughter and amusement.

In these two examples, the teaser is the first one to bring on displays of
amusement while teasing the teased person’s transgression. The teased people
then joins in this amusement through laughing over their own momentary
embarrassment. These examples show that embarrassment is generally displayed
through highly visible embodied actions, which are enacted along with verbal
expressions. However, the display of embarrassment does not hinder
communication, but provides a source of shared amusement. In the next section, I
will especially discuss the distinct role of embodied actions and laughter in the
teasing activity.

6.5 Amusement in teasing activities

To date, teasing has not yet been empirically studied from the point of view of
embodied or nonverbal aspects of talk. However, some researchers have
suggested that nonverbal cues such as gesture and laughter are off-record markers
in teasing, which convey distinct information in the teasing activity (Keltner et al.
2001). The linkage between teasing activity and specific gestures is very complex,
because each activity occurs in a specific context. For instance, the specific
gesture of tilting or lowering the head while covering the face with hands serves
as an expression of embarrassment by the teased person, and this is commonly
displayed just after teasing reveals a transgression. This, however, can be
expressed in an amused rather than a serious manner, as discussed in section 6.4.
Recipients can also play along with the teasing through laughter alone, and the
laughter from tease recipients often prompts more teasing activities. In this
section, we ask how hand gestures and laughter contribute to greater amusement
in the teasing activity. The findings show that laughter and hand gestures do not only enrich the verbal expression, but actually co-constitute the teasing activity, and can play many roles in the larger sequence of teasing activity.

6.5.1 Laughter and hand gestures concurrent with speech

This section contributes specific understanding on how laughter and embodied actions can, when concurrent with speech, bring about greater amusement in teasing activities. Two interesting phenomena which appear in the data are 1) that the teased participants can initiate the amusement and help extend the teasing activity via laughter or embodied actions, and 2) that the teaser’s verbal expressions and concurrent hand gestures may convey slightly different messages.

Embodied actions can upgrade the degree of amusement in teasing. In the first recorded example to follow, Edith (who is from Australia) and Jenny (who is from the United States) enter a playful exchange. Edith initiates the first jesting remark (lines 4–5) regarding the researchers who organize the data collection, and who stay at the scene for a very short while at the beginning of the recording. Edith makes a joke that when these researchers return, they will count the number of uneaten biscuits on the table. Viola affiliates with this joke, saying Yes. However, Edith’s Australian-style expression of “biscuits” becomes the source of teasing.

In this conversation, Edith becomes a tease target. Later, Jenny teases her, saying that she refers to “dinner” as “tea.” We will notice Jenny’s interesting embodied actions and special verbal techniques with which she invites everyone to join in the amusement.

Example 18. She calls dinner tea. (From “Always in Oulu”)

1 JENNY: [##] @Australian.
2 [2(H)2]
3 [2{(TABLE)}2]
4 EDITH: Well,
5 these guys are gonna count how many biscuits we eat too.
6 VIOLA: [#Yes].
7 JENNY: [Stop] [2calling them biscuits2].
8 EDITH: [20000002]
9 JENNY: They’re cookie [3s3].
10 EDITH: [3#3]
11 X: @@@@@ 

108x696
EDITH: [4Bis4]cuits.

X: (H)

JENNY: #Biscuits #are #like --

X: Do you call biscuits in Australia?

JENNY: (0.3) Biscuits are some [thing] --

EDITH: [<HI> This] is a bis[2cuit2] </HI>.

JENNY: [3[2She2] calls dinner <SM> tea </SM>3].

{3{(TURNS HER HEAD AND BODY POSTURE TOWARDS THE AUDIENCE,
LOOKS AT THEM, AND POINTS AT EDITH WITH HER THUMB.)}3}

Fig. 50. Frame in line 18.

<HI> <VOX [I’m] gonna have some tea </HI>.

X: [8]

JENNY: [#Like #with chicken and mashed potatoes VOX >].

EDITH: [#Everything].

Fig. 51. Frame in line 23.

X: @@@@@{202}

JENNY: [2(H)2] She keeps asking me,
what should I have with tea.
I’m like,
I dunno,
cookies @?
X: @[@@[2@@2]
EDITH: @[@@[2@@2]
X: [@@]
JENNY: <SM><P> [2No2],
Tea </P></SM>.
X: @@[] @@
EDITH: [] (H)
X: (H)
EDITH: You gonna get the argument #on here.
[This is] right.
X: [#]
EDITH: #The tomato_ (/təmətə). 
No.
It’s mato_/me troo). ((HITS THE TABLE AUDIBLY ON “MA”))
Tomato_/təmətə) @@@@. ((hits the table again on “ma”))
X: @@@ (H)
EDITH: (H)

The teasing source in this conversation is the difference in meaning of the words “biscuits” and “tea,” between Australian and American English. In line 4, as the researchers who have set up the video recorder are about to leave, Edith jokes that these researchers are going to count how many biscuits the conversation participants eat. Jenny then starts teasing Edith’s Australian expression of “biscuits” by issuing a directive in line 7, Stop calling them biscuits. Literally speaking, an imperative sentence gives an order. But while making this imperative statement, Jenny slightly nods her head and smiles. When she says the verb stop, she does it in a low pitch, with a pleasant, soft tone of voice. These prosodic cues and embodied actions betray that this is not a commanding or disapproving action. It is clear that Jenny is not attacking Edith, but making fun of the Australian expression. Edith immediately goes along with this teasing, by laughing before Jenny completes the utterance (in line 8). As a result, Edith, the teased person, is the one who initiates the amusement. Edith’s laughter provides grounds for the continuation of teasing activity. The women continue to tease each other back and forth, using embedded corrections (see below, Jefferson 1987) and sustaining a playful, pleasant tone of voice in alternating between the words “biscuits” and “cookies.” Edith initiates the expression of “biscuits” (line 5), then
they exchange a series of embedded corrections, echoing each other’s tone of voice in saying “biscuits” (line 5), “cookies” (line 9), and “biscuits” (line 12), while making correction actions. In lines 14 and 16, Jenny makes a jesting effort to explain what biscuits are, and Edith corrects her again.

In the final exchange of embedded corrections in line 17, Edith emphasizes her opinion (This is a biscuit) with a markedly raised pitch, and with special stress on “this.” The syntactic structure in this embedded correction echoes and responds to Jenny’s utterance in line 9 (They’re cookies). According to Jefferson (1987), “embedded corrections” are different from “corrections.” An “embedded correction” incorporates the correction into ongoing talk, while a simple “correction” requires explanation. Through this conversation’s embedded corrections, the teasing activity becomes a fun exchange of verbal expression and laughter, as the women playfully stick to the expressions used in their own countries, without asking for any explanations from each other.

This teasing activity goes on as Jenny (in line 18) begins teasing Edith over the way she refers to “dinner” as “tea.” In pronouncing the key teasing term “tea,” she uses a smiling voice. While looking at the audience with a smile, she points at Edith with her thumb (in line 18, Fig. 50), rather than with her index finger. As a result, Jenny’s teasing does not convey a negative meaning, but instead brings about more amusement. Apart from the accompanied facial expressions and gestures, Jenny’s teasing is distinct in its verbal expressions. Her voiced direct reported speech in lines 19 to 21 (<HI> [I’m] gonna have some tea </HI>.[#Like #with chicken and mashed @ potatoes]) mimics the voice quality of the original speaker (Edith), but with a markedly raised pitch. According to Couper-Kuhlen (1993), the prosodic cues in voiced direct reported speech are hints of a critical stance while reporting someone else’s words. In addition, direct reported speech is commonly found in contexts where an amusing incident is recounted (Bauman 1996, Halt 2000). Here, Jenny reenacts Edith’s Australian expression in an amusing manner.

In response to Jenny’s playful actions and mimicking of her utterances, Edith escalates her list of food items to be eaten at “tea,” by including, everything. She follows this by laughing while looking at the direction of her audience (Fig. 51). Here, she acknowledges Jenny’s teasing activity, and exaggerates it.

Jenny’s teasing brings Edith and the audience a great deal of laughter (see lines 11, 24, 30, and 34), mainly because of her pleasant laughing voice and hand gestures. Jenny also invites the group to laugh with her by turning her body orientation towards the audience, as she does her third tease (lines 25–29).
The teasing activity in this recording involves three teases, all targeting the same object, namely Australian English. However, Jenny addresses the tease to the audience, by the third-person reference and with voiced direct reported speech. Jenny’s body orientation during the three teases (body facing the audience) shows that she does not target Edith, but takes the audience as her addressee, while telling them Edith’s transgressions. Edith sees the humour in her Australian expressions, and is eager to share them with others. It is the stance of the teased person, and the way she responds to the teasing, that decides whether this activity can become an amusing exchange. And in these exchanges, Edith plays along with the teasing through laughter, embedded corrections, and by extending the expressions. The third parties, who Jenny invites to join in the exchanges, respond with laughter. After the completion of the tease sequence, Edith continues to play jokes with Jenny on the pronunciation of “tomato.”

In sum, Edith’s initiation of amusement in response to the first tease makes the amusing exchange possible. The teaser, Jenny, further invites the whole group to join in the teasing activity through embodied actions, though her words do the action of teasing. Jenny’s smile, voice, laughter, and embodied actions betray that she also thinks Australian expressions are amusing. The playful tease has been reciprocated and is taken in jest, so the conversation has accomplished an exchange of mutual amusement.

The following example further illustrates how teased people can play along with teasing, and provides a dramatic performance including both verbal expressions and hand gestures. In Example 19, Rukmini teases Robert for liking to drink orange soda—like the comical, clumsy teen sitcom figure named Kel from *Kenan and Kel* (an American TV show). In response to this teasing, Robert acts the role of Kel, who is an awkward and somewhat crazy fanatic for orange soda. Robert plays along with Rukmini’s teasing by giving a dramatic performance of verbal mimicking and hand gestures.

Example 19. *I love orange soda.* (from “Oh my God”)

```
1 RUKMINI: [(H) The] plain one is really good,
2 but I’ve got the one with the spices,
3 [it’s] just so=,
4 GUY: [Yeah].
5 I had one --
6 I don’t know what mine was,
7 it was really nice.
8 ROBERT: (0.3) [Yeah] I’m not really a tea person.
```
RUKMINI: [Yeah].
ROBERT: .. or a coffee=--
RUKMINI: [So] what do you drink like,
orange soda?
ROBERT: [Orange juice].
GUY: [Coffee with soda].
RUKMINI: [@@@] [2#That's fit (H)]2] [3000003]
ROBERT: [2@No= @2],
GUY: [2#So2]3#you #should #drink #]
ROBERT: [4[3<SNG><VOX I love3] orange so=da=VOX> </SNG>4]
[4((BURIES HIS HEAD IN HIS HANDS AND LOWERS HIS HEAD))4]

Fig. 52. Frame follows line 18.

RUKMINI: @@@@@
GUY: [The --
RUKMINI: [((lowers head))]
ROBERT: [Kenan and Kel],
RUKMINI: [<Hi> @@ @ </HI>]
ROBERT: [O=hyea=h].
[((WAVES HIS FISTS IN THE AIR))]

Fig. 53. Frame in line 24.
When Rukmini asks what he drinks, Robert claims that he is not a tea or coffee person in lines 8 and 10. Then Rukmini asks him whether he drinks “orange soda” in lines 11–12. At first, Robert does not recognize he is being teased. He corrects her, saying that he drinks orange juice in line 13. Guy guesses that Robert might even drink *Coffee with so=da* (line 14). Rukmini replies to this, first with loud laughter, then with a verbal confirmation, and finally with more loud laughter. This over-exaggerated reaction makes Robert recognize that he is being teased. In response to Rukmini’s laughter, Robert pretends to protest by moaning *No*, but with a laughing voice in line 16. Then, in a laughing and singsong voice, he furthers the teasing by admitting that he loves orange soda. His voice mimics that of the comic figure, Kel (line 18). While mimicking Kel’s voice, Robert buries his head in his hands and lowers his head (Fig. 52), acting as if he is embarrassed for being teased. Rukmini watches the performance and laughs. Robert informs Rukmini that he knows that the source of her teasing is from the comic, Kenan and Kel. Then he escalates his performance, continuing to mimic Kel’s voice and acting like Kel (lines 24–25). He performs Kel’s fanatic gestures, waving his fists in the air to emphasize his love of orange soda (Fig. 53). This performance with hand gestures generates more amusement. Clearly, the recipient does not mind being teased as a childish figure from the teen sitcom.

These two examples both indicate that laughter and hand gestures can bring additional amusement to the concurrent speech, both for teasers and their teasing targets. The teasers in both these two examples offer hints that the thing being teased is amusing, and the tease recipients then initiate a round of amusing exchanges of mockery. In Example 18, *She calls dinner tea*, the teaser’s pointing gesture with the thumb and the teased person’s laughter response, both invite laughter. The teaser’s pleasant, soft tone of voice helps create further amusement. In the second example, Example 19, the teased person, Robert, uses his embodied actions to act out the teasing and brings about further amusement. Thus everyone involved in the conversation shares an achievement of mutual amusement.
6.5.2 Mimicking the tease recipient’s prior gestures

This section examines one particular teasing activity in which the teasing is done by exaggeratedly mimicking the other speaker’s gestures. In the previous Example 17, Cheater, Viola teases Jenny as a cheater, accompanying this by laughter and an accusing hand gesture. And in Example 20, which follows, Jenny teases Viola back by picking up this line and mimicking Viola’s gesture from Example 17.

Jenny retaliates for Viola’s earlier teasing after they have talked about some other topics. And she does this mainly by mimicking Viola’s prior gestures.

Example 20. You suck so bad for that. (From “Always in Oulu”)

1  VIOLA: I was [3 so surprised2] that it3] [4 was4] [5 so5] --
2  EDITH: [3 {{CUTLERY}}3]
3  JENNY: [4 (H) oh6],
4  (H) [6 {{POINTS AT VIOLA WITH INDEX FINGER}}6]
5  you suck so bad for that.
6  (H) I was trying so nice,
7  (H) trying to hide [it,
8  EDITH: [@@@@@@]
9  JENNY: to not look like I was like throwing] away good food,
10 EDITH: ((CUTLERI!))
11 JENNY: (H) like uh,
12  [2..<VOX what is that [under] your hand VOX>2].
   [2((POINTS AND LOOKS AT ONE POINT IN FRONT OF VIOLA))2]

13 VIOLA: [@@]
14 X:  (Hx) @
15 VIOLA: I'm sor[ry but] --
16 JENNY: [It's called tatter[2@ing]2].
EDITH: [It was a birthday gift and all from a French guy],

JENNY: [Yeah,]

<EDITH> I didn't wanna be </EDITH> [like],

EDITH: [Yeah]

JENNY: <VOX> that is the grossest thing I've ever tasted VOX>.

EDITH: [(CUTLERY)]

VIOLA: [XX]

EDITH: [You --]

VIOLA: [Sorry but,]

JENNY: [I [got] bored,]

JENNY: [(H)]

VIOLA: .. you were talking quite a time,

VIOLA: .. @

<F> [@@] </F>
Viola explains that she teased Jenny in the prior talk because she was so surprised to find out the truth about the uneaten candy (line 1). Jenny then cuts into Viola’s lines with the preface token, *oh*, in a markedly raised pitch (line 3). Then she recycles *oh* with smile in line 4. Heritage (1984b: 305) indicates that *oh* is a strong indication that its producer is responding to talk from a prior speaker. Here *oh* indicates that Viola’s prior revelation is consequential for the subsequent remarks.

While saying *oh*, Jenny points a condemning finger in Viola’s direction, replaying Viola’s prior gestures (Fig. 54) from several minutes before in Example 17. Then she teases Viola, saying *you suck so bad for that* (line 5). This is a seemingly disparaging insult, but the hand gesture, the raised pitch affiliated with *oh*, and an excited tone of voice clearly signal that Jenny is making a humorously exaggerated statement.

In line 12, Jenny continues to replay both the vocal quality and the hand gestures of Viola’s prior teasing (Fig. 56). For instance, in the voiced direct speech, *what is under your hand*, Jenny exaggeratedly mimics the pointing gesture and even the gaze direction used by Viola in the prior talk. By mimicking Viola’s prior talk and gesture, Jenny turns Viola into a target of teasing (Goodwin & Goodwin 1992). Meanwhile, Viola’s laughter overlaps the word *under* in Jenny’s line. This laughter implies that Viola does not take the retaliation seriously.

Confronted by Jenny’s teasing, Viola does not defend her prior accusation. Instead she apologizes for it, and explains her motive. Viola’s explanation for why she teased Jenny in lines 28–29 makes the conversation even more amusing, and they all burst into laughter (Fig. 58).

The analysis here shows how teased people can tease back, simply by mimicking other people’s gestures. Jenny’s teasing is done for the purpose of complaining. But she conveys this by mimicking Viola’s verbal expressions and hand gestures, which makes the teasing complaint amusing.

### 6.5.3 Teasing activities done by hand gestures alone

This section examines how teasers can make fun of others through gestures alone, and the teased person can play along with this teasing by hand gestures only. Example 21 illustrates how a teaser conveys ridicule by hand gestures without accompanying verbal expressions. Then in Example 22 and Example 23, we see how teased people may respond by hand gestures alone.
In the following instance of teasing initiated by hand gestures alone (Example 21), the speakers discuss a man who Cassandra does not like, and who she considers “over-friendly.” Jenny defends the man by stating that she is also overly friendly. Then Edith teases Jenny, suggesting that the overly friendly American way invades other’s personal spaces. She suggests this by exaggeratedly illustrating Jenny’s words with hand gestures.

Example 21. You’re already in my personal bubble. (From “Always in Oulu”)

1 JENNY: Where’s he from.
2 CASSANDR: (0.65) Maroc.
3 (0.4) Studies in France.
4 JENNY: *(H) I know him.*
5 (0.7) <HI> [He’s] a very nice boy </HI>.
6 CASSANDR: ![#](0.9) Everybody is saying the same.
7 <F> No </F>.
8 He’s *[not]*.
9 EDITH: ![@](0.8)
10 JENNY: N*[2o.*
11 He’s a very very2] nice boy.
12 EDITH: ![2@@@@@@2](0.9)
13 JENNY: He’s very friendly=.
14 EDITH: ..Oh,
15 ***
16 ##.
17 ***
18 JENNY: (0.3) R=eral [ly friendly=].
19 CASSANDR: ![2](I’m not) soft.
20 CASSANDR: ![2Like2](3~An)dre.
21 EDITH: ![202](3@3)
22 JENNY: ![3A little bit3] little [4bit4] #um
   but really ![5friendly.(5](5(H) ((LIFTS HER LEFT ARM FROM THE
   KEYBOARD, WAVES IT WITH CL ENCHED FIST IN THE AIR AND
   Puts IT DOWN))5)
25 JENNY: But very friendly.
26 VIOLA: Yeah.
27 EDITH: Very friendly.
28 Too much.
29 VIOLA: (0.7) Yeah.
30 JENNY: (H) I’m American @.
31 Everyone’s overly friendly @.
32 X: (H)
33 EDITH: [<RASP><HI> Ngeah </HI></RASP>].
34 ((MOVES HER HANDS AND UPPER BODY TOWARDS JENNY))
35 JENNY: (H) ((LEANS FARTHER AWAY FROM APPROACHING EDITH))
36 Yeah.
Like if you=, 
[if you invade my personal bubble],

Fig. 61. Edith’s hand gesture in line 39.

EDITH: [((MOVES THE CHAIR CLOSER TO JENNY, TOUCHES JENNY’S ELBOW WITH HER OWN, LEANS ON THE TABLE, AND LOOKS AT JENNY))]

JENNY: I think in g--
Yeah.
Like you’re [already in my personal bubble].

EDITH: [@@@@@@]

JENNY: [2And I <F> know </F>2] you.

EDITH: [2##2]

Over several speaking turns, Jenny defends the Moroccan boy, saying that he is actually very nice and friendly. In response to Jenny’s first defence of the boy, Cassandra disaffiliates with her (in lines 6–9). Edith responds to Jenny and Cassandra’s exchange by laughter in line 10. Jenny then recycles her first saying by emphasizing that the boy is very, very nice in line 12, and at this, Edith laughs even harder (line 13). Her laughter in line 13 and line 21 does not clearly indicate if she is taking sides in the disagreement. It simply displays that she thinks the friendly argument between Cassandra and Jenny is amusing. Jenny continues attempting to persuade the other recipients to accept her opinion, but it does not seem to be successful. In line 23, Edith first laughs, and then disaffiliates with Jenny with a protesting gesture of waving her left arm with a clenched fist in the air (Fig. 59). This protesting hand gesture overlaps Jenny’s word “friendly,” which displays that she disagrees with this term. And the following teasing actions suggest that Edith’s prior laughter may also have indicated disaffiliation with Jenny’s defence of the Moroccan man.
Edith now corrects Jenny’s description of the man as very friendly, saying instead that he is too much (line 29). Viola shows her agreement with Edith. At this point, all the other speakers share an opinion opposed to Jenny’s. And Jenny tries to persuade them by taking herself as an example, stating that every American is overly friendly. This statement suggests that the Moroccan boy’s friendliness is not too much. In response to this defence, Edith stretches her hands and opens her palms to touch Jenny in an aggressive way, performing a supposedly typical American “overly friendly gesture” (Fig. 60). This gesture exaggerates and ridicules the friendly American way. Jenny responds to the exaggerated gesture with a big smile and an exaggerated gesture as well, leaning farther away from Edith’s approach. Then Jenny continues to defend herself, claiming that even friendly people have a personal bubble. This indirectly defends her view, by suggesting that the overly friendly American way does not intrude on other people’s personal spaces. Upon hearing of the personal bubble, Edith moves her chair closer to Jenny and gives her an elbow bump (Fig. 61). Here she further teases that the friendly American way described by Jenny actually does invade other persons’ personal spaces. As with the previous teasing, these playful hand gestures illustrate the speaker’s words in a mocking manner, and bring about amusement to the conversation.

The next instance shows that tease recipients can respond to teasing with hand gestures or laughter only. In Example 22, three speakers are eating a Finnish cake. Jenny asks what is on the bottom of the cake, and Edith says it is a biscuit (lines 1–8). The expression “biscuits” occasions teasing from other participants again, as had happened in Example 18 (She calls dinner tea.). In this conversation, however, Jenny teases Edith verbally, while Edith responds to Jenny’s teasing with hand gestures alone.

Example 22. It's a spoon biscuit. (From “Always in Oulu”)

1 JENNY: [What] is this.
2 On the bott[2om2].
3 EDITH: [2#Like2] biscuits#aren’ #they?
4 VIOLA: (1.2) @@@[3@@@@3]
5 JENNY: [3It’s3] like like cake?
6 EDITH: [3<HI> What </HI>3].
7 VIOLA: It’s [4tea@4]@.
8 EDITH: [4<HI> Mm </HI>4].
9 JENNY: O’you do you just call [5anything5] that’s bread @biscuits@?
10 VIOLA: [5@@5]
In line 3, Edith replies to Jenny’s question by using a “tag question” with rising intonation. This shows that she is not certain whether the cake’s layer is a biscuit. In the following 1.2-second inter-turn gap, Jenny glares at Edith with surprise. Seeing Jenny’s comical facial expression, Viola bursts into laughter. Jenny then teases Edith, asking how she can call a cake a biscuit (line 5). Viola pushes the teasing further by referring to the cake as tea, as discussed in Example 18 (*She calls dinner tea*). Since Edith has just experienced the friendly and amusing teasing from the prior discussion, she plays along with this teasing again, using the equivocal acknowledging token *Mm*, with a markedly raised pitch. This seems to demonstrate her acknowledgement of the teasing, and playfully suggests confusion on her own part.

Jenny then teases Edith again, asking whether she calls every type of bread “biscuits” (in line 9), while looking at Edith with a smile. Edith responds to this tease with a smile, and by sticking her thumb up (Fig. 62). This playful gesture does not indicate whether she accepts the teasing, but it does display that she knows being teased. Edith’s non-serious attitude, shown by her hand gesture, encourages Jenny to try more daring teasing. With the encouragement from the tease recipient and laughter from the third party, the teasing activity becomes more amusing in lines 12–13. Edith plays along, laughing at the teasers’ humorous suggestions as to what Australians might call the cake’s bottom layer (line 15). This case demonstrates that the response to teasing through hand
gestures can have an equal effect as playful verbal expressions. The three consecutive tease lines (lines 9, 12, and 14) build on the humorous responses and stances of the teased person. The amusement in the conversation is increased because of Edith’s amusing hand gesture.

Next we find another instance (Example 23) where the teasing target responds jestingly to a serious tease with hand gestures alone. In this conversation, Jason tells his friends that he will skip his literature class because he has to do laundry. Even worse, he will use all the three washing machines in the laundry room, which obviously breaks the school rules. Mary criticizes his inappropriate behaviour with the mocking remarks of “you bastard” and “you’re a bastard.” Jason, however, tries to transform these accusations into an amusing teasing activity.

**Example 23. You’re a bastard. (From “Never in Canada”)**

1  SOP:  Huh--
2  X:  Ah,
3  XX literature class is [tomorrow].
4  JAS:  [Yeah].
5  But I’m missing [lit,
6  X:  [at nine--]
7  JAS:  Because I have] to do laundry@@@@@.

![Fig. 63. Frame in line 7.](image)

8  MAR:  Erica [said],
9  SOP:  [00] [00]
10 MAR: [that she was]--
11 SOP: [2@@@2]
   [2{(RAISES HER RIGHT ARM, KNOCKS THE ELBOW ON THE TABLE,
      TILTS HER HEAD TO THE RIGHT SIDE, AND COVERS HER FACE
      WITH THE RIGHT HAND)2}]
13 SOP: [(H)]
14 MAR: [Well that’s (filthy)].
15 (1.2) ((background chatter from the camera crew))
16 JAS: It’s not my fault.
17 I’m uh--
18 MAR: [Yeah],
19 JAS: [XXX]
20 MAR: [2it is yo2]ur fault,
21 JAS: [2XX2]--
22–50: ommitted
51 MAR: [2Which2] one are you on.
52 The middle one,
53 or the--
54 (1.2)
55 MAR: Which--
56 JAS: The washers?
57 MAR: Yeah.
58 JAS: I have all three in the morning.
59 (1.7)
60 MAR: You [bastard].
61 JAS: [((Rubs his hands))]

Fig. 64. Frame in line 9.
62 SOP: You have all three.
63 Jason
64 JAS: [@@@@@]
65 MAR: You’re a ba{stard},

Prior to Mary’s teasing, Jason was telling the recipients how he deals with the laundry. The teasing source first starts in Jason’s line, [Yeah]. But I’m missing [it, Because I have] to do laundry@@@@@ (lines 5 and 7). Jason’s laughter closely follows this utterance, because he knows that it is a wrongdoing. Jefferson (1985) and Haakana (2001) showed that if laughter is not targeted at a single word or phrase, but follows an entire turn, then it is quite commonly associated with “misdeeds” or “delicate talk” of various sorts.
At Jason’s announcement, Sophie and Mary’s smiles are suddenly frozen as they look at him while he is still laughing (Fig. 63, line 7). Sophie joins Jason’s laughter in line 9, but Mary does not share the laughter (Fig. 64). Instead, Mary raises her right arm, knocks on the table with her elbow, tilts her head to the right side, and covers her face with her right hand. Her embodied actions display that she is embarrassed by Jason’s actions and excuses (Keltner et al. 2001). Mary also does not seem satisfied with Jason’s non-serious attitude here, and she criticises Jason’s inappropriate behaviour, saying *Well, that’s filthy* (in line 14). Jason rejects Mary’s comment by claiming that it is not his fault (line 16). When Mary hears that Jason will use all the three washers, she mockingly teases him (in line 60), saying *You bastard*. And Jason responds to this tease by rubbing his hands and laughing (Fig. 65). The activity of hand rubbing tells the other speakers that he admits breaking rules, but it also suggests that he enjoys a minor transgression. In this way he responds to Mary’s teasing with some humour. His amused rubbing gesture maintains rapport with his audience by jestingly accepting the teasing.

Lampert & Ervin-Tripp (2006: 67) noted that “[t]he men in our mixed-sex groups often responded to a woman’s tease with a supportive self-directed remark, which the women could easily interpret as acceptance, a sign of bonding, and encouragement to tease even more.” This is exactly what happens in this instance, where Mary teases Jason again by using the upgraded recycling, *you’re a bastard*. The first saying (line 60) of *you bastard* is already a strong tease. Sophie also displays her shock that Jason uses all the three washing machines. Jason’s unserious attitude seems to irritate Mary, and she recycles her first saying with a syntactic variation. Her second saying, *you’re a bastard*, is more like a statement of fact, and is highlighted with a markedly raised pitch. Jason responds to this upgraded tease with more hand rubbing (Fig. 65). His gesture suggests that he jestingly accepts the teasing, but ignores its message by transforming the criticism into an amusing game (Fig. 65 and Fig. 66).

To sum up, hand gestures alone can do the action of teasing by overt illustration (as in Example 21, *You’re already in my personal bubble*). The tease targets can also initiate amusement in response to teasing and display their humour via hand gestures (Example 22 and Example 23). These instances illustrate how powerful hand gestures are in communicating during teasing activities.
6.5.4 Laughter in teasing activity

In the preceding sections, it was seen that an exchange of laughter prior to teasing activity can provide a safe ground for teasing to begin (see Example 17, cheater). But laughter or smiling voice which immediately follows or accompanies the teasing lines can also display the humorous intent of critical words (see Example 18, She calls dinner tea.).

This section will further demonstrate the distinct functions of laughter in teasing activities.

In Example 24, Cassandra complains that a boy was talking about her nearby while she was taking a nap. And according to her, this guy seems to follow her everywhere. Her picky, critical opinion of this boy becomes a target of teasing. Jenny teases her through a series of comments, and both the target (Cassandra) and a third party (Viola) play along with their laughter.

Example 24. He could be breathing your oxygen. (From “Always in Oulu”)

1 CASSANDR: And,
2 he didn’t appear.
3 So I ask him,
4 and he told me,
5 (H) yea=h.
6 He was talking of me while you were sleeping.
7 (0.4) (H) What the hell?
8 CASSANDR: (H)
9 JENNY: ..That’s creepy=.
10 CASSANDR: Why this guy has to see me.
11 Sleeping.
12 It is not nice.
13 JENNY: Hm..
14 CASSANDR: I don’t look nice when [I’m asleep].
15 JENNY: [So now you won’t] talk to him,
16 because he looked at you sleeping?
17 CASSANDR: ..Yeah.
18 JENNY: ..Because he sat next to you and had a conversation,
19 while you were sleepin[g]?
20 VIOLA: [0][0][2][0][2][0][2]
21 CASSANDR: [2][2][y=eh=2].
23 CASSANDR: [3][3][3]
24 EDITH: @@[4][4][4]
In this conversation, the teaser baits a trap for the recipient. Cassandra complains of the Moroccan boy’s behaviour, and Jenny responds to her complaint with the remark, That’s creepy (line 9). This seems to be a remark displaying empathy. As a result, Cassandra responds with more complaints (lines 10–12), because she thinks that Jenny is on her side. Until now, Cassandra does not know that Jenny is teasing her and holds quite a different view of the matter.

In lines 15–16, Jenny responds to Cassandra’s further complaints by asking a question. She asks if the reason Cassandra will not talk to the boy anymore is because he looked at her sleeping. Cassandra confirms that this is the case. Then Jenny invites Cassandra’s second confirmation by making another declarative sentence, with questioning intonation. In this question, Jenny emphasizes again that Cassandra does not like the guy because he once sat next to her, and had a conversation while she was sleeping. Heritage (2010) proposes that declarative questions assert a probable answer to the question and asks for confirmation. Cassandra confirms this query by saying Yeah, with laughter this time. And a third party, Viola, also laughs on hearing of Jenny’s concluding remark. The laughter from Cassandra indicates that she now recognizes that Jenny is teasing her (line 21).

In line 22, Jenny shakes her head and tells Cassandra that she should let it go. The head shaking says that she does not agree with Cassandra’s complaints. But she pretends to treat the complaints seriously, and gives her serious suggestions. Cassandra’s laughter overlaps the delivery of Jenny’s suggestion. Without any
verbal expressions, her laughter is the sole response to this teasing. Another participant, Edith, also laughs along. Now all the recipients clearly know that teasing activity is underway.

In line 26, Jenny further escalates the teasing activity by saying, *and forgive him*. The target and the audience once again show appreciation for Jenny’s comment by laughing. This teasing activity is built gradually, and reaches a punch line when Jenny exaggerates the reason for forgiving the boy, *he could be breathing your oxygen* (line 34). The recipients all burst into laughter.

This example shows one interesting aspect in the way teasing is delivered, which is quite similar to Example 16 (*she said, one of her students is fit*). As the teasing is built over several turns, and becomes more explicit, the recipient, Cassandra, plays along by laughter alone. In this teasing instance, laughter from a tease target, without verbal response, implies willingness to join the conversational play, and to proceed with the teasing activity. In sum, the tease recipient’s laughter can show appreciation of the prior teasing, though not necessarily affiliation (see Example 24, *He could be breathing your oxygen*).

Glenn (2003: 127) indicates that “[w]hen laughter is produced on its own without other verbal response, its stance towards the laughable is equivocal, e.g. a recipient’s laugh might be derisive, appreciative, or embarrassed.” For instance, Example 16 (*she said, one of her students is fit*) demonstrates that laughter from the teased person can indicate embarrassment, and bring the conversation amusement as well. The tease recipient may play along with the teasing by laughing, meanwhile displaying embarrassment (see Example 16, *She said, one of her students is fit*.). Thus, laughter from the teaser or from the teasing recipient provides grounds for other interactional activity and reciprocal amusement.

6.5.5 Summary

Teasing activities are rich in amusing, exaggerated hand gestures, and in mutual laughter, as our data shows. Either the teasers or the tease targets can initiate amusement in the midst of teasing activity. And gestures or laughter are two distinct channels for enhancing amusement in these instances. The data indicates that nonverbal activities in teasing can reveal multiple levels of emotional experience.

In teasing activity, it is often the hand gestures or the smiling voice which bring richer meaning and amusement to otherwise critical remarks. The teasers invite laughter and a playful response from the recipients by using exaggerated
gestures. These gestures may contradict the meaning of the verbal expressions. By exaggeratedly mimicking the hand gestures of the other speakers, the participants can convey both criticism and amusement. Playful teasing is often accompanied by exaggerated facial expressions and distinct prosodic cues. It is often accompanied by happy laughter before, during, or after completion of verbal expressions. Exaggerated hand gestures have a strong comedic effect, and commonly result in laughter. Of course there are a greater number of meaningful gestures in the data than we have been able to touch on.

In the teasing instances I have analyzed, the receipt of teasing by laughter from a tease target implies willingness to join the conversational play, to proceed with the teasing activity, and initiate amusement. Thus, the laughter provides grounds for other interactional activity and reciprocal amusement. The recipients’ laughter can encourage the teaser to continue the teasing activity. It is not necessary for the tease recipients to play along with the tease verbally. They can just show their understanding by laughter alone.

6.6 Echoing in teasing activity

In the data collection we have examined so far, the tease recipients display their recognition of being teased in various ways. And when the teasing is reciprocated by jokes, it is often done through echoing. Echoing can happen at different levels: prosodic, lexical, syntactic, or semantic repetition of the immediate prior tease. This section studies how the teased person echoes the teaser’s tone of voice and syntactic structures when responding to the teasing.

6.6.1 Introduction to echoing in social interaction

In many teasing activities, tease recipients echo the teaser’s tone of voice. Close observation shows that the tone of voice used in teasing usually affects the emotional response of the tease recipient. Though the following seven instances vary in their particulars, the analyses reveal the common features they share.

The term “echo” refers to current speaker’s immediate phonological, prosodic, lexical, syntactic, or semantic repetition of the prior speaker’s utterances, with some variations. This phenomenon has been discussed in studies of interactional sociolinguistics (e.g. Tannen 1987a, 1987b) and discourse analysis (Norrick 1987). These researchers use “echo” to describe a wider range of behaviour than just repetition. Norrick (1987: 245) took the view that repetition is endemic in
everyday conversation. Speakers not only repeat their own words and phrases at various points in the discourse, but they also echo the wording, rhythms, and turns of their interlocutors.

According to Tannen (1987a: 215), repetition is a pervasive type of spontaneous pre-patterning in conversation. She points out that the reality of language is less under our control than we realize. Speaking is commonly imitative and repetitious, and much repetition in conversation is automatic. Thus, she suggests that speakers repeat, rephrase, and echo (or shadow) words of other speakers in conversation without stopping to think, but rather as an automatic and spontaneous way of participating in conversation.

Echoing contains the phenomenon of repetition. And repetition can display a range of the emotions which have been discussed in the research literature. Johnstone (1994: 6–11) indicated that repetition serves learning, helps people get the floor for speaking, expresses disagreement, maintains rhythm, gives time to think, informs or reinforces a sense of community relatedness, is emphatic, and aesthetic.

Tannen (1989) argued that repetition serves the tasks of production, comprehension, connection, and interaction. Consequently, it serves coherence and interpersonal involvement in a conversation. Also, repetition can serve the goals of getting the floor, showing listenership, providing back-channel response, stalling, savouring, showing appreciation of a good line, among other things.

6.6.2 Echoing through tone of voice and syntactic structures

We will now observe the actions of echoing in teasing activity, and especially how this action can display amusement.

In the following recorded case, one tease triggers a series of teasing activities. In Example 25, Mary (an American) asks Sophie (a Canadian) whether Canada has St. Patrick’s Day. This seemingly innocent question triggers a tease from Jason (another American), in which he asks whether Canada has running water.

Example 25. Do you guys have running water? (From “Never in Canada”)

1  MAR: I figure --
2   on St. Patrick's Day,
3 (1.1)
4   It would be--
5   I would get--
6   try and get the American's together,
Mary is talking about getting some Americans together on St. Patrick’s Day. Then she suddenly drops this topic, and asks whether Canada has that celebration. After getting a confirmation from Sophie (line 12), she still carefully explains that she is not sure if Canada has St. Patrick’s day, as shown by her repairs in lines 14 and 16–17.

Jason then joins Mary by asking Sophie a seemingly child-like question: Do you guys have running water in Canada. He says this with a falling intonation, which in an interrogative sentence generally expresses certainty, and asserts a fact of which the speaker is certain (Leech & Svartvik 1994: 23). Thus it is more like a statement than a question. Contrasted with Mary’s over-caution, this question is an obvious tease, because Jason exaggeratedly downgrades the Canadian living standard, while exaggerating his own ignorance. Sophie goes along with this tease by the backchannel, Mm, displaying her recognition. Then she teases back by
positively evaluating Jason’s question, and then comparing it with one of her own, in which she echoes Jason’s syntax with an alternate word, electricity, with the same child-like tone of voice. This humour further prompts a tease from Mary in line 25, Do you guys live in igloos?, which also echoes the syntactic structure of Jason’s prior tease.

These three consecutive teasing activities build on prior ones, ranging from “running water,” to “electricity,” and then to “Canadians living in igloos.” The flow of this is quite similar to the teasing activities in Example 22 (It’s a spoon biscuit). The speakers echo each others’ playful tones and syntactic structures. And then the teasing activity brings up a new topic for Sophie, in which she tells a story related to Mary’s tease (as we will see in the examples below).

The three examples given below will discuss two different tones of voice in teasing exchanges: the ironic tone, used in Example 26 and Example 27, and the playful tone of voice, shown in Example 28. The teasing in Example 25 brings about a new story: the Canadian girl, in which Sophie explains that a guy on a Canadian TV show played a trick when making a program for America, claiming that the Canadian parliament meets in an ice castle, which is melting because of global warming. She says that the governor of Texas actually believed this, and called on people to save Canada’s parliament building through a TV promo. The whole discussion is long, so I select a short excerpt containing the main teasing activities.

**Example 26. Canadians are evil. (From “Never in Canada”)**

1  SOP:  [It was a special],
2  SOP:  It was like,
3  MAR:  [@(h)]
4  SOP:  [a one] hou--
5    one hour special,
6    something like that.
7  (h) uh--
8  Is--
9  they-- they had t--the governor of Texas,
10    and actually,
11    doing like this <AIR QUOTES> promo </AIR QUOTES> for Canada.
12  (h) to help save our parliament building.
13  because,
14  it was melting,
15  cause of,
16  you know,
17 global warming.
18 (1.2)
19 MAR: @@@@[@]
20 JAS: [(Yeah)].
21 ...
22 MAR: (h)
23 JAS: That's a terrible trick.
24 ...
25 MAR: That's funny
26 (2.0)
27 JAS: Canadians [are evil].
28 SOP: [It's so sad].
29 (1.1)
30 SOP: It ranks
31 for evil.
32 MAR: Yeah.
33 (0.6)
34 That's why they only killed,
35 thirty-eight people a year,
36 and we killed eleven thousand,
37 two hundred fifty three,
38 ...

As Sophie is telling the dramatic story of the governor of Texas, she states the word “promo” while making air quotes with her hands, to make fun of the Texas governor’s ignorance. The other speakers clearly enjoy Sophie’s amusing storytelling. Then Jason teases that Canadians are evil (line 27), commenting on the TV guy’s mischievous broadcast of false information, as well as teasing the Canadian people in general. These comments involve Sophie as one of Jason’s teasing targets. The word “evil” comes from the participants’ prior discussions which are not included in this transcript, concerning the recent (2003) United States government denunciation of several nations (namely North Korea, Iraq, and Iran) as an “axis of evil.” However, these three speakers in the conversation were opposed to the invasion of Iraq, and had agreed that the United States government was itself pretty evil. Now, Jason teasingly applies this label to Canada, and does so in a way that is overtly exaggerated, because obviously, the Canadian TV prankster cannot represent all Canadians. His irony is therefore clearly marked by its extremity (Clift 1999: 538).

Since Sophie is aware of Jason’s ironic tone of voice, she does not object directly. Instead, she treats this ironic teasing with her own ironic humour. She
plays along with the teasing by admitting, *it’s so sad*, as if Jason’s ironic evaluation was accurate. She further acknowledges that, *it ranks for evil*. Notice that in Sophie’s response, “It” refers to “Canada,” not to “Canadians.” In this counter teasing activity, she playfully suggests that the United States ranks Canada as an evil country as well. She switches the reference from the people, as in Jason’s line, to the country. As a consequence, Sophie’s teasing conveys shared ironic humour. This irony is recognized and shared by both the teasers and the teasing targets, because “it relies on common understandings and assumptions, and on accepted standards of behaviour to which the speaker makes appeal” (Cliff 1999: 538).

This ironic humour is further echoed by Mary’s statement (32–38), suggesting that the Americans actually rank a lot higher for evil, since they have a lot more murders per year. Mary first goes along the previous teasing of Canadians with her acknowledging token, *yeah*, in line 32. Then she says something which totally contradicts her own remark. Her talk contains obvious criticism with the reference to “they” and “we.” “They” refers to Canadians, while “we” refers to Americans. The reference echoes that used in Jason’s talk (line 27). Thus, Mary also counter-teases the United States government in an ironic way. In this teasing activity, all three speakers indirectly and ironically suggest that the United States government is evil in some way. In short, irony occupies this teasing activity. The speakers echo each others’ ironic tone, and do not object to it.

This analysis makes the same argument proposed by Clift (1999), that irony shows the extent of affiliation and the differences in range of attitudes in conversational data. Clift (1999) examined verbal irony in conversational data by adopting Goffman’s concept of “framing” and “footing.” She highlighted aspects of verbal irony which differ from traditional understandings (Grice 1975: 53, Levinson 1983, Haverkate 1990, Giora 1995, Barbe 1995) in which irony is a mode of speech where the meaning is contrary to the words, and also differing from Grice’s (1975) understanding that irony contains hostility and contempt. In contrast to these views, Clift’s analyses showed that the sequential placement of irony displays discernible shifts of footing, and that irony shows differences in the extent of affiliation, and differences in the range of attitude. When teasers use verbal irony in interaction, the responses of their recipients often show agreement through laughter, or through continued irony. The different extent to which recipients affiliate with irony allows ironists to enter potentially sensitive interactional territory.
The following Example 27 further illustrates how the speakers can continue their ironic exchange by echoing each others’ tones of voice. In this conversation, Jason complains that Finnish people are angry with him because he is American. Mary teases him by asking (lines 28–32): *How do they even know, you’re American. You wear a, flag on your head?* Later in the conversation, Jason is again teased by Sophie for possibly misusing this pun (line 46). The first teasing leads to more teasing activities, then playful exchanges.

Example 27. *You wear a flag on your head?* (From “Never in Canada”)

1 JAS: [but at] least um,
2 (1.5)
3 when I came here,
4 like f--
5 for the first two weeks,
6 I go-- g--
7 I was bombarded.
8 (1.0)
9 like literally,
10 people were like,
11 (0.6)
12 you know,
13 y- you cowboy,
14 and,
15 what’s wrong with Amer--
16 like,
17 I had a lot of people here,
18 like angry at me,
19 actually.
20 It was very weird.
21 SOP: Was this at school?
22 or,
23 like..people [here]?
24 JAS: (Everywhere).
25 Helsinki,
26 was pretty bad about it.
27 ..
28 MAR: Wait a minute,
29 how do they even know,
30 you’re American,
31 You wear a,
32 *flag on your head?*
33 SOP: (hx)
34 JAS:  Nah,
35  well I have a Canadian flag.
36  ..but I lost the pin.
37  (0.7)
38  [I]—
39 SOP:  [I'll] give you another pin.
40 JAS:  Really?
41  I [had a]—
42 SOP:  [I'll] have to think about that,
43  [2Wait a minute2],
44 MAR:  [2I quit2] wearing,
45  [3my pin3],
46 SOP:  [3You might mis3]@use @that.
47  (h)(hx)[@@]

(48–105 lines Deleted)
106 JAS:  Then I say,
107  <VOX You got a problem with that,
108  I'll call my embassy VOX>. 
109  (1.3)
110 MAR:  We're going to bomb,
111  Finland [X]
Jason describes how people in Finland are angry with him because of his identity as an American. Mary teases him, asking how people even know he is an American, and if he wears an American flag. She says this with a markedly raised pitch, an ironic tone, and a surprised facial expression (eyebrows rising and mouth opening) in lines 28–33 (Fig. 67). Her tone of voice is both humorous and exaggerated. In addition, she exaggerates the teasing with the intensifier “even,” expressing that Jason’s description is unbelievable. Sophie immediately laughs along (Fig. 65). In reply, Jason does not explain how people know he is an American. He takes up the tease by the face-threat mitigator (Jucker 1993: 447) and “stalling” device (Sandlund 2004: 173), *Nah, well*, which help him to refocus and to select a desirable response. And he chooses to go along with the tease, by joking that he has a Canadian flag (lines 34–38), echoing the ironic tone of voice in the immediate prior talk, which displays his amusing stance towards Mary’s tease.

The recipients both go along with this joke by laughing. Later, Sophie teases Jason, saying that he might misuse the pin for his flag (lines 46–47). She uses a humorous but slightly ironic tone of voice, embedded with a laughter token. This teasing seems like a reference back to Jason’s claim to be Canadian in a storytelling of Chapter 5 and his various jokes on Canadians, etc. Jason goes along with Sophie’s teasing, giving an acknowledging smile (Fig. 66) in line 47. In this light-hearted exchange, the tease sequence goes through several turns, as the tease recipient responds with more jokes. Then the tease activities lead to serious discussions between Mary and Jason (lines 48–105), which are not included in the transcript. In the deleted part of the conversation, Mary tells the recipients that she is not proud of the American government, but is still proud of being an American. Jason then explains why it is easy for people to figure out his American accent. Then the conversation returns to its playful track. In lines 106–110, the participants collaboratively play jokes, not only on Finland but also on the U.S. The teasing activity helps generate a happy atmosphere.

This example nicely illustrates how the tease target displays recognition of being teased, and reciprocates this with playful jokes which echo the teaser’s ironic tone of voice. In these cases, the irony in the teasing activity does not lead to conflict, but brings about both amusement and also serious discussion. The speaker and recipient gradually build on the previous teasing, sustaining the
humour and ironic tone of voice across a series of turns, thereby achieving a great deal of shared amusement.

In the following conversation (Example 28), Edith goes to her room and brings back photos of her ex-boyfriends to show the participants. However, Jenny teases Edith, accusing her of refusing to satisfy their curiosity about her boyfriends. The humour and amusement are increased by the string of reciprocated jokes in which the participants echo each others’ playful tone.

Example 28. You can create your own band like that family in the “Sound of Music.”
(from “Always in Oulu”).

1 JENNY: That’s the one that you’re going for.
2 EDITH: .. No.
3 VIOLA: [F] No [/F].
4 EDITH: [#That’s] the singer [2one2].
5 VIOLA: [F2] He2 is [/F] with the=,
6 .. with # girlfriend(Hx).
7 JENNY: .. Yeah.
8 But that’s the one you were # about # in # sauna # right?
9 EDITH: (0.7) That’s ~Jack.
10 JENNY: (0.8) [So] where’s ~Jack.
11 EDITH: [~Jack] --
12 JENNY: I wanna see the new [2one2].
14 EDITH: (1.1) ~Jack is Tasmanian,
15 .. we dated for .. for year[s],
16 JENNY: [W] here’s Tasmania.
17 VIOLA: (0.6) <HI> Tasmania </HI>.
18 [Really].
19 EDITH: [##] at bottom @Australia (H).
20 (0.6) [We dated for four] years.
21 VIOLA: [0=h].
22 EDITH: .. But.
23 .. We’re not together anymore.
24 And I,
25 probably,
26 really don’t @need @to @say @this @on @video @tape.
27 (H) And then after ~Jack was ~Ted.
28 But,
29 VIOLA: (1.2) [But ~Ted],
30 EDITH: [####](possibly “that’s the end of it”))
31 VIOLA: {0.5} He’s the one who broke.
32 .. Before you came here.
33 EDITH: He’s,
34 JENNY: {{SPOON}}
35 VIOLA: {0.7} Hm?
36 X: (TSK)
37 EDITH: <SING> Lalalala </SING>.
38 JENNY: {0.9}
39 X: (TSK)
40 VIOLA: @[@@]
41 JENNY: [Oh].
42 wow.. with a few musical children,
43 you can create your own little.. band.
44 .. Travel [pia]2 ces,
45 VIOLA: [0]20000
46 EDITH: [200002]
47 JENNY: like that2],
48 VIOLA: @2]
49 JENNY: family in the “Sound of Music.”
50 EDITH: <A> @Yeah @yeah @yeah [@yeah] </A>,
51 VIOLA: <SM> #Have your family,
52 [do you remember </SM>]?
53 EDITH: {the Von @Trapps}.
54 JENNY: You’re already lame.
55 EDITH: (1.4) <WH> whew </WH>.
56 [0]==
57 JENNY: [@]
58 @@ (H)
59 EDITH: [I don’t] know.
60 VIOLA: [What]?
61 EDITH: .. #We’re not gonna have babies.

Jenny and Viola want to know more about Edith’s ex-boyfriends. They insist on pursuing the topic mischievously with a playful tone of voice. For instance, when Jenny insists on knowing which picture shows Edith’s new boyfriend, Viola joins Jenny’s insistence by repeating, Yeah yeah, overlapping with Jenny’s completion of the turn (line 13). Though Jenny and Viola persistently stick to the question, Edith declines to go into detail, because she knows that the conversation is being recorded in video (lines 22–26). She tries to skip over their persistent demands by singing lalalala (line 37). She tries to halt the topic by repeating this singsong syllables (Stivers 2004). However, the singsong voice does not sound like a serious halting signal. The evasive action, her singsong utterance, is then teased
by Jenny (lines 41–44), who intentionally connects Edith’s singing with one of her ex-boyfriends, who was a singer. She teases with a playful tone of voice that Edith and her ex-boyfriend can create a family band with their musical children (lines 41–44). This teasing makes Edith and Viola laugh immediately. Their laughter overlaps with the end of Jenny’s tease line (lines 45, 46, and 48).

After this, Edith plays along with Jenny’s teasing by saying yeah four times, in a laughing rush-through voice. Then she provides the family name of the Sound of Music characters, acting as if this has answered Jenny’s suggestion. The use of rhythmically repetitive, singsong speech like lalalala (line 37) and <A>@yeah @yeah @yeah @yeah</A> in rapid speech, are playful responses by which Edith treats Jenny’s persistent curiosity and teasing as childish. In this way, Edith tries to halt the questions and to tease Jenny for her curiosity. In the qualitative analyses of mother-child interactions, Miller (1986) indicated that parents often tease their children with repetitive and singsong expressions such as “yeayeayeayea.” In a similar way, repetitive and humorous phrases are often rhythmically placed in teasing activities (Drew 1987).

Still, Jenny sticks to the topic by teasing Edith: you’re already lame, which indicates that Edith is already famous. Edith first answers this tease with a surprise token “whew,” pretending that she accepts the compliment, and that the statement is true. Then she continues responding to the tease in line 61 (We’re not gonna have babies).

In this example, the teased person, Edith, treats a sensitive topic with humour because she wants to avoid discussing it in the video-recording. She retains the playful tone of voice and makes the teasing more enjoyable by accepting and building on Jenny and Viola’s lines with playful repetitive sayings (lines 37, 50), surprise tokens (line 55, whew), or jokes (lines 53 and 61). The way she plays with the teasing by echoing the teaser’s playful tones of voice appears to be more friendly and playful than a simple evasion of the questions.

To summarize, in these teasing activities (Example 25, Example 26, Example 27, and Example 28), the tease recipients sustain the humour from prior remarks by echoing the tone of voice (e.g. ironic or playful tone), or the syntactic structures used by the teasers. This practice of echoing enables the teasing activities to undergo several exchanges. And the speakers in these exchanges successfully achieve a joint emotional stance by reciprocating each others’ tones of voice.
6.7 Summary

The collections of examples in this chapter show that teasing is an emotionally involved interactive activity. The conversations used in this study all reach a climactic point of amusement, though they vary in how this happens. In each case, laughter and/or hand gestures serve as distinct markers for teasing. The teasers often combine seemingly critical words with laughter, or with laughing voices and embodied actions. The teasing is mostly triggered by prior speaker’s minor transgressions. However, in many cases the content in teasing is not directly related to the target’s vulnerable point. For instance, the teaser may target some social or cultural deviance from his/her own norms. The Australian is teased by an American for her Australian manner of speech, or the American is teased according to stereotypes of the clumsy American.

In receipt of such teasing, the stance and emotional display of the tease recipient plays a key role in bringing about shared amusement, and in creating entertaining exchanges among the teasers and tease recipients. There are many ways for playing along with teasing which can bring amusement. For instance, the teasing may be reciprocated by jokes with dramatic embodied actions, or the recipients play along by echoing the teaser’s jokes.

Teasing has a distinct nonverbal display. Embodied actions used in teasing help to enhance the conversational amusement. These gestures perform all kinds of actions, and magnify the amusement from verbal expressions, as examined in section 6.5. Tease recipients can also respond by embodied actions or by laughter alone. The shared laughter can also be an effective remedial action for the tease recipient. Laughter while delivering critical comments indicates that the words should not be understood literally. And laughter in teasing reception signals acknowledgement of the teasing and willingness to engage in the amusing play. This study argues that playful teasing accompanied by smiling and laughter can help overcome feelings of embarrassment and create shared amusement in an otherwise humiliating situation.

To sum up, this empirical study indicates that teasing activities can be an interactive and humorous play between teasers and tease recipients in social interaction. The playful exchanges, done through jocular remarks, laughter, or embodied actions, make the teasing activity amusing. Teasing activity in social interaction provides a vivid illustration that shared experience of amusement and of other emotions in conversation are matters of interactive and intersubjective achievement.
Next, I proceed to present the discussion and conclusion of this thesis in Chapter 7.
7 Discussion and Conclusion

The preceding empirical analyses have shed new light on the coordinated use of verbal expressions, prosodic cues, and embodied actions in everyday interactions. The study especially offers detailed multimodal analyses, by examining four types of emotional display in English conversation: frustration in argument, joy in storytelling, and embarrassment and amusement in teasing activity. By integrating the study of emotional displays with the examination of the sequential organization of talk-in-interaction, the study demonstrates how emotional displays are embedded in local contexts of social action and shows the roles they play in interpersonal communication. In what follows, I shall reflect on the findings, consider their weaknesses, and discuss the possible directions for future work.

Chapter 4 pays detailed attention to the turn-by-turn development of emotion display in conversational argument, with systematic attention paid to prosody. On the basis of this analysis, two broad types of displays of frustration are found: those involving combined use of verbal and nonverbal cues, and those achieved through nonverbal actions only. This study especially contributes to our understanding of what specific linguistic expressions, prosodic cues, and embodied actions are salient in the display of frustration.

The chapter examines a case of everyday conversation, in which the speakers argue whether George Bush will be re-elected as U.S. president. The combined verbal and nonverbal expressions of frustration involve competitive turn-taking, overlaps, assertive stances conveyed by coordination of verbal and nonverbal cues, and abrupt interruptions of preceding turns. In defending themselves, both parties in the argument commonly resort to verbal expressions, such as extreme-case formulations, or arguments with an “if/then” structure. Their assertive stances, conveyed by these rhetorical devices polarize the discussion, invalidate alternative views, and leave the oppositional party no common ground for communication. Each party’s arguments are strongly rejected by the other, and there is a circular phenomenon in which speakers’ assertiveness increases when their opinions receive strong objections. Thus there is close link between the increased assertiveness and frustration.

These verbal expressions of frustration are often produced with a heavy, contrasting stress on certain words, with a markedly raised pitch and extra loud intensity. The speakers question their opponents with louder intensity than the surrounding talk. Unavoidably, these verbal expressions are coordinated with
facial expressions, hand gestures, and postures. They look straight at the other
party, and lean their upper bodies forward towards the target of frustration.
Furthermore, the speakers sometimes combine their verbal expressions with the
Open Hand Supine gesture for strengthening their expressions.

In some cases the speakers display their strong frustration without using
verbal components at all, through embodied actions alone. The consecutive
displays of frustration include frustrated facial expressions, blinking the eyes
while shaking the head, bending the head downwards, tilting the head to another
direction, turning the body orientation away from the target, ending eye contact,
or making fidgeting hand movements. They also sigh and shake their heads
without giving verbal objections. These nonverbal displays of frustration look
more or less like withdrawal behaviours, which lead to obvious tension or even an
impasse between the speakers. This empirical study yields the finding that the
embodied actions of withdrawal are a specific type of expression for frustration in
argument.

The study also shows that there is a close linkage between the prosodic cues
and embodied actions for the display of frustration in argument. When the
speakers repeat or recycle their arguments with a markedly raised pitch, they also
tend to repeat or recycle their hand gestures, but with a stronger emphasis. I argue
that the speakers display their negative stance or frustration towards the other
through pitch elevation and more emphatic hand gestures in recycling. By
recycling their words with a markedly raised pitch and a more demonstrative
gesture, they reinforce their first expression and amplify their frustration. This
finding is consistent with the view that prosody does not operate independently of
its local interactional, lexical, and sequential environment (Local 1996, Wilkinson
& Kitzinger 2006).

Chapter 4 is exploratory, providing guidance for future work on the study of
argument and emotional display of frustration. Future work could attend to the
connection between the expression of frustration and its specific embodied
actions and verbal expressions, through a detailed analysis of a wider collection
of similar interactional situations and also other types of activities than argument,
and to focus on certain recurrent sequence type, like proposal-disagreement and
request-refusal sequence.

Chapter 5 explores the joint accomplishment of joy in multiparty storytelling
through examining multimodal cues. This study proposes that the collaboration
between the storytellers and recipients determines whether the storytelling
achieves an outcome of mutual joyful moments. The study explores this
interaction through a special focus on the role of the story recipients. Furthermore, the study compares why and how storytelling receives different reactions from the recipients.

Storytellers generally try to gain the recipients’ full and enthusiastic attention by involving them in the exchange. However, the development of the story is driven largely by the recipients. The storyteller generally starts the story with an “exciting” preface to generate anticipation in the story recipients, but the recipients can respond to this in different ways. The recipients’ responses influence how the story is told, and also change the manner of interaction between storytellers and recipients. In one reported case, the recipients immediately display interest in the story, giving broad smiles and asking questions concerning the story. In the other case, the recipients do not show obvious interest, and the outcome is quite different.

During the course of telling, storytellers act out the scenes in the story through voiced direct reported speech, with coordinated embodied actions. In doing so, they mimic the voice quality and reenact the conduct of characters in the story. The story recipients can express their willing participation and interest in two main ways: 1) They give direct verbal compliments, such as expressing appreciation of the story or commenting on it. Typically they use adjectives roughly synonymous with those the storyteller has used to introduce the story. In doing so, they formulate what the storyteller has said, and convey their personal involvement. 2) The recipients join in the storytelling, adding their feedback through collective laughter, smiles, head nods, and gaze exchanges. These interactive activities by the recipients may help the story to reach its climax, and thus accomplish shared joy.

In multiparty storytelling, recipients also collaborate through combined verbal and nonverbal cues, or through nonverbal cues alone. They may exchange opinions on incidents in the story and display their appreciation of each others’ comments in a laughing voice. They can also show affiliation and exchange responses to the story with each other through nonverbal collaboration, such as exchanging gazes for confirmation, promptly joining each others’ laughter, or supporting each others’ comments by laughing, smiling, and nodding. Such actions make the storytelling a shared experience. The study also points out an important dual role, in which some participants can be both supporting actors in the story (taking the storyteller’s side in telling the tale), while also taking the role of story recipient.
This chapter also examines a second storytelling episode, which fails to engage the recipients and does not achieve an experience of shared joy. In this case, the recipients respond in a different way, and do not collaborate with the storyteller either verbally or nonverbally. They give negative comments on the story directly through verbal cues, or distance themselves from the story through nonverbal cues. These more negative responses are also shown in two main ways: 1) through verbally downplaying the novelty or humour of the story, or 2) by remaining pointedly silent, declining to join in laughter when invited to do so, or showing non-participation through defensive embodied actions, such as the folded-arm posture.

Even though storytelling is a particularly rich environment for studying mutual joy, future work could take a more focused approach and not study such long sequences but concentrate on some recurrent sequences of actions and individual actions involved in occasioning enjoyment in interaction. Such multimodal studies on joy and related emotions are still missing from interactional research to date.

Chapter 6 studies the emotional display of embarrassment and amusement in playful teasing activities. Teasing involves a range of cues which signal playful intent, including verbal and nonverbal cues. Though teasing often involves mocking remarks towards a personal target, this analysis of teasing interactions shows that both the teaser and the teased person share in bringing the activity to an amusing conclusion. Thus, either the teaser or the tease recipient can initiate amusement in the teasing activity.

This study makes original observations on tease recipient’s displays of embarrassment, in which responses of embarrassment and amusement are commonly mixed. In many situations, the teaser makes critical remarks, knowing it might bring the tease recipient an embarrassing moment. But the teaser commonly conveys this criticism with laughter or embodied actions that display a distinct sense of amusement. Though the recipients display embarrassment through actions such as lowering the head or covering the face, they may also display amusement through laughter and amused verbal expressions. This chapter examines how gestures, co-occurring with verbal expressions hand, play an important role in bringing about amusement in the teasing activity, both for the teaser and the tease recipient. The linkage between teasing activity and specific gestures is very complex, because each kind of gesture occurs in a specific context. However, this analysis leads to a generic conclusion that teasers can indicate an intention of amusement behind their mocking remarks, and tease
recipients can also initiate shared amusement through their gestures or laughter. The use of exaggerated or playful gestures by either the teaser or tease recipient has a strong comedic effect. Very often, the hand gestures bring about richer meaning and amusement to the teasing activity. This study also highlights one specific way of using gestures in the service of teasing: the device of teasing simply by performing exaggerated mimicry of the other person’s earlier gestures.

This chapter especially analyzes how some gestures bring about amusement when occurring in a specific context. One example is pointing at somebody with the thumb, while teasing their manner of speaking. Another is opening the palms and touching someone aggressively while illustrating the overly friendly American way. A third example is rubbing hands in response to critical teasing, in order to transform the situation into an amusing game. In many cases, teasing can be done through embodied cues or hand gestures alone. This has the same amusing effect as playful teasing done by the combined verbal and nonverbal cues. However, such gestures can be used in other contexts as well. Future studies could compare the use of such gestures in other contexts to establish whether these gestures are specific to teasing or if they can be used in the service of other actions and activities as well.

The chapter also investigates the importance of sequencing of the actions involved in teasing. For the teaser, the sequential placement of the laughter is crucial for conveying the sense of amusement. Laughter or a smiling voice during or immediately following the teasing utterances indicates the intent of amusement. Furthermore, if a teasing statement of disapproval comes after an exchange of shared laughter and playful gestures, this also affords a sense of playful jesting to the remark (see Example 17, Cheater, in Chapter 6). The teaser or a third party can relieve the tease target’s uneasiness with laughter.

The messages sent by teasers can be interpreted in many ways by the teased persons. In the way they respond to teasing, the recipients’ contribute much to the ongoing social interaction. If they play along with the teasing, they may display this by various means, such as exaggerated verbal expressions (jokes or jocular remarks), by their tone of voice, laughter, or by gestures. Laughter plays an important role in the reception of teasing. It provides grounds for further interactional activities and reciprocal amusement. The tease recipient’s laughter can show appreciation of the teasing, though not necessarily affiliation with it. The tease recipient may laugh and display embarrassment at the same time. Laughter or hand gestures alone can signal a willing reception of teasing. In many cases, the tease recipients can play along with the teasing and show their
understanding by laughter alone. Laughter from a tease target, without and verbal response, implies willingness to join the conversational play and to proceed with the teasing activity.

In general, when teasing is expressed with obvious exaggerating verbal and nonverbal means, the recipients often respond with playful remarks as well. According to Lampert & Ervin-Tripp (2006: 53), “[t]he experience of jointly playing with ideas allows interactants to show that they have similar attitudes and beliefs towards the objects of the play, and as a result, to reinforce the personal bonds between them.”

Although teasing activity happens in many different social situations, the impact of gender difference on teasing activity is not considered in this study. In future work, we can examine gender differences in teasing activities, such as studying patterns in the subjects and styles of teasing for each gender.

Overall, this dissertation aims to uncover the patterns of emotional display in the intersubjective exchange between participants. There are mutual influences in the expression of emotions, such as the willing participation and interest shown by the recipients of storytelling, which further motivate the storyteller to create an exciting version of the story. The way teasers and recipients of teasing respond to each other involves a mutual effort to achieve amusement. Further, these emotional displays, whether of frustration in argument, joy in storytelling, or embarrassment and amusement in teasing activities, all involve the coordination of verbal choices, prosodic cues, and embodied actions.

To conclude, in argument, storytelling, or teasing, verbal expressions alone are not enough to identify the emotions involved. Additional information present in the sequence needs to be read from the prosodic cues and the accompanied embodied actions. For instance, the stress, intonation, or embodied actions accompanying certain words indicate which parts of an utterance should be given extra attention.

This empirical study finds a series of links between verbal expressions, prosodic cues, and gestures. Though it is hard to link specific gestures with certain emotions, we can say, for example, that the Open Hand Supine gesture, co-occurring with verbal argument, displays a strong desire to persuade the oppositional party. Specific gaze behaviours tend to co-occur with particular facial displays of emotion, such as the exchange of happiness or amusement. Gaze exchange tends to seek confirmation and mutual trust, while averted gaze tends to accompany embarrassment and frustration. Moreover, the study suggests that displays of emotions exist in reciprocal social exchanges. This study has
argued that interpreting the expression of emotion must include the analysis of the social context and the sequential placement in which multimodal interactions and verbal expressions are involved.

The methodology of this study draws from the conversational analytical approach and explores the ways people convey emotion in interpersonal relationships, and it specifically contributes to our understanding of how verbal and nonverbal cues interact with each other in emotional expression in everyday spoken interaction. Furthermore, this study builds on many contributions by previous researchers who have studied social interactions and emotion in social interaction. It presents authentic findings on how emotions are actually displayed in everyday conversation and therefore makes a contribution to different fields of study on emotions: in addition to conversation analysis and discourse analysis, it can contribute to affective technology, and information and communication technology (ICT). As ICT permeates our modern society and has a growing influence on human experience, social scientists have paid increasing attention to the new discipline of emotion-oriented computing, which deals with the design of systems and devices that can express, recognize, interpret, and process emotions (see, e.g. Yu & Zhou 2008, Yu & Zhou 2009, Yu et al. 2009, Zhou & Yu et al. 2007, Zhou & Yu et al. 2009a, 2009b). However, few studies have tried to integrate the findings from the analyses of multimodal emotional cues of ordinary conversation into social and emotion-oriented computing. As a result, the field of social and emotion-oriented computing can benefit from these findings.
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Appendix

Symbols used in transcription from Du Bois et al. 1993

UNITs

Intonation unit (one line is one IU) {carriage return}
Truncated intonation unit --
Truncated word -

TRANSITIONAL CONTINUITY

Final (clear falling intonation) .
Continuing (level, slight rise or fall),
Appeal (high rise, seeking a validating response) ?

SPEAKERS

Speech overlap [ ]
(numbers inside brackets index overlaps, see overleaf)

ACCENT AND LENGTHENING

Primary accent (prominent pitch movement carrying intonational meaning) ^
Secondary accent '
Unaccented
Lengthening (of a sound, syllable) =

PAUSE

Long pauses > 0.7 seconds (0.8)
Medium pauses 0.3–0.6 seconds …
Short pause < 0.2 seconds (brief break in speech rhythm) ..

VOCAL NOISES

e.g., (TSK), (SNIFF), (YAWN), (DRINK)
Glottal stop %
Exhalation (Hx)
Inhalation (H)
Laughter (one pulse) @
Laughter during speech (e.g. 1–5 words) (e.g. @two @words)
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Laughter during speech (e.g. +6 words) @ (e.g. <@ many many words @>)

QUALITY

Special voice quality (voice of another) <VOX words VOX>
Forte: loud <F words F>
Piano: soft <P words P>
Higher pitch level <HI words HI>
Lowered pitch level <LO words LO>
Parenthetical prosody <PAR words PAR>
Allegro: rapid speech <A words A>
Lento: slow speech <L words L>
Marcato: each word distinct and emphasized <MRC words MRC>
Whispered <WH words WH>
Breathy <BR words BR>
Creaky <CREAK words CREAK>
Crying <CRY words CRY>
Yawning <YWN words YWN>
Singing <SING words SING>

TRANSCRIBER’S PERSPECTIVE

Uncertain hearing <X words X>
Uncertain #word X
Indecipherable syllable
Researcher’s comment ((    ))
Code-switching <L2 word or several words L2>
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