InLiSt No. 17

Interaction and Linguistic Structures

Formal Aspects of Collaborative Productions in English Conversation

Beatrice Szczepek

Konstanz

June 2000

In recognition of the enthusiasm he has brought to all aspects of the study of spoken verbal interaction, we dedicate this series to Professor Dr. Aldo di Luzio, University of Konstanz.

1. Introduction

Collaboration between speakers on different linguistic levels is one of the basic conditions for functioning talk-in-interaction. In this paper the notion of interactional collaboration is taken up with respect to conversationalists' deployment of syntax and prosody. The phenomenon under discussion is the collaborative production of syntactic constructions and prosodic units by two speakers. The following investigation will attempt to categorize collaborative productions according to some of their formal characteristics. In addition, it will be claimed that collaborative productions are non-competitive incomings into the turn-space of another speaker and cannot be considered interruptions.

2. Previous research on collaborative productions

In the conversation-analytic tradition collaborative productions were first mentioned by Sacks (1995) under the term "collaboratively built sentences". They also receive a brief mentioning in Schegloff (1984) and are part of what Falk (1980) treats under the heading of "duets". The largest contribution to the subject has been made by Lerner (1991, 1994, 1996), who calls the phenomenon "sentences-in-progress." Ferrara (1992) speaks of "joint productions"; and in a section in Ono/Thompson (1995) they are treated as "co-constructions." A brief summary of these positions will be helpful for a further understanding of the phenomenon.[1]

Sacks (1995) sees the main contribution of collaborative productions to discourse as social. For him, the syntactic possibility of constructing a sentence together is at the same time a possibility for collaboratively constructing a social unit.

> The fact that there is a job that any person could clearly do by themself (sic), provides a resource for members for permitting them to show each other that whatever it is they're doing together, they're just doing together to do together. That is to say, if one wants to find a way of showing somebody that what you want is to be with them, the best way to do it is to find some way of dividing a task which is not easily dividable, and which clearly can be done by either one alone. (1995:147)

---

[1] Another piece of recent work that has dealt with collaboratives is Díaz, Antaki and Collins (1996). It is concerned with collaborative productions in circumstances too specific to be considered in the present general overview, namely with the "collective formulation (...) of a problem solution on a joint footing" (1996:525). Collaborative productions are also briefly treated in Hartung (1998) as a way of being ironic, in Glindemann (1987:66*ff*) as one form of speaking "unisono," and in Bublitz (1988:238*ff*) as a subcategory of speaker contributions which support the primary speaker. Schwitalla (1993) has some examples in his section on "redebegleitendes Sprechen" (75*ff*).

Following Sacks' interpretation, collaborative productions are a way of using syntax as a linguistic resource for social aims, specifically for the forming of a social group within a conversational setting.

In Lerner's two main articles on collaborative productions (1991) and (1996), he discusses "compound turn constructional unit formats". These are two-fold structures which consist of a preliminary and a final component. The completion of the final component of a compound TCU is a conventional place for possible speaker change. "Preliminary component completion", i.e. the completion of the first part of the two-fold utterance, is typically not a transition relevance place. These preliminary completions, however, allow a recipient to project the upcoming of the final component and thereby to project when the next transition relevance place, i.e. the next possibility for speaker change, is about to come. An example is the *if X then Y* construction. Once a speaker has reached the completion of the *if X* component, the following component *then Y* can be predicted to close the format and thereby make an upcoming transition relevance place possible. According to Lerner, collaborative productions occur when second speakers, instead of waiting for the TRP after the final component, come in after the preliminary component completion and produce the final element. In the above case this would mean that when a current speaker produces *if X*, another speaker comes in after the completion of this component and produces the *then Y* element.

Other two-fold formats which Lerner (1991) describes are quotations following a verbum dicendi, parenthetical inserts which project the continuation of what has come before, lists, disagreements prefaced by *well*, contrasts, and the spelling of names in two parts. Lerner (1996) also acknowledges that there are "unprojected opportunities for completion" (1996:256), which are not occasioned by compound TCU formats but by "any conversational practice that disrupts the progressivity of talk within a turn" (1996:257). Such conversational practices are laugh tokens; intra-turn silences caused, for example, by a word search; and word repetitions. However, Lerner does not describe cases of collaborative productions which do not occur either in a compound TCU format or after some kind of 'trigger' from the first speaker.

The focus of Lerner's research on collaborative productions is decidedly that of syntax-for-conversation:

> The collaboration of two speakers within what is achieved as a single sentence provides a way to recover features of sentence structure, where those features are not wholly tied to the talk of individual speakers. Sentence production can be seen here as an interactional achievement. The import of this is that the completion of one speaker's utterance by another participant reveals aspects of an interactionally relevant syntax. (1991:441)

The formats themselves, however, are not all syntactic in nature, but range from pragmatic formats (lists) to semantic relations (contrasts) to interactional activities (doing disagreement). This lack of distinction between different linguistic levels obscures the fact that not all formats are on a par with one another.

One of the essential components of talk-in-interaction, prosody, is not considered by Lerner. The only reference to prosodic parameters is to pausing between the *if X* and the *then Y* components (1996:242); no mention at all is made of intonation. Yet it is precisely the investigation of prosody that would permit an analysis to include a broader range of types of collaborative production. The data used for the present paper contains a large number of cases which are neither part of a two-fold format nor prompted in any other observable fashion by the current speaker. The present investigation will try to include both prosody and syntax in a formal description and differentiation of collaborative productions.[2]

Ferrara (1992) sets out to examine both the syntactic and the social aspects of 'joint productions,' as she calls them. Yet, although she repeatedly claims that their existence points toward a notion of the sentence as a "discourse unit under production" (1992:207), her treatment of empirical examples is not an in-depth analysis of their syntactical structure. Instead, the paper's main focus is the speakers' social motivations for joint productions.

Ferrara differentiates four categories of collaboratives: "utterance extensions" are additions to an already complete syntactic construction. According to Ferrara, they are motivated by a "respect for the truthfulness of utterances" (1992:218) in the second speaker. "Predictable utterance completions" are those in which the second speaker anticipates how the first speaker's utterance might continue. "Helpful utterance completions" are incomings from recipients who wish to assist the current speaker in a word search. The first speaker's difficulty is often signaled prosodically by *uh* or by a pause or both. "Invited utterance completions" are discourse strategies used by first speakers who, according to Ferrara, disguise their questions as incomplete statements, and thereby their lack of information as mere hesitation. This way, first speakers can prompt their recipients to supply what they themselves do not care to show they lack. The prosody of these completions is similar to that of hesitation: level intonation (rather than rising, which might indicate a question), with syllable lengthening plus a brief pause.

These four categories are ones that certainly serve to distinguish different types of collaborative productions. However, to treat them as exclusive does not lead to a successful differentiation of the phenomenon. The second part of a collaborative production can be a syntactic extension and predictable at the same time. A first speaker can invite an incoming, and the second speaker's completion can simultaneously be helpful. Whether or not an

---

[2] cf. 3.2.2.

incoming is a syntactic extension, predictable, helpful or invited are conditions of collaborative productions that hold independently of one another on different, if sometimes overlapping levels of talk-in-interaction (such as syntax, speaker-knowledge, speaker motivation). Ferrara (1992), like Lerner, also fails to investigate the prosodic aspect.

Ono/Thompson (1995) classify their findings according to only one linguistic level. "Co-constructions" can be either syntactic additions or completions. In the first type, the incoming speaker adds material to the first speaker's syntactically complete utterance and this addition is accepted by the original speaker. In the second type, the incoming speaker completes a first speaker's incomplete syntactic gestalt.

The research goal of Ono/Thompson's study is to show that conversationalists orient to abstract "constructional schemas" (1995:16), which are described in terms of a syntax for conversation. Possible schemata are NP V NP or NP V NP PP, which incoming speakers orient to when they complete another's utterance. According to Ono/Thompson, "collaborative turn-sequences (...) provide evidence for projectable completion points and joint orientation to a notion of 'sentence'" (1995:11).

The exclusively syntactic orientation of Ono/Thompson's work does not allow for a consideration of the prosody of co-constructions. Neither does it pursue potential conversational functions of collaboratives.

3 Data and units of analysis

This section will prepare the ground for the following investigation of collaborative productions. First the data corpus for the current study will be described. Secondly, the syntactic units which underlie this investigation will be introduced and a preliminary restriction of the data collection will be made on syntactic grounds. Thirdly, the prosodic units into which spoken conversational language can be divided will be presented. A fourth subsection will consider interactional units.

3.1 The data corpus

The corpus for this study is approximately 40 hours of recorded spoken interaction. Two different types of conversational settings have been used: 16 hours of the material are private conversations, 4 hours of which are by British English speakers, 12 hours by North Americans. All of these conversations take place in informal settings among friends and family members. 24 hours are recordings of radio phone-in programs, in which the atmosphere between hosts and their colleagues, guests and callers is also an informal one.

Out of the 200 examples of collaborative productions, roughly three fourths were produced during private conversations, the rest during radio shows.

The data has been transcribed according to the GAT transcription notations provided in the appendix.

3.2 Syntactic units

In order to avoid the problematic concept of sentence, the notion of the "syntactic gestalt" will be adopted from Auer (1996). He points out that

> a wider conception of syntax seems necessary in order to deal with the structural ellipsis of obligatory constituents (of a finite verb), one which goes beyond the limits of the traditional sentence. (1996:61)

Auer argues that in question-answer sequences, for example, answers are often necessarily elliptical, but are still considered syntactically complete structures. What constitutes a syntactic gestalt, therefore, depends on the surrounding context in which the structure has been produced.

We will be dealing with a number of syntactically elliptical constructions when we look at the second part of a collaborative production in which the incoming speaker completes or extends a first speaker's utterance. This second part is typically presented as belonging to an ongoing syntactic gestalt rather than as a complete structure of its own. Consider, for example, the following excerpt:

(1) 28: Wide Australian

```
1      WA:    one of DAvid's FRIENDS comes from cAme from HAMle ↑HAMPstead.
2             when he      [was (.) THIR↑TEEN. (.)
3      BE:                 [<<h> (↑DOES he)>
4      WA:    [or eLEven. (1.1)
5      BE:    [<<h> OH:,>
6      WA:    you would you would NEver GUESS it from his ACcent <<l> I mean
7  ->         he's -> (.)
8  -> BE:     WIDE auSTRAlian   [now.
9      WA:                      [speaking au[STRAlian,
10     BE:                                  [yeah.
11     WA:    with (        )
12     BE:    [m;
13     MA:    oh yEs like KEIR does of course but, (0,5)
14            <<h> FUNNily eNOUGH EWAN DOESn't.>
```

In (1) BE's collaborative incoming (line 8) is a syntactic continuation of WA's *he's* (line 7). BE treats WA's *'s* as a copula for her predicate adjective *WIDE austrAlian* and together they form a complete syntactic gestalt. However, BE's material is not only syntactically linked to WA's utterance, but it also continues the ongoing action in which WA was engaged, here a description of a person's accent.

In the present paper, only those cases in which the elliptical construction is presented as a continuation of the first speaker's syntactic construction and conversational action are considered collaborative productions. In other instances a similar type of ellipsis is used differently, which leads to its exclusion from the collection:

(2) 101: In the party?
```
1     MA:    and they had (.) i think she said TWELVE.
2  -> RI:    in the PARty?
3     MA:    NO.
```

In (2) MA produces what Sacks (1995:528*ff*) calls an "appendor question". These are prepositional phrases which are tacked onto another's complete utterance and function as questions about that utterance, usually carrying high rising, try-marked intonation. In this paper, such appendors will not be considered collaborative productions, as they have been convincingly analyzed as other-initiated repair (Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks (1977), Schegloff (1997: 510*f*)). As such they are syntactic continuations but pragmatically independent actions from a second speaker,[3] which accomplish a conversational goal different from that of the previous utterance.

3.3 Prosodic units

The prosodic units according to which the examples have been transcribed are 'intonation units', also referred to as 'tone-groups'.[4] An intonation unit has been described as "a stretch of speech uttered under a single coherent intonation contour."[5] Each tone-group minimally has a "nucleus", which is the most prominent syllable of the intonation unit.[6] Prominence here relates to pitch movement, duration and volume, either independently or in combination with one another. Typically the nucleus, or the lexical item which it is part of, marks the semantically most significant information in the tone group. The nucleus is often the last accented syllable in an intonation unit.

From the nucleus onwards the pitch movement of the intonation unit is classified as either final or non-final. These notions have to do with perceptive finality: do we hear the end of an intonation unit as projecting more talk or not? In the dialects of English considered here, finality in this respect is realized in two different ways; either a fall to the bottom of the speaker's voice range (beginning with the nuclear pitch movement) or a high rise, such as the one we would produce when asked to give a typical example of an English yes/no

---

[3] cf. Schegloff 1996:76.
[4] The terms will be used interchangeably here. For the following cf. Crystal (1969); Couper-Kuhlen (1986); Selting (1995).
[5] DuBois *et al* (1993:47).
[6] Crystal (1969).

question. Non-final intonation units are typically characterized as ending either in a truncated fall, a slight rise or level intonation.[7]

A frequent boundary between tone groups is a micro-pause. However, pauses alone do not make up an intonation unit boundary, as there can also be pauses within the unit and, alternatively, there can be unit boundaries without pauses. The more reliable indicator for a boundary is the perception of a prosodic break between the two tone groups, caused often by a break in rhythm and/or pitch. The break in rhythm and timing comes from final lengthening on the last syllable of an intonation unit[8] contrasting with the first unstressed syllables of the new intonation unit which are often accelerated or return to the previous speech tempo. The intonational break is caused by a break in the pitch trajectory, typically when the last syllables of the previous tone group decline, and the first syllables of the new unit return to mid.[9]

3.4 Interactional units

The interactional units which we will be dealing with here are turns and turn constructional units (TCUs):

> The components of which turns-at-talk are composed we have in the past (SSJ, 1974: 702-4) termed "turn constructional units." By "turn constructional unit" (...) we meant to register that these units *can* constitute possibly complete turns; on their possible completion, transition to a next speaker becomes *relevant* (although not necessarily accomplished).
> (...) the (or one) key unit of language organization for talk-in-interaction is the turn constructional unit; its natural habitat is the turn-at-talk. (Schegloff 1996: 55, emphasis in the original)

Potential transition to a next speaker happens at a transition relevance place. Concerning TRPs, this paper will follow Ford/Thompson's (1996) definition of turn completion in a syntactic, intonational and pragmatic sense. Intonational completion refers to the above mentioned realization via a final fall or a final rise in an intonation unit (Ford/Thompson 1996:147). Therefore, if a tone group ends in a truncated fall or a slight rise, for example, it signals that the ongoing turn is still incomplete, irrespective of syntactic completion. If a tone

---

[7] For a more detailed discussion of intonational finality and its role for turn-taking cf. 3.4.

[8] cf. Cruttenden (1986:39*ff*).

[9] "Given that each tone-unit will have one peak of prominence in the form of a nuclear pitch movement (...), then it is the case that after this nuclear tone there will be a tone-unit boundary which is indicated by two phonetic factors. Firstly, there will be a perceivable pitch change, either stepping up or stepping down, depending on the direction of nuclear tone movement – if falling, then step-up; if rising, then step-down; if level, either, depending on its relative height. (...) The second criterion is the presence of junctural features at the end of every tone unit." (Crystal 1969:205*f*).

group ends in a fall to the bottom of a speaker's voice range, it signals the potential end of a turn.

Selting (1996) has argued for Standard German that such a categorization is impossible:

> In Standard German, however, I could not auditorily identify specific pitch configurations, such as a specific depth or height of the terminal fall or rise, which is characteristic of unit- or turn-ending. Instead, in a most fundamental sense, every terminal pitch movement and its possible completion can retrospectively be continued and thus made into a non-terminal one, by simply taking up the pitch the speaker has ended with and continuing it. (1996:372)

However, she does agree that there are certain pitch movements which project further talk:

> There is, indeed, a pitch configuration that uniformly signals and locally projects non-ending of a turn: (Non-low) level (or slightly rising) pitch accents which sound as if held in suspension. (1996:379)

The possibility of continuation after every potential completion is known from syntax (cf. Auer 1996). However, the fact that utterances can be continued does not exclude the notion of potential completion, either for syntax or for prosody. So if a speaker in a natural, informal conversation, after arriving at a final fall, a complete syntactic gestalt and a pragmatic end point, continues to speak, this does not imply that there was no potential completion. It may for example mean that nobody else has decided to take the floor.

The data for the current investigation come from speakers of Standard American and Southern British English and they routinely orient to the types of turn-completion identified by Ford/Thompson (1996). I will therefore continue to consider falls to the bottom and high rises turn-final intonation units and slight rises, truncated falls and level pitch non-final ones.[10]

4.   Collaborative productions

In this section, our object of study will be defined. Two possibilities of categorizing the phenomenon will then be presented: the first considers the current speaker's perspective, the second considers the perspective of the incoming speaker.

---

[10] From work with German data of the Swabian variety I know that the truncated fall, which is a typical projecting contour in the English varieties named above, often occurs at turn-endings, which demonstrates the necessity for drawing a distinction between individual language variants in a discussion of prosodic finality.

4.1 Definition

Collaborative productions are utterances which are produced by more than one speaker. They therefore emerge as a two-part structure; however, this two-part structure need not be predetermined by the grammatical or pragmatic make-up of the utterance itself. Collaborative productions form one syntactic gestalt. The syntactic gestalt must be recognizable as one syntactic construction, i.e. the second speaker's material must be syntactically linked to the first speaker's. It must also be prosodically linked to the prior contour so that the incoming part can be heard as a continuation of the previous speaker's intonation.

4.2 Types of collaborative productions

The aim of the following two subchapters is to find a way of categorizing collaborative productions according to certain formal characteristics. First, they are classified with respect to the first speaker's perspective. This speaker's part of the collaborative production is analyzed according to how it projects the utterance to continue. Second, a categorization is suggested which takes on the continuing speaker's perspective and differentiates collaborative incomings into those that are syntactic and/or prosodic completions of the first speaker's material, and those that are extensions of it.

4.2.1 Types of projection

In this subsection, an attempt is made to use the notion of projection as a formal categorizing factor for collaborative productions. Projection in this context refers to a first speaker's incomplete utterance which in some way syntactically, semantically, pragmatically and prosodically foreshadows whether, and if so, how that utterance is going to continue. The term is therefore not necessarily used in the traditional conversation-analytic sense of projection of a transition relevance place only, but also includes the way in which an utterance will continue.

Selting (1996), referring to the traditional use of the term projection, suggests four ways in which an ongoing utterance can project an upcoming TRP:

> Syntactic projection, which is done by the initiation of syntactic schemata; prosodic projection, which is accomplished by the use of prosodic means of unit and/or turn holding or yielding; semantic projection, which is realized by the use of particular lexical constructions such as *either ... or*, *first ... second*, etc., or by starting to provide a piece of information that needs to be completed; discourse-pragmatic or sequential projection, which is achieved by the formulation of announcements, prefaces or other kinds of initiation of recognizable activity types which are thus being made expectable. (1996: 359)

These types of TRP projection can also be applied to the sense of projection employed here, i.e. how an utterance will continue after certain cues on different linguistic levels.

Syntactic projection, which of course always occurs simultaneously with the pragmatic projection of the turn-sequences so far, has been described by Auer (1996:59), who also concentrates on TRP projection:

> During the emergence of a syntactic gestalt, the chances for predicting (correctly) the not-yet-produced remaining part (and therefore, its termination) continually increase. Thus, the production of a gestalt in time starts with a phase of minimal projectability, implying a high load of perceptual-cognitive work on the part of the recipient and of productive-cognitive work on the part of the speaker, and ends with a phase of maximal projectability in which the speaker profits from the quasi-automatic terminability of already activated patterns and the recipient from the low informational load of the remaining utterance.

A format which Lerner (1991) also mentions is *if X then Y*, which allows only for a narrow range of possible continuation after the preliminary component *if X* has been delivered. It sets up a frame that requires one concrete kind of continuation, and together with the pragmatic content of previous utterances by the speakers, this continuation is rather predictable. See for instance the following extract:

(3) 30: Renting

```
1      PA:    if you ↑HAD to sell it nOw.=
2             =you'd got ´fIfteen ´THOUsand ´POUNDS in ↑↑CASH. (1.8)
3   ->        but if you'd've ↑bEEn RENTing, (.)
4   -> BA:    <<all> you wOUldn't have[HAD that;>
5      PA:                             [STILL,
6      RO:    <<p> yeah;>
7      PA:    you're ↑nOt likely to have saved up fIfteen thousand pounds,=
8             =in three or four ↑YEARS;
9             ↑WOULD you.
```

There are many more such formats, some of them syntactic, others semantic and discourse-pragmatic in nature.[11] Some of them are listed in Lerner (1991)[12]. Others occur in the data for the present investigation. Missing syntactic heads are one kind; an incoming speaker fills in a noun at the end of a first speaker's syntactic gestalt. Here, the constraint to complete is of course quite strong. Other formats, such as current speakers ending their utterance with 'because', 'but', or 'which' may not be equally strong in their projection constraint, as those items can in some environments be left dangling. However, the largest number of formats

---

[11] 'Semantic' according to Selting's (1996) definition of semantic projection through certain lexical constructions.
[12] cf. 2.

are individual in nature, such as first speakers' projection of an upcoming exemplification by ending in 'for example', projection of proper names by ending in 'she's called', instructions consisting of several parts that can be continued, etc. There is hardly enough space to give examples for all these possible formats, whose only common property is that they can be continued. However, this list is intended to give an impression of how varied these kinds of projection are. This is especially the case if one includes the semantic and the discourse-pragmatic level of interaction. Incoming speakers constantly orient to the content of preceding material and very often also to what a prior utterance is in the process of doing, which allows them to predict how it is going to continue.

In addition to the types of projection mentioned above, a speaker's prosody can also foreshadow how an utterance is going to continue prosodically. In the following, this type of projection will be discussed in some detail. In many ways prosodic projection is harder to deal with than the preceding syntactic, semantic and discourse-pragmatic formats, as it opens up to the incoming speaker a much broader range of possibilities for continuation.

Some prosodic contours seem to call for a specific kind of continuation from a second speaker. Of course, prosodic projection should never be considered independently of the projection of the utterance's pragmatic content, but more as a contextualization cue thereof. It also operates without the compelling frame of a syntactic construction. In spite of these restrictions, however, one can sometimes speak of a contour which makes a certain type of continuation particularly probable:

(4) 29: Rubbish

```
1      PA:    but you CA:N use quality meat        [for SAUSages.
2      BA:                                         [VEAL actually,
3      RO:    ↑Oh you no you you CA:N,
4             and and they DO:,
5             [in in GERmany ↑And swItzerland,
6  -> PA:    [but the but the ma↑JOrity of sAUsage:s,
7  ->        A::RE,
8             [(        )
9  -> BA:    [↑RUbbish.
10     (1.0)
11     PA:    what they CAN'T sEll as ROASTing BOILing,
12     BA:    that's ↑RIGHT;
13 -> PA:    ↑FRYing joints.
```

PA sets up a contrast between sausages that are made out of *quality meat* and those that are not. When he reaches lines 6 and 7, the pragmatic content of his utterance has already become rather clear. His prosody in these two lines also opens up a global contour that seems to aim for one particular kind of completion: *sAUsage:s,* (line 6) is lengthened in its last syllable and ends in rising intonation. *A::RE,* (line 7) is also lengthened and rising, and occurs as its own intonation unit. In co-occurrence these two tone groups build up tension for

some sort of climax. A possible climax is offered by BA with a high step-up and a steep fall on ⇑*RUbbish.*, both of which seem to have been projected by PA's prosody in lines 6 and 7, and by the contrast on the content level of his utterance.[13] That PA himself continues on the same prosodic lines can be seen in line 13, where he, too, produces a step-up on ⇑*FRYing.*[14] Syntactically, the projection of PA's utterance so far allows for more than one possibility of completion, and BA chooses to insert an NP. PA later continues with a relative clause.

(4) shows how an environment of contrast can call for a steep falling contour. Another environment in which certain prosodic projections seem to occur rather frequently is that of conversational lists. Lerner (1994) deals with "responsive list construction", however without considering their prosodic make-up. Couper-Kuhlen (1999) has taken up Lerner's notion of collaborative lists and shown how speakers engage in "prosodic routines" when they build a list together. According to her, prosodic projectability of an upcoming list item takes place with respect to pitch height, amplitude and timing. In all these areas a first speaker sets up a pattern that is repeated in at least two list items before a second speaker comes in with an additional one. For example, a first speaker may divide list items into intonation units and use the same pitch height, i.e. the same musical note, and an isochronous rhythmic beat on each nucleus. This practice will project the same pitch and timing for a third list item produced by an incoming speaker. An item in a collaborative list can also project a particular intonation contour, as in the following example:

---

[13] Steep falls have been analyzed as signaling contrast by Couper-Kuhlen (1986).
[14] Another example in which this steep falling contour is projected is
3: Let her go

```
1       HE:    I had to make a decision with my MOther,=
2              =who was eighty seven years OLD, .hh
3              i'm an only CHILD,
4              a:nd I had to make the decIsion whether or NOT; .hh
5              to conTInue - .hh
6              hAve her continued O:n maCHI:NES, (.) .hh
7       BE:    <<p> mhm,>
8       HE:    O:R to let her GO:,
9   ->         and i mAde the decIsion to      [lEt her ⇑GO.
10  -> BE:                                     [<<p> lEt her ⇑GO.>
11      HE:    and it was (.) .hh VEry very ⇑DIFFicult.
```

Here, again the projected contour occurs in an environment of contrast, namely that between to *hAve her continued O:n maCHI:NES* or *to let her GO:.* That the contour has been in some way projected is at least retrospectively evident in the simultaneous production of the steep fall by both speakers (lines 9/10). The same contour has also been mentioned by Auer (1996:75) in a constructed example*:* *"Susy, is, pregnant!*" I would like to treat the fact that this contour is used to construct an example as tentative evidence for its being part of a repertoire of stereotyped intonation contours. In this case, if it is indeed a stereotyped contour, a projection as the one in (4) is even more plausible. (For stereotyped and stylized intonation contours cf. Ladd (1978))

(5) 98: France

```
1     JI:    it's not aVAILable here in the united stAtes,
2  ->        it's only in FRANCE,
3  -> JO:    ENGland,
4     JI:    and
5            YEAH.
6  ->        and SWEden,
7            RIGHT.
```

The contour in question is one that terminates in a final rise beginning on the last accented syllable and spreading across the remaining unaccented syllables that follow it. In (5) we do not know whether JI had intended to begin a list in line 2, but with JO's continuation (line 3) a list emerges, JI accepts it and continues it in line 6. The rising contour in line 2 seems to project another rising contour in line 3; the projection of the similar contour goes of course together with the projection of a similar lexical item, in this case a name of a country.

In collaborative list production it seems obvious that what one item projects is a replication of certain qualities of that same item, in the present instance both the lexico-semantic field from which the following item is chosen and the prosodic design with which it is delivered.

> Lists are characterized precisely by the fact that they are accumulations of like items: they are constructed as members of a class. This is symbolized not only by like syntactic constituency but also can be iconically cued by like prosodic patterning. Identical prosodic treatment in essence says 'This one is like that one' – it is a way of constructing similarity even if it may be verbally lacking. (Couper-Kuhlen 1999:20)

This aspect of prosodic replication holds not only for collaborative lists, but for collaborative productions in general. It can be achieved by speakers who repeat a prosodic element from the previous speaker's utterance, as in the following example:

(6) 101: Very well

```
1  -> MI:    i figured   [↑OH: they must KNOW each other. (-)
2  -> JA:                [↑OO:; (-)
3  ->        ↑OO:;
4  -> HE:    very ↑WELL in fact. (1.0)
5  -> MI:    [that's what i a↑SSU::MED.
6     JA:    [GROSS.
```

The pitch jumps on ↑OH: (line 1) and ↑OO:; (lines 2/3) are simultaneously produced by two different speakers. Although one cannot speak of prosodic projection in the sense that these pitch movements call for more jump-ups, they do seem to prepare the ground for a repetition of that pitch contour by the third speaker in line 4. In line 5 the original speaker repeats the contour once more on *that's what i a↑SSU::MED*. The jump up in pitch seems to be passed back and forth between the speakers, who in this example are not engaged in a list. Their

repetition and collaboration occurs on a solely prosodic level. Syntactically, line 1 does not project a continuation, HE adds an AdjVP to a potentially complete syntactic gestalt.

Some cases of prosodic projection that occur in the data remain obscure to the analyst, as they refer to a repertoire of prosodic stereotypes that only the speakers themselves seem to have access to. One such example is (7):

(7) 97: Baking cookies

```
1      KA:    the FIRSt saturday in my nEw appartment;=
2             i'll be CELebrating and i'll go;
3             <<all> WHAT am i gonna do;
4             WHAT am i gonna do;>
5   ->        and THEN i'll go; .hh
6   ->        [<<h+ff> i'm baking COOKie::s ->
7   -> WA:    [<<h+ff> i'm gonna CLEA::N ->
8             <<h> i'm gonna bake COOKies;
9             i'll have FUN.>
```

Although the semantic content of the two continuations is not equivalent (*baking COOKie::s* vs. *CLEA::N*), both speakers use identical prosody – high pitch and fortissimo volume - after KA's inbreath in line 5. This might be due to some facial expression by KA, or to an individual stereotype developed in the family which the participants are members of. There are no obvious prosodic signals from KA that project the following outburst. Still, there must have been some kind of initiation for this kind of prosodic design to occur so utterly simultaneously.

Prosodic projection of the above types is such that a particular contour is projected by a preceding contour and sometimes by other factors such as pragmatic context or conversational routines. In many of the examples, the projection becomes retrospectively evident from the simultaneous production of the second contour by both speakers. Of course, projection on the level of prosody is much more indistinct than syntactic projection. In all cases of prosodic projection, the incoming speaker would have had the chance to continue differently, whereas once someone has said *if X*, there is not much choice as to what comes next.

Instances of more concrete projections of prosody are rather rare. In many collaborative productions, prosodic projection must be considered in its traditional conversation-analytic sense of projecting TRPs. The following example is one where the first speaker's intonation unit signals simply a non-final turn rather than a particular form of continuation:

(8) 100: Hippo

```
1      MA:    and he'd FALLen off the honda; (.)
2             and the hippo had (.) TAken a BITE;
3             RIGHT;
4      RI:    [O:H;
5  -> MA:    [just Opened its mOUth and;
6  -> RI:     just took a CHUNK out.
7      MA:    yeah.
```

MA's intonation contour in line 5 signals 'more to come' on a turn-taking level, it projects prosodic continuation rather than restart, but no marked prosody in the sense of the previous examples. Typically, speakers match their pitch and loudness with those of the preceding contour. However, the exact prosodic nature of the following material cannot be foretold. In (8) the story has been pragmatically introduced as an example for the rare case of a man being bitten by a hippo. As the climax of the story is obviously coming up (*just Opened its MOUTH and;*), it is not difficult for the incoming speaker to provide it. Syntactically, *and* projects either a main clause, a VP or an NP. The second option is what occurs here.

4.2.1.1 Summary

There are types of projection which lend themselves easily to a notion of describable formats, the most obvious one being syntax. Other levels of talk-in-interaction, such as the prosodic, do not allow for such a strict division into concrete formats. However, such a separation of linguistic levels is of analytical use only. For the actual participants of the conversation the levels of prosody, pragmatic content, interactional activities and syntax are of course constantly interwoven. It seems that in some collaboratives, the level on which participants orient in their projection is more strongly one or the other. In (3), "Renting," the projection is under a strong syntactic constraint created by the *if X then Y* format. The syntax hardly allows for a different way of continuation, whereas it is difficult to say in detail how the incoming speaker's prosody is going to continue. In (4), "Rubbish," we get a strong sense of prosodic orientation towards a certain prosodic contour, which projects a climax in the form of a steep fall. This projection is rather concrete and any other way of continuation would come as a surprise. Syntactically, however, the construction can continue in various ways and this is in fact what happens. The incoming speaker treats the preceding *A:RE* as a copula for a predicate nominative; the original speaker treats it as a one for a relative clause. In (8), "Hippo," the incoming speaker's orientation seems to be mainly one towards pragmatic content: what must follow is a story climax. Both prosodically and syntactically, however, no concrete form of projection seems to hold, although of course only certain kinds of continuations are prosodically and syntactically expectable.

Lerner's (1991, 1996) notion of possible formats is derived from the idea that in a collaborative production, first utterances project second utterances and that therefore constructions which are inherently two-fold are typically used for collaboratives. This is not exclusively the case. When speakers build an utterance together, they make use of many different ways in which that utterance can be divided up. The fact that two speakers work together in the production of an utterance automatically gives that collaborative production a two-fold structure. However, this does not imply that all collaboratives are inherently bi-partite on any linguistic level.

The categorization of collaborative productions according to their form of projection excludes a number of examples which do not fall into any format category but are still collaborative productions. I therefore wish to suggest a second formal categorization for them which will enable us to include other kinds of collaboratives.

4.2.2 Completions and extensions

Another formal distinction can be made from the incoming speaker's perspective, namely between collaborative incomings which *complete* the current speaker's part of the collaborative production or which *extend* it. Ferrara (1992) and Ono/Thompson (1995) both mention these two basic types of collaboratives with regard to the syntactic make-up of the utterances. The first type is a syntactic completion, in which the first speaker begins a construction and the second speaker finishes it. The second type is a syntactic extension, i.e. the second speaker adds material to a construction from the first speaker which is already potentially complete. Syntactic completion will be understood here in the sense of Auer (1996), who looks at different types of syntactic expansions in his discussion of turn-continuations in German data:

> A possible syntactic completion point has been reached when a structure has been produced which is syntactically independent from (i.e. does not project into) its following context. (Obviously, such syntactic independence is not to be equated with pragmatic or conversational independence.) (1996:60)

However, the distinction between completions and extensions in collaboratives does not apply to syntactic gestalts only, but also to prosodic contours. They, too, can be possibly complete or incomplete, and so either be completed or extended by an incoming speaker. There is one type of collaborative production in which the second speaker produces a completion of a global intonational contour which the first speaker has begun. A second type is again an addition of material after the first speaker has produced a final intonation contour. In this case, however, the second speaker's contribution will have to contain syntactically extending material in order for the phenomenon to still count as a collaborative production.

Intonational completeness and incompleteness have been described in 3.3 and 3.4 as pitch movements that either signal potential turn completion (final pitch movements) or project more talk from the same speaker (non-final pitch movements). Finality has been said to be realized via a low fall or a high rise, non-finality via a truncated fall, a slight rise or level intonation. All these pitch movements refer to the last accented syllable in the tone group. This is also the kind of prosodic finality that was mentioned in 4.2.1 above: does the end of an intonation contour signal a possibility for speaker change or does it project more talk from the current speaker? In other words, is it - together with other parameters such as semantics, syntax and gaze - part of a TRP-projection? In this understanding of projection, the question that arises concerning collaboratives is whether an incomplete turn constructional unit is being completed by the incoming speaker, or whether an already potentially complete TCU is being extended.

In the following, the different types of completing or extending collaborative incomings will be exemplified. The notions of completion and extension will be applied both to the syntactic and the intonational level.

4.2.2.1 Syntactic and prosodic completions

Collaborative productions that are completions with respect to both prosody and syntax are the most typical, making up 75% of the data. Consider for example:

(9) 12: Accurate

```
1     PE:    and he said the Only thing WORSE than sEcond hand SMUG;
2            <<laughing+p> GOD;>
3            sEcond hand SMOKE is; (-)
4            MOral SMUGness.
5     all laugh
6  -> PE:    which (.) which is (.) aGAIN REAlly; (1.0)
7  -> LI:    <<l> Accurate.>
8     PE:    yeah.
```

In this extract from a private conversation PE is apparently searching for the right expression and receives help from LI. Neither the prosody nor the syntax of the first speaker's material is complete and we find the second speaker completing it in both respects: *accurate* fits as predicate adjective and the low fall on it signals intonational finality.

The way in which LI prosodically designs her incoming is one of "prosodic integration." This term, which is used by both Selting (1996) and Auer (1996), refers to the prosodic continuation of the prior material:

> Syntactic expansions as well as any other continuations of the utterance can
> be packaged in different prototypical ways: 'Prosodic integration' refers to the
> co-occurrence of the verbal continuation with a simple continuation of the

> contour without a melodic or other break, 'prosodic independence' refers to the co-occurrence of the verbal continuation with a new prosodic unit with its own intonation contour which sets it apart from the prior contour and unit by constituting a prosodic break. (Selting 1996:371)

Local (1992) draws a similar distinction between prosodically "continuing" and "restarting" a turn after interruptions or insertions. Auer (1996) distinguishes different kinds of integration and exposure, namely by pitch, tempo, loudness, pausing and rhythm.

In the above example, *Accurate* is integrated on two of these levels. There is no intonational reset, but the incoming continues the ongoing declination line where the preceding contour left off, which is at a rather low pitch level. In Auer's (1996) terms, this is integration by pitch via addition of another accent unit. It is also integrated with respect to loudness, as it is kept rather quiet in accordance with the prior utterance, which constitutes a kind of increment to the preceding story climax (line 24).

Most prosodic completions are integrated into the prior contour in the sense demonstrated above, so, for example those in (1) "Wide Australian", (3) "Renting", (5) "France" and (8) "Hippo." Yet there are some that are prosodically prominent, i.e. the incoming begins at a higher pitch than that at which the preceding contour left off. However, this does not necessarily make them exposed in the sense of Auer (1996) or independent in the sense of Selting (1996). See for instance (4) "Rubbish," (6) "Very well" and (7) "Baking cookies." In these three examples, the prosodic exposure has been part of the projection from the previous intonation contour and can therefore still be considered an integration into that contour. In (4) "Rubbish" we saw how the prosodic and lexical climax *↑RUbbish.* has been made expectable by the preceding contour and lexical content. In (6) "Very well" the pitch prominence on *↑WELL* has been prepared for by a number of pitch jumps before and in (7) "Baking cookies" the *<<h+ff> i'm gonna CLEA::N ->* seems to have been projected by some conversational routine which these particular speakers share. So the prosodic designs of these three examples can be treated as continuations of first utterances which projected intonational prominence. Therefore the fact that they are prosodically prominent does not necessarily make them independent of what has gone before. They are still integrated into the preceding contour.

Syntactic completion is realized in many different ways in the data. A current speaker may interrupt the progression of his/her incomplete syntactic gestalt at various points. The second speaker has two options for continuation. One is to pick up the syntactic gestalt where the first speaker has left off (see examples (1) – (9)). Another is to repeat some of the first speaker's verbal material and then continue the construction. This distinction has possible implications for the notion of syntactic boundaries.

Fox/Jasperson (1995) have investigated the syntactic implications of self-repair. They claim that "in turn beginnings, if repair is initiated after an auxiliary or main verb, the verb and its subject are always recycled together; the verb is never recycled by itself." (1995:110) Thus they seem to suggest that the syntactic boundary between NP and VP is possibly not a major one, as speakers are reluctant to recycle the VP alone without its subject NP. From the data for the present paper this particular claim cannot be supported. However, other syntactic boundaries can be investigated, such as the boundary between P and NP in a PP. See for example:

(10) 43: Bread

```
1      CE:    I think they have better EAting habits in FRANCE; (.)
2             but but to hear YOU talk uh;
3      TI:    [well my FRENCH -
4  -> CE:     [you know they eat they eat a treMENdous amount of of of -

5  -> SI:     [of BREAD.
6      CE:    [of bUtter uh produc-
7             MILK products.
```

In his incoming in line 5, SI repeats the preposition *of* from CE's utterance instead of latching an NP directly onto it. It seems as if the speaker considered a repetition necessary in order to signal that what he is doing is a continuation of the PP begun in line 4 rather than a free-standing NP. He treats the boundary between P and NP as not strong enough to hold across two speakers' utterances and therefore in need of being reinforced by a repetition of the preposition *of*.

Another example demonstrates repetition of first speaker's material at a different syntactic boundary:

(11) 1:Bills

```
1      HE:    we ↑jUst HEARD the other day;=
2             about ↑WELLstone by the way bArbra,
3             <<all> hE never mentioned this to YOU;=
4             but i don't s'pose he WOULD;> .hh
5             that hE is one of the ↑THREE ↑LARgest;
6             uhm uh (.) intro↑DUcer of ↑BILLS;
7  ->         uh that uh that um
8  -> BE:     [<<f> that SPEND MOney.>
9      HE:    [well Anyway.
10            MOney spending    [bills.
11     BE:                      [<<l> Okay;>
```

HE begins a relative clause in line 7 but stops after the relative pronoun *that* due to a word search. BE comes in by repeating the relative pronoun and then completing the relative clause instead of continuing immediately with a relative clause without COMP. Here again, the incoming speaker does not seem to consider the boundary between the relative pronoun

and the relative clause strong enough to allow for an interpretation of her material as a continuation of the previous utterance.

There seems to exist a preference for conversationalists to begin an incoming at certain boundaries rather than at others. For example, second speakers seem to have no problem coming in with a predicate after a copula ((1), "Wide Australian", (4) "Rubbish" and (9), "Accurate"), with a *then*-clause after an *if*-clause ((3), "Renting") or with an AdvP after a complete syntactic gestalt ((6) "Very well"). In all these instances, incoming speakers do not repeat any of the previous verbal material but pick up the construction precisely where the first speaker left off. This is strong empirical evidence for major boundaries holding between the above constituents.

Participants do seem to mind, however, coming in with an NP after a preposition ((10) "Bread") and with a relative clause after a relative pronoun ((11) "Bills"). In these cases, they repeat the preposition and the relative pronoun, respectively. Such empirical evidence points in the direction of weaker syntactic boundaries that do not seem to hold across speaker change. In order to signal that their material is a continuation of what has gone before, participants repeat some of it before they continue.

In addition to Fox/Jasperson's (1995) work on repair, a thorough investigation of the way syntax is handled by incoming speakers in collaborative productions would certainly offer another source of evidence for the interactional relevance of syntactic constituents.

4.2.2.2 Prosodic completions and syntactic extensions

The problem that arises with the distinction between completions and extensions is that the prosodic and the syntactic aspects of completion do not always coincide, i.e. something that is an extension on the syntactic plane can be a completion with respect to prosody. See for example:

(12) 3: Decided to live

```
1      BE:    so is THAT lIngering or is THAT lIving.
2             i mean ↑SOME people would sAY,
3             THAT is a living ↑DEATH. .h
4             what STEven is going thrOUgh,
5             is the ↑W::ORST thing .h that could hAppen. .h
6             Other people say <<all+p> look at his MI:ND;>
7             ↑LOOK <<p> what he's accOmplished.>
8      CA:    yeah but well: it's prObably a little bit of BOTH;=
9             [but he just -
10     BE:    [mhm,
11  -> CA:    i mean <<rall> he: still: took the bull:: by his ´`HO::RNS, (.)
12  -> BE:    <<all> and decIded to LIVE.>
13     CA:    a:nd -
14            YEAH.
15            there's a lot of people who: LAY down and give ´UP;
```

In (12), taken from a radio program, the host BE asks CA for his opinion on the difficult question whether the physician Steven Hawking's life is 'lingering or living'. We find CA answering rather hesitantly *well: it's prObably a little bit of BOTH;*. His hesitation reveals itself also in his prosody in the tone-group in line 10. He slows down considerably, he lengthens four syllables to an extreme (*he:, still:, bull::, HO::RNS*) and he speaks on a completely level pitch until the last syllable, *horns*, on which he produces non-final intonation in the form of a truncated fall, so that on the prosodic level we as listeners expect a continuation of his turn. Syntactically, however, the construction is potentially complete. That CA is not finished, even though he pauses after his first intonation unit, can be seen not only from his non-final rise on the last syllable but is also evident in that he continues with *a:nd-* after BE has come in.

CA's prosodically realized hesitation seems to signal to BE a possibility to come in with a prosodic completion. She does so with a syntactically elliptical utterance, a subclause without a subject noun phrase, and with continuing intonation.[15] She begins her intonation unit without a reset and comes down to a final fall on the last syllable, *LIVE.*, which is a prosodic completion of CA's turn. However, although the intonation of BE's incoming suggests prosodic integration into CA's turn – it begins at an even lower level than that at which CA left off – one cannot speak of full integration when one takes tempo and speech rate into consideration.

BE's incoming is produced faster than CA's previous turn beginning. He has lengthened all his syllables and spoken rather slowly. BE's syllables are produced without any lengthening and the tempo at which they occur is noticeably faster than that of CA's tone group. The impression we as listeners get from this example is that BE is signaling on the one hand non-competitiveness by integrating her intonation into CA's material, but that - because she brings the turn to completion at a different tempo from his – she is reshaping the pace of talk.

---

[15] By continuing intonation I mean the intonation of the incoming which continues the preceding

The analysis of the above example has demonstrated that when it comes to prosodic completions of prior turns it is necessary to distinguish between prosodic integration and exposure in the different prosodic dimensions. It is possible to find an incoming intonationally integrated into the first speaker's turn, but exposed in other prosodic dimensions, such as tempo and speech rate, as in (12), "Decided to live". It seems as if this possibility enables speakers to follow different strategies at the same time. Intonational integration is the prosodic design that characterizes a completion as part of the ongoing turn and not as an individual utterance. It can therefore signal that an incoming speaker does not intend to take over the floor with his/her completion. Simultaneous non-integration of speech rate and tempo signal a disjunction on these levels of production and therefore enable the incoming speaker to shape the current turn production without having to illegitimately interrupt.

4.2.2.3 Syntactic and prosodic extensions

Extensions in both a prosodic and a syntactic sense, i.e. cases in which the first speaker's material is potentially complete in both respects, are rare, which perhaps points towards the strong indication of finality that springs from the combination of syntactic and prosodic termination. Still, collaboratives of this kind do occur. One can again distinguish integrated and exposed incomings, but we will see that an exposed incoming that is an extension of both a complete syntactic gestalt and a final intonational contour can only be considered to be a marginal case of a collaborative production.

The following example is taken from a private conversation among two friends:

(13) 38: Bending over backwards
```
12    CO:    and people ALso;
13           who've never been CLOSE friends of hers;
14           but who'd BEND over BACKwards; (.)
15 ->        <<l+p> for this WOman.> (.)
16 -> AL:    but are TIRED of bEnding over bAckwards.
17    CO:    but they stIll ↑DO.
18           we ↑A:LL still do.
```

In line 4 CO has pragmatically, syntactically and prosodically completed a potential turn. She has made her point, she has produced a complete syntactic gestalt and she has signaled prosodic completion via a final fall and a following pause. AL's extension is one that is syntactically elliptical, it lacks a subject noun phrase. It is also prosodically integrated, which is possible although the preceding contour has already come to a potential completion. According to Auer (1996:70), "any material may be included into a potentially closed intonational contour as a prosodic continuation." Although AL does not continue the pitch

---

contour, in the sense of Local's (1992) distinction beteen continuing and restarting.

level of the immediately preceding intonation unit, which is particularly low and quiet, as it is an increment, she does return to the intonational level of the previous turn in lines 1-3. By coming in without an intonational reset AL signals that her utterance is continuing the prior turn rather than starting a new one. One therefore still hears the incoming as integrated into the prior turn. However, on the content level, AL's extension turns out to be an unacceptable continuation from CO's perspective. CO does not want to make the point that people *are tired of bending over backwards*, but quite the opposite, that *they still do*. It seems that retrospectively, AL's incoming is treated by CO as an independent rather than as an integrated turn. Again, we have to take the different linguistic levels of an utterance into consideration. Prosodically, the incoming is integrated into the preceding turn by its producer. On the level of content, it is treated by its recipient, however, as an individual turn which is contradicting the very utterance it was designed to continue. Note that on the lexio-semantic level, too, the diverging opinions become apparent. Whereas the *but* at the beginning of the incoming seems to be doing continuation, the *but* at the beginning of the next turn seems to signal disagreement.

The following example is an excerpt from a family dinner conversation:

(14) 29: River

```
8      PA:    we ↑pOInted out this pub at mawnan smith when we passed THROUGH
9             there.
10            but we wAnted to get ↑rAther NEARer to the, (.)
11     RO:    THAT'S RIGHT,
12  -> PA:    RIver.
13  -> RO:    and we THOUGHT     [there must be something in MALpas.
14     PA:                       [(      )
15            yeah.
16     RO:    and there WASn't.
17     PA:    m.
18     RO:    yeah,
19  -> PA:    and we deCIded to go through that ROAD,
20            from which there were lOvely VIEWS,
```

In this example, the second speaker's incoming is neither prosodically nor syntactically designed as an integration into what has gone before. PA clearly produces a final intonation contour on *RIver.* in line 5. In line 6 RO comes in with an onset on *THOUGHT.* which hits approximately the same pitch height as the previous nucleus *RIver* and which seems to signal the beginning of a new turn. Both the first and the second speakers' utterances are syntactically complete. A case such as this one is a marginal instance of a collaborative, as the only element which turns the sequence into a syntactically holistic unit is RO's *and* in line 6.

That the incoming can still be perceived as a continuation of what went before can be accounted for on a more global level. Rather than a single turn, the speakers are producing a narrative together, and on the content level the incoming is integrated into the whole

collaborative story-telling. The incomings prefaced by *and* (see also line 12) are therefore components of a larger collaborative sequence.[16]

4.2.2.4 Summary

In the above discussion of completions and extensions on the syntactic and the prosodic level we have examined three possible combinations: completions of both syntax and prosody, extensions of both syntax and prosody and prosodic completions which are syntactic extensions. Theoretically, there is one more combinatory possibility: syntactic completions which are prosodic extensions. This variant, however, is not found in the data at all. This means that collaborative continuations from second speakers do not follow utterances which are syntactically incomplete but prosodically complete. Indeed, it seems that such utterances are indeed rare.[17]

The question why speakers do not signal completion on the prosodic level when the syntax is still incomplete may be accounted for in two ways, with regard to syntax and to prosody. One explanation might involve the "priority of syntax" attested by Auer:

> If, then, the independence of prosody from syntax is considerable, the priority of syntax nonetheless cannot be denied either. The discussion (...) suggests a model in which syntax and prosody cooperate in very delicate ways, each of them on the basis of its particular semiotic possibilities. Into this model of a division of labour, syntax brings its capacity to build relatively far-reaching gestalts, the completion of which becomes more and more projectable in time; prosody, particularly intonation, brings in its local flexibility to revise and adjust these gestalts while they are 'put into speech'. Thus, syntax retains its priority, but prosody/intonation is nevertheless independent from it. (Auer 1996:75)

The "priority of syntax" and the flexibility of prosody are characteristics from the perspective of predictability. A syntactic construction projects much more concretely into the future than does a prosodic contour. With respect to collaborative productions this could mean that if a syntactic gestalt is incomplete, the constraint to complete it is far too strong to allow for prosodic contextualization of turn-finality at this point, even though prosody would be flexible enough to be so used. In this interpretation, syntactic incompletion does not co-occur with prosodic finality - which has been analyzed as contextualizing turn-finality - because a turn that is syntactically incomplete would not be considered complete. In other words, an unfinished syntactic gestalt is rarely the end of a turn[18]. Prosodic finality, however, does

---

[16] For collaborative story telling see Falk (1980) and Lerner (1992).

[17] If they did occur, it would be difficult to explain their absence from collaborative productions. One would have to assume, for example, a conversational constraint which keeps speakers from completing syntactically incomplete constructions when the prosody contextualizes finality.

[18] If it is, it co-occurs with an unfinished prosodic contour and its elliptical format implies that there is something missing, as in the case of a "trail-off."

contextualize potential turn-ending. This might explain the fact that syntactic incompletion seldom occurs with prosodic completion.

A second way of accounting for the non-occurrence of the phenomenon is via prosody. Unlike prosodic finality, a syntactically complete construction does not signal potential turn-completion. It only does so with accompanying turn-final prosody:

> Intonational and pragmatic completions are nearly always syntactic completions as well. But the reverse (is) not the case. Syntactic completion points in English (...) are *not* nearly always intonational and pragmatic completion points; there are in fact many more syntactic completion points than any other kind. In other words, the data show that intonation and pragmatic completion points select from among the syntactic completion points to form (...) 'Complex Transition Relevance Places' (CTRPs). (Ford/Thompson 1996:154, emphasis in the original)

Non-final prosody in combination with complete syntax overrides the syntactic completion signal with respect to turn-ending. The reason why a syntactically incomplete construction does not receive turn-final prosody is perhaps because the contextualization cue for turn-ending from prosody would be too strong. The fact that it takes prosody to signal turn-finality shows how prosody has priority over syntax in the signaling of turn completion.

5 Collaborative productions as non-competitive early incomings

A large number of collaborative productions are early incomings into the turn space of another speaker, that is they are produced before the first speaker has reached a possible prosodic or syntactic completion point. In fact, collaborative incomings which follow a TRP are considered a marginal group here. In the following the question whether a collaborative production is an illegitimate incoming will be briefly considered.

Although natural conversation seems to be strongly constrained by the fact that "overwhelmingly, one party talks at a time" (Sacks/Schegloff/Jefferson (1974:700)), several kinds of conversational settings can be distinguished in which next speakers come in at other than possible completion points and thereby sometimes create overlap.[19] However, those instances are usually of relatively short duration, which in itself suggests a strong tendency for interlocutors to abide by the one-speaker-at-a-time constraint.
French/Local (1986) in their work on "Prosodic Features and the Management of Interruptions" have divided early incomings by next speakers into "turn-competitive" and "non-competitive" interruptions. Their article is based on the finding that

---

[19] cf. Tannen (1984).

> the positioning of interrupter's speech at a non-completion point in current turn
> does not alone make for a hearing of that speech as directly competitive for
> the turn. (1986:162)

According to French/Local (1986), the distinction between competitive and non-competitive incomings cannot be made on syntactic or lexical grounds. The only way for a current speaker to classify an early incoming as one or the other is by orientation to the incoming speaker's prosody.

Turn-competitive incomings are those in which the incomer takes the floor from the current turn-holder at a non-completion point. For the interactants, certain prosodic cues seem to signal such an intention already in the course of the early incoming itself. French/Local (1986) find that the prosodic characteristics of these interruptions are a combination of *forte* and high pitch, both seen in relation to that speaker's ordinary speech volume and pitch height. The authors present four empirical observations which serve to prove speakers' orientation to those features.

Firstly, if an interrupter manages to take possession of the floor, s/he returns to his/her normal volume and pitch height as soon as the first speaker has stopped talking.

Secondly, from the point of view of the current speaker, s/he either takes up the competition and speaks with raised volume and slower tempo for the whole duration of the overlap, or s/he yields the floor and lets his/her turn 'fade out.'

Thirdly, non-competitive incomings are usually very short utterances with which speakers do not attempt to take the floor, but on the contrary wish to support the current speaker in his/her momentary right to speak. Typical cases of this would be backchannelling, interjections or asides. French/Local (1986) ascribe to them the prosodic feature of *piano* and to demonstrate their non-competitive nature give empirical evidence that often current speakers even stop talking and give their interrupters time to finish their non-competitive utterances before they resume their own turn.

The fourth and last piece of evidence is current speakers' prosodic behavior in case of persistence. The very fact that they raise their volume only and not their pitch seems to signal that they do not wish to be understood as claiming the floor illegitimately, which would require a combination of both, but that they consider themselves to have the right to the floor at that particular moment.

Selting (1995) takes up French/Local's distinction between turn-competitive and non-competitive interruptions but introduces another category of incomings: "legitimate" claims to the floor. These are not only pursued by those speakers whose turn is being intruded on but also by those who believe themselves to have a right to speak even though somebody else's turn is currently in progress. Typical examples are interposed questions, immediate replies to

questions and certain kinds of repair. These legitimate incomings are also produced with <*f*>, and not <*f* + *h*>, which would imply an illegitimate incoming.

If we look at the prosody of the collaborative incomings in the examples analyzed above, we find that only one out of 14 instances of collaborative productions is produced *forte*. (7) "Baking cookies" is an exceptional example in the sense that both speakers raise their voice at the same time and the loudness seems to belong to the climax-like role of that last intonation contour of the turn. This kind of *forte* can therefore be suspected not to belong in the same category as illegitimate incomings, where *forte* means a higher volume in comparison to that of the current speaker.

There are two examples in the data corpus for this investigation where a second speaker comes in at *forte*. One is (11) "Bills", in which a lengthy word search is completed by the incoming speaker. The other comes from a private conversation in which the couple KE (male) and JO (female) are telling a friend about a doctor's diagnosis of a disease which KE has suffered from:

(15) 101: Drink

```
1      KE:    he just di- did a BLOOD TEST.=
2             =and said yEAh well your b- your blOOd's all SHOT,=
3             =and you have the lIver of a NINEty year old, .hh
4             uhm -
5             [and i w- <<f> and i and i THINK->
6  -> JO:     [<<f> dO you DRINK?>
7  ->         and he DOESn't    [drInk.
8      KE:                      [<<f> and i think ->
9             and i think uh:: -
10            you you picked up some uhm    [ (.)
11 -> JO:                                   [<<pp> VIrus.>
12 -> KE:     VIrus;
```

In line 6 JO comes in at a higher volume than KE, the original speaker. He reacts to her loudness by also speaking up, as we can observe in lines 5 and 8. After she has stopped talking he returns to his ordinary volume (line 9). This is the only instance in this data collection in which a collaborative incoming could be understood to be an interruption, at least from the perspective of the current speaker. However, it does not have all the prosodic characteristics that have been ascribed to interruptions: JO's incoming is produced at *forte* but not at a higher pitch than KE's. Still, one can interpret his reaction to her incoming as a reaction to an illegitimate incoming. However, JO's production at *forte* could be interpreted with Selting (1995) as considered legitimate by JO herself. The fact that she is KE's girlfriend could imply that she believes herself to have an equal right to quote KE's doctor and to collaborate in the telling of his diagnosing practices. KE possibly believes the conversational topic of his illness to be his own property only and therefore sanctions JO's incoming.

There are no examples in the collection in which the second speaker comes in at both higher volume and pitch. The typical prosodic make-up of the collaborative incomings is the same volume as the previous speaker (cf. (3) "Renting", (4) "Rubbish", (5) "France", (6) "Very well", (8) "Hippo", (9) "Accurate", (10) "Bread", (12) "Decided to live", (13) "Bending over backwards" and (14) "River"). There are also several cases of an incoming that is produced at a lower volume, as for example (15) "Drink," the second collaborative production *VIrus.* in line 11.

All this is strong evidence from prosodic analysis in favor of categorizing collaborative productions as non-competitive incomings. In addition to prosody, there is a more structural factor which supports the non-competitive character of collaboratives. The way incoming speakers manage floor-allocation also shows that they are not interrupting but supporting the current turn-holder. In 12 out of 15 instances examined above, the floor goes back to the person who started the collaborative production immediately after the second speaker's incoming. This relation is indeed roughly representative for the whole data corpus, which means that in most cases the incoming person only takes over for the brief completion or extension of another's turn. There seems to be a tacit understanding that the original speaker is the main speaker who is in possession of the floor. The collaborative incomings seem to support the first speaker in his/her right to speak. This, too, points towards the non-competitive character of collaboratives.

Another factor that allows for a characterization of collaborative productions as non-competitive is first speakers' reactions in third position, after the collaborative incoming has occurred. Not only does their prosodic reaction suggest that they are treating the incoming as non-competitive (there is no return of competition with <ff>), but also their verbal behavior can be so interpreted. In 7 out of the above 15 cases the original speaker agrees with or repeats the incoming material before continuing their own turn. (cf. (5) "France", (8) "Hippo", (9),"Accurate", (11) "Bills", (12) "Decided to live", (14) "River", (15) "Drink", lines 11-12). This, too, is evidence that the original speaker is supporting rather than sanctioning the incoming collaborator.

6 Conclusion

The investigation has shown how speakers who jointly create an utterance can share a turn. They do not treat each other as interrupters into one another's turn space but as collaborators in the production of an interactional unit. This occurs on various levels of conversation; those of syntax and prosody have been examined here. The content level has mostly been left unmentioned although of course it can never be ignored. The many aspects of non-verbal communication, such as gaze, gesture and body posture have also been left out of the analysis. Of course, an investigation of collaborative productions within a larger semiotic framework would profit immensely from an inclusion of these interactional dimensions into the analysis.

Continuing the present investigation, one can now examine what exactly speakers achieve in interaction when they produce utterances together. Such a functional analysis will be the next step in my investigation of collaborative productions.

Appendix

GAT-Transcription Conventions

Basic Transcription Conventions

Sequential structure

[ ]	overlap
[ ]	
-	quick, immediate connection of new turns or single units

Pauses

(.)	micro-pause
(-), (--), (---)	short, middle or long pauses of cat 0.25 - 0.75 seconds, up to ca. 1 second
(2.0)	estimated pause of more than cat 1 second
(2.85)	measured pause (measured to hundredths of a second)

Other segmental conventions

and=uh	slurring within units
:,: :,:::	lengthening, according to its duration
uh,ah, etc.	hesitation signals, so-called "filled pauses"
'	glottal stop

Laughter

so(h)o	laughing particles during speech
haha hehe hihi	syllabic laughing
((laughing))	description of laughter

Reception signals

hm, yes, yeah, no	one syllable signals
hm=hm, yea=ah, no=o	two syllable signals
'hm'hm	two syllable signal with a glottal stop, usually signals negation

Accents

ACcent	primary, or main accent
!AC!cent	extra strong accent

Final pitch movements

?	high rise
,	mid-rise
-	level pitch
;	mid-fall
.	low fall

Other conventions

((cough))	paralinguistic and non-linguistic actions and events
<<coughing> >	accompanying paralinguistic and non-linguistic actions over a stretch of speech
<<surprised> >	interpretive comments over a stretch of speech
( )	unintelligible passage, according to its duration
(such)	presumed wording
al(s)o	presumed sound or syllable
(such/which)	possible alternatives

| ((   )) | ommission of text |
| -> | specific line in the transcript which is referred to in the text |

Detailed Transcription Conventions

Accents

ACcent	primary or main accent
Accent	secondary accent
!AC!cent	extra strong accent

Pitch step-up/step down

| ↑ | pitch step down |
| ↓ | pitch step up |

Change of pitch register

| <<l> > | low pitch register |
| <<h> > | high pitch register |

Change of key

| <<narrow key>> | use of small segment of speaker's voice range |
| <<wide key>> | use of large segment of speaker's voice range |

Intra-linear notation of pitch movement within an accent

'SO	fall
'SO	rise
SO	level
^SO	rise-fall
"SO	fall-rise
↑ˋ	small pitch step up to the peak of the accented syllable
↓´	small pitch step down to the bottom of the accented syllable
↑ˋSO or ↓´SO	conspicuously high or low pitch step up or down to the peak or the bottom of the accented syllable
↑ˋSO or ↓ˍSO	pitch jumps to conspicuously higher or lower accent

Volume and tempo changes

<<f> >	forte, loud
<<ff> >	fortissimo, very loud
<<p> >	piano, soft
<<pp> >	pianissimo, very soft
<<all> >	allegro,fast
<<ten> >	lento, slow
<<cresc> >	crescendo, becoming louder
<<dim> >	diminuendo, becoming softer
<<acc> >	accelerando, becoming faster
<<rall> >	rallentando, becoming slower

Breathing in and out

| .h, .hh, .hhh | breathing in, according to its duration |
| h, hh, hhh | breathing out, according to its duration |

References

Auer, Peter (1996): "On the Prosody and Syntax of Turn-Continuations" in: Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Margret Selting (Eds): *Prosody in Conversation*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Bublitz, Wolfram (1988): *Supportive Fellow-Speakers and Cooperative Conversations. Discourse Topics and Topical Actions, Participant Roles and 'Recipient Action' in a Particular Type of Everyday Conversation*. John Benjamins Publishing Compnay. Amsterdam.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth (1986): *An Introduction to English Prosody*. Max Niemeyer Verlag. Tübingen.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth (1999) "Prosodic Stylization". Paper presented at the Seminar on Prosody, Grammar and Interaction in Helsinki, October 1999.

Cruttenden, Alan (1986): *Intonation*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Crystal, David (1969): *Prosodic Systems and Intonation in English.* Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Díaz, Felix, Antaki, Charles and Collins, Alan F. (1996): "Using Completion to Formulate a Statement Collectively" *Journal of Pragmatics* 26. 525-542.

Du Bois, John W., Stephan Schuetze-Coburn, Susanna Cumming and Danae Paolino (1993): „Outline of Discourse Transcription," in: Jane A. Edwards and Martin D. Lampert (Eds): *Talking Data. Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers. Hillsdale, New Jersey.

Falk, Jane (1979): *The Duet as a Conversational Process.* University Microfilms International. Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Ferrara, Kathleen (1992): "The Interactive Achievement of a Sentence: Joint Productions in Therapeutic Discourse" *Discourse Processes* 15. 207-228.

Ford, Cecilia E. and Thompson, Sandra, A. (1996): "Interactional Units in Conversation: Syntactic, Intonational, and Pragmatic Resources for the Management of Turns." in: Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff and Sandra A. Thompson (Eds): *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Fox, Barbara A. and Jasperson, Robert (1995): "A Syntactic Exploration of Repair in English Conversation" in: Philip W. Davis (Ed): *Alternative Linguistics. Descriptive and Theoretical Modes.* John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam.

French, Peter and John Local (1986): "Prosodic Features and the Management of Interruptions" in: Catherine Johns-Lewis (Ed): *Intonation in Discourse*. Croom Helm. London.

Glindemann, Ralf (1987): *Zusammensprechen im Gespräch. Aspekte einer konsonanztheorethischen Pragmatik*. Max Niemeyer Verlag. Tübingen.

Hartung, Martin (1998): *Ironie in der Alltagssprache: Eine gesprächsanalytische Untersuchung*. Westdeutscher Verlag. Opladen.

Ladd, D. Robert (1978): "Stylized Intonation" *Language* 54. 517-540.

Lerner, Gene H. (1991): "On the Syntax of Sentences in Progress" *Language in Society* 20. 441-458.

Lerner, Gene H. (1992): "Assisted Story Telling: Deploying Shared Knowledge as a Practical Matter" *Qualitative Sociology* 15 No3: 247-271.

Lerner, Gene H. (1994): "Responsive List Construction" in: *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 13/1, 20-33.

Lerner, Gene H. (1996): "On the 'Semi-Permeable' Character of Grammatical Units in Conversation: Conditional Entry Into the Turn Space of Another Speaker" in: Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff and Sandra A. Thompson (Eds): *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Local, John (1992): "Continuing and Restarting" in: Peter Auer and Aldo di Luzio (Eds): *The Contextualization of Language*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam.

Ono, Tsuyoshi and Sandra A. Thompson (1995): "What Can Conversation Tell Us About Syntax?" in: Philip W. Davies (Ed): *Descriptive and Theoretical Modes in the Alternative Linguistics*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam.

Sacks, Harvey (1995): *Lectures on Conversation*. Ed. by Gail Jefferson. Blackwell. Oxford.

Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff and Gail Jefferson (1974): "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation" *Language* 50: 696-735.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1984): "On Some Questions and Ambiguities in Conversation" in: J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage (Eds.): *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1996): „Turn Organization: One Intersection of Grammar and Interaction", in: Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff and Sandra A. Thompson (Eds): *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1997): „Practices and Actions: Boundary Cases of Other-Initiated Repair." *Discourse Processes* 23. 499-547.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., Gail Jefferson and Harvey Sacks (1977): „The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation" *Language* 53. 361-382.

Schwitalla, Johannes (1992): "Über einige Weisen des gemeinsamen Sprechens" *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 11. 68-98.

Selting, Margret (1995*): Prosodie im Gespräch. Aspekte einer interaktionalen Phonologie der Konversation*. Max Niemeyer Verlag. Tübingen.

Selting, Margret (1996): "On the Interplay of Syntax and Prosody in the Constitution of Turn-Constructional Units and Turns in Conversation" *Pragmatics* 6,3. 357-388.

Tannen, Deborah (1984): *Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk Among Friends*. Ablex Publishing Corporation. Norwood, New Jersey.

Tannen, Deborah (1989): *Talking Voices*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Previously published in this series: