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Abstract

This thesis examines how co-present participants manage intervening courses of action in social interaction. It is comprised of a summary and three original papers, which focus on 1) activity suspensions, in which participants temporarily suspend an ongoing activity in favour of an emergent, intervening course of action, and 2) activity resumptions, in which participants resume the suspended activity once the intervention has been dealt with. Using video-recorded, everyday interactions in English and Finnish as data and conversation analysis as the method, this study explores the complex relations between linguistic form, sequence organisation and body behaviour, and how these may work together to constitute activity suspensions and resumptions in interaction.

The thesis identifies recurrent multimodal practices that participants use and orient to when they negotiate transitions into, and out of, intervening courses of action in two different environments, namely in conversational (story)tellings and in ‘multiactivity’ situations (in which participants become involved in more than one activity at the same time). Importantly, the study shows how the body provides a powerful resource for projecting and negotiating these transitions subtly and flexibly, thus enabling participants to maintain a smooth flow of interaction and activities and to avoid overt interactional conflicts in the face of discontinuities and abrupt changes in unfolding interaction. The study provides new information on the construction of activity suspensions and resumptions in interaction by describing them holistically, as linguistic, prosodic and embodied accomplishments. It also sheds new light on some of the practices involved in how participants coordinate their activities and involvements in situations in which multiple relevancies may be at stake.
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Tiivistelmä

Tutkimuksessani tarkastelen vuorovaikutuksen keinona, joiden avulla osallistujat käsittelevät keskeytyksiä sosiaalisessa vuorovaikutuksessa. Tutkimus koostuu yhteenvedon-osuudesta ja kolmesta artikkelista, jotka tarkastelevat kahtia siirtymäkohtaa: 1) keskeyttävien toimintajaksojen aloitusta, eli meneillään olevan toimintalinjan keskeyttämistä toisen vuoksi, ja 2) keskeytynneen toimintaan paluuta sen jälkeen kun kilpailleva toimintalinja on saatettu päätökseen. Aineisto koostuu videoiduista englannin- ja suomenkielisistä arkikeskusteluista, joita tutkin keskustelunanalyyttista menetelmää käyttäen. Kuvaan työssäni kielellisen muodon, toimintajaksojen ja kehollisuusteiden välisiä kompleksisia suhteita ja yhteispeliä keskeytymisen ja paluun rakentumisessa.

Aineistossa esiintyvät systemaattisia, multimodaalisia käytänteitä, joiden avulla osallistujat neuvottelevat ja merkitsevät meneillään olevan ja keskeyttävän toimintalinjan välisiä siirtymiä kahdessa eri kontekstissa: kerrontavuoroissa ja monitoimintatilanteissa, eli tilanteissa, joissa on meneillään useampi yhtäaikainen toimintajakso. Yksi keskeisinä havainnoistani on, että kehon resurssit ovat tärkeässä roolissa näissä siirtymissä, sillä ne mahdollistavat osallistujien välisen neuvottelun hienovaraisin keinoin ja tulevaa siirtymää ennakoivat ja pitävät näin yllä sujuvaa vuorovaikutuksen kulkua myös disjunktivistä ja ennakoimattomista toimintalinjojen lomassa. Tutkimukseni tuottaa uutta tieoa keskeyttävistä toimintajakoista ja paluuvälineistä holistisella lähestymistavallaan eli tarkastelemalla niitä kielellisesti, prosodisesti ja kehollisesti rakentuvin kokonaisuuskoina. Lisäksi se tarjoaa uuden näkökulman osallistujien neuvottelukäytänteisiin tilanteissa, joissa nämä koordinoivat toimintaansa ja osallistujuuttaan useamman meneillään olevan toimintalinjan kesken.
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1 Introduction

Within the course of their everyday social encounters, people are frequently doing more than one thing at the same time (e.g. having a conversation while serving and eating food) while also moving forward with their different activities within the encounter, transitioning from one (phase of an) activity to the next (e.g. from one topic of talk to another, and from having dinner to playing a game). Even though at first glance such an observation may seem obvious and even trivial, on closer inspection it becomes clear that maintaining something as ordinary as a face-to-face conversation with friends does not simply happen but is an interactional accomplishment. This is to say that such ordinary social situations do not follow a predetermined script, but the participants in the encounter need to continuously negotiate and maintain the progressivity of their ongoing activities, as well as the transitions between and within them, through their interactional contributions and through their understandings of others’ contributions. In these situations, it is then not surprising that participants also frequently come to face a practical problem: how to deal with sudden, intervening courses of action that emerge in spontaneous interaction, and how to get ‘back on track’ once these interruptions have been dealt with.

This thesis investigates such junctures in casual, everyday interactions in English and Finnish in which an ongoing activity, which participants currently orient to as their main focus of joint attention, comes to a temporary halt because of some locally relevant, intervening course of action. This new course of action is then temporarily prioritised and dealt with collaboratively, after which participants return to the on-hold activity. Using the framework of conversation analysis (CA), this study zooms in on the two boundaries at which participants transition into, and out of, intervening courses of action, namely activity suspensions (i.e. initiating an intervening course of action and putting the current activity on hold) and activity resumptions (i.e. returning to the suspended activity after the intervening course of action has been dealt with) in interaction. Activity boundaries constitute such moments in interaction that make salient participants’ understandings of and orientations to the status, structure and hierarchy of their different activities and “involvements” (Goffman, 1963) in them, and managing them requires collaborative, interactional work between participants. As Berducci (2001, p. 453) maintains: “analysis of structuring actions yields essential insights into the entire activity”. This thesis demonstrates that when managing these transitional boundaries, participants make use of not only language but multiple
communicative channels (verbal, prosodic, embodied) as well as features of their material surroundings as interactional resources, which form constellations of recognisable and recurrent *multimodal* practices that participants demonstrably use and orient to in the examined situations. By ‘multimodality’ I refer to any and all potentially relevant modalities used for communication: talk, prosody, all bodily manifestations and object-adaptive behaviours, spatial orientations, etc. Under multimodality, *embodiment* refers exclusively to features of the body and its interactionally meaningful orientations to the material world (e.g. gaze, facial expression, gestures, body posture and movement of different parts of the body, as well as object manipulations).

During the past 20 years, there has been a recognised need in the field of conversation analysis to move forward towards incorporating other modalities besides talk into analyses of interactional phenomena. A vast collection of CA-based research has accumulated on the role of bodily conduct, material artefacts, the spatial surround, etc., alongside talk and even beyond talk, in social interaction (e.g. Depperman, 2013; Goodwin, 2000; Rasmussen, Hazel, & Mortensen, 2014; Stivers & Sidnell, 2005; Streeck, Goodwin, & LeBaron, 2011; see also Keevallik, 2018, Couper-Kuhlen, 2018, and Streeck, 2018, on a very recent debate on the role of bodily resources in the emergence and construction of grammar in interaction). However, as observed by Hazel, Mortensen and Rasmussen (2014, p. 5), much of this research has been done in institutional settings, such as classrooms and workplaces, while mundane interactions have received far less attention in the literature (but see e.g. Ford, Thompson, & Drake, 2012; Hayashi, Mori, & Takagi, 2002; Mondada, 2009a). The present thesis contributes in important ways to these concerns and to the study of multimodal interaction in general by examining activity suspension and resumption in mundane interactions and as multimodal constructions. More specifically, it contributes to the study of “complex multimodal Gestalts” (Mondada, 2014a) with its holistic approach, which aims to describe how different multimodal resources are mobilised and assembled together to form activity suspensions and resumptions, showing how these situated, multimodal compositions can also exhibit systematic features across individual examples as well as across two different languages (English and Finnish).

Importantly, the thesis demonstrates the systematic relevance of embodied and material resources for participants’ collaborative achievement of activity suspensions and resumptions in co-present interaction and also shows that the practices formed by these resources are generalisable beyond just one language. Resumptions in particular have so far been studied mostly from a linguistically-
oriented perspective (see e.g. Jefferson, 1972; Local, 2004; Mazeland & Huiskes, 2001; Wong, 2000), but not much research exists that would consider them as actions situated within embodied interaction (cf. Levinson, 2013) and take into account the role of other modalities besides talk and prosody in their accomplishment. Moreover, the present thesis augments prior research on the linguistic properties of resumptions by identifying recurrent linguistic patterns for resumption in both English and Finnish data. It also complements prior research on the sequential organisation of intervening sequences by focusing on their sequential boundaries (i.e. how they are initiated and closed) and examining them as multimodal constructions. The thesis further contributes to research on the relatively understudied concept of ‘multiactivity’ in social interaction (cf. Haddington, Keisanen, Mondada, & Nevile, 2014) by identifying practices that participants use to negotiate their involvement in multiple courses of action and to prioritise between their activities by suspending one activity in favour of another.

The main objective of this thesis is to uncover the interrelations between linguistic form, prosody and embodied practices deployed by participants when they collaboratively negotiate and accomplish activity suspensions and resumptions in co-present interaction. It answers the following research questions:

(1) In what ways are activity suspensions and resumptions recognisable and meaningful actions to participants-in-interaction? For example, how do participants negotiate the hierarchy between their different activities and prioritise between them in situations in which multiple involvements and relevancies are at stake?

(2) What different multimodal practices can be found in the data for suspending and resuming activities? What is the relationship between verbal, prosodic and embodied resources (such as gestures, head shakes, gaze, body postures and bodily movement), as well as participants’ orientations to their material surroundings (e.g. object manipulations), in the construction and accomplishment of activity suspensions and resumptions?

Article I examines resumptions within the context of conversational storytelling in English interaction, identifying a recurrent, multimodal practice used by tellers to return to their suspended tellings after an intervening course of action. Article II examines activity suspensions within the context of multiactivity in English and Finnish interactions, identifying a multimodal practice, ‘noticing-occasioned intervention’, that participants use when initiating a course of action relating to an emergent, potential problem with some other-than-current activity, thus suspending the current activity in favour of the noticed ‘trouble’ that is treated as requiring the participants’ more immediate attention. Article III investigates
resumptions in multiactivity settings, in English and Finnish interactions, demonstrating how they are accomplished through a gradual, stepwise process of collaborative, multimodal negotiations, and showing that they exhibit both systematic and situated features in their composition.

This thesis is organised as follows: in chapter 2, I present the research materials used in this study, including the video recordings and the used transcription conventions for talk and embodied conduct. In chapter 3, I first introduce the research method of conversation analysis and then discuss the relevant theoretical background for the thesis, ending with a final, brief description of the research process of CA and its practical realisation in this study. In chapter 4, I move on to present the findings of each original article, followed by an analysis of one example from the data, which illustrates the phenomena discussed in the articles. In chapter 5, I draw these findings together and discuss their implications and contributions as a whole to the field of conversation analysis and social interaction research, followed by some final concluding remarks in chapter 6.
2 Research materials

This chapter provides a description of the data used and the conventions employed for transcribing talk and embodied conduct in this thesis.

2.1 The video data

The data collections for the original articles have been gathered from three different sources. The examined data consist of video-recorded, naturally occurring, co-present interactions in English and Finnish. Most of the data come from the Oulu Video Corpus of Spoken English and Finnish, collected in Oulu (e.g. among exchange students), the UK, the United States and Australia during 2001-2017. This collection of recordings is maintained in English Philology at the Research Unit for Languages and Literature at the University of Oulu. The recordings have been partially transcribed but not annotated. The data have been collected following the ethical guidelines of the University of Oulu, the Academy of Finland and the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity. Before data collection, the research subjects have given their written consent to being recorded and for the recorded materials to be used for research purposes and in scientific publications. The data have been anonymised so that, for example, the names of the research subjects have been replaced with pseudonyms in the transcripts, and images from the video recordings used in publications have been blurred to prevent identification. The main principle in data collection has been that the interactants are involved in various everyday and more institutional activities, including making use of objects and artefacts in their surround (e.g. mobile phones, laptops, documents, kitchen utensils, tools). This collection currently contains approximately 60 hours of video recordings in English and Finnish.

From the Oulu recordings, I have used a total of 27 hours of data (16.5 hours of English and 10.5 hours of Finnish data), most of which are from mundane interactions between friends and/or family. A few recordings are from educational settings (one from a PhD supervision meeting and one from a seminar session). These data were selected because they represent settings involving multiunit tellings (article I) and/or situations in which participants need to coordinate their involvement in multiple activities that involve both talk and manual action (articles II and III). In addition, I have some 4 hours of video-recorded, conversational Finnish data extracted from the Conversation Data Archive (Keskusteluntutkimuksen arkisto), which is maintained by the Department of
Finnish, Finno-Ugrian, and Scandinavian Studies at the University of Helsinki. I have also used two additional recordings (“Farmhouse” and “Game night”) which contain American English, mundane conversations recorded in the 1990s in the US. The former recording was kindly provided by Professor Barbara Fox at the University of Colorado Boulder and the latter by Professor Cecilia Ford at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. These two recordings amount to approximately 1h 40 minutes of data. Thus, the total amount of data used in this thesis sums up to approximately 32.5 hours (18 hours in English and 14.5 hours in Finnish).

Article I is based on English data only, while articles II and III are based on English and Finnish data. My motivation behind using both English and Finnish data has been to investigate whether, and to what extent, suspension and resumption practices are generalisable beyond one language and culture. On the basis of the findings yielded by these data, I have been able to provide a more robust and convincing argument of the nature of the identified practices as being recurrent and systematic by demonstrating their occurrence across two different languages and cultures.

2.2 Transcription conventions

In this thesis, transcription of talk for articles I and II as well as this summary is based on the standard conventions used in the field of conversation analysis (CA), as originally developed by Gail Jefferson (e.g. 2004), with some minor variations (mostly, simplifications). However, in article III, which is chronologically the first published article, I have used the Discourse Transcription conventions, or also known as “the Santa Barbara style” (cf. Du Bois, Schuetze-Coburn, Cumming, & Paolino, 1993), in transcribing talk in the data examples. Transcription of embodiment is also different from articles I and II, being based on my own system devised specifically for the purposes of article III. These conventions are described in detail in the article. The change in the used transcription styles for talk and embodied conduct between the chronologically first article and the two later ones reflects the general development in the field of CA in multimodal transcription conventions as well as the process of development and refinement in my own methods for analysing and transcribing data and finding the most suitable conventions that would best serve the data used and the research foci adopted in this thesis.

From the CA point of view, when transcribing talk, it is important to write down not just *what* was said, but *how* it was said (ten Have, 2007, p. 94). The reasons for
this will be explicated more in upcoming sections (3.1 and 3.1.3 in particular). The transcripts include details such as identification of the participants (indicated with pseudonyms), the words as they are spoken, other sounds as they are uttered (e.g. *uh, mhm, tsk*; inhalation and exhalation, laughter), inaudible or incomprehensible sounds or words, overlapping talk, spaces and silences within talk, and different prosodic aspects of talk such as pace, stretching of words and sounds, stress, volume or noticeable changes in pitch (for a detailed description of the symbols used, see Appendix I). All of these features of talk can be (and, in prior research, have been demonstrated to be) interactionally meaningful and relevant. Further, in the Finnish examples, English translations are provided on unnumbered lines under the transcribed lines of talk.

In addition to features of talk, the transcripts include depictions of participants’ embodied conduct, transcribed according to conventions developed by Lorenza Mondada (e.g. 2014b, 2018) with some minor adaptations. A detailed list of the used conventions is given in Appendix II (and in articles I and II). As noted by, for example, ten Have (2007, p. 108) and Heath and Luff (1993), when working with video recordings, the general and recommended practice seems to be to start with a detailed transcription of talk and then later to add descriptions of embodied actions (e.g. gaze, gesture, body posture and movement) to the transcripts, fitting them to the timeline provided in the transcribed talk. This is also the practice adopted in the present study, mainly for the reason that talk features prominently in the activities under examination here and thus serves as a natural starting point for creating the transcriptions (but see e.g. Mondada, 2018, on transcribing mostly silent, embodied sequences of action). The transcriptions of participants’ embodied actions are placed under each line of talk where relevant, and these are supplemented by images from the data in places of particular analytical interest.

---

1 There are different ways in which researchers go about transcribing words ‘as they are spoken’. While some tend to use standard orthography, others opt for modifying the standard system, with different degrees of consistency, in order to capture deviations from it, that is, speech as it is actually produced by individual speakers (e.g. *did you / didje, or was / w’z*). In this study, I have mostly used standard orthography unless the use of a particular, "deviant" form seems to bear some local relevance for the interaction with respect to the focus phenomena examined here.

2 A full description of these conventions can be found, for example, at https://mainly.sciencesconf.org/conference/mainly/pages/Mondada2013_conv_multimodality_copie.pdf
3 Theoretical and methodological framework

The theoretical framework and the research methodology adopted in this thesis are grounded in conversation analysis (CA). The thesis combines the method of CA with a multimodal approach to the study of interaction, which is increasingly becoming the norm in contemporary research in the field of CA. This chapter provides a critical discussion of the theoretical and methodological framework the thesis builds on. Further, it situates the thesis within relevant research areas of CA and multimodal interaction and relates findings from prior research to those of the thesis.

The chapter is organised as follows: section 3.1 introduces the origins and foundations of conversation analysis as a research field and a research method and describes the basic principles and analytical concepts that are relevant from the point of view of this thesis. Section 3.2 moves on to describe the specific interactional environments in which activity suspensions and resumptions are examined in this study. Section 3.3 provides a description of the sequential structure and properties of intervening courses of action and their boundaries. Finally, section 3.4 describes the different interactional resources contributing to the accomplishment of activity suspensions and resumptions against the background of prior studies.

3.1 Conversation analysis

Conversation analysis aims at describing the methodical organisation of the everyday lives of members of (a) society, focusing on the local accomplishment of this organisation in and through social interaction between those members, who are commonly referred to in CA as “participants”. CA is both an established research field and a research method in the social sciences (e.g. Hazel et al., 2014, p. 1), including, for example, linguistics (on interactional linguistics in particular, see e.g. Hakulinen & Selting, 2005, and Selting & Couper-Kuhlen, 2001), discourse analysis, anthropology, psychology, social psychology and communication studies, and it is also used in other research areas such as educational sciences and logopedics. Within conversation analysis, two distinct, though in many respects overlapping, areas of research can be identified: on the one hand, there is the study of everyday, mundane interaction, in which the object of interest is interaction itself and its mechanisms as “an entity in its own right” (ten Have, 2007, p. 8). The study of mundane interaction is still considered by some as the ‘purest’ form of CA,
because mundane interaction has been considered as the primordial site for human sociality and, as such, the richest available domain for research (e.g. Heritage, 1984a, pp. 238-240). On the other hand, there is ‘applied CA’ which tends to focus on the study of institutional interaction, concerning itself with the ways in which different social institutions (e.g. health care, government, law, trade, education) are managed, or “talked into being” (Heritage, 1984a, p. 290), in and through interaction (for an overview of this vast field of research, see e.g. Mondada, 2013). One branch of this line of research examines the communicative practices of work communities with an ‘interventionist’ agenda, showing how these practices may be improved (e.g. Antaki, 2011). The present thesis, however, represents the first line of inquiry by focusing on the everyday interactional practices of participants in mundane interaction.

3.1.1 The origins and development of CA and its methodological foundations

The origins of conversation analysis trace back to the work of two American social scientists, namely Erving Goffman and Harold Garfinkel, in the 1950s and 1960s. They both sought to diverge from the prevailing view in social sciences at the time, which considered the details of everyday life and social conduct to be fundamentally disorderly and, essentially, unworthy of systematic, sociological inquiry. Goffman (e.g. 1955, 1963, 1983) put forth the idea of the “interaction order” as a separate form of social institution in its own right that could be systematically studied.3 Around the same time, Garfinkel (1967) was developing his own theory of social order, which he termed “ethnomethodology” – a theory based on observations of the methodical ways in which members of a society organise their everyday lives (see e.g. Heritage, 1984a). It was out of the legacy of these works that conversation analysis emerged, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, when one of Goffman’s (and later, Garfinkel’s) students, Harvey Sacks, working together with his colleagues Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson, developed his own approach to studying social order (see especially lectures by Sacks, 1992 [1964-1972] and Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). This approach was radically different from the existing methods in sociology such as coding and field observation; it was based on empirical observations of naturally occurring interactions, captured in

3 See e.g. Drew and Wootton (1988) for discussions on the contribution of Goffman to the study of social interaction.
recordings that could be played repeatedly for analysis, and focused on the methodical organisation of talk-in-interaction. However, as Sacks himself has pointed out (1992, Vol. I, p. 622), this was not due to any principled interest in language per se but because of practical necessity. As the data available in those days were mainly in the form of audio recordings (starting from Sacks’ investigations of recorded phone calls to a suicide prevention center), talk quite naturally became the object through which interaction was initially studied.

Despite technical constraints, however, some scholars used video recordings for the analysis of social interaction quite early on (see e.g. C. Goodwin, 1981; M. H. Goodwin, 1980; Heath, 1986; Schegloff, 1984), incorporating into their analyses not only talk but also embodied resources such as gaze, gestures and body movements. As video technologies developed and became more accessible and reliable, the number of CA studies that recognised the relevance of embodiment and materiality to interaction began to steadily grow. The turn of the millenium in particular features a clear rise in interest in the field of social interaction research on embodiment – what Nevile (2015, p. 127) calls the “embodied turn for research on language and social interaction” (emphasis in the original). In other words, during the 21th century, a rapidly growing body of conversation analytic research has begun to accumulate on the role of bodily conduct, alongside talk and even beyond talk, in social interaction (e.g. Goodwin, 2000; Stivers & Sidnell, 2005; Streeck et al., 2011), including a number of edited volumes as well as special issues and featured debates in the journals of the field, devoted to the study of multimodal interaction (e.g. Deppermann, 2013; Haddington et al., 2014; Keevallik, 2018; Nevile, Haddington, Heinemann, & Rauniomaa, 2014; Rasmussen et al., 2014, and many more).

As a research approach, conversation analysis can be characterised as qualitative and data-driven (e.g. Heritage, 1984a, p. 243): rather than starting out with a set of predefined, abstract categories or theories of the researcher, which would then be confirmed on the basis of data, the starting point is the data itself. As already mentioned, from its very beginnings, conversation analysis has insisted on using recorded, naturally occurring interactions as data, meaning interactions that have not been specifically “set up” and controlled by the researcher in a laboratory, but which take place in participants’ natural settings such as their homes.

---

4 Further, the paper by Sacks and Schegloff (2002) on “home position” is based on a conference paper that dates back to 1975 and was one of the earliest attempts to describe bodily action systematically (Mondada, 2014a, p. 139).
cafes, workplaces, etc., and which would have taken place even without the recording. This kind of data captures human interaction as it actually occurs, in real-time and as a ‘situated’ achievement between interlocutors, thus being “less ‘artificial’” than data acquired with more experimental and researcher-controlled methods (e.g. ten Have, 2007, p. 9). The importance of mechanically recording, rather than using recollected or otherwise summarised representations of data is also emphasised in CA (e.g. Heritage, 1984a, p. 238; Sacks, 1984, pp. 25-26; Schenkein, 1978, pp. 2-3; Sidnell, 2010, p. 20-23), because it enables the analyst to consult the data, in all of its details, again and again, and to create detailed transcripts of the data, in order to conduct micro-level analyses of the subtleties and nuances that contribute to interaction, as countless CA studies have empirically shown such subtleties to be of significance to participants. This brings up another important point in the CA approach to data: whatever claims are being made about interactional phenomena in the data, these must be demonstrated as being relevant for the participants themselves (e.g. Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 290), through an empirical observation of the details of what the participants are saying and doing, but also how and when they are doing the things they do. This “participants’ perspective” is an important starting point for CA analyses of interaction and leads to CA operating “closer to the phenomena” (ten Have, 2007, p. 9) than most other approaches. For this reason, quantification and coding of data have generally been considered as antithetical to the CA approach, because using such methods would mean losing sight of the intricacies and details of interaction that are meaningful for participants (but see e.g. Stivers, 2015, for an argument in favour of using coding and quantification methods in CA).

When conversation analysts look at a piece of interaction and begin to analyse what the participants are doing, the basic reasoning technique they use is often referred to as the ‘next-turn proof procedure’, which is based on looking at interaction in its context: in order to understand what a particular turn-at-talk or interactional move is doing in the interaction, one needs to look at what came before and what comes next, that is, how the participants themselves display their understanding of and orientation to that prior talk in their next turn(s) (e.g. Sacks et al., 1974, p. 729; Heritage, 1984a, p. 242). The basic question that guides the analyst (as well as the participant) is ‘why that now?’ (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), that is, why that particular turn or move is produced in that particular way, at that
particular moment and in that particular position in ongoing interaction. From the CA perspective, then, interactional organisation is seen as an orderly accomplishment that is oriented to and displayed by the participants themselves, not as a prescriptive set of rules arrived at and imposed by the analyst with an exterior, “God’s eye” view (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, pp. 14-15).

The next section will discuss some of the most important discoveries on the organisation of social interaction that have been made in CA and the terms and concepts developed as a result of these discoveries which are also relevant for the present thesis.

3.1.2 Basic principles for the organisation of social interaction

As discussed in the previous section, even though CA started out with a focus on the organisation of talk-in-interaction, a more accurate description of its research interests would be the “interactional organisation of social activities” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 14). That is to say, unlike most other approaches to linguistic research, CA’s perspective on language is to examine it as an object designed and used to accomplish actions (requests, complaints, challenges, agreements, assessments, etc.), situated in particular social and interactional contexts. As Drew (2005, p. 75) observes, interaction between people is based on their shared, mutual “communicative competencies”, which consist of both their knowledge of the language itself (i.e. elements such as lexis, grammar and syntax, intonation and prosody, and how they are put together and used) and their knowledge of the structures, patterns, norms and expectations involved in interacting with others. Our shared communicative competencies are manifested through the interplay between language and action and allow us to establish a mutual understanding of what is said and what is done in talk-in-interaction. However, as the substantial amount of accumulated research on multimodal interaction especially since the turn of the millennium (cf. Nevile, 2015) has shown, the communicative competencies of participants go beyond their knowledge of language and ways of using it to accomplish actions; they also encompass participants’ shared knowledge of embodied practices as well as the endogenous meanings and affordances of the material world (with its local ecologies) around them. Participants are thus able to achieve intersubjective understanding and carry out their joint activities in social, co-present interaction through the complex, mutually elaborative interplay between these different semiotic resources (e.g. Goodwin, 2000; Streeck et al., 2011).
When looking at social interaction from a CA perspective, the starting point is the sequential organisation of the activities of participants-in-interaction. Sequences form coherent courses of action, and, according to Schegloff (2007, p. 2), are “the vehicle for getting some activity accomplished”. Sequential organisation operates on more than one level of human (inter)action: in a more narrow sense, it operates at the level of talk, creating conversational coherence; in a wider sense, it operates at the level of action, enabling the orderly accomplishment of social actions, embedded within social activities, in and through multimodal interaction (which encompasses both talk and embodied conduct as well as participants’ interactionally meaningful orientations to their material surroundings). In discussing the relationship between ‘sequence’ and ‘activity’, Heritage and Sorjonen (1994, p. 4) define a course of action as constituted and undertaken in and through a (series of) sequence(s) and activity as the work achieved across these sequences as a topically coherent or goal-coherent unit. According to Robinson (2013, p. 259), within CA, there is no clear or precise conceptualisation and definition of ‘activity’, but a common theme is that activities are achieved across more than one sequence of action. Indeed, as Keevallik (2010, p. 157) reminds us, defining what counts as an activity and where activity boundaries are is ultimately ‘a members’ problem’ within the interactive event and cannot therefore be determined in any principled, abstract way. In the following, I will present the basic principles of CA as they have been laid out in prior research, in which the object of analysis has been the methodical organisation of talk-in-interaction. These principles continue to inform the sequential analyses of multimodal interaction research and are also important from the point of view of this thesis.

In addition to sequence organisation, another fundamental organising principle in interaction is the turn-taking system, which describes the ways in which conversational participants negotiate and accomplish orderly turn-taking in interaction. The basic model for the organisation of turn-taking was originally developed by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) who, based on empirical evidence, proposed a simple set of rules to describe how turns are allocated in conversation, arguing that turns at talk are distributed in systematic ways among participants. The three most basic rules in their model are: 1) turn-taking occurs, 2) one speaker tends to talk at a time, and 3) turns are taken with as little gap or overlap between them as possible. Of course, everyday conversation is anything but an ideal representation of these rules: it is a common feature of any naturally occurring interaction (with the exception of more formal or ceremonial forms of talk) to have
more than one speaker talk at a time, and there are certainly gaps and overlapping talk in conversation. Nevertheless, empirical data overwhelmingly show how conversational participants orient themselves to this ideal of coordination.

In the turn-taking model by Sacks et al. (1974), there are two main components: a ‘turn-constructional component’ and a ‘turn-allocational component’. Turns at talk are seen as constructed out of units that are commonly referred to in the CA literature as turn-construction units (TCUs in short), which roughly correspond to linguistic categories such as sentences, clauses, phrases, or even single words (such as wow!, what? or hm). From the CA perspective, one essential feature of a TCU is that it constitutes a recognisable action – or more than one action – in the context of that particular conversation, with these particular participants (e.g. Schegloff, 2007, p. 4). Furthermore, it is possible for the participants in the course of a TCU not only to recognise what kind of a unit it is but, most essentially, to anticipate at what point it is likely to end (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 702). This phenomenon is known as projection in CA. Closely connected to the notion of a TCU and its projectability is the second component of the turn-taking model: the turn allocation component, or the transition-relevance place (TRP in short). At the end of each TCU, there is the possibility for a legitimate transition between speakers, where it is either possible for another speaker to take a turn at talk, or for the same speaker to continue with another TCU. The dynamics of the respective interactional situation determine how turns are allocated between participants; in other words, it is up to the participants to negotiate and coordinate turn-taking in the course of a conversation.

Furthermore, each new turn-at-talk constitutes an interactional ‘move’, which is designed to fit into the local circumstances and context of talk so that it takes into account what was said in prior talk, being shaped by this talk, and also sets up possibilities for and restrictions on how the next turn after it will be shaped (e.g. Goodwin & Heritage, 1990, p. 287; Heritage, 1984a, p. 245; Raevaara, 1997, p. 75). In other words, the participants’ understanding of and orientation to the talk is continuously re-defined and re-adjusted at each ‘next’ TCU or turn produced during the course of a conversation. According to, for example, Jefferson (1978, p. 246, footnote 8), such next-positioning is a basic device for tying an utterance or turn to the one after it. Likewise, Schegloff (2007, pp. 2-3) observes that the participants

---

6 Some scholars (Ford, Fox, & Thompson, 1996; Ford & Thompson, 1996) have used the term “complex transition relevance place” (CTRP) as an extension of the linguistically-oriented notion of a TRP to describe the convergent syntactic, intonational, pragmatic as well as embodied resources that participants rely on and orient to when anticipating possible turn completion points in interaction.
of a conversation constantly monitor each TCU and each turn not only for a possible completion point and for a possible next speaker, but also for what action(s) the current speaker might be doing with his or her talk, which then has implications for what action might be relevant in the next turn as a response. For example, when the current speaker makes a request, then the projected, relevant response from the next speaker is to grant or refuse the request. Moreover, the maker of the request may have an idea whether the recipient of the request might be more inclined to grant or to refuse the request and, therefore, formulates the request differently depending on the projected response. This phenomenon is known as turn design in CA, which involves the selection of the action to be accomplished in the next turn and also the way in which this action is to be performed (e.g. Drew, 2005, pp. 85-86). Participants are thus constantly analysing ongoing talk, and their response in the next turn is shaped by this analysis and designed so as to fit to the talk of the just-prior turn. This relationship of ‘nextness’ or adjacency between turns and utterances as well as their relationship to the larger interactional context are central to understanding how conversation is organised and understood by the participants.

The basic sequence type through which the ‘nextness’ relationship and the turn organisation of conversation has been explored in much of CA research is the adjacency pair (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 710; Schegloff, 1968, 1972, 2007). Adjacency pairs are two-part structures which have a recognisable ‘first pair part’ and a ‘second pair part’. Examples of these conventionally paired actions are questions and answers, greetings and return greetings, requests and grants/refusals or invitations and acceptances/declinations. The first pair part, or the first action, opens up a slot in the conversation for the second pair part, so that this second action is expected to occur. For example, when a participant asks a question, he or she expects to get a response, and the recipient of the question is also aware of this expectation, orienting towards fulfilling it. This connection between the first and second part of an adjacency pair is called conditional relevance (Schegloff, 1968; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), which prevails even when the second pair part is delayed or does not occur at all, in which case it is treated as being “noticeably absent” (Sacks, 1992, Vol II, p. 35), that is, some kind of reason or explanation is attributed for the absence and possibly some form of remedy is attempted. A sequence in its most basic form, then, is an adjacency pair (consisting of two turns-at-talk, or two conventionally paired “moves”), which can become expanded in several different positions within or around the base pair (e.g. Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2001; Heritage & Sorjonen, 1994; Schegloff, 2007). Moreover, many studies have shown that adjacency pair structures are not only a feature of talk but they can also be
constructed with embodied resources, so that one pair part, or both parts, may be produced entirely without talk or with only minimal verbal resources (see e.g. Broth & Keevallik, 2014, and Kärkkäinen & Keisanen, 2012). Schegloff (2007, p. 9) further observes that there are also other types of identifiable sequence types that are not based on adjacency pairs, such as forms of conversational storytelling and other “telling” sequences or “topic talk”.

In addition to the types of sequences discussed above, there are also larger sequential organisations that structure and inform institutional or social activities (cf. Robinson, 2013) and even entire interactional encounters (cf. Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Institutional interactions in particular regularly have an “overall structural organization” or “supra-sequential coherence” whereby the institutional tasks and activities are normatively ordered and thus highly predictable in their organisation and also treated and produced by participants as having to be done in a certain order (e.g. Robinson, 2013; Weatherall & Edmonds, 2018). As discussed by Robinson (2013, pp. 274-6), this organisation also includes participants’ identities for interaction, that is, the interactional rights, obligations and expectations related to their institutional roles in those settings. However, as Robinson (2013, p. 257) points out, there are also a variety of more mundane social activities that involve multiple, normatively ordered sequences of action (such as opening a birthday present). He further identifies a need in the field of CA to investigate “how relatively ordinary (vs. institutional) affairs inform, and are informed by, overall structural organizations” (p. 278).

As Heritage and Sorjonen (1994, p. 4) observe, one of the ways in which participants display an orientation to overall structural organisation as a coherent undertaking is by orienting to it as something that may be ‘departed from’ and ‘returned to’. This thesis shows how transitional junctions like activity suspensions and resumptions make particularly salient participants’ orientations to the overall structural organisation of their activities, as they ‘depart from’ and ‘return to’ these activities, and in so doing, also engage in negotiations about the status of and the hierarchy between their different activities and involvements in them, for example, by orienting to them as “main” and “side” (Goffman, 1963, pp. 43-45). As such, the transitions involved in suspending and resuming an ongoing activity are different from other types of activity transitions, such as opening and closing entire interactional episodes or encounters (e.g. LeBaron & Jones, 2002; Lindström, Nörby, Wide, & Nilsson, 2017; Mondada, 2009b; Mortensen & Hazel, 2014; Robinson, 1998; Tuncer, 2015) or moving from one (phase of an) activity to another (e.g. Broth & Keevallik, 2014; Keevallik, 2010; Keisanen, Rauniomaa, & Siitonen,
When participants suspend the present, ongoing activity in order to attend to some intervening course of action, they do not definitively abandon or terminate the suspended activity but only temporarily depart from it. That is to say, the intervention is treated and framed as a temporary digression, not as the start of some completely new course of action, so that a return to the suspended activity is treated and oriented to as being ‘due’ after the intervening course of action has been dealt with (cf. e.g. Deppermann, Schmitt, & Mondada, 2010; Keisanen, Rauniomaa, & Haddington, 2014).

As prior studies on activity transitions have suggested, boundaries between activities, or between different phases of them, are rarely sharp and clear-cut. In discussing how co-present participants organise engagement and disengagement of talk and joint activities, Goodwin (1981, p. 106) observes that the transitional boundary between moving from a state of mutual engagement to disengagement affords a space within which participants can mutually reorganise their bodies and actions in a way that gives them time to prepare and adjust their actions for the upcoming change to disengagement. Such closing work is conducted multimodally, through talk and embodied conduct, with the different modalities constituting “a plurality of sequentially ordered simultaneities” (Mondada, 2018, p. 94, emphasis in the original) which follow different temporal orders. Thus, transitions, at the same time, make salient the organisation of activities into recognisable sequences and the obscure, fuzzy nature of the boundaries between them. Indeed, as Berducci (2001, p. 476) observes, human action and interaction should be viewed in a seemingly contradictory manner in “that it both consists of discrete objects and is a continuous stream”.

In the data examined in this thesis, sequences not based on adjacency pairs but on other types of organisation (‘tellings’ in particular) feature prominently, as will be discussed in upcoming sections. In mundane settings examined here, the order and organisation of activities as well as participants’ interactional rights and obligations within these activities are in general not as highly routinised or predetermined as in institutional contexts discussed above; rather, they must be negotiated and worked out locally by participants and are also subject to change within the course of unfolding interaction. Further, during an intervening course of action, participants’ orientation to the continued relevance of the intervened-upon activity is manifested in many different ways by participants in their verbal contributions as well as through their embodied conduct and object-adaptive behaviours (see e.g. Example 2 in section 4.4 and Excerpt 1 in article III of this
thesis). Finally, as will be discussed in chapter 4, the examined activity suspensions and resumptions in this study do not constitute abrupt, clear-cut switches out of, and back into, the main activity but, especially in the case of resumptions (articles I and III), the return to the suspended main activity is a gradual, stepwise accomplishment involving collaborative and multimodal negotiations between participants.

### 3.1.3 The research process

As was discussed in previous sections, conversation analysis is a highly empirical, data-driven method. After the data has been recorded (and possibly transcribed), the ideal starting point for analysis is what is referred to in the literature as ‘unmotivated looking’ (e.g. Sacks, 1984, p. 27; Schegloff, 1996, p. 172). This means that, rather than narrowing down the scope of research too much in advance by deciding and defining in detail what the object of study will be and making assumptions about what will be found, the researcher should simply start by going through the data and seeing what kinds of interesting phenomena emerge from it. In reality, however, this is not such a straightforward matter. As, for example, ten Have (2007, pp. 120-121) points out, looking at data cannot be entirely unmotivated, because being able to notice potentially interesting phenomena in a stream of seemingly unremarkable course of social interaction requires a trained eye and an understanding of the basics of interactional organisation (e.g. the rules of turn-taking and principles of sequence organisation). Furthermore, looking at data is always motivated by research interests, without which there would be no looking in the first place (cf. Psathas, 1990, pp. 24-25). The ideal of unmotivated looking rather suggests that one should take an “open-minded approach” to the data, using the basics of CA to structure one’s looking (ten Have, 2007, p. 121) but not limit it too much based on prior definitions or hypotheses of what should be found in the data.

In the case of this thesis as well, the starting point was not entirely ‘unmotivated’, because I started looking at data with a specific research interest: how participants suspend and resume activities in co-present interaction. However, I did not start with a precise theoretical definition or conceptualisation of ‘suspension’ and ‘resumption’ and what they should look like in the data. I only had a very general idea of the phenomenon when I first began examining the data, with no specific hypotheses in mind, for example, on particular resources that would turn out to be relevant for the analysis. Consequently, rather than starting
with a theoretical, data-detached definition of activity suspensions and resumptions, the guiding principle was to find out how (and if) they are recognisable and relevant actions for the participants themselves and, based on these empirical observations, to work towards a definition and description of the examined phenomena (see section 3.1.1 for further discussion on the ‘participants’ perspective’ in CA).

In the CA approach, a time-consuming but fundamentally important exercise in the initial process of data analysis is to produce detailed transcripts of the recordings. As ten Have (2007, p. 96) observes, transcriptions are important analytical tools because they provide researchers with an insight into the participants’ conduct. In practice, transcribing data is the first analytical phase in the research process, because it directs attention to the minute details of interaction and enables the researcher to notice interesting phenomena that might otherwise escape attention (Schenkein, 1978, p. 3). Nevertheless, a transcription is always a compromise between capturing as much detail as possible while still maintaining a reasonable level of readability. No transcription system is perfect, because it is simply not possible to include everything that is going on, in all of its detail, in a transcript. As a result, transcripts are inevitably selective and produced for the specific purposes and interests of the researcher who transcribes the data and therefore should not be considered as a substitute for the recordings (e.g. Heritage & Atkinson, 1984). That is to say, the researcher should never rely solely on the transcripts but should always work with the actual data alongside the transcript (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997, p. 70), which can then be refined and supplemented during repeated viewings of the data and gradual development of the analysis. This standard working method in CA has also been followed in the present study.

In the process of analysis, the next step after transcribing and locating an interesting phenomenon in the data is to start building a collection of cases by trying to find as many instances of the phenomenon as possible in the data (e.g. Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, pp. 93-98; Sidnell, 2010, pp. 31-34). The purpose of this exercise is to look for ‘patterns of interaction’ (e.g. ten Have, 2007), that is, to identify recurrent and systematic practices that are generalisable beyond individual cases or individual participants’ idiosyncratic practices. Through repeated viewings/listenings and detailed transcriptions of the recorded data and careful analyses of each collected example, the researcher gradually develops a deeper understanding of the phenomenon (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997, p. 87), including a grasp of its systematic features as well as variations between individual examples. However, as Psathas (1995, p. 46) outlines, a discovered interactional phenomenon may be based on a collection of numerous instances of similar phenomena (as in
the present thesis), but it can also be based on single cases that illustrate, for example, some structurally complex or otherwise significant phenomena. The process of building the data collections in the present study has proceeded in the same way in all three original papers: at first I simply started going through the data, casting a wide net in my search of instances in which some ongoing activity was temporarily put on hold because of an intervening course of action and then later returned to. In articles I and III, the search was targeted towards moments of return, and in article II, towards moments of suspension. Gradually, as my understanding of the examined phenomena grew, the research foci began to narrow down to fewer examples with similar, recurrent properties. During this process, I also began to familiarise myself with prior research on the examined phenomena, which allowed me to refine the analyses and deepen my understanding of the phenomena. However, at the initial stages of data analysis, I avoided making any predetermined classifications or formulating precise definitions of activity suspensions and resumptions. Consequently, the findings and arguments made in this thesis on the identified interactional practices are based first and foremost on observable phenomena in the data rather than on predefined theoretical conceptions.

3.2 The sequential contexts of activity suspensions and resumptions

In this thesis, activity suspensions and resumptions (and the intervening courses of action that come between them) are examined in two different sequential and activity contexts: 1) in conversational storytellings and other extended telling sequences (article I), and 2) in situations of ‘multiactivity’ (articles II and III), in which participants engage in multiple tasks and activities that involve both talk and manual action. In the latter context, the activities are organised into wider action sequences, often made up of consecutive adjacency pairs and their expansions. Examples of such activities in the data are roleplaying sessions or participants working on a laptop together. It should be noted that these two contexts are not mutually exclusive: storytellings take place also in multiactivity situations and, on the other hand, competing activities may emerge during a storytelling which may cause temporary disruptions to the telling (see e.g. Example 2 in section 4.4). Nevertheless, these two contexts represent different levels (of complexity) of sequential organisation: while storytellings comprise a single, albeit extended, sequence, in the examined multiactivity settings the action sequences usually form larger entities, being made up of “sequences of sequences” (Schegloff, 2007), that
is, successive courses of multimodal action that make up an activity. As the findings will show, the intervening courses of action in these two contexts emerge, and are constructed, somewhat differently (see section 3.3.3 and chapter 4).

### 3.2.1 Conversational storytelling and other multiunit turns

In sequential terms, conversational storytelling and other extended, descriptive or explicative tellings are constructed from multiple turn-construction units of talk by a single speaker and thus require a longer-than-usual turn at talk to accomplish (e.g. Goodwin, 1984, p. 226; Mandelbaum, 1993, p. 252). It remains outside the scope of the present study to describe in detail the sequential organisation of storytelling sequences or their internal structure and its different narrative components (but see e.g. Mandelbaum, 2013; Norrick, 2000; Stivers, 2008; Thornborrow & Coates, 2005). However, as pointed out originally by Sacks (1992, Vol. II, pp. 222-228), a participant who wishes to tell a story does not simply begin to tell it, but rather, the participant needs to use special techniques to introduce the prospective story to the ongoing turn-by-turn talk (typically, via a story preface). By using storytelling techniques, the storyteller is able, among other things, to engage conversational co-participants as story recipients, so that they will withhold talk at what might otherwise be a legitimate TRP, to negotiate whether, and how, the story will be told, whether it is completed or in progress, and how it should be responded to at its completion (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, pp. 132-136; Jefferson, 1978, p. 237). However, successfully engaging co-participants as story recipients and proceeding with the telling does not definitively ensure the continuation of extended speaker rights for the storyteller; the story-in-progress and its relevance still need to be sustained, and its ending negotiated, in cooperation with the recipients, thus making ‘storytelling’ an interactionally and socially collaborative achievement (Lerner, 1992, pp. 247-248; Mandelbaum, 1993, p. 252; Ryave, 1978, pp. 130-131).

Because the accomplishment of a (story)telling is crucially dependent on the collaboration of recipients, it is therefore not surprising that recipients also frequently produce talk during tellings. Much of this talk is supportive of, and shows alignment with, the ongoing telling as well as the action it implements, for example, when the recipients produce continuers (such as mm, uhhuh or yeah) and affiliative responses to, or even become co-tellers in, the telling (see e.g. Lerner, 1992; Mandelbaum, 2013; Stivers, 2008). However, for various interactional reasons, recipients may also produce responses that disrupt the ongoing telling sequence or divert it from its projected course (e.g. M. H. Goodwin, 1997;
Mandelbaum, 2010), thus resulting in a “side sequence” (Jefferson, 1972) within the ongoing telling sequence. Likewise, (story)tellers themselves may digress from the main line of their own tellings, for example, by producing talk that constitutes a parenthetical segment (e.g. Goodwin, 1984; Mazeland, 2007) within the main storyline. Article I examines such intervening courses of action within telling sequences, focusing on the sequential transition in which the teller resumes their on-hold telling after an intervention (see section 4.1).

3.2.2 Multiactivity as a context for activity suspension and resumption

In simple terms, multiactivity refers to ‘being involved in, or doing, more than one thing at the same time’ as examined from a social interactionist perspective. This perspective proposes a different approach to what has commonly been referred to as ‘multitasking’ in cognitive and sociological research as well as in more vernacular contexts (see Haddington et al., 2014, for a more extensive discussion). From this perspective, the interest is not on the cognitive abilities and/or limitations of individuals engaged in multitasking in experimental settings but in the ways in which multiactivity is organised and managed as a real-life concern for participants, accomplished in and through the details of participants’ interactional contributions and joint action in real time, in naturally occurring interaction. The various sequential and temporal organisations of multiactivity have been examined mostly in institutional contexts that feature complex, often technology-rich workplace settings (e.g. Heath & Luff, 1992; Mondada, 2008, 2011, 2014b; Nevile, 2004) from the point of view of how professionals at work organise and accomplish their multiple involvements and tasks in these settings (see also e.g. LeBaron & Jones, 2002, and Toerien & Kitzinger, 2007, on service encounters). However, and perhaps a bit surprisingly, mundane, everyday interactions as sites for multiactivity have received far less attention in the literature (but see e.g. Goodwin, 1984; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1992, Mondada, 2009, and Schegloff, 1998; for studies on multiactivity in cars, see e.g. Haddington & Rauniomaa, 2011; Mondada, 2012, and Nevile, 2012).

Articles II and III of this thesis target multiactivity situations in everyday, mundane interactional settings, focusing on one type of “coordination regime” (Mondada, 2011, p. 225), according to which activities may be organised within multiactivity, namely by suspending and resuming activities. More specifically, both articles examine moments within multiactivity in which two (or more) lines
of action become incompatible, for example, because they both require the use of the same resource (i.e. talk and/or same parts of the body) and thus cannot be dealt with simultaneously. In practice, this incompatibility results in a situation in which participants need to organise their involvement in these activities by temporarily suspending one course of action in favour of another (cf. Keisanen et al., 2014). The suspended activity is oriented to as the current main activity, or “main involvement” (Goffman, 1963, p. 43), that is, the activity that currently occupies the participants’ main focus of joint attention, which needs to be resumed after the intervening course of action has been dealt with. In this context, intervening courses of action (that come between activity suspension and its later resumption) tend to occur either as inserted sequences (or what Schegloff, 2007, calls “insert expansions”) between two pair parts of a base adjacency pair sequence, or between ‘sub-sequences’ of a larger sequential structure, that is, after a completed phase of an activity before moving on to the next phase of the activity. However, such descriptions of the sequential organisation of activity suspensions and resumptions within multiactivity are further complicated by the fact that these activities frequently involve both talk and manual action and thus take place in multimodal action streams.² As will be discussed in upcoming sections, and in article III of this thesis in particular, incorporating in the analysis of sequential transitions the participants’ use of embodied resources as well as their orientation to their material surroundings stretches and blurs these sequential boundaries and raises questions about strictly talk-based definitions of sequences (cf. e.g. Keevallik, 2010, 2018).

3.3 Intervening sequences within ongoing courses of action

When looking at sequential boundaries in which participants suspend and resume activities, it is also necessary to examine the intervening sequences that come between those suspensions and resumptions. In this section I will present prior, relevant research on intervening sequences in interaction and discuss how the present study relates to previous findings.

² Of course, it should be stated that basically all co-present interactional activities, including predominantly verbal activities such as conversational storytelling or other kinds of topic talk, are inherently multimodal because they take place in a physical world with physically co-present participants. Many studies have shown how gaze, gestures and other embodied resources have, among other things, important organisational and expressive functions in tellings and are used in different ways to signal and to negotiate the participation status of both teller and recipients (e.g. Goodwin, 1984; Rossano, 2012; Stivers, 2008; Streeck, 2009).
A review of prior literature shows that the interactional reasons for initiating intervening courses of action as well as their sequential properties vary considerably. There are differences at least in terms of who initiates the sequence (i.e. current speaker or recipient); what action(s) it implements; how it is formulated (e.g. as a question or statement); what its relationship to the ongoing activity is (i.e. whether it is topically related or unrelated); where in the ongoing sequence the intervention is placed (i.e. its sequential position and timing with respect to ongoing talk and action); how long the sequence is (minimal or expanded) and how the eventual return to the suspended activity is accomplished. It is beyond the scope of this study to discuss all of these different variations and their sequential properties in detail, but some observations relevant from the point of view of this thesis will be provided in what follows.

Prior, linguistically oriented research has mostly examined intervening courses of action as intervening talk and how it is sequentially organised within conversational contexts. In these studies, a division is usually made between intervening sequences initiated by a recipient or by the current speaker. Intervening sequences initiated by the current recipient (i.e. other-initiated interventions) have been studied under the label of, for example, “side sequences” (e.g. Jefferson, 1972; Mazeland & Huiskes, 2001) or “oblques” (Koenig, 2006). Intervening sequences that are self-initiated by the current speaker have been termed, for example, “parenthetical” sequences (e.g. Auer, 2005; Duvallo & Routarinne, 2005; Mazeland, 2007) or “digressions” (e.g. Kärkkäinen, 2012) within a multiunit turn (and which may or may not involve speaker change in the form of recipient responses). In the following sections, I will discuss some of this research, which will provide a background for describing the kinds of intervening courses of action examined in this thesis.

3.3.1 Other-initiated side sequences

In her paper on side sequences, Jefferson (1972, p. 294) characterises them as occurrences during an ongoing activity that may not feel as being “part” of that activity, but which nevertheless appear to be somehow relevant. When there is such an occurrence, it constitutes a break in the ongoing activity, but not a termination, because the ongoing activity will be resumed. In her paper, Jefferson mostly focuses on side sequences launched by what she calls “remedies”, which target some trouble in the ongoing activity and are therefore subsidiary to that activity (1972, p. 312). When such a subsidiary sequence is initiated, the ongoing activity
comes to a temporary halt, but it is resumed again later, after the trouble in the subsidiary sequence has been solved. In all cases discussed by Jefferson, the remedial procedures are initiated by someone other than the speaker of the trouble source, that is, by a co-participant in the conversation. Jefferson (1972, pp. 314-315) argues that side sequences consist of nameable and recognisable “parts” that participants orient to, including a “first part” which is marked by items like by the way or oh incidentally that specifically signal the following sequence as subsidiary and not competitive, and a “last part” which is marked by items like oh or okay that recognisably close the subsidiary sequence by signalling “satisfactory termination” of the action they follow. In light of these observations, Jefferson (1972, p. 317) introduces a three-part structure to describe the sequential environment of side sequences, which she terms the “O-S-R sequence” (On-going sequence, Side-sequence, Return to on-going sequence).

In a later study, Mazeland and Huiskes (2001) use Jefferson’s O-S-R sequence as a basis for describing the sequential environment in which the Dutch connective maar (‘but’ in English) is used as a resumption marker after an expanded other-initiated repair sequence, which they call non-minimal postexpansion (see also Schegloff, 2007). This sequential structure is in essence an extended adjacency pair, which most typically becomes expanded after the second pair part (i.e. as a post-expansion). The sequential length of the post-expansion varies, depending on how the problematic issue in the sequence is handled and oriented to by the participants, but in many cases the repair sequence expands over several turns.

As Mazeland and Huiskes (2001, p. 151) observe, when a side sequence is extended long enough, it may begin to lose its primarily subsidiary character and the participants begin to orient to it as “talk in its own right”. However, if the talk in a side sequence is clearly subsidiary, even in such expanded cases, participants work towards a point of return to the main sequence, and as soon as the problem that occasioned the side sequence is solved, returning is the appropriate ‘next’ thing to do. Mazeland and Huiskes (2001) and Jefferson (1972) also discuss another type of intervening sequence which they describe as “competitive”: these constitute “a recipient-proposed focus shift that is alternative to the line pursued by teller” (Mazeland & Huiskes, 2001, p. 151). That is to say, competing lines of action propose a departure from the current main course of action rather than a temporary shift of focus because of some trouble in the main sequence. Competitive activities tend to be recognisable as such immediately upon occurrence, while subsidiary activities are often recognisable as such only in retrospect, upon resumption of the main sequence (cf. Jefferson, 1972, p. 314). According to Mazeland and Huiskes
(2001, p. 154), the competing line of talk may be elaborated upon until it reaches a “saturation point” before returning to the original course of action becomes relevant, or as in the cases discussed by Jefferson (1972, p. 312), it may even terminate the ongoing sequence altogether.

In the data examined in this thesis, most of the other-initiated intervening courses of action expand over multiple TCUs and turns-at-talk and, in some cases, may begin to lose their subsidiary character. However, unlike the competing lines of talk in Jefferson (1972), the intervening sequences in this thesis never terminate the intervened-upon main sequence, which is always (eventually) resumed. Indeed, determining if a particular sequence is subsidiary or competitive is not a straightforward matter, as many of the sequences in the data have characteristics of both. They are all subsidiary in the sense that, even during considerably expanded interventions (which may or may not reach a “saturation point”), participants nevertheless orient to the continued relevance of the suspended activity, making this orientation salient in different ways during the intervention (see article III in particular). However, at the same time, these interventions can be ‘competitive’ by virtue of initiating alternative courses of action that do not have their source in just-prior talk and action but rather relate to other relevancies of the situation beyond the currently ongoing activity (articles II and III).

3.3.2 Self-initiated parenthetical sequences

In addition to the other-initiated intervening sequences discussed above, the data includes instances of self-initiated intervening sequences, that is, sequences initiated by the current speaker of the ongoing course of action. In prior research, these same-speaker insertions, which usually constitute brief, parenthetical remarks or segments within an ongoing turn-at-talk, have been observed to provide the speaker with a solution to a design problem caused by the linearity of speech production (cf. Mazeland, 2007): they enable speakers to perform “self-corrective” actions in real time (Wong, 2000) in providing recipients with necessary materials for understanding upcoming talk (see also Auer, 2005), but they also provide recipients with a framework of interpretation on what kind of a turn is in progress and what the speaker’s stance towards their in-progress talk might be (Kärkkäinen, 2012). While some of these parenthetical segments seem to be specifically designed to invite a recipient response (cf. Mazeland, 2007), others are decidedly not seeking one (cf. Kärkkäinen, 2012).
Parenthetical insertions tend to occur in a sequential environment in which, according to Auer (2005, p. 77), an emerging syntactic pattern or fragment (i.e. a TCU) is “broken off” by the speaker, that is, the fragment remains syntactically, semantically and prosodically incomplete, as the speaker then starts a new TCU which introduces a different line of thought, subtopic or argument. After this parenthetical insert has been completed, the same speaker returns to the broken-off structure and recycle it syntactically and/or semantically. However, the broken-off fragment may also be a syntactically complete construction, which is still heard as “pragmatically” incomplete because it projects further talk or subsequent TCUs by the same speaker (cf. Duvallon & Routarinne, 2005; Mazeland, 2007; Wong, 2000).

Most of the parenthetical sequences examined in the studies discussed above are brief, turn-internal remarks of one or two TCUs (and in some cases may include minimal recipient responses), while longer parenthetical sequences have not received much attention in the literature so far, even though some studies have noted their existence in passing (e.g. Duvallon & Routarinne, 2005, p. 61). The present thesis complements this research by examining more expanded parenthetical sequences consisting of multiple TCUs and/or multiple turns-at-talk.

### 3.3.3 Intervening sequences in this study

Even though different terms have usually been adopted for other-initiated and self-initiated intervening talk in prior research, in this thesis I use the term *intervening sequence* to describe both other-initiated and self-initiated cases. This is because in my data, the intervening sequences under examination all extend beyond a few TCUs and across more than one turn at talk, and the return to the suspended main activity is done as a resumption rather than a continuation. Participants thus systematically treat these sequences as being somehow problematic and something that needs to be moved away from before the return to the suspended activity can be accomplished. In addition, the question of who initiates the intervening sequence does not seem to have a systematic effect on how the resumption of the suspended activity is accomplished by participants. The same linguistic and embodied practices are used in both other- and self-initiated cases (see articles I and III).

Below is an example of a simple (unexpanded) case of an other-initiated intervening sequence from my data. However, it is not a repair sequence as discussed in Jefferson (1972) and Mazeland and Huiskes (2001) but a brief, humorous sideline within the telling. In the extract, Jason is telling his co-
participants (Mary and Sophie) a story about a night out with friends and what happened at the taxi queue.

(1) Oulu Video Corpus. 001: The taxi line (0-32 min. <T:00:05:34>)

01 JAS: but it’s like, four thirty in the morning and like,
02 there are a hundred people in a line for a taxi.
03 (1.2) and like, me and Mark,
04 oh no not Mark.
05 (.) it was me, and Marco, and Jave, and Tim.
06 (0.9)
07 like so a German, an American, a [Spaniard],
08 MAR: [Spaniard],
09 JAS: and an Italian, right?
10 .hh and we all look [at this]-
11 MAR: [it sounds like] a joke.
12 JAS: yeah, [we]-
13 SOP: [he][hehehehehe]
14 MAR: [hehehehehe]
15 JAS: hehe yeah.
16 (0.6)
17 JAS: but we all look at this like, gigantic line,
18 and we’re like, what the hell is going on.

In lines 01-09 Jason provides his recipients with some necessary background information about who he was with and what their nationalities were, which is important information for the eventual punchline of the story (omitted from transcript). Even though Mary’s utterance at line 08 is inserted in overlap with Jason’s ongoing turn-at-talk, it is not an intervening turn but rather constitutes a case of “assisted storytelling” (Lerner, 1992) by contributing a detail relevant for Jason’s telling (she knows the people Jason is talking about but does not know the story), thus supporting and facilitating its progressivity. The intervening side sequence is initiated a little later, at line 11. Jason’s turn in line 10 is cut off in mid-utterance when Mary takes a turn partly in overlap (line 11), producing an ad hoc humorous comment about Jason’s just-prior talk (lines 07-09), namely how it resembles the opening line of a certain category of ethnic jokes. Mary’s turn
temporarily suspends the progression of Jason’s ongoing telling sequence by initiating subsidiary talk that relates to what went on just before by virtue of being “locally occasioned” (Jefferson, 1978) by it but does not straightforwardly continue the trajectory of its main sequence (cf. Jefferson, 1972; Koenig, 2006). In other words, Mary’s turn proposes a topical focus shift to the line pursued by the teller (cf. Mazeland & Huiskes, 2001) and launches a brief side sequence within the storytelling sequence as participants respond appreciatively to her humorous comment with laughter and a minimal reactive token in lines 13-15 (although Jason displays some initial confusion in line 12)\(^8\). The sideline is not pursued further and thus remains “accountably brief” (Raymond & Lerner, 2014, p. 242); immediately after the participants’ minimal reactions to Mary’s ad hoc comment, Jason resumes his suspended telling in line 17 and the story continues (resumptions will be discussed in more detail in section 3.3.4).

In addition to the kinds of “accountably brief” intervening sequences as illustrated in Example 1 above, the data examined in this thesis contain many instances of intervening sequences that expand (sometimes considerably) beyond the minimal adjacency pair structure and may include several speaker changes (see e.g. Example 2 in article I and Excerpt 1 in article III). This expansion may emerge in a “stepwise” manner (Sacks, 1992, Vol II, p. 300) as the speaker digresses further away from their main line of telling and/or as recipients respond to the intervening talk, which may be followed by some further, disjunctively placed actions inserted in an opportunistic way before participants have negotiated a possible point of return to the suspended activity. Nevertheless, a(n eventual) return to the suspended activity is treated and oriented to by the participants as being ‘due’.

Another issue that warrants some discussion relates to the intervening sequence’s topical (un)relatedness to the suspended main activity. Although the notion of conversational ‘topic’ is itself a rather elusive one (see e.g. Brown & Yule, 1983; Button & Casey, 1985; Schegloff, 1990), a rudimentary distinction can nevertheless be made between instances where there is a clear, recognisable breach of topic and instances where the topic of the intervention is somehow related – and subsidiary – to the topic of the ongoing main sequence, in which case a topical transition is not necessarily immediately recognisable as such but develops gradually, in a stepwise and emergent manner, and is only retroactively treated as

\(^8\) It seems that Jason does not immediately recognise Mary’s comment as humorous, because he begins to produce a serious response to it (line 12). However, he cuts his turn short because of overlapping laughter by Mary and Sophie, after which he seems to “get” the joke: he begins to smile, nods his head, shrugs and produces an appreciative response token, produced with laugh quality, in line 15.
intervening and as something that needs to be moved away from. While the kinds of side sequences and parenthetical sequences examined in prior research are overwhelmingly cases in which the intervening sequence emerges in one way or another from its immediately preceding context (cf. article I), the majority of the intervening sequences in my data are topically disconnected from their main sequences, so that there is a clear breach of topic – or rather, a disjunctive shift from one activity to another. In other words, the interventions do not have their source in just-prior talk but relate to factors outside of the present conversational context, and often to some features or events in the participants’ concrete, material environment and to their tasks and activities therein (see articles II and III). Such cases consequently open up the analysis from matters of ‘talk’ to matters of ‘action’.

3.3.4 Resumption as a return strategy

In prior, linguistically oriented research on resumption in interaction, it commonly refers to a practice by which the speaker of an extended, multiunit turn returns to their turn after its progressivity was temporarily put on hold because of an intervening side sequence. Once participants have collaboratively closed the side sequence, the speaker returns to their suspended, multiunit turn. However, as observed by, for example, Jefferson (1972, p. 318) and Mazeland and Huiskes (2001, p. 155), the return does not simply happen automatically, but it is a task performed and achieved cooperatively by the participants in specific, characterisable ways.

As originally proposed by Jefferson (1972, pp. 318-319), the speaker has two different options on how to design their return to the on-hold activity: they can do the return as a “resumption” or as a “continuation”, with each of these options having its distinctive components and techniques. “Resumption” marks that there is a problem in accomplishing a return by treating the talk of the side sequence as having been disruptive and something that needs to be moved away from when the on-hold activity is returned to. “Continuation”, on the other hand, provides for its own interactional uninterestingness: it treats the return as unproblematic by integrating the talk of the side sequence seamlessly into the talk of the returned-to activity, thereby deleting it from the surface of the interaction. When a side sequence becomes expanded, this often seems to cause a problem for participants that needs to be dealt with before it is possible to return to the main line of telling. As Auer (2005, p. 98) observes, past research has shown that “the longer the parenthesis, the more likely is a non-smooth continuation”, but as Mazeland and
Huiskes (2001, p. 150) point out, even in such expanded side sequences, the return to the ongoing sequence is not necessarily done as a resumption. Choosing one option or the other is not automatic but depends on how the speaker decides to treat the intervening course of action, and they can use and exploit these two strategies to serve particular interactional ends, for example, to “cover up” the problem of return (Jefferson, 1972, p. 319; see also Mazeland & Huiskes, 2001, pp. 144-145). Nevertheless, in their data, certain types of side sequence initiations seem to promote the use of resumption rather than continuation in returns: they actively pursue topical interests of the recipient and bring about a focus shift in the talk. These differ from the “halting, time-marking” (Mazeland & Huiskes, 2001, p. 150) type of side sequences after which returns are typically done as continuations: these are not controlled by, nor do they promote any topical interests of, the recipients, who simply act as listeners trying to keep track of ongoing talk. In general, these observations can be confirmed on the basis of my data as well, although, as discussed above, the participants always have a choice on how to treat the intervening course of action.

In the next section, I will discuss some relevant prior research on the different interactional resources used for initiating intervening talk and resuming prior talk in conversation.

### 3.4 Interactional resources for bracketing intervening courses of action

As was already discussed in section 3.1, conversational participants tend to orient to ongoing talk in terms of the next-positioning principle: every current utterance or turn is interpreted and produced against the background of immediately prior talk, while at the same time projecting certain expectations for subsequent talk. Initiating an intervening course of action in the middle of an ongoing activity constitutes a “break in contiguity” (Bolden, 2009a) by intervening into the expected trajectory of that ongoing activity. Moreover, at the end of the intervening sequence, the return to the ongoing activity creates another disjunctive ‘hitch’ in the talk as it refers back to pre-suspension talk and action. Consequently, the speaker needs special devices for indicating to their interlocutors that their current contribution does not continue what went on in just-prior talk but is a departure from it, either because it initiates some new course of action (suspensions) or because it refers further back to some earlier bit of talk (resumptions). Some of the most common devices for accomplishing this work are discussed in the following subsections.
3.4.1 Discourse markers

There is a wealth of research on the pragmatic functions of discourse markers, that is, items like *oh*, *well*, *and*, *but*, *so*, *y’know*, *anyway*, and *like*, among others (see e.g. Aijmer, 2002; Jucker & Ziv, 1998; Lenk, 1998a; Schiffrin, 1987). Rather than provide any substantial propositional content to discourse, they operate on a meta-level of discourse, creating discourse coherence, or as Rühlemann (2007, p. 116) puts it, “flag the sequential structure of discourse by indicating how discourse relates to other discourse, as a continuation, elaboration, digression, transition, qualification, approximation, interpretation, quotation or other”. Furthermore, Aijmer (1996) makes a functional distinction between “local” and “global” discourse markers, where the local ones operate on a micro-level, marking a relationship between adjacent utterances, while the global ones operate on a macro-level of discourse, signalling topic transitional boundaries, e.g. topic closure, topic shifts or topic resumption (see also Lenk, 1998b). In more CA-informed studies, they have also been observed to mark transitions between entire activities (e.g. Heinemann, 2017; Keevallik, 2010), or phases of activities (e.g. Modaff, 2003; Robinson & Stivers, 2001), in interaction.

From the point of view of this thesis, two sequential boundaries in which discourse markers have been observed to regularly occur in turn-initial position are of particular interest: transitions in which an intervening course of action is initiated and transitions in which an on-hold course of action is resumed. In the case of intervening turns-at-talk, prior studies have identified items often referred to as “misplacement markers” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 319-20), including items such as *by the way*, or *oh incidentally* (Jefferson, 1972, p. 315), which are used to indicate that the next contribution is going to be done outside of its proper place. Other markers of disjunction in English include, for example, *hey* (Levinson, 1983, pp. 313-315), *look* (Sidnell, 2007) and *oh* (Bolden, 2006; Schegloff, 1987, p. 72). In addition, several discourse markers have been identified in English that are used for signalling a return to prior talk, including *so* (Bolden, 2008, 2009b), *and* (Heritage & Sorjonen, 1994) or *and uh(m)* (Local, 2004), *but* (Schiffrin, 1987, pp. 9 As Jucker and Ziv (1998, pp. 1-2) outline, discourse markers constitute a vast class of linguistic elements and are far from well-defined in the literature; there is no general agreement as to what kinds of linguistic items should be considered as belonging to the class of discourse markers – a question even further complicated by variations between different languages. As a reflection of this, there is a plethora of different terms used for describing such items, including “discourse markers”, “pragmatic markers”, “discourse particles”, “connectives”, and many more, as well as many different functions they have been reported to carry out in discourse.
176-177; Redeker, 1990, p. 373; Park, 2001, p. 157-159) and anyway (Ferrara, 1997; Jefferson, 1981, pp. 54-56; Lenk, 1998a, p. 99; Sacks, 1992, Vol II, pp. 567-568). Equivalent resumption markers in other languages include the Dutch maar/'but’ (Mazeland & Huiskes, 2001), the Finnish mut(ta)/’but’ and ni(in)/’so’ (e.g. Duvallon & Routarinne, 2005; Sorjonen, 2001, pp. 270-273) and the Swedish iallafalli/’anyway’ (Ottesjö, 2005), just to name a few.

Based on the data examined in this thesis, markers of disjunction are not very frequently used in intervening turns at talk (see section 4.2 for the results for article II). In fact, there is a much higher frequency of discourse markers as turn-initial elements in resumptions than in initiations of intervening talk, and in resumptions they also exhibit more systematic uses in different sequential and activity contexts (see the results for articles I and III). This is likely due to the fact that while intervening courses of action can perform numerous different actions and, consequently, can be initiated and formulated in various different ways, resuming a prior course of action is a relatively stable and systematic practice that is also performed in specific, systematic ways (although there is, of course, some variation in the linguistic resources used in individual, situated instances of use).

3.4.2 Recycling lexical materials from prior talk

In addition to turn- or utterance-initial discourse markers (such as but, anyway or so in English, and mutta / ‘but’ and niin / ‘so’ in the Finnish data), the resumptions in my data (in both articles I and III) frequently contain recycled elements from prior talk. As suggested in prior research, recycles in particular seem to be a recurrent feature of non-smooth returns to prior talk (e.g. Auer, 2005, p. 98; Duvallon & Routarinne, 2005, p. 56; Mazeland & Huiskes, 2001). According to Mazeland and Huiskes (2001, p. 160), when the speaker does the return as a resumption, he or she typically recycles (i.e. repeats) the last telling unit before the telling was abandoned in favour of a different line of talk. The recycled elements thus re-install the position from which the suspended line of action can be ‘continued’. However, it is not always the last telling unit that gets recycled: it is the last suitable telling part that can serve as a basis for continuation of the telling (cf. Mazeland & Huiskes, 2001, p. 160). The recycled part should nevertheless be as late as possible in the telling-so-far before the intervening talk, so that it can be recognised by the participants. Furthermore, as Mazeland and Huiskes (2001, p. 160) note, the speaker whose turn-at-talk was intervened upon is usually also the
one who later resumes the on-hold turn-at-talk. This observation can be confirmed on the basis of my data as well.

In the data, recycled elements from prior talk can comprise individual words, phrases, clauses, or even longer syntactic constructions (cf. e.g. Wong, 2000). More specifically, the format of the recycle can vary from an almost word-for-word lexical and syntactic repeat of the last suitable telling component to a “semantic paraphrase” (Auer, 2005, pp. 92-93) of the projected, unfinished fragment, that is, another version of the fragment without any relationship to its syntactic form. In other words, as the data show, the recycle need not be (and in most cases also is not) an exact lexical and syntactic repeat of the last telling unit, but its format can range anywhere from a repeat of the syntactic structure but with slightly different words, to a recycle of only a few key words, to a semantic paraphrase or reformulation of the last telling unit. After the initial resumption utterance, the speaker continues the abandoned line of talk by producing a recognisable next component of telling. Mazeland and Huiskes (2001, p. 160) argue that the participants seem to orient to the resumption part with the initial maar and the recycle as a ‘preliminary’ to the next component, that is, to the delivery of more talk about the reintroduced event. For an illustration of this practice in my data, let us revisit Example (1):

10       and we _all_ look [at this]-
[...]  
17       but we _all_ look at this like, gigantic line,
18       and we’re like, what the hell is going on.

Jason’s resumption utterance in line 17 is prefaced with the discourse marker but, followed by a recycle of the last suitable telling component from talk prior to the intervention (from line 10). As shown above, the recycle, or the “second saying” (Wong, 2000) in line 17 is an almost exact repeat of the “first saying”, after which Jason completes the syntactic construction from the broken-off fragment in line 10 and moves on to produce the next component of telling from line 18 onwards.

### 3.4.3 Prosodic features of interventions and resumptions

Prosody is one important interactional resource that can be used to indicate the sequential status of a turn. That is to say, in addition to verbal cues, the prosodic design of a turn can systematically contribute to the ways in which its relationship
to surrounding talk is understood and heard by co-participants. For example, depending on the prosodic delivery of a turn, it can be hearable as a continuation of the immediately preceding talk (e.g. Szczepak Reed, 2009), a return to some earlier bit of talk (e.g. Local, 2004), or the start of some new course of (topical) action (e.g. Couper-Kuhlen, 2004; Riou, 2017; Szczepak Reed, 2009). Prior research has shown how different articulatory features – pitch and amplitude in particular – can accomplish such work.

In the case of parenthetical sequences, many studies have reported how they are often prosodically clearly separate from their main sequences, being characterised by features such as noticeably lower pitch and lower volume levels and faster tempo than their surrounding talk (e.g. Duvallon & Routarinne, 2005, p. 54; Local, 1992, p. 278; Mazeland, 2007, pp. 1838-1842). However, there seems to be more variation with respect to prosodic features marking the return to the main sequence. Local (1992, p. 278), for example, observes that after the parenthetical segment, the speaker often reverts to the pitch, loudness and tempo of pre-insertion talk when returning to the main frame. However, this seems to be the case only when the parenthetical segment exhibits fairly stable prosodic characteristics throughout its delivery, so that the parenthetical prosody is maintained until its end. Such parentheticals tend to be relatively brief and tend not to involve speaker change, at least not right before returning to the main sequence (cf. e.g. Duvallon & Routarinne, 2005; Mazeland, 2007). More complex intervening sequences that involve turns by more than one speaker and may expand over quite long passages of talk rarely exhibit such stable prosodic characteristics. With such extended sequences in between, there seems to be no systematic prosodic relationship between pre-intervention talk and its later resumption, but the prosodic delivery of the resumption rather seems to adapt to its local sequential environment (cf. Local, Auer, & Drew, 2010, on ‘resuscitations’). Indeed, as Kärkkäinen (2012, p. 484) argues, it is not necessarily the exact prosodic details of digressions that matter as much as their contrastive relationship to surrounding talk. In the case of resumptions examined in this thesis, it is the disjunctive prosodic shift (in terms of pitch and loudness) in relation to just-prior talk that seems to characterise them (cf. article I).

3.4.4 Embodied and material resources in intervening sequences

Activity suspensions and resumptions have so far not received much specific attention from a multimodal perspective, but many prior studies have examined
other types of activity transitions (i.e. moving from one activity to another consecutively) from a multimodal point of view especially in various institutional settings, such as medical consultations (e.g. Campion & Langdon, 2004; Heath, 1986; Modaff, 2003; Mondada, 2011; Newman, Button, & Cairns, 2010; Robinson & Stivers, 2001), scientific work (e.g. Berducci, 2001), work meetings (e.g. Depermann et al., 2010; Mondada, 2006), educational situations (e.g. Hazel & Mortensen, 2014; Szymanski, 1999), and service encounters (e.g. Dausendschön-Gay & Krafft, 2009; LeBaron & Jones, 2002; Lindström et al., 2017). Some studies from an emerging, new branch of “experimental” CA-based research (cf. Kendrick, 2017, special issue in ROLSI) have also examined transitions between joint activities (e.g. Stevanovic et al., 2017) with the help of cutting-edge technology such as eye-tracking and motion capture, which allow for a particularly detailed tracking of participants’ synchronised embodied conduct (such as body sway), showing the relevance of such conduct to the accomplishment of the activities and the transitions between them.

The studies above have shown, among other things, how embodied and material resources (especially task-relevant objects) figure in important ways in the collaborative accomplishment of the transitions. Often they have been observed to project, or prepare for, an upcoming action before the ‘action proper’ begins (e.g. Dausendschön-Gay & Krafft, 2009; Keisanen & Rauniomaa, 2012; Rae, 2001; Streeck & Hartge, 1992; Streeck & Jordan, 2009). Some studies that have zoomed in on specific lexical items marking transitional boundaries have, however, situated these items within embodied interaction (e.g. Keevallik, 2010; see also Heinemann, 2017). For example, Keevallik (2010) introduces a boundary particle in Estonian (Nii) which marks boundaries between activities that unfold in an expected order and range from entirely physical activities to topical changes in predominantly verbal contexts. Even though these boundaries may be marked with linguistic items, as Keevallik (2010, p. 165) points out, participants orient to human actions as a whole. Thus, topic boundaries in conversation are but a subcategory, a special case, of the more overall category of activity boundaries which are multimodal in nature, that is, involving both verbal and embodied components.

However, as mentioned earlier, there is to date not much research that would specifically focus on the multimodal features of the sequential boundaries around intervening courses of action. Some studies have examined the concurrent use of embodied resources with talk and prosody in producing brief, parenthetical segments within multunit turns. For example, Kärkkäinen (2012) describes the different interactional resources that together implement and co-construct stanced
digressions within a current speaker’s turn. In addition to certain linguistic and prosodic cues, speakers employ gestures, gaze, head movements and facial expressions to mark off the digression from its surrounding talk as a side remark not in need of a recipient response. In an in-depth analysis of a single case of conversational storytelling, Goodwin (1984) also observes how a teller organises her body differently during different segments within the story, visibly differentiating between a parenthetical segment and the climax segment of the story with the movement and positioning of her hands. In Kärkkäinen’s (2012, p. 489) data, the boundaries of the digression are marked in specific ways, so that there is a clear reorientation of gaze and other embodied practices at its beginning and completion. In her data, gaze aversion at the beginning of the parenthetical insertion and its return to its original orientation at completion of the insertion is a recurrent feature. Interestingly, in my data, gaze aversion seems to be patterned rather differently (see article I). Kärkkäinen (2012, p. 497) further argues that stanced digressions emerge as “points of heightened embodiment”, as the use of gesturing and other embodied cues are usually more animated than those of the talk before or after the digression. Furthermore, Schegloff (1984, p. 290) observes how a gesture that was in progress when the current talk became suspended may be resumed when the speaker is about to resume the suspended talk. This recycling of gestures from pre-intervention talk is also a recurrent feature of resumptions in my data (article I).

Other studies that have addressed the systematic deployment of embodied resources in intervening talk include, for example, Li’s (2014) work on Mandarin Chinese interaction and Rasmussen’s (2014) work on Danish interaction. Both studies identify the consistent use of a particular body movement, namely ‘leaning forward’, in different sequential positions in intervening segments of talk. Rasmussen (2014) describes the systematic use of this embodied resource in the current speaker’s construction of repair actions within an ongoing turn-at-talk, in an environment of troubles in understanding (by the co-participant). The cases examined by Li (2014) are other-initiated intervening sequences, in which the current recipient’s forward-leaning movement co-occurs with their insertion of an intervening question that temporarily suspends the progression of the ongoing turn-at-talk; once an answer is provided, the intervening participant withdraws the forward-leaning posture. Thus, the intervening participant’s hold of the forward-leaning posture not only visually marks their turn as an intervention but also functions as resource for mobilising a response to their question, being further accompanied by gaze to the interrupted speaker (Li, 2014, p. 57). In a similar vein,
a study by Floyd, Manrique, Rossi and Torreira (2016) shows how embodied ‘holds’ (i.e. holding the hands, head, eyes, upper body, etc., in a stationery position) are used as a systematic resource in other-initiated repair sequences across three different and unrelated languages (Northern Italian, the Cha’palaa language of Ecuador and Argentine Sign Language). They demonstrate how the timing of the embodied hold is closely aligned with the repair sequence, accompanying its initiation and being disengaged only after the identified trouble is resolved and the sequence closed.

Furthermore, some studies have discussed the use of embodied resources in managing participants’ orientation to multiple involvements in interaction, whereby bodily orientations can be used, among other things, to make salient participants’ hierarchisation of their involvements as “main” and “side” (cf. Goffman, 1963, pp. 43-44). For example, Schegloff (1998) describes the use of a particular bodily configuration, “body torque” (i.e. the divergent orientations of the body segments above and below the waist and the neck), for displaying the ranking of two simultaneously relevant involvements (see also Kamunen, submitted). By twisting the upper segments of the body (trunk and/or head) relative to the lower segments of the body (torso, legs), a participant can display a temporary, divergent orientation to an inserted, “interruptive” activity, while simultaneously displaying with the planted orientation of the lower body parts a continued orientation to the intervened-upon activity. The most strongly projected resolution of this type of postural configuration is a return of the upper/lesser body parts to convergent alignment with the lower parts, thereby also displaying a return to the intervened-upon activity (Schegloff, 1998, pp. 543-544). In their study on participants’ management of dual involvements in interaction, Raymond and Lerner (2014) describe what they call “interjected actions”, which can be initiated by any one of the involved participants and which are used for suspending an ongoing activity in order to pursue another course of action. These interjected actions are composed in a way that makes recognisable the continued relevance of the suspended activity through the use of several multimodal features, such as “sotto voce” (quiet voice) and various bodily adjustments (Raymond & Lerner, 2014, p. 242). As such, these sequences have many features in common with the intervening courses of action examined in the present thesis, although the kinds of “accountably brief” sequences described by Raymond and Lerner (2014) are not very common in my data.
4 Activity suspensions and resumptions as complex, collaborative and multimodal accomplishments

The present chapter discusses the themes examined in the three articles that this thesis is based on and presents their most important findings. Article I focuses on the multimodal accomplishment of resumptions within conversational (story)telling sequences. Articles II and III examine participants’ practices for managing situations of multiactivity by focusing on two different sequential positions: while article II examines activity suspensions occasioned by a noticing, article III investigates how suspended activities are later resumed in multiactivity situations. The final section presents a synthesis of the main results of articles I, II and III via an illustrative example analysis.

4.1 Article I: The multimodal accomplishment of resumption in conversational (story)telling

The first article investigates resumption practices in everyday interaction. It examines resumptions in an interactional environment that may be characterised as predominantly linguistic, namely in the context of conversational storytelling and other types of extended, multi-unit turns. It identifies a recurrent, multimodally constructed teller’s practice used for resuming a suspended telling after an intervening side sequence. The data are in English.

As discussed in the article, conversational (story)telling sequences in interaction are socially collaborative accomplishments and involve specific points at which it is appropriate for the recipients of those tellings to respond to them in specific ways (e.g. Lerner, 1992; Mandelbaum, 1993, 2013; Stivers, 2008). It is then also not that uncommon that these tellings may become temporarily suspended for various interactional reasons, at other, less-predictable points during the course of their production. For example, recipients may intervene into the expected trajectory of a telling to ask questions about some details relating to the story, to initiate repair, to joke, or even to attend to a sudden occurrence outside the present interactional context (cf. article II). Most of the interventions examined in the article, however, are cases of displaying active recipency rather than ‘doing interrupting’ or initiating a disjunctive course of action: in asking questions, initiating repair, etc., the recipient is trying to make sense of what the teller is saying.
and show that they are being attentive listeners (compare to articles II and III). For these same interactional reasons, it is also possible for the tellers themselves to self-digress and produce a parenthetical segment that momentarily suspends the progressivity of their main line of telling in order to secure understanding and to achieve recipient alignment, for example, by explaining details, initiating repair or producing assessments. Nevertheless, in both other-initiated and self-initiated cases, the intervening course of action temporarily halts the progressivity of the ongoing telling sequence but does not terminate it: the suspended telling sequence will be resumed.

As the article suggests, resumptions are a solution to a practical participants’ problem, as they provide tellers with systematic, interactional means to navigate out of an intervening side sequence within a telling. In other words, resumptions form collaboratively recognisable and oriented-to practices, which tellers use to communicate to their co-participants that their next contribution does not relate to just-prior talk, nor does it start some new course of action, but is a return to their suspended, unfinished telling. As proposed by Jefferson (1972, p. 319), resumption is a specific return option for participants, with specific sequential and linguistic properties which are designed to mark that the return is somehow problematic. In other words, resumptions retroactively mark prior talk (of the intervening sequence) as having been an intervention that needs to be moved away from, and there are special linguistic devices which are regularly used for doing such work. The article discusses some of these linguistic devices found in the data, which consist of 7 hours of English interactions. The initial analysis, which started with locating all occurrences of resumption within telling sequences, revealed that the most frequently occurring special devices for marking resumption in the data are the discourse markers but and anyway. Many pragmatic studies on different functions of discourse markers have noted that these two markers have a basic resuming function in common, where they signal a speaker’s return to a prior, unfinished conversational topic (e.g. Ferrara, 1997, p. 350; Lenk, 1998a, p. 99; Redeker, 1990, p. 373; Schiffrin, 1987, pp. 176-7). Several conversation analytical studies have briefly discussed the use of these markers in resuming prior talk in interaction but

---

10 Jefferson (1972, p. 319) calls such devices “attention getters” (e.g. listen or hey you know) but does not discuss them in detail beyond a few data examples. As discussed in more detail in section 3.3.4, Jefferson (1972, pp. 318-320) makes a distinction between ‘resumption’ and another return option, ‘continuation’, which is linguistically framed as if there was no intervention. In other words, by using continuation, participants treat the talk of the intervening sequence as if it was part of the main telling sequence and can be integrated smoothly and unproblematically into subsequent talk (of the returned-to telling). Typically, returns by continuation are prefaced with items such as and or so.
mostly in connection with other matters or functions (e.g. Jefferson, 1981, pp. 54-56; Koenig, 2006, p. 53; Park, 2010; Park, 2001, pp. 157-9; Sacks, 1992, Vol. II, pp. 567-8), or in other languages (e.g. Mazeland & Huiskes, 2001; Ottesjö, 2005). However, not much CA-based research exists that would specifically and systematically focus on resumption practices in the context of (story)tellings, or on but and anyway as markers of resumption, in English interaction, especially as examined from a multimodal perspective.

Based on a video data collection of 29 occurrences of resumptions, the study identifies a recurrent, interactional and multimodal practice used by tellers to return to their on-hold telling after an intervening side sequence, with the linguistic format of but/anyway (+ recycle) + next component of telling. That is to say, the resumption utterance is prefaced with either the discourse marker but or anyway (including a few cases of the marker cluster but anyway). Results seem to support prior, pragmatic and CA-based research in that these two markers seem to share the same basic function of marking a return to a prior telling by the same speaker. However, the data show that they also exhibit a subtle difference in terms of their interactional import. While but seems to be a more neutral marker, signalling contrast on a sequential rather than inferential level between units of talk, anyway seems to have the additional function of marking relevance relations between sequential units; it has a dismissive undertone, retroactively marking the talk of the intervening sequence as tangential to the main line of telling. In most cases, the resumption marker is then followed by some form of recycling of lexical materials from pre-suspension talk, which further contribute to the utterance’s recognisability as a resumption by tying back to prior talk and reinstalling it into the present context (see e.g. Local, 2004, and Wong, 2000), after which the teller continues with the next component of telling that finally moves the telling forward so that it recognisable continues (cf. Mazeland & Huiskes, 2001).

The verbal resumption utterance is frequently accompanied by a noticeable shift in both prosody and embodiment. The prosodic shift in the resumption utterance is most commonly marked by a noticeable rise in pitch and amplitude when compared to the immediately prior talk but is ultimately adaptable to its local environment (cf. Local et al., 2010, on the prosody of resuscitating turns). In some cases, there may be a shift downwards in pitch and amplitude, if the just-prior talk of the intervening sequence is produced with emphatic prosody, in which case the resuming teller may revert back to the prosody of their pre-intervention talk in their resumption utterance. In both kinds of prosodic shifts, then, it is the disjunctiveness of the shift when compared to just-prior talk that makes the sequential transition
back to the suspended telling recognisable as such, regardless of whether it is an upward or a downward shift in pitch and volume. The shift in embodiment may manifest itself in a variety of ways, both situated and systematic. While some types of bodily conduct, such as self-grooms, pointing, iconic gestures, frowning, etc., seem to be locally occasioned, that is, locally assembled constructions that work in that specific situation with its local, unique “ecology” (Mondada, 2014a) and are therefore not directly reproducible in other contexts, other embodied resources seem to be used more systematically, most notably the brief aversion of gaze by the primary speaker during resumption, and a certain type of dismissive hand gesture used recurrently in connection with anyway (which provides further evidence on the dismissive undertone of anyway; this gesture is systematically absent from the but-prefaced resumptions). An interesting finding in some of the examples was also the teller’s embodied re-adoption of a specific “telling position” of their hands at resumption, which functions as a pre-component to the subsequent verbal resumption utterance. This distinctive bodily configuration is a visible display of ‘doing being a teller’ (see also Goodwin, 1984, and Streeck & Hartge, 1992) that, in this sequential position, also visibly marks the teller’s return to their unfinished telling.

As discussed before, conversational storytelling as an activity is predominantly verbal, being carried out mostly through talk that relates to some events or matters outside of the participants’ immediate, material, perceptually available context. Consequently, it is the linguistic resumption practice that then ultimately makes the resumption recognisable as such. However, even when it comes to activities in which language is dominant, these activities take place in embodied interaction, which is why the body and its resources cannot be ignored if we are to understand in a holistic way how resumptions – or any social actions in co-present interaction – are accomplished. In this accomplishment, linguistic and embodied resources may be doing different kinds of work: while language creates explicit ties with prior talk, embodied resources mark visible shifts in the teller’s orientation to and engagement with the talk and their co-participants. When used co-verbally, embodied resources complement and reinforce the resumption utterance, and when used pre-verbally, they foreshadow and prepare co-participants for an upcoming resumption (also article III).
4.2 Article II: Noticing-occasioned intervention as a practice for managing multiple involvements in interaction

Article II investigates the multimodal accomplishment of activity suspension by focusing on a specific interactional practice, noticing-occasioned intervention, that participants use in situations of multiactivity to attend to emergent ‘troubles’ in other-than-current activities while a current course of collaborative action is still underway, thereby suspending that course of action. It describes the sequential placement and multimodal composition of noticing-occasioned interventions as well as the emergent process through which an individual participant’s noticing of trouble develops into a collaboratively oriented-to, new focus of joint attention. The data are in English and Finnish.

The article investigates such moments of multiactivity in everyday, mundane interactional settings in which an ongoing activity that currently occupies participants’ main focus of joint attention becomes temporarily suspended in favour of an intervening course of action that participants treat as requiring their more immediate attention. Importantly, the noticing-occasioned intervention does not terminate the activity it intervenes upon but only temporarily suspends it (cf. Keisanen et al., 2014), as participants collaboratively deal with the trouble implicated by the noticing, after which they return to the on-hold activity (see also Raymond & Lerner, 2014). As such, the sequential organisation of noticing-occasioned interventions resembles that of side sequences (Jefferson, 1972), though there are some notable differences. While side sequences are topically related to their main sequences by virtue of targeting some identified trouble source in just-prior talk and thus serve to remedy troubles within the currently ongoing activity, noticing-occasioned interventions, on the other hand, are topically disconnected from the activity currently underway: they do not emerge from, nor are they topically coherent with, the current course of action but constitute a break from it (cf. Jefferson, 1984a, p. 194, on topical disjunctiveness). In other words, they target some material object or feature that is treated as having potentially problematic implications for some other-than-current main activity, thus re-invoking interactional relevancies beyond the ‘here-and-now’ in a multiactivity situation. As such, they are not only topically, but also sequentially, disjunctive: they intervene into the expected trajectory of the ongoing course of action in a position that could potentially be treated as interruptive or misplaced.

Because the noticings in the data are introduced rather abruptly and disjunctively into ongoing interaction, thus often resulting in (partial) overlap with
the current speaker, at first glance they seem to confirm claims made in prior research about the “interruptiveness” of noticings (e.g. Drew & Chilton, 2000; Goodwin & Goodwin, 2012; Sacks, 1992, Vol II, pp. 90-92). However, as discussed in more detail section 5.1, talk that is initiated in overlap is not necessarily (overtly) treated or oriented to by participants as interruptive. In fact, as prior CA research has so robustly shown, much of overlap in interaction results from participants’ observable orientation to the rules of turn-taking, which can also be confirmed on the basis of the data examined here.

In the data, noticing-occasioned interventions occur in three different sequential environments: within extended, multiunit turns (storytellings in particular), between first and second adjacency pair parts (most typically, question-answer), or between more complicated series of sequences (i.e. “sequences of sequences”, Schegloff, 2007) that make up (phases of) the activity currently in main focus (see also section 3.2.2). One important finding of this study is that, within these sequential environments, noticing-occasioned interventions are rarely designed to be heard as competitive. In fact, they seem to be designed in a way that makes salient participants’ simultaneous orientation and sensitivity, on the one hand, to local concerns of ongoing sequential progression and speaker rights in the ‘here-and-now’ and, on the other hand, to more global concerns relating to the overall progressivity of the multiactivity situation by locating and addressing emergent troubles in other-than-current activities.

Based on the data, intervening in the turn and/or action space of another with a noticing is typically a very intricate and subtle process whereby participants display an orientation to minimising disruptiveness, and in so doing, they also implicitly treat their noticings as being potentially intrusive and/or misplaced with respect to the ongoing activity. This orientation is shown in the data, among other things, by the careful timing of participants’ interventions: in most cases, they tend to avoid disruptive incomings and monitor for sequentially legitimate positions for inserting intervening talk. Such legitimate positions in the data occur at the anticipated, or actual, completion of the current speaker’s ongoing TCU or turn, thus showing the intervening participant’s orientation to a potential TRP, or during progressional difficulties or pauses in the current speaker’s ongoing turn-at-talk. When the particulars of the situation demand a more sudden intervention in a potentially more disruptive position, that is, in the middle of the current speaker’s turn, in a position termed by Jefferson (1986) as “interjacent overlap”, participants have ways of doing this non-intrusively. Importantly, as the data show, in such situations the use of non-verbal resources in particular plays an important role in
mitigating the disruptiveness of the intervention. Through the use of embodied resources, object manipulations (e.g. pointing rather than verbally intervening upon an ongoing turn-at-talk) and prosody (for example, using quiet voice and/or low pitch register), intervening participants can subtly insert their noticings into ongoing interaction even in such, potentially more disruptive, positions. Embodied resources can also project an upcoming intervention, for example when the intervening participant touches and moves the noticed object to make it more readily available and witnessable for co-participants.

Based on the 32 cases in the data collection, a recurrent practice emerges for doing noticing-occasioned interventions. They are constructed as complex, multimodal actions, occasioned by 1) one participant’s initial, “embodied noticing” (Kääntä, 2014) of some event or feature in their immediate, material, perceptually available surroundings which they treat as having potentially problematic implications for some other-than-current main activity. Following the initial embodied noticing, the same participant then produces 2) a multimodally constructed noticing turn, which draws others’ attention to the noticed feature and usually, but not necessarily, involves some verbal component that explicates the noticed feature for others. It in effect puts on hold the ongoing activity as co-participants respond to the noticing in subsequent interaction. In the data, most interventions are initiated by someone other than the current speaker (other-initiated interventions), but there are also cases in which the current speaker self-suspends their own, current-activity-related talk when doing a noticing (self-initiated interventions). The same, two-part structure is used in both types of noticings in the data.

An embodied noticing can manifest itself in many different ways, most importantly through a sustained, intense gaze on the noticed object and accompanying facial expressions such as a frown, which further indicates that something problematic was noticed (cf. Kääntä, 2014; see also Kaukomaa, Peräkylä, & Ruusuvuori, 2014). Other manifestations in my data include pointings, sudden changes in the trajectory of body movements, and various forms of object manipulations as well as orientations with different parts of the body, such as tilting the head or leaning, towards the noticed object. The data show that though the initial, embodied noticings are not usually attended to by others (cf. also Kääntä, 2014), they are nevertheless publicly visible and available displays of something being noticed and meaningful events for the participant doing the noticing. They are the triggering events in an emergent process that leads up to the intervention, collaborative action and suspension of current activity. This process includes the
noticing participant organising their embodied conduct in a way that enhances action recognition by others and monitoring for a sequentially opportune moment to insert their noticing.

The ensuing noticing turn most typically takes the form of a simple declarative, such as *it is raining* or *nysse meni kiinni itse asiassa* (‘now it turned off actually’), or an interrogative, such as *have you lost the stone* or *enks mää saanukkaa* (‘didn’t I get any’). These turns frequently involve deictic references to the noticed, concrete feature that is locally and perceptually available to all participants in their immediate environment. In addition, some turns are produced as grammatically incomplete, minimally constructed formulations, such as *hius* (‘hair’) or *jaha, taas kamerat* (‘oh, the cameras again’). Less common are formulations such as interjections (e.g. *what the hell*; *uu, wo-hou* (‘ooh, who-hoa’)), laughter, or the use of ‘oh’ prefaced declaratives in some of the more sudden cases of interventions (cf. Drew & Chilton, 2000; Heritage, 1984b). In some cases, embodied resources alone (e.g. pointing) may be used for doing a noticing-occasioned intervention, when the intervening participant invites a co-participant to notice and make the initial move rather than initiating intervening talk themselves. The prosodic delivery of the noticing turn is frequently either unmarked (i.e. not significantly standing out from its surrounding talk) or subdued (meaning quiet voice and/or low pitch registers). Competitive prosody, which is characterised by high amplitude and high pitch (French & Local, 1983, 1986) is only rarely used. In fact, competitive incomings (with interjacent overlap and competitive prosodic delivery) are resorted to only in special circumstances, for example, in the case of “extraordinary noticings” (Hutchby, 2008) that target something exceptionally noteworthy.

What is particularly noteworthy about these findings is the recurrent absence of any special linguistic devices for explicitly marking the intervention as disjunctive to just-prior talk (with some exceptions as listed above). In prior CA research the principle of adjacency has been firmly established (starting from Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974), according to which the basic assumption in conversation is that every ‘next’ contribution relates to, or is a continuation of, the previous contribution, unless otherwise indicated. Thus, when the speaker’s next contribution does not relate to what went on before, they must do something to “lift the assumption” (Heritage, 1984a, p. 261). Prior studies have identified various linguistic devices for marking disjunctive talk, such as “interruption markers” (Schegloff, 1987, p. 72) in turn-initial position, that is, items like *wait a minute* or *oh*, or “misplacement markers” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 319-20) such as *by the way*, which are used to indicate that the next contribution is going to be done
outside of its proper place. Other devices include figurative expressions (Drew & Holt, 1998), or in the context of action suspension within multiactivity, explicit suspension turns prefaced with items like wait or hang on (Keisanen et al., 2014), which make salient that one course of action is suspendable but the other not. One of the major conclusions of this article is that the largely unmarked linguistic and prosodic delivery may be an interactional strategy to avoid ‘doing interrupting’, or even ‘doing suspending’, in an overt, explicit way, on the surface level of interaction (i.e. through talk). It is then the subtle, embodied orientations and object-adaptive behaviours that do the work of signalling, and preparing participants for, shifts between different activities and involvements within multiactivity.

Another important observation is that the noticings in this sequential position (i.e. as interventions) do not in general target any incidental, as-yet-unnoticed feature of the environment but seem to be done “for cause” (Keisanen, 2012). They target activity-relevant features or objects, even though these may not be relevant for the participants’ current main activity. In other words, they re-invoke the interactional relevance of other-than-current main activities and thus relate to managing the overall progressivity of the participants’ multiactivity, that is, managing their multiple involvements, emergent “projects” (Levinson, 2013) and constantly shifting foci of attention in the course of their joint action. As such, they are treated as legitimate rather than disruptive actions and, thus, are also formulated as ‘unproblematic’, as shown among other things by their unmarked linguistic and prosodic delivery as well as their reception by co-participants: even though they are topically and sequentially disjunctive, they are typically not contested by others but receive an aligning response (though not necessarily an affiliative one) in subsequent interaction.

4.3 Article III: Resuming suspended activities in situations of multiactivity

The final article examines how co-present participants in situations of multiactivity collaboratively accomplish the resumption of a suspended activity through a gradual, stepwise process of multimodal negotiations. It argues that these stepwise negotiations represent a local instance of multiactivity in practice, that is, where organising multiple courses of action becomes a demonstrable concern for the participants, who use these negotiations as an interactional practice that enables
them to flexibly manage activity transitions in complex situations of multiactivity. The data are in English and Finnish.

Similar to article II, this article also targets such moments of multiactivity in which two (or more) lines of action become incompatible and cannot be dealt with simultaneously, in practice resulting in a situation in which participants need to suspend one course of action in favour of another (cf. Keisanen et al., 2014). During the intervening course of action, participants demonstrably maintain an orientation to the continued relevance of the suspended main activity whose resumption is the projected 'next' action after the intervening course of action has been dealt with. In so doing, the participants also make salient their intersubjective understandings of the hierarchy and prioritisation between these activities: the intervention is treated as a temporary side activity within the main activity (cf. Goffman, 1963), even though it may become expanded, thus delaying the resumption of the main activity. Article II describes one practice that participants use to insert intervening courses of action while a current activity is still underway, thus suspending that activity. This article, on the other hand, focuses on what happens after the intervening course of action has been collaboratively dealt with by participants: it examines participants’ interactional practices for resuming suspended courses of action in multiactivity situations.

The findings and observations in this article are based on a collection of 34 occurrences of resumptions, drawn from 16 hours of video data from English and Finnish interactions. The data show that, in the examined, complex situations of multiactivity, suspended activities are not resumed promptly and unproblematically at the first suitable transitional slot after closing the intervening sequence, but rather, the transition is accomplished through a gradual, stepwise process that involves 1) an initial negotiation phase before the participants move on to 2) the actual resumption phase of the suspended activity. In the negotiation phase, participants begin to work towards a transition back to the suspended activity, creating favourable conditions for resumption. This work involves closing competing line(s) of action and displays of bodily reorientation to the activity-relevant features of the suspended activity. This multimodally performed phase is temporally organised as occurring partly simultaneously with the closing phase of the intervening course of action, so that participants show a “double orientation” (Deppermann et al., 2010) to the two lines of action by orienting to one activity (i.e. to the upcoming resumption) with embodied means while still verbally engaged in another (i.e. in closing the intervening sequence). In the article, I use the term transitional overlap.
to describe this organisation. 11 Indicating transition-readiness with embodied resources before producing talk provides participants with an interactional practice that enables them to subtly and flexibly manage the transition and, if necessary, to back out of it in order to attend to possible, further interventions that may emerge within multiactivity, without causing any discernable conflict at the surface of talk-in-interaction. In the resumption phase, participants successfully accomplish the return by producing a recognisable, verbal resumption utterance, which exhibits certain recurrent linguistic features. In the Finnish data, discourse markers mutta (‘but’) and nii(n) (‘so’) in particular occur recurrently as utterance-initial (or stand-alone) markers of resumption, while in the English data, so and um are the most common markers in this context. In addition, recycling lexical materials from pre-suspension talk and using deictic expressions are linguistic resources used in both languages. Resumption utterances are frequently accompanied by various, situated uses of embodied resources and object-adaptive behaviours (pointings in particular) that complement and reinforce the verbal utterance and draw co-participants’ attention to the activity-relevant object, and via the object, to the suspended activity itself (cf. Goodwin, 1986, 2003).

It is argued that this gradual, stepwise transition from the intervening course of action to the suspended activity, and the multimodal negotiations that create favourable conditions for resumption, represent a local instance of multiactivity in practice, that is, where organising multiple courses of action becomes a demonstrable, visible concern for participants. Furthermore, the data reveal that even though resumptions exhibit some systematic and recurrent features across different multiactivity situations, they are situated practices, constructed as a local, context-sensitive combination of linguistic and embodied components. They constitute a practice that enables participants to flexibly manage activity transitions in complex situations of multiactivity. The article challenges prior, linguistically oriented research on resumption practices by adopting a wider, holistic perspective on what it takes to accomplish a specific action, resumption of a suspended activity, within multiactivity. This accomplishment is multimodal and collaborative by nature, as it takes place in situated, embodied interaction between co-present

11 The term ‘transitional overlap’ should not be confused with the “transitional onset” of overlap as described by Gail Jefferson in her seminal work on overlapping talk (e.g. 1984b, 1986). Transitional onset of overlap refers to the specific turn-taking mechanism in which, at a point of possible turn completion, the current recipient starts to talk at the same time as the current speaker continues with further talk (Jefferson, 1984b, p. 12). In article III, ‘transitional overlap’ refers to two streams of action which overlap for a while when participants transition from one to the other.
participants. The findings demonstrate the important role of embodied resources in resumption practices and raise more general questions relating to prior, logocentric definitions of discourse units and their boundaries by showing how incorporating embodiment into the analysis stretches and blurs the sequential boundaries between activities (cf. Keevallik, 2010). In addition, the article discusses the interactional functions of two Finnish particles, *mutta* and *nii(n)*, as well as the English markers *um* and *so*, showing how they are systematically used for resuming suspended activities within multiactivity.

4.4 Synthesis: An example analysis of suspending and resuming an activity

In this section, I present an analysis of one example from the data collection in order to illustrate how participants in the data negotiate and accomplish activity suspensions and resumptions, that is, how they collaboratively deal with an intervening course of action during an ongoing activity and how they later accomplish the resumption of the intervened-upon, suspended activity.

The following example is from the Finnish data (Oulu Video Corpus). In this recording, three friends have gathered together for a roleplaying session, and before the actual playing starts, the participants (Markus, Elina and Hanna) talk about their favourite science fiction films and TV series. The examined roleplaying sessions in the data can be characterised as multiactivity settings: they typically last for several hours during which participants engage in many other activities besides game playing, such as intermittent off-game talk, preparing and eating food, using their phones, putting on background music, changing tapes in the video cameras, etc. Consequently, participants need to negotiate and coordinate their involvement in these different activities as well as the transitions between them (cf. Mondada, 2014b).

In the situation examined below, the participants have set up the two video cameras and turned them on only a few minutes before our extract begins. One of the participants, Hanna, is mainly responsible for the recording. During the first few minutes of the recording, Markus (in whose apartment the roleplaying session takes place) has been introducing his DVD collection of bad karate films from the 80s and 90s, and just before the beginning of the extract, he has initiated a multiunit telling turn concerning one particular film and about one of the actors in it. Elina, who seems to be his primary recipient at this stage, is holding the DVD cover of this particular film, examining it during Markus’s telling (see Figure 1).
However, Markus’s multiunit turn comes to a temporary halt when Hanna initiates a noticing-occasioned intervention about one of the cameras recording the interaction. In the following analysis, I will discuss the participants’ management of this intervening episode by focusing in particular on the two sequential boundaries examined in this thesis: 1) initiation of the intervening sequence and suspension of the current activity, and 2) resumption of the suspended activity.

**Noticing ‘trouble’ and initiating an intervening course of action**

First, we will turn our attention to Hanna’s noticing of potential trouble with the camera and how she initiates intervening talk occasioned by this noticing.

(2a) Oulu Video Corpus. 013: Gary Cole (<T:00:01:19>)

01 MAR: sitten sen {1.0} tuo to®ta: (0.6)¥
    and then his the um
han:   //LOOKS TO CAM.
02 MAR: ¤(0.7)¤(1.2) nemesis on ai®van #(0.2)
    nemesis is the
han:   ¤....LOOPS TO SIDE------LOOPS TO CAM.-->
    #Fig.2
03 MAR: uskomattoma:n (0.3)¤(0.5) hupaïsa Gary Cole.
    unbelievably funny Gary Cole.
han:   -->LOOPS TOW. ELI-->
04 (1.6)¤(0.5)¤(0.4)
han:   -->LOOPS TO CAM.--LOOPS TOW. ELI-->
05 MAR: ää:, (mm) *®se oli *®tos®&a: (.) &American Gothic®cissa.
uh  he was in the  American Gothic.

mar:  //*.......*LOOKS AT HAN-->
mar:  &.......&POINTS TOW. HAN-->
han:  -->&LOOKS TO CAM.&LOOKS DOWN--------------&LOOKS AT MAR-->

06  (0.3)¤(0.2)¤(0.5)¤(0.2)¤
han:  -->&....&LOOKS TO CAM.&LOOKS AT MAR-->
mar:  --&RETRACTS POINT

07  MAR:  ää:, *näytteli (.) sheriffiä.
      uh,  played  a sheriff.
mar:  -->*LOOKS AWAY-->

08  (0.8)

From line 01 onwards, Markus shifts the topic in his ongoing telling from the film he introduced to his recipients before the beginning of the extract to one of the actors in it, whom he mentions by name (line 03), followed by a silence of 2.5 seconds (line 04). It seems that Markus may be waiting for recipient uptake on his mention of the actor, because, upon not receiving one, he self-digresses from his telling by producing further details about the actor, thus pursuing a possible recognition from his co-participants (lines 05 and 07). During Markus’s telling, Hanna’s embodied actions show that she may have identified a potential problem with the camera facing her: already at line 01, she performs an “embodied noticing” (Kääntä, 2014) by fixing her gaze on it and then performing an abrupt shift in her gaze and head orientation to the side and back to the camera again (lines 02 and 03; Figure 2).12 At the same time, she visibly displays her ongoing monitoring of the talk-in-progress and her recipient status with respect to Markus’s telling by alternating her gaze between her co-participants and the camera (lines 03-06) and shifting her gaze to Markus when he addresses her (line 05).

12 Of course, it is only in retrospect, when Hanna initiates intervening talk about the camera later on, that the full meaning of her embodied actions here become clear. Nevertheless, at this point already, her embodied orientation and the sustained, intense gaze to the camera render visible that something about the camera has caught her attention (cf. Kääntä, 2014). Later on it becomes clear that she is worried about whether the camera is capturing her fully. In light of this, her abrupt head and gaze shift to the side and then back to the camera at line 02 could be seen as a visible manifestation of her trying to estimate where the camera is pointing at and if it is possibly set up too low.
Fig. 2. Hanna performs an embodied noticing.

Meanwhile, Markus’s attempts to induce recognition from his recipients seem to be unsuccessful. Let us look at the next segment of the extract (2b).

(2b) Oulu Video Corpus. 013: Gary Cole (<T:00:01:37>)

09 MAR: Δ>(nii) missähän se< — *(yeah) I wonder what-

eli: ΔBEGINs TO EXTEND HAND WITH DVD TOW. MAR-->  
10 *(0.3)*Δ #=>(0.3)Δ

mar: *......*LOOKs TOW. DVD-->  
eli: -->ΔLEANS FORWARD, HAND EXTENDEDΔ  
han: -->#GLANCES TOW. DVD, THEN LOOKs TOW. ELI-->  
 #Fig.3

11 MAR: +kaik[kial]la muualla se nyt +#onkaa ollu? what else he has been in?

12 HAN: [/*=kat-**]*]  

will-

mar: +REACHes FOR & TAKES DVD---------+ORIENTs TOW. DVD SHELF+  
 #Fig.4

han: -->#LOOKs AT CAM.--->  
13 +Δ(0.7)#Δ(0.2)+Δ

mar: +LEANS TOW. DVD SHELF & PUTS THE DVD IN+  
eli: ΔLEANS TO SIDE & REACHes FOR PENCILΔ  
han: -->#LOOKs TOW. ELI-->  
 #Fig.5

14 MAR: mut tota=
but erm

15 HAN:  "will you take a look, Elina, if (.) I’m—"
    han:  "looks to cam."----------------"glances tow. eli-->
    eli:  "@looks to han-->
    mar:  "-->*looks to han-->
    #Fig.6

16 HAN:  "näkääkö mun pää &tuosas *k(h)ame*@ras(h)@sa@.
if you can see my head in that camera."
    han:  "looks to cam."----------------"looks tow. eli-->
    han:  "&nods tow. cam.&
    mar:  "-->*.....*looks to cam.-->
    eli:  "-->@.......@looks to cam.-->

17    #(0.8)*(0.2)*Δ(0.3)
    #Fig.7
    mar:  "-->*.....*looks at han-->
    eli:  "Δleans forward to get up from chair-->

After the recipients show no signs of responding to Markus’s candidate
recognition reference at line 07, he continues in search of another candidate (line
09). However, simultaneously with his turn, Elina begins to lean forward in order
to give him back the DVD cover she was holding (see Figure 3). As a result, Markus
cuts off his own turn-at-talk as he notices Elina’s embodied action, and a pause in
speech follows as Markus and Elina deal with the handover and Markus grabs the
DVD cover (line 10; Figure 4). Hanna also monitors this object transfer (line 10)
and seems to orient to it as an opportunity to initiate talk about her noticing, as she
opens her mouth and initiates a turn-at-talk (line 12). Her turn, uttered with a voice
so quiet that it is almost inaudible, sounds like it could be the first syllable of the
Finnish *kato* (‘look’).13 However, her initiation comes late, as Markus almost
simultaneously continues with his unfinished turn at line 11. This “progressional”
overlap (Jefferson, 1984b) is quickly resolved: Hanna immediately drops out of
overlap and monitors for a more opportune moment to insert her turn. During the

13 Here again, we have the wisdom of retrospection: this is what Hanna indeed says when she ‘tries
again’ later at line 15, but the full grammatical form that she uses is not the imperative *kato* (‘look’) but
the inflected *katsaa*, which takes the form of an interrogative + second person singular pronoun, i.e.,
‘will you (take a) look’. In addition, even though Hanna’s utterance at line 12 is almost inaudible, the
movement of her mouth on the video offers a further clue about the word she is trying to utter.
production of his turn (line 11), Markus shifts his embodied orientation towards the DVD shelf, preparing to place the DVD back on the shelf. The trajectory of his movement continues during the ensuing silence at line 13, during which the DVD finally reaches the shelf (Figure 5). During the silence, Elina also orients to her own side activities (she reaches for the pencil case, as she is about to start drawing).

Fig. 3. Elina initiates the object transfer.

Fig. 4. Markus grabs the DVD; Hanna observes the transfer.
In line 14, Markus appears to attempt a resumption of the main trajectory of his telling after his self-digression, with *mut tota* (‘but erm’). As mentioned in section 4.3, in the Finnish data, *mut(ta)* frequently occurs as a marker of resumption in the examined multiactivity situations. However, Markus’s turn is cut off by Hanna, who tries again, and this time successfully, to initiate talk about her camera noticing; she asks Elina to check whether she is visible in the camera that is supposed to record her (lines 15 and 16). Her noticing targets and identifies a potential problem with an object in the participants’ immediate, material environment, which is relevant for another activity than the one currently occupying their main focus of joint attention, namely their recording of the pending roleplaying session. At first glance, her turn could be labelled as an interruption of Markus’s telling. However, if we examine more closely the sequential positions in which Hanna takes, or attempts to take, a turn, they both show her closely monitoring the progress of ongoing talk and her co-participants’ embodied activities. The first attempt (line 12) comes after a sudden pause in the teller’s speech (line 10), during which he becomes momentarily distracted because of a manual “side” action (when Elina hands him back the DVD). The second, and successful, attempt comes after the teller’s self-digression within the telling sequence which reaches a possible completion point (line 11) and is followed by silence, during which the teller occupies himself with putting the DVD back to the shelf (line 13). So although Hanna’s turn in lines 15-16 is produced almost in overlap with Markus and is “interruptive” in the sense of intervening in an unfinished telling sequence, Hanna’s

---

14 There is some affinity here to what Campion and Langdon (2004) refer to as ‘opportunistic announcements’, used as a kind of ‘By the way, doctor’ practice by patients during medical consultations to initiate unexpected, sudden changes of topic, which occur in positions that are either candidate closings or observable breaks in the doctor’s attention.
initial embodied noticing (which takes place some time before she actually initiates talk about it) and the timing of her intervening turn-at-talk show that she is orienting to the rules of turn-taking (cf. Sacks et al., 1974) and is closely monitoring for an opportune moment to insert talk about her noticing in a minimally disruptive position (cf. article II).

Hanna formulates her intervening turn as an interrogative in the form of a request addressed to a specific participant (freely translated as will you take a look, Elina, if I’m- if you can see my head in that camera.). In this particular case, then, the noticing-occasioned intervention takes the form of ‘embodied noticing + request’. Like most other cases in my data, the intervening verbal turn here is not prefaced with any markers of disjunction that would explicitly mark the turn as being produced ‘out of turn’ or being topically disconnected from just-prior talk (such as by the way or hey). It is also not prefaced with items like wait or hang on that would explicitly formulate her turn as suspending the ongoing course of action in favour of something more urgent (cf. Keisanen et al., 2014), nor does it contain any overt formulations of being an interruption, such as apologies (cf. Weatherall & Edmonds, 2018). In other words, it is not designed to be heard as interruptive or competitive. This claim is further corroborated by the prosodic delivery of Hanna’s turn, which does not have characteristics typically associated with competitive prosody (i.e. high pitch and loudness levels, as discussed by e.g. French & Local, 1983), but rather, the turn is produced with what can only be described as “unmarked” prosody, that is, it does not stand out from its surrounding talk and is not hearable as being outside the speaker’s normal pitch range or loudness levels.15

Hanna produces her request multimodally: first, she shifts her gaze to the camera at the beginning of her utterance at line 15, thus with her embodied orientation projecting, and making publicly visible for co-participants, an upcoming action related to the object she is gazing at, before explicitly identifying that object verbally (which only happens at line 16). This gives her time to establish a collaborative attention shift and re-direct her co-participants’ attention away from their currently ongoing activity to this new, unexpected course of action. In fact, this is what happens at line 15 when Hanna’s co-participants react to her utterance by shifting their gazes to her (see Figure 6). Thus, Hanna has her co-participants’ attention before she has verbally explicated the target of her noticing. At the beginning of her next utterance (line 16), after briefly glancing at Elina, Hanna

---

15 However, it should be stated that this observation is not based on acoustic measurements but solely on the author’s auditory impressions.
shifts her gaze back to the camera and nods emphatically towards it while simultaneously uttering *that*, followed by an explicit verbal reference to the camera and a formulation of the noticed, potential problem. Thus, she uses multimodal resources in constructing a reference to the target of her noticing, which proves efficient: almost immediately after, both Markus and Elina turn their gazes to the camera (line 16; Figure 7).

Fig. 6. Establishing a collaborative attention shift.

Fig. 7. Directing co-participants’ attention to the noticed object.

*Participants’ treatment of the intervening sequence*

(2c) Oulu Video Corpus. 013: Gary Cole (<T:00:01:45>)

17        #(0.8)*(0.2)*Δ(0.3)

#Fig.7
Co-participants respond to Hanna’s request by aligning with the course of action it projects, thus suspending the ongoing, multiunit telling turn in favour of it. Elina complies with embodied means by getting up from her chair, leaning in towards the
camera and craning her neck in order to take a closer look (lines 17, 19 and 21; Figure 8). Markus responds with verbal commentary in lines 18 and 20, thus displaying his participation in the ongoing course of action even though he is not the addressed recipient of Hanna’s request. Elina gives a verbal confirmation to the request by stating that Hanna is indeed visible in the camera (line 22), after which the participants visibly disengage themselves from this activity and begin to reorient themselves to their pre-intervention, embodied formation, Markus by orienting to the DVD shelf and Elina by beginning to sit down (lines 23 and 24; Figure 9). Hanna acknowledges Elina’s confirmation by producing a “sequence-closing third” (e.g. Schegloff, 2007) at line 24, followed by a brief silence and a potential TRP (line 25). In this sequential slot, conditions for resuming the suspended telling sequence would be favourable (cf. article III), but Markus does not initiate resumption: the intervening sequence becomes expanded briefly as he engages in a kind of playful mock celebration of the successful outcome of the camera check (lines 26 and 29) by upgrading the positive assessment in Hanna’s just-prior turn (line 24) and, in this way, showing that he is “playing along” and that the intervention was not problematic for him.

Fig. 8. Elina complies with Hanna’s request.
During the intervening sequence, the status of Markus’s telling as the current main activity that has been temporarily suspended rather than definitively abandoned is made salient by the participants in many ways. Firstly, it is visible in the participants’ bodily arrangements, that is, in the way they maintain their primary orientations to the suspended activity while at the same time orienting with some parts of their body to the side action with the camera (cf. e.g. LeBaron & Jones, 2002, p. 556; Schegloff, 1998; see also Example 1 in article III). Throughout the intervening sequence, Hanna maintains her ‘recipient posture’ (i.e. a posture displaying attentive recipiency to Markus’s telling), sitting in the chair with arms crossed over her chest, almost motionless, and only orienting to the camera with her gaze (Figures 6-9). Elina breaks away from her sitting posture, but only partially, leaving one leg on the chair for support when leaning in to look at the camera, thus also visibly marking that she is only temporarily departing from the conversational formation with her co-participants and will soon return to her seat (Figures 8 and 9). Markus turns his head and gaze towards the camera but otherwise remains in the same position that he has been occupying during his telling. Further, when Hanna initiates the intervention, he was placing the DVD back on the shelf with his right hand (see Figure 5), which remains “frozen” in this position almost throughout the intervening sequence (cf. embodied “holds” in Floyd et al., 2016), as shown in Figures 6-9. He only withdraws the hand away when he lifts up his hands in mock celebration during the brief expansion of the intervening sequence (line 26). Thus, he is visibly marking his ongoing telling sequence (and related embodied actions) as suspended during the camera-related intervention.
Secondly, the participants’ minimal verbal contributions frame the intervention as being only a temporary side action. There is very little talk during Elina’s inspection of the camera, as others observe mostly in silence and wait for the outcome, and Markus produces his comments (lines 18 and 20) with a quiet voice and low pitch. The exchange between Elina and Hanna is also very brief and minimal (lines 22 and 24), and the brief expansion by Markus does not invite, nor does it seem to be designed to invite, any further talk about the camera. As soon as Elina announces the positive outcome of the camera check, participants begin to collectively re-assume their pre-intervention embodied formation, even though they are still producing talk related to the camera, thus displaying a “double orientation” (Deppermann et al., 2010) to the two lines of action, closing one while, with their embodied reorientations, creating favourable conditions for returning to the other. In sum, participants collaboratively treat and frame the intervening sequence as only temporarily suspending what is oriented to as the current main activity, namely the ongoing conversation about films and TV shows, and this interactional work is carried out through the participants’ verbal contributions as well as their embodied conduct.

Finally, we will turn our attention to the way in which the suspended telling sequence is resumed.

Resumption as a complex, multimodal composition

Once participants have collaboratively negotiated closure of the intervening sequence and established favourable conditions for resuming the suspended activity, Markus resumes his on-hold telling. Below is a transcript showing the transition from the intervening sequence back to the main sequence.

(2d) Oulu Video Corpus. 013: Gary Cole (<T:00:01:54>)

26 MAR: ↑ jiapellido:,  
       yippee,  
mar:  &LIFTS UP BOTH HANDS TO SHAKE THEM IN CELEBRATION-->
27   (0.3)Δ(0.5)  
eli:  --&SITS DOWN
28 HAN: (• [ )•)–
29 MAR: */[meillä] on *Hanonnan späää.  
       we’ve got Hanna’s head.
Lines 26-29 show the final few, sequence-closing utterances of the intervening sequence. Simultaneously with his utterance at line 29, Markus displays with his embodied actions a withdrawal from the intervening course of action and a reorientation to his suspended telling by withdrawing his gaze from Hanna, the initiator of the intervention, and by stopping his “celebratory” gesturing, thus visibly dropping the current subject of talk (see Figure 10, frames A and B). In article I, in connection with resumptions in (story)tellings, aversion of gaze at the moment of resumption (or immediately before or after the resumption utterance) was found to be a systematic, embodied feature of the resumption practice in English data. I have not conducted a systematic analysis of the Finnish data from this perspective, but this one example would seem to suggest a possibility that gaze aversion at resumption could be generalisable beyond English data, although further examination would obviously be necessary to make any definite claims about this. Markus also makes use of some situated, embodied resources for marking his return to the on-hold telling. During the silence in line 30, he begins to turn in his swivel chair towards Elina, and this movement continues up to the point...
when he initiates verbal resumption in line 31 (Figure 10, frame C). Thus, he very visibly withdraws from the camera-related interaction with Hanna and reorients himself towards Elina, the primary addressee of his on-hold telling. After this, he initiates the resumption.

The verbal resumption utterance in line 31 has the typical format of the identified linguistic resumption practice in article III for Finnish data, and also in article I (even though the data is in English), namely ‘resumption marker + recycle + next component of telling’. The resumption utterance is prefaced with the discourse marker cluster muta nii (‘but yeah’)\(^{16}\), which, after some hesitation, is followed by a recycle in the form of a repeat of the name of the actor, Gary Cole, whom Markus was talking about before the suspension. After this, he continues his telling from line 32 onwards with the next component of telling which recognisably moves the telling forward (cf. Mazeland & Huiskes, 2001). Simultaneously with the verbal resumption utterance, Markus glances towards Elina and stretches his left leg so that it extends towards her (see Figure 10, frame D). The timing of this body care moment is interesting, because Markus begins extending his leg towards Elina exactly the moment he initiates the verbal resumption (line 31). The stretching movement reaches its apex right after Markus utters *erm*, and he holds the leg in this position until line 32, halfway into his next utterance after the resumption utterance. After the verbal resumption, he reassumes his pre-intervention “telling posture”: he turns in his swivel chair back to “home position” (to apply a term used originally by Sacks & Schegloff, 2002, to describe the base position of gestures), that is, to the specific spatial position he occupied during his telling before the intervention, where his body and feet are oriented somewhere between Hanna and Elina (see Figure 10, frames E and F), and his gaze is directed to his primarily addressed recipient, Elina (see Markus’s gaze shift at the end of line 32). In this way, Markus resumes his telling both verbally and with embodied means (cf. article I), constructing his resumption as a complex, multimodal composition (cf. Mondada, 2014a, on “multimodal Gestalts”) that consists of both systematic and situated features.

---

\(^{16}\) In the Finnish data, the most common markers were mut(ta) (‘but’) and nii(ni) (‘so’ / ‘yeah’) as separate markers, but these also sometimes co-occur in a cluster in the data, for example, in the form of mut(ta) nii(ni), for which perhaps the closest translation in English would be ‘but yeah’. 
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Fig. 10. The complex, multimodal composition of Markus’s resumption.
5 Discussion

In the previous chapter I have presented the main findings of each article. Next, I will move on to discuss the relevance and the import of these findings as a whole and the contribution of this thesis to previous research.

In the introductory chapter, I presented the following research questions this thesis has aimed to answer:

(1) In what ways are activity suspensions and resumptions recognisable and meaningful actions to participants-in-interaction? For example, how do participants negotiate the hierarchy between their different activities and prioritise between them in situations in which multiple involvements and relevancies are at stake?

(2) What different multimodal practices can be found in the data for suspending and resuming activities? What is the relationship between verbal, prosodic and embodied resources (such as gestures, head shakes, gaze, body postures and bodily movement), as well as participants’ orientations to their material surroundings (e.g. object manipulations), in the construction and accomplishment of activity suspensions and resumptions?

Each original article has, from its own perspective, shown how suspensions and resumptions are recognisable and meaningful actions for participants-in-interaction (Research Question 1), and each article has also identified specific, multimodal practices for their accomplishment (Research Question 2). In the following sections, these questions (henceforth referred to as RQ1 and RQ2) will be further addressed, and their relevance to the discussion will be pointed out for the reader where appropriate.

5.1 ‘Intervening’ rather than ‘interrupting’

The kinds of interventions examined in the three articles are different in many respects. In both articles II and III, the intervening courses of action are topically “disconnected” (Mondada, 2014b) from the current main activity, and hence their legitimacy and relevance need to be negotiated with co-participants. As the data show, noticing-occasioned interventions (article II) are treated as legitimate actions rather than interruptions, as they target some other-than-current activity whose relevance for the overall multiactivity situation is made salient through the intervention (RQ1). However, at the same time, the intervening participants display their understanding of and sensitivity to the sequentially disjunctive placement of their actions by showing an orientation to minimising the disruptiveness of their
insertions (cf. also Example 2 in section 4.4). In article I, on the other hand, most of the interventions are grounded in the currently ongoing telling activity and prompted by perceptible troubles or other locally occasioned matters therein. Nevertheless, they temporarily halt the progression of the ongoing telling, even though they can be considered in general more as displaying active recipiency rather than “interrupting” (RQ1); in intervening, the recipient of the telling is (at least initially) trying to make sense of what the teller is saying or in some other way provides online commentary on the telling-in-progress. However, intervening sequences may sometimes expand or develop into unforeseen directions. After all, as Raymond and Lerner (2014, p. 242) point out, returning to the suspended activity after an intervening course of action is a “contingent accomplishment” that may sometimes fail. In my data, the return that was “promised” as the next relevant action after the intervention may be delayed but not completely abandoned.

Prior research on overlapping talk and interruption has already shown how overlap does not necessarily correlate with interruption, and that interrupting is a member’s category rather than an objectively definable phenomenon (e.g. Bilmes, 1997; Drew, 2009; Jefferson, 1984b, 1986; Schegloff, 2000, 2001; Weatherall & Edmonds, 2018). This means that in order for a conversational move to be labelled as an ‘interruption’, there must be evidence in the data that participants themselves treat and orient to it as such, for example, by explicitly complaining about being interrupted or by apologising for having interrupted. In the data examined here, such explicit claims of ‘doing interrupting’ or being interrupted, or other explicit linguistic devices such as turn-initial interruption markers or suspension turns, tend to be used only in special circumstances. Typically, the intervention and subsequent suspension of the current activity is made recognisable in other, more implicit ways (e.g. through participants’ body behaviour), as discussed in article II (RQ2). In fact, it is often only in retrospect, when an intervened-upon activity is later resumed rather than simply continued, that the intervening course of action is marked as having been somehow problematic, even when it was not overtly treated as such immediately upon occurrence (articles I and III).

5.2 Linguistic resumption practices and their activity contexts

Resumption as a specific return strategy marks the return to the suspended activity as being somehow problematic, and this marking is done by using special devices (cf. Jefferson, 1972; Mazeland & Huiskes, 2001). In reference to RQ2, this thesis has identified some of the linguistic practices used for resuming suspended courses
of action in two different activity contexts, in (story)tellings (article I) and in multiactivity situations (article III). One recurrent device in both contexts was the recycling of lexical materials from pre-suspension talk in the resumption utterance. Recycling was used in both English and Finnish interaction in similar ways. Another device was the use of turn-initial (or stand-alone) discourse markers which preface the resumption utterance. These exhibited some variation between the two contexts of use and also some language-specific uses. In multiactivity situations, the most common resumption markers in English data were *um* and *so*. In the Finnish data also, one common marker of resumption was *nii(n)* (‘so/yeah’), which is proof of a consistency between the two languages in the use of this marker in this context. Another common marker in the Finnish data was *mutta* (‘but’), whose English equivalent however was not very common in the multiactivity context. Moreover, I found no equivalent in the Finnish data for the English *um* that would be used similarly in resuming a suspended activity. In the context of (story)tellings, in which only English data was examined, the markers *but* and *anyway* were most frequently used.

The variation in the use of English resumption markers in multiactivity situations and in tellings is likely due to the different nature of the two activity contexts. In prior, pragmatic and discourse analytic research, *but* and *anyway* have been observed to have a resuming function in narratives and thus it is not surprising that these markers also occur frequently in my data in storytellings and other types of multiunit telling sequences (article I). As an activity, storytelling is predominantly verbal and tends to concern matters or events beyond the ‘here-and-now’ that exist outside the participants’ present, immediate, physical reality. In tellings, resumption markers thus operate primarily at the surface level of interaction, marking sequential boundaries between units of talk. The activities discussed in the multiactivity contexts (article III for resumptions), however, are very much anchored in the participants’ physical reality, that is, their immediate, concrete, perceptually available surroundings. These activities are often task-oriented or otherwise involve both talk and manual action as well as the use of material objects. In this context, the interactional organisation of activities relies very much on other modalities besides talk, and the resumption markers operate in transitional boundaries between units of multimodal action rather than simply units of talk. It is quite likely then that the variation in the use of different resumption

17 There are some equivalent vocalisations in Finnish such as *aa, ää /ææ/, öö /øø/, or *mm*, but I found no consistent evidence for these being used similarly in a resuming function in the data.
markers in multiactivity and in (story)tellings may be explained at least in part by the different nature of the activities under examination in these contexts, even though making more specific claims about this would require further research.

5.3 The role of embodied resources in activity suspensions and resumptions

As discussed in section 3.4.4, many prior studies on activity transitions in which participants move between consecutively ordered (phases of) activities, closing prior ones and initiating new ones, have shown the significance of multimodal resources for the accomplishment of these types of transitions (e.g. Dausendschön-Gay & Krafft, 2009; Keevallik, 2010; Lindström et al., 2017; Robinson & Stivers, 2001). In my data, embodied resources that contribute to the accomplishment of activity suspensions and resumptions include, for example, gaze shifts, deictic references coupled with pointing gestures in particular, and other bodily orientations to, and manipulations of, activity-relevant objects (RQ2). Especially in activities that involve both talk and manual action and are often centred around (a) concrete object(s), these objects provide a powerful resource for participants in marking, in a publicly visible way, their transitions to impending actions involving those objects, and thus negotiating with others their engagement with, or disengagement from, their different activities and involvements in them (e.g. Hazel & Mortensen, 2014; Lindström et al., 2017; Szymanski, 1999). Indeed, based on the results of all three articles, it seems that linguistic and embodied resources may create different affordances for accomplishing the two kinds of transitions examined in this thesis (RQ2). While linguistic resources in general do the more explicit work of creating structural and cohesive ties between units in interaction (especially in predominantly verbal activities such as tellings), embodied resources then do the more subtle work of marking, and making publicly visible, shifts in participants’ orientations to and (dis)engagements with the talk, with their ongoing activities and with their co-participants.

Preparing with embodied means an upcoming action in a publicly visible and available way is what is common for both transitions. However, resumptions, unlike suspensions, are projected actions; in other words, during the intervening course of action and even possible further insertions, participants still maintain a (more or less) collaborative orientation to the continued relevance of the suspended activity and to its eventual resumption (RQ1 and RQ2). As discussed in article III, preparation work for an upcoming resumption is conducted collaboratively, among
other things, through embodied, synchronised orientations to activity-relevant objects when negotiating for the appropriate moment to resume. Such orientations to activity-relevant objects are manifested, for example, through sustained gaze and other parts of the body (e.g. tilting the head towards the object or leaning in towards it using the upper body) as well as touching, picking up, moving, and manipulating in other ways these objects before producing a verbal, intervening utterance that then explicitly initiates the transition. The interactional relevance of these embodied orientations is made particularly salient in some data examples in which, during a long suspension, a participant may do intermittent orientation displays towards activity-relevant objects even though still continuing with intervening talk in order to visibly mark the continued relevance of the suspended activity and an impending resumption as soon as intervening business has been dealt with. Moreover, after several delays and unsuccessful attempts to resume, participants may perform increasingly emphatic embodied orientations to activity-relevant objects, thus visibly displaying their increasing commitment to disengaging from intervening business and returning to the suspended activity.

In the case of suspensions launched by noticing-occasioned interventions, there is no initial, collaborative orientation to the transition. Instead, they are launched by an individual participant’s noticing that deals with sudden, unexpected and thus unprojected courses of action; they are not what is expected to occur next. Consequently, the intervening participant first needs to “get others on board” with this sudden change of course, that is, to establish joint attention by alerting others to their noticing and to negotiate a suspension of the current activity.

These two different transitional boundaries in the context of multiactivity are organised in a similar, two-part structure starting with an initial, embodied orientation, which is followed by a turn-at-talk that makes the transition explicit (RQ2). In the case of noticing-occasioned interventions (article II), the structure is as follows: 1) An individual, embodied noticing, followed by 2) a multimodal noticing turn. In the case of resumptions (article III), the structure is as follows: 1) Collaborative, embodied negotiation, followed by 2) a multimodal resumption turn. In both transitions, the initial, embodied phase overlaps with the currently ongoing interactional sequence, or rather, is performed in parallel with it. In the case of noticing-occasioned interventions (article II), the embodied noticing phase is typically quite brief and performed unilaterally by one participant during the currently ongoing activity. In the case of resumptions (article III), participants show a “double orientation” (Deppermann et al., 2010) to the two lines of action during the embodied negotiation phase by orienting to one activity with embodied means.
while still verbally engaged in another. To some extent, this occurs also in the resumptions of suspended (story)tellings discussed in article I: participants collaboratively orient to closing the intervening sequence not only through talk but also by body-visualy realigning themselves to their pre-intervention positions, and the resuming teller uses resources such as gaze aversion and re-adoptions of the “teller’s posture” before verbally resuming their suspended telling. These practices are practical manifestations of the more general property of human (inter)action and its prevailing orientation to anticipation and projection, referred to by Streeck and Jordan (2009) as “the forward-looking nature of embodied communication” (see also e.g. Dausendschön-Gay & Krafft, 2009; Mondada, 2018; Stukenbrock, 2014).

In conclusion, the findings suggest that embodied resources largely make possible smooth transitions when moving into and out of intervening courses of action, because they do the initial, subtle negotiation work that is needed in order for the participants to arrive at an intersubjective understanding of where they are right now and where they are going next without having to bring up this negotiation to the surface of interaction explicitly (RQ1 and RQ2). As Streeck and Jordan (2009, p. 95) so aptly observe, “when examined in terms of its projective properties, the very fabric of interaction and communication seems to be imbued with forward-looking anticipatory structures that facilitate ongoing, fluid interactions in a dynamic social environment”. Importantly, projection does not only concern matters of sequentiality or nextness of turns and actions, but also the “multimodal simultaneity or cotemporality of action components” (Stukenbrock, 2014, p. 83). The present thesis supports these views by providing evidence on the multimodal nature of projection and conditional relevance in co-present interaction. Embodied resources enable participants to project, or publicly put on offer, their ‘next’ actions before definitively and explicitly implementing them, while current actions are still ongoing. These can then be aligned or disaligned with by others through their embodied displays, and subsequently pursued or withdrawn from until a more opportune moment arises, without ever disturbing the flow of ongoing interaction. Thus, participants are able to maintain a smooth flow of interaction and progression of activities.

In addition to the projective and anticipatory properties of embodied resources, they are frequently used concurrently with talk in activity suspensions and resumptions (RQ2). One particularly prevalent resource used in both types of transitions is the use of pointing gestures, often coupled with deictic expressions in the intervening or resuming turn-at-talk. In the case of noticing-occasioned
interventions (article II), the pointing gestures targeting the noticed object function as “front-loaded” cues (cf. e.g. Levinson, 2013) that serve to establish joint attention on the target of the noticing before the verbal noticing turn has reached its projected completion. Sometimes the intervention may be performed solely through a pointing gesture without an intervening turn-at-talk, thus enabling a subtle entry into the ongoing course of action and inviting others to initiate talk about the noticed, pointed-to object (see Example 3 in article II). In the case of resumptions, pointing to a deictically-referred-to object that is relevant to the suspended activity serves as a visible means to reorient co-participants to the suspended activity, and moreover, to a specific, concrete point of departure from which the suspended activity can be continued, such as pointing at a pile of receipts that were being processed before the intervention (see Example 1 in article III). Besides pointing (and other forms of object orientations and manipulations), other embodied resources also frequently co-occur with turns-at-talk that initiate intervening sequences or resume suspended courses of action. Some examples of these are the teller’s brief gaze aversion and the re-adoption of a “telling position” of the hands when resuming a suspended telling. More detailed findings with respect to these were already discussed in the previous chapter. However, to sum up, resources such as gaze, body posture and movement and various forms of object-adaptive behaviours are used in both systematic and situated ways in negotiating and accomplishing activity suspensions and resumptions in interaction.
6 Conclusion

This thesis has set out to examine how co-present participants negotiate and accomplish activity suspensions and resumptions in interaction. The aim has been to go beyond descriptions of specific linguistic items or patterns in order to examine in a holistic way the participants’ coordinated, contingent and systematic use of different multimodal resources (linguistic, embodied and material) when they collaboratively suspend and resume activities in interaction. The thesis has identified recurrent linguistic patterns for resumptions in both English and Finnish data (articles I and III). However, it has also demonstrated that, even in activity contexts in which language may be the predominant mode of communication (cf. article I in particular), embodied and material resources play a crucial role, and feature in systematic ways, in the accomplishment of the examined actions, also showing that these practices are generalisable beyond just one language (articles II and III).

The findings of this thesis have also contributed to research on the relatively understudied concept of ‘multiactivity’ in social interaction by focusing on activity suspensions and resumptions as moments during which participants’ orientations to their multiple involvements and their negotiation and coordination of the hierarchy and status of their different activities is made salient. Within this context, the thesis has shed new light on the way intervening courses of action may be occasioned (article II) and how participants later navigate their way out of these interventions and accomplish a return to the suspended activity (article III). It has demonstrated how the status of an intervened-upon activity as being suspended (rather than abandoned) is not necessarily made explicitly known by participants but can be manifested in various, more implicit ways (see article III, and Example 2 in section 4.4). The thesis has also shed new light on the nature of ‘noticings’ as social actions (e.g. Goodwin & Goodwin 2012; Keisanen 2012; Schegloff, 2007) by discussing their multimodal composition and the relationship between the initial, embodied noticing and the ensuing verbal turn with multimodal components in the process of accomplishing noticing-occasioned interventions in interaction (article II). Further, the thesis has shown the significance of embodied resources in the gradual process of negotiating favourable conditions for resumption within multiactivity, and how they provide participants with subtle means to flexibly coordinate their actions during these transitions when multiple and emergent relevancies may be at stake. Finally, the thesis has shown how the transitional processes involved in suspending a current activity by intervening with a noticing,
as well as resuming a previously suspended activity, make salient participants’ negotiations of interactional relevancies and hierarchies between their different activities and involvements in them. In and through such negotiations, participants show an orientation to maintaining what Robinson (2013) refers to as “supra-sequential coherence”, or “overall structural organization”, of their social encounters, which has been to date a rather understudied area in the field of conversation analysis. The findings have demonstrated how participants’ orientation to structural organisation operates on different levels of social interaction: it is not just sequence organisation on a local level that is under scrutiny and relevant for participants, but also the overall structural organisation of their activities and even entire interactional encounters.

In examining activity suspensions and resumptions, this thesis has mostly focused on activities that are carried out predominantly through talk. Consequently, suspending and resuming activities in the examined situations has necessarily involved the use of language. It remains a matter for future research to investigate how these transitions might be accomplished in activity contexts in which activities are mostly carried out without talk, involving silent, manual action(s) with minimal to no talk by participants. Furthermore, the systematic co-occurrence of specific linguistic patterns with recurrent embodied practices would warrant some further research in order to determine if, for example, features like gaze withdrawal and re-assuming the telling position of hands when returning to an intervened-upon telling sequence are recurrent practices “on their own”, or whether they are specifically connected to the linguistic practices identified in this thesis. One issue to explore would be to see if the two different return practices, ‘continuation’ and ‘resumption’ (Jefferson, 1972; see also section 3.3.4), are different not just in terms of their linguistic properties but also in their embodied performance. Another issue, which has been somewhat underrepresented in this thesis, is prosody. Although I have made some observations on prosodic patterns in connection with articles I and II and have included some description of prosody in analyses of individual examples in article III, a more detailed and systematic study based on acoustic measurements would have yielded more rigorous results, and certainly much more remains to be discovered on the role of prosody in activity suspensions and resumptions. The present solution has been a compromise between including an important resource into the holistic analyses of the multimodal practices under investigation while not being able to devote too much analytical attention to one specific resource.
Indeed, when studying interactional phenomena in co-present interaction from the ‘participants’ perspective’, it becomes clear that participants themselves make sense of each other’s conduct by relying on a holistic analysis of talk, prosody, gaze, gesture, body orientation, spatial configuration, etc., that is, of all the materials that are immediately available to them in the moment-by-moment unfolding course of interaction. These different resources are in a complex, reflexive relationship with each other and, therefore, cannot necessarily be usefully separated (cf. Hayashi et al., 2002, p. 113). This, one could argue, leads to the conclusion that studying them separately either makes no sense, or at least renders a very incomplete picture of the interactional phenomenon under scrutiny. As Hazel et al. (2014, p. 4) argue, CA studies on social interaction and the practices therein should, by default, consider the studied phenomena as multimodal, unless there are special grounds for a “mono-modal” approach in the data. From this perspective, then, interaction should be viewed on all levels (i.e. on the level of TCUs, turns, sequences, activities and entire interactional encounters) as a “temporally unfolding stream of multimodal conduct” (Hayashi, 2005, p. 47). Using video data in conversation analytic research is increasingly becoming the norm and has resulted in more and more studies that take into account visible phenomena besides talk in their analyses of interaction. Some studies have even suggested a need for turning around the language bias in the field so that embodiment, rather than talk, should serve as the starting point for investigations, which seems especially warranted in the growing number of studies focusing on contexts in which embodiment is the norm while talk is only used in special circumstances (cf. e.g. Stevanovic & Monzoni, 2016). If we consider the fact that all interaction is inherently embodied, this then leads to the valid question made by Nevile (2015, p. 140): “Can we fully understand an (any) action or phenomenon without considering embodiment?".
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Appendix I.

Symbols used in transcription of talk

Based on Jefferson (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wo[rd]</td>
<td>onset of overlapping talk or other sounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wo]rd</td>
<td>end point of overlapping talk or other sounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.8)</td>
<td>silence in tenth of seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(. )</td>
<td>micropause, silence less than 0.2 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wor-</td>
<td>cut-off word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hh</td>
<td>outbreath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.hh</td>
<td>inbreath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>no break or gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;word&lt;</td>
<td>talk quicker in tempo than surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORD</td>
<td>talk louder than surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>»word«</td>
<td>talk softer than surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wo::rd</td>
<td>extension of a sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w(h)ord</td>
<td>word produced through laughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word.</td>
<td>downwards intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word?</td>
<td>upwards intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word,</td>
<td>continuing intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑word</td>
<td>shift to talk high in pitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓word</td>
<td>shift to talk low in pitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(word)</td>
<td>word in doubt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(      )</td>
<td>unclear word(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II.

Symbols used in transcription of embodied conduct

Based on Mondada (e.g. 2014b)

* * Each participant’s actions are delimited between two identical symbols and are synchronized with correspondent stretches of talk.
+ + The action described continues across subsequent lines until the same symbol is reached.
* --> The action described continues after the excerpt’s end.
---> The action described continues across subsequent lines until the same symbol is reached.
*--->> The action described continues after the excerpt’s end.
.... Action’s preparation.
---- Action’s apex is reached and maintained.
// The point at which tracing a particular embodied action begins or ends.
mar Participant doing the embodied action is identified in small characters.
Fig Image; screenshot
# The exact moment at which the screenshot was taken.
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PARTICIPANTS’ MULTIMODAL PRACTICES FOR MANAGING ACTIVITY SUSPENSIONS AND RESUMPTIONS IN ENGLISH AND FINNISH INTERACTION

Marika Helisten