InLiSt No. 4
Interaction and Linguistic Structures

TCUs and TRPs: The Construction of Units in Conversational Talk[*]

Margret Selting

Potsdam
June 1998

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.

_____

_____

Prof. Dr. Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen
Dr. Susanne Günthner
Universität Konstanz
FG Sprachwissenschaft
PB D 180
D-78457 Konstanz

Prof. Dr. Margret Selting
Universität Potsdam
Institut für Germanistik
Postfach 60 15 53
D-14415 Potsdam

Prof. Dr. Peter Auer
Albert-Ludwig-Universität Freiburg
Deutsches Seminar I
Werthmannplatz
D-79085 Freiburg i. Br.

_____

_____

1.   Introduction

The basic unit of talk as suggested by conversation analysis, the so-called 'turn-constructional unit', has been the focus of much research interest. Although the notion of the 'turn-constructional unit' as introduced by Sacks/Schegloff/Jefferson (1974) is now widely accepted, it has become apparent that the details involved in the interpretation of this unit are far from clear. As it seems, 'turn-constructional unit' (TCU) is still very much an intuitive and holistic notion which awaits deconstruction (or decomposition) and reconstruction of the possible constructional components and the constitutive practices or signalling resources that participants deploy in order to make 'TCUs' interpretable.

Recently, uncertainty has arisen as to what precisely a TCU is and how it can be recognized in transcripts of conversational talk.

-       Some researchers showed some hesitation when talking about 'units' in talk: what units are there on what levels?
-       In discussing and devising the transcription system GAT (Selting et al. 1998), our research group found it necessary to introduce the notion of 'phrasing unit' to capture production units as transcribed from conversational talk.
-       Some of the footnotes in Schegloff (1996) suggest that Schegloff and Goodwin do not (always) agree on the criteria and the segmentation of talk into TCUs; they seem to have different notions of what a TCU is.
-       In their recent work, Thompson and her research group suggest departing from the segmentation of talk into TCUs towards the analysis of the practices which are used in order to form and make turns interpretable (Ford/Fox/Thompson 1996).

All this is evidence that the notion of the TCU needs to be clarified and related to other units in talk.

In this paper, I want to first show in detail that the notion of the TCU needs clarification, and why, and then suggest some solutions. In my view, we need to separate TCUs and TRPs more clearly, i.e. distinguish between TCUs that do not and that do end in TRPs. As a consequence, we need to clarify the relation between different kinds of units: under what conditions are what kinds of units TCUs and under what conditions do TCUs end or not end in TRPs?

2. 'Units' in CA and CA-related research

Let me briefly remind you of the most important characteristics of the Sacks/Schegloff/Jefferson (1974) model. In their seminal paper, Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson posed as one of the most fundamental problems for conversationalists to handle and for conversation analysts to explain, the problem of how smooth turn taking without too much overlap and without too much gap can be achieved. Their solution is the proposal of "a simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation". They propose a mechanism for the organization of turn taking which relies on two components:

(1)   a turn-constructional component which deals with the construction of units, turn-constructional units (TCUs), and

(2)   a turn-allocation component which deals with the regulation and negotiation of turn allocation at the end of each TCU for the next such unit.

The turn-constructional component thus describes the units at the ends of which turn allocation and transition becomes relevant. This basic unit of talk is called the turn-constructional unit. How is this unit defined in detail?

2.1   TCU and TRPs

TCUs end with points of possible completion of unit-types, so-called 'transition relevance places' (TRPs) which make turn transition relevant but not necessary. This means, as Schegloff (1996: 55) insists, that TCUs are potentially complete turns: "By 'turn-constructional unit,' it may be recalled, 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 TCU is thus a 'unit' in conversation that is defined with respect to turn-taking: a potentially complete turn. The TCU is not defined as a linguistic unit.

In their further discussion of TCUs, Sacks/Schegloff/Jefferson (1974) mostly used examples of one- or multi-unit turns, in which indeed the 'units' were TCUs in this sense, suggesting a systematic relation between TCUs and grammatical units: "There are various unit-types with which a speaker may set out to construct a turn", they say.

> "Unit-types for English include sentential, clausal, phrasal, and lexical constructions (...). Instances of the unit-types so usable allow a projection of the unit-type under way, and what, roughly, it will take for an instance of that unit-type to be completed" (Sacks/Schegloff/Jefferson 1974: 702).

Linguistic units, and in particular syntactic constructions such as sentences, clauses, phrases and lexical constructions allow the projection of possible completion or TRPs of TCUs. With respect to sentences, Sacks/Schegloff/Jefferson (1974: 709) say:

> "sentential constructions are the most interesting of the unit-types, because of the internally generated expansions of length they allow - and, in particular, allow BEFORE first possible completion places (...) Sentential constructions are capable of being analysed in the course of their production by a party/hearer able to use such analyses to project their possible direction and completion loci. In the course of its construction, any sentential unit will rapidly (in conversation) reveal projectable directions and conclusions, which its further course can modify, but will further define."

But other construction types can be projected, too. Sacks/Schegloff/ Jefferson give the following characterization:

> "Various 'turn-constructional units' are employed; e.g. turns can be projectedly 'one word long', or they can be sentential in length" (1974: 701).

Sacks et al. take the fact that next speakers start immediately and without gap after single-word units such as *What?* or single-phrase turns such as *Met whom?* etc., without waiting for possible sentence completion, as evidence for the projection of such single-unit turns (cf. 1974: 702).

Later on in their paper, Sacks/Schegloff/Jefferson continue to point out the relevance of their model as follows:

> "We have proposed that the allocation of turn-space is organized around the construction of talk IN the turn. That organization appears to key on one main feature of the construction of the talk in a turn - namely, that whatever the units employed for the construction, and whatever the theoretical language employed to describe them, they still have points of possible unit completion, points which are projectable before their occurrence" (1974: 720).

What matters for turn-taking, is, thus, projected TRPs, i.e. 'possible completion points' of constructions: "These turn out to be 'possible completion points' of sentences, clauses, phrases, and one-word constructions, (...) and multiples thereof" (1974: 721).

Yet, Sacks et al. pointed out that the details of projection in their model still needed research:

> "How projection of unit-types is accomplished, so as to allow such 'no gap' starts by next speakers, is an important question on which linguists can make major contributions" (1974: 703)

For linguists, it perhaps needs to be pointed out here that the unit Sacks et al. have in mind is fundamentally different from those units that other researchers, among them linguists, have mostly been looking for, namely units displaying "self-determined, independent, recognizable completeness. This" - Sacks et al. hold - "appears to contrast with the main turn-organizational character of conversation, which is the interactional shaping of turns" (1974: 727).

Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, when commenting on the structure and recognizability of units, mostly mention and elaborate on their syntactic structure. At the same time, however, while not dealing with it in detail, they were well aware of the importance of prosody and intonation to the formation and recognition of units and, possibly, unit types. In their 1974 paper, they comment on the role of intonation as follows:

> "Clearly, in some understanding of 'sound production' (i.e. phonology, intonation etc.), it is also very important to turn-taking organization. For example, discriminations between *what* as a one-word question and as the start of a sentential (or clausal or phrasal) construction are made not syntactically, but intonationally. When it is further realized that any word can be made into a 'one-word' unit-type, (...) via intonation, then we can appreciate the partial character of the unit-tyes' description in syntactic terms" (1974: 721f.).[1]

As the turn-constructional unit is defined with reference to linguistic structures, it is naturally of interest to students of spoken language and interactionally oriented linguists who feel that ethnomethodology's and CA's conception of social interaction is a useful and inspiring model of the 'social interaction' that language use is normally embedded in.

Yet, it has to be kept in mind that, as Schegloff insists (see above), the unit of TCU is defined with respect to the organisation of turn-taking: a TCU is a potentially complete turn. The TCU is not per definition a linguistic unit. It is an interactionally relevant unit that ends in a TRP. How does it then relate to linguistic units?

So far, as we have seen, the definition of TCUs largely relies on two kinds of criteria:
(1)   syntactic structure, or better: possible syntactic construction in the given context, and
(2)   projectability, or more precisely, as Schegloff made clear: the (cap)ability of the respective unit to constitute a possibly complete turn, ending in a TRP.
As I will show, the mentioned problems result from the fact that neither of these criteria is watertight and therefore the definition and conception of the TCU needs some clarification. On the one hand, not every sentence, clause, phrase etc. - even if

intonationally presented as a 'unit' of some kind (see below) - ends in a TRP; on the other hand, units that do end in a TRP can have multiple sentences, clauses, phrases etc. before their possible completion points (see Sacks/Schegloff/Jefferson 1974: 721, quoted above). There are, as everyone knows, many cases of semantically, pragmatically or prosodically projected further talk in a turn that exceeds the scope of single syntactic constructions before reaching a TRP. How are we going to deal with this in detail? A closer examination leads to two possible solutions to the problem which in turn result in different kinds of slight amendments to the model of turn-taking as presented by Sacks/Schegloff/Jefferson (1974).

2.2   The Problem

The difficulties arise with more complex TCUs. This becomes evident with the following kinds of problems: the analysis of syntactically continued but prosodically independent constructions, the analysis of 'compound TCUs' and the analysis of 'big packages' or 'large projects' such as stories told in conversation. - Intuitively, we all know that, for instance, stories are produced in a number of smaller units, utterances which we transcribe and delimit by notation symbols such as '.', ';', '-', ',' and '?' at the ends of such units. What kinds of units are these units and how do they relate to TCUs?

As I pointed out above, there seems to be some disagreement within CA with respect to the segmentation of talk into TCUs. In one of his most recent papers, Schegloff (1996) discusses the relation of syntax and prosody for the formation and recognition of TCUs. Without going into detail, his conception seems to be the following: In some cases prosody can prevent possible syntactic units from being heard and interpreted as independent TCUs. In general, however, syntax is stronger and overrides prosody in signalling TCUs and their continuation. Thus, continuations of a prior sentence with a following causal clause introduced by *because* seem to always count as the continuation of the TCU, regardless of their prosodic packaging (Schegloff 1996: 59). At the same time, however, Schegloff admits in a footnote that this is a controversial point and that Goodwin opts for an analysis in which the prosodically independent causal clause is looked upon as a new TCU. A similar problem recurs at another place in the paper. If, however, there is a controversy about the segmentation of talk into TCUs in CA, this indicates the necessity to clarify the notion of the TCU.

An instance of longer TCUs is also given in so-called 'compound TCUs'. In perfect

agreement with the turn-taking model, Lerner (1996) analyses 'if-then' and 'when-then' constructions as 'compound TCUs', even if a prosodic break signalling preliminary component completion displays the entire construction in two prosodic or intonation units. An example of such a construction is given in (1) (for the notation conventions see the appendix and Selting et al. 1998):

(1)   K3: 103-104
       ((after Nat has told that she helped her father a lot))


```
1     Nat:   bloß wenn es darum ging
              only when it happened
2            daß ICH seine hilfe BRAUCHte? .hh
              that I needed his help .hh
3            is egal WIE? (.)
              doesn't matter how
4            dann GING das I:Rgndwie GINGS dann nich;
              then it worked somehow it didn't work then
5            dann gabs IMmer irgndwelche GRÜNde bei ihm
              then there were always some reasons
6            warum er mir nich HELfen konnte; ((etc.))
              on his side why he couldn't help me ((etc.))
```

Here, the beginning of the syntactic, or - as I would rather say: lexico-syntactic - construction 'if-then' or 'when-then' is looked upon as projecting an entire complex TCU in which both the 'if'/'when' and the 'then' clause have been (lexico-)syntactically projected. Prosody, or intonation in particular, can signal the completion of a preliminary component of the TCU under way, the possible locus of certain kinds of recipient responses such as anticipatory completions of the TCU by another speaker or collaborative turn completions: "The intonation contour of an utterance can certify various syntactic constituents as complete; however, it is the syntax (informed by its sequential location) that will show if the completion of an intonation unit is a preliminary component completion or a TCU completion" (Lerner 1996: 243). TCU-internal preliminary component completion as furnished by a compound TCU is also projectable and "provides an additional syntactic resource for recognitional entry" (1996: 252). As Lerner treats 'if/when-then' constructions as projected syntactic constructions, i.e. complex sentences that end in a TRP, he can here confirm the primacy of syntax over prosody for the interpretation of the entire complex sentence as a TCU. Yet, his treatment makes it clear that there may be different kinds of units before a TRP that are relevant for interaction, i.e. those component parts of the 'compound' TCU that correspond to the single 'if'/'when' and 'then' clause and that are signalled and delimited via intonation. The first one does not and the second one does end in a TRP.

Other kinds of activities that routinely seem to be constructed with more than one clause or sentence are the so-called 'big packages' or 'larger projects', e.g. the telling of stories or jokes, descriptions, direction-giving, the formulation of complex arguments in argumentation sequences etc. In fact, example (1) is a fragment from the longer conversational story presented in (1'):

(1')   K3: 77-112 (Laufnr. 036ff.)

((Nat's entire story about her father; this story is produced after several other stories that Nat told about her and her father's relationship))

```
1     Nat:  und: (.) das WAR ne zeitlang war das SCHON
             and       for some time that was quite
2           ne recht gute beziehung;
             a good relationship
3           aber: ähm (2.0)
             but    uhm
4           <<all> also JETZ überHAUPT nich mehr;=
             well now it isn't at all
5           =un JETZ is auch> so (.) geFÜHLSmäßig total
             and now I feel completely
6           das GEgenteil bei mir,=ne,
             the opposite you know
7           (3.0)
8           un man SCHLUCKT auch viel so als als toch[ter.
             and one swallows a lot being a a daughter
9     Ida:                                            [ja;
                                                        yes
10          (.)
11    Nat:  dem VAter gegen[über.=
             from your father
12    Ida:                 [hm,
                             hm
13    Nat:  =SEHR VIEL.
             very much
14          (1.5)
15    Nat:  also: (.) mir is das JETZ erst so beWUSST
             well      I only realized now
16          geworden was da: hh so für mechaNISmen
             what kind of mechanisms were
17          abgelaufen [sind;=das'
             active there      that
18    Ida:             [man is VIEL zu NACHsichtig;
                         one is much too understanding
19    Nat:  <<ingressiv> JA- > (.)
             <<ingressively>> yes >
20          geNAU;
             exactly
21          man verSTEHT alles;
             one understands everything
```

9

```
22        und SO-
          and so
23        und mein VAter: (.) KAM nun auch
          and my father      came to my place
24        HÄU<<all>fig an;=
          quite often
25        =GUT;> (.)
          well o.k.
26        seine ARbeitslosigkeit,
          his being on the dole
27        daß er auch den ganzen tag .hh äh: dann
          that he was the whole day        then
28        eben alLEIne war,
          in fact alone
29        weil seine freundin geARbeitet hat, (---)
          because his girlfriend was out working
30        .hh un dann hatte er n HERZinfarkt vor: (.)
             and then he had a heart attack at
31        <<all, flach> d also d mein VAter is recht JUNG;=
          <<all, flat> d well d my father is quite young
32        =der is erst VIERnVIERzig;=>
          he is only forty four>
33        =d vor DREI JAHren,
          d three years ago
34   Ron: hm,
          hm
35   Nat: un:dh äh: dann sowieSO-=
          and       then even more
36        =dann hat er ab und zu mal beKLEMmungen-
          then he felt constrictions every now and then
37        und ICH dann nach SANDkrug ge:(.)RAST-
          and I then hurried to ((place name))
38        damit wir zusammen MITtag essen können-
          so that we could eat lunch together
39        damit er jemanden DA hat un so-
          so that he had someone there and so
40   Nat: .hh bloß wenn es darum ging
          only when it happened
41        daß ICH seine hilfe BRAUCHte? .hh
          that I needed his help .hh
42        is egal WIE? (.)
          doesn't matter how
43        dann GING das I:Rgndwie GINGS dann nich;
          then it worked somehow it didn't work then
44        dann gabs IMmer irgndwelche GRÜNde bei ihm
          then there were always some reasons
45        warum er mir nich HELfen konnte;
          on his side why he couldn't help me;
46        [.hh das (.) das is mir auch HINterher erst
               that   I only noticed that
47   Ron: [           ((holt tief Luft))
                       ((takes a deep breath))
48   Nat: so auf]gegangen;
          afterwards
     Ron:      ]
```

10

```
49          wie das (.) wie die beziehung eigentlich
            how that    how that relationship in fact
50          ABgelaufen is.=ne, (.)
            worked you know
51          daß die nämlich sehr EINseitig war.
            that namely it was very one-sided
52   Ida:   hm,
            hm
53          (2.5)
54   Ron:   und wie is das bei DIR zu deinem vater? ((etc.))
            and how is it with you and your father ((etc.))
```

Harvey Sacks (1992) points out that activities such as story telling in many cases are projected as needing more than one sentence to accomplish. In order to secure the turn for an extended turn, story tellers seem to seek and/or be allotted an extended turn by producing a 'preface' or 'pre-sequence' such as 'announcement/invitation- ratification' before the launching of the big package of the story proper. In extract (1'), lines 4 through 22 can be analysed as a complex preface to the telling of the story, lines 23 through 51 show the story proper. The story proper is detailed in many such internal units. These internal units may also be relevant for, e.g., the placement of continuers and other recipiency responses by the story recipients; story-internal asides, side-sequences etc., which can of course be oriented to possible completions of internal units, postpone the completion of the story but do not delete its projection. In lines 31 through 34, the story teller inserts an aside into such a unit; the complex unit is acknowledged by Ron with *hm,*. The same kind of organisation holds for other 'big projects' such as extended descriptions, arguments, etc. and their internal organization (cf. also Kallmeyer/Schütze 1977). How are activities like this to be analyzed? What is a TCU here: every syntactic clause, every component part of the story, or the entire projected story?

2.3   The Possible Solutions

Taking the two criteria for TCUs, we run into serious problems which show that we have to separate the notions of TCU and TRP. For the analysis of such activities as the telling of the story proper, we need to decide between two alternatives:

(1)   We can either rely on the criterion that 'TCUs can constitute possibly complete turns' and therefore end in TRPs. We thus treat the entire story that is being told after its preface and ratification, until its first point of possible story completion, as one single TCU, which is organized into smaller other kinds of units internally.

11

(2)   Or we can rely on the criterion of syntactic unit and then treat each sentence, clause, phrase etc. as a TCU, claiming that activity-type internal completion points of TCUs are blocked from being treated as transition relevance places (cf. Houtkoop/Mazeland 1985:599).

What are the arguments for or against either solution? As the number of cases in which TCUs do not end in TRPs is not insignificant and, therefore, not to be ignored, we need to decide on a clear and explicit treatment of such cases.

2.3.1 Possible Solution 1: TCUs as possibly complete turns that end in a TRP, and phrasing units below the TCU

For solution (1), we would treat the entire story that is being told after its preface and ratification and before its possible story completion as one projected single TCU, which is organized into smaller other kinds of units internally. This has the advantage of starting out from the projected activity type and treating the formation of internal units as contingent on the constitution of activities; it is not the 'units' as such that matter to the participants, but the constitution of activities in conversation (Schegloff 1996, see also below). In this view, it would be no problem to recognize that there are other means of projection besides syntax, namely prosody, lexico-syntax, semantics, pragmatics and activity-type specific organization schemata. Furthermore, it would be no problem to explain why within longer 'projects' not every internal unit needs to end with turn-holding devices, thus manifestly signalling incompletion as long as the larger projection is operative; single internal units only need to expound holding devices if they are ambiguous with respect to ending in a TRP. In this view, story-internal and thus TCU-internal 'units' would be analysed as production units below the TCU which are constituted in order to incrementally formulate the story as a whole in an orderly and recipient-designed way. An advantage of this solution would be that the notion of TCU would be reserved for those units that indeed are immediately relevant for the operation of the rules of turn-taking and we would be able to distinguish terminologically between units not ending in a TRP and units ending in a TRP.

This view seems to be the view advocated by Harvey Sacks in his lectures. For story telling, Sacks (1992, Volume II: 227) says:

> "The fact that stories take more than an utterance to produce involves that tellers should in the first instance see that they're intending to tell a story, and that it might take more than a sentence to produce, and seeing that, they turn it into at least a two-utterance thing in which they first say they're going to tell a

story, get permission to do that, and then tell the story. So it's a systematic occurring fact that stories, taking more than a sentence to produce, turn out to take more than an utterance to produce" (cf. also Jefferson 1978).

If, here 'utterance' is used in the sense of the later 'TCU', then Sacks states that stories that are being produced in more than one sentence, are produced in more than one TCU, with possible speaker transition being provided for after the first TCU, i.e. the story preface or story announcement. This, however, entails that after story-telling has been projected and ratified, notwithstanding embedded side-sequences such as identification or repair sequences, the entire story that is then being told in however many sentences or other syntactic and prosodic units until its TRP, i.e. its possible story completion point, should be looked upon as one projected unit, i.e. one TCU. This corresponds to the fact that shortly before the quoted passage, Sacks (1992, Volume II: 226) speaks of story-telling as an activity in which the story preface and ratification are designed to secure permission for a 'multi-sentence utterance'. This point is further reinforced, when Sacks relates the coherence of a story to the story as a whole; he says:

> "hearer's business is not to be listening to a series of independent utterances, but to a series of sentences that have their connectedness built in (so that their connectedness has to be understood to understand any one of them (sic!))" (Sacks, unpublished lectures, quoted by Psathas 1995: 23) .

In this view, the TCU is by no means per definition co-extensive with linguistic units defined in terms of syntax and prosody. It can be co-extensive with single sentences, clauses, phrases etc., but it can also be much longer than one such unit. At the same time, this shows that according to this view at least in these 'big packages', there must be some other kind of 'unit' below the TCU.

However, a big disadvantage is that this solution is not the one that Sacks/Schegloff/Jefferson in their 1974 and other later papers opted for, albeit not always very explicitly.

2.3.2 Possible Solution 2: TCUs as possible linguistic units and TRPs as the endings of possibly complete turns

Sacks/Schegloff/Jefferson (1974) suggested that TCUs in most cases consist of some kind of possible syntactic construction. This view has become the more common view, albeit mostly held implicitly.

For this solution (2), we would rely on syntactic criteria and treat every syntactically possible unit as a TCU. In fact, the basic components of the turn-taking model would now be linguistic units. In this case, the projection of larger activity types such as stories which project longer 'projects' than single sentences would have the effect of constraining, overlaying and blocking story-internal completion points of TCUs from being treated "as normal transition relevance places" (Houtkoop/Mazeland 1985: 599). In their argumentation for this solution (for what they called 'closed discourse units'), Houtkoop and Mazeland (1985) consequently go as far as suggesting that in this view the single story-internal TCUs display story-incompleteness: "telling a story displays a property of story-incompleteness of the speaker's project at the end of most of the syntactical units by which the story is produced" (Houtkoop/Mazeland 1985: 599). There is indeed evidence that, e.g. by performing story-prefaces, participants do routinely project stories as larger 'projects', but there is no evidence that they deploy each story-internal unit in each story to display story-incompleteness manifestly. Recipients also seem to orient to and rely on the larger projection of the story, not necessarily to the non-story-completion of each internal unit. In extract (1'), lines 25, 43, 45, 48 and 50 do not end with manifestly observable turn-holding devices.

In this view, we need to distinguish between TCUs that do and that do not end in TRPs. Non-final TCUs in the turn often but not always project turn-holding, final TCUs project turn-yielding. The TRP of non-final TCUs in the turn is suspended until the possible turn-final TCU. The production of larger projects is describable as an incrementally produced interactive achievement in which speakers suspend and recipients refrain from making use of suspended TRPs.
A critical point of this solution that needs amendment is: There are other than syntactic means to project single TCUs and longer 'projects', e.g. prosodic, lexico-syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and activity-type specific devices. I will deal with such devices below. The sole reliance on only syntactic criteria is unjustified (cf. Local/Kelly 1986, Local 1992, Selting 1996). TCUs are interpreted as the result of the interplay of syntactic, lexico-semantic, pragmatic, activity-type specific and prosodic devices in their sequential context.

As this is the more common and received solution, I will adhere to it, taking it as the basis for discussion and the suggestion of amendments. That is, I will call the smallest linguistically possible unit a TCU, with one or more than one TCU constituting a possible turn that ends in an operative TRP. The question now is: What exactly is such a TCU,

i.e. how is it made recognizable, and under what conditions do TCUs end or not end in operative TRPs, i.e. how is projection achieved for single- and multi-unit turns? For reasons of simplicity, I will talk of TCUs with or without TRPs.

2.4   Units and Turns

Let us look at fragment (1) again.

(1)   K3: 103-104

        ((after Nat has told that she helped her father a lot))

```
1     Nat:  bloß wenn es darum ging
             only when it happened
2           daß ICH seine hilfe BRAUCHte? .hh
             that I needed his help .hh
3           is egal WIE? (.)
             doesn't matter how
4           dann GING das I:Rgndwie GINGS dann nich;
             then it worked somehow it didn't work then
5           dann gabs IMmer irgndwelche GRÜNde bei ihm
             then there were always some reasons
6           warum er mir nich HELfen konnte;
             on his side why he couldn't help me;
```

See also the detailed prosodic transcript in Figure 1, Appendix I.

In the fragment presented here the units in lines 1 - 3 could not be analysed as a complete turn. Let us recall that before the fragment given here, Nat started out by stating that in contrast to former times, her relationship to her father now was not good at all, rather the opposite. After then Nat has just told her recipients that she has helped her father a lot, her utterance in lines 1 and 2, *bloß wenn es darum ging daß ICH seine hilfe BRAUCHte?* ('only when it occurred that I needed his help'), is not hearable as a complete turn. Apart from the lexico-syntactic projection of a 'then'-clause following the 'when'-clause, the continuation also has to present negatively evaluated information that warrants Nat's change to bad feelings for her father (cf. (1'): 1-6). The same holds for her next utterance in line 3, *is egal WIE?*, a parenthetic remark which only postpones the projected lexico-syntactic and semantic continuation. It is only at the end of the next utterance in lines 4 through 6, *dann GING das I:Rgndwie GINGS dann nich; dann gabs IMmer irgndwelche GRÜNde bei ihm warum er mir nich HELfen konnte*, that possibly a turn might be complete. Nevertheless, this possible turn is composed of

the clearly separated smaller units in lines 1-2, 3, 4 and 5-6, which are all TCUs that do not end in TRPs.

It is the interplay of syntax and prosody that constitutes and delimits TCUs in general: possibly complete syntactic constructions in co-occurrence with possibly complete intonation contours constitute and delimit 'units' which are interpretable as semantically possible chunks and recipient designed information units (cf. Chafe, e.g. 1993). If we listen to this fragment, we immediately recognize these smaller units. Each smaller unit is presented as a syntactically and prosodically independent utterance which has its own accents and thus semantic foci.

In general, if we accept that the interplay of syntax and prosody, in the given semantic-pragmatic and sequential context, packages and chunks talk into units that may but need not end in TRPs and thus may but need not be co-extensive with a possible turn, we need to separate TCUs as the basic linguistic units, and TRPs as possible turns made up of one or more than one TCU.

In this example, TCUs are in most cases co-extensive with intonational or prosodic units that configure and delimit possible or designedly complete syntactic constructions such as sentences, clauses, phrases, one-word constructions etc. As, however, as I will show, prosody and intonation cannot be looked at as the only or in all cases the overriding criterion over, e.g. syntax, it is not identical with an 'intonation unit' or 'prosodic unit'.

Single TCUs and their combination in multi-unit turns seem to be designed to organize the emergent and incremental intra-turn organization of activities. This includes e.g. the organisation of story-telling (cf. also Selting 1994, 1995), the distinction between certain kinds of activity types performed with prosodically differently phrased kinds of causal and concessive constructions (cf. Günthner 1996, Couper-Kuhlen 1996), or the chunking of information (cf. also Chafe 1993) in an interactionally relevant and recipient designed manner.

The interpretation of a TRP presupposes the completion of a TCU. That means that every unit ending in a TRP is also a TCU, but a TCU need not necessarily end in a TRP. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson's (1974) definition of the TCU entails the condition under which a TCU ends in a TRP: if, and only if, it is also a possibly complete turn.

In single-unit turns, a TCU always ends in a TRP. In multi-unit turns, however, there are non-final and final TCUs within the turn. If a turn could be possibly complete, all the prior TCUs taken together form the multi-unit turn that ends in a TRP. As long as a possible turn-final TCU is not complete, the turn is not complete and there is no TRP. If a possible turn-final TCU is complete, there is a TRP. This means that the turn may end here, but, as we will see, it need not end here: all kinds of units are flexible and expandable (Selting 1996). A turn ending in a TRP can thus be built with one or more than one TCU and TCUs can be built with one or more than one intonation unit (see below).

We can build the following abstract model of the turn:

Single-unit turn:
[TCU]   (]   ]   ...)
     TRP1   (TRP2   TRP3 ...)

Multi-unit turn:

[TCU1]   ([TCU2]   ...)   [TCUn]   (]   ]   ...)
                                        TRP1 (TRP2   TRP3 ...)

'(   )' denote optional components of the model
'[   ]' denote possible TCUs, further ']' denote possible further TRPs

Following this, we can always begin by analysing TCUs and then further analyse how interlocutors distinguish and recognize operative TRPs, i.e. how they distinguish non-final TCUs from final TCUs in a turn (cf. Selting 1996).

In the following I will look more closely at TCUs and their relation to TRPs in their sequential context. What is a TCU precisely? What is the role and relation of linguistic structures such as syntactic, prosodic, lexico-semantic, pragmatic and activity-type specific construction schemata? How are TRPs projected and made recognizable?

I will elaborate on both of the criteria used to define the TCU: I will first deal with the interplay of syntax and prosody for the formation of single TCUs, in order to show (a) that syntax cannot be used as the only criterion, and (b) how 'units' are formed and made recognizable in talk, in particular TCUs and possible turns ending in TRPs. After that, I will deal with the kinds of projection of larger multi-unit turns, in order to show that and why we need to distinguish between TCUs with and without operative TRPs.

3.   Unit-formation in general: the interplay of syntax and prosody in the formation of TCUs and possible turns

Recent research has shown that by deploying co-occurring practices, signalling cues or construction schemata from pragmatics, lexico-semantics, syntax, prosody and non-verbal cues, participants in conversation can construct, besides unclear and camouflaged cases, also more or less clear yet flexible 'units' which are, for instance, syntactically and prosodically constituted and delimited (cf., e.g., Couper-Kuhlen/Selting 1996, Selting 1995, 1996, Ford/Fox/Thompson 1996 and others). So even when Ford/Fox/Thompson want to direct their attention more to participants' practices of turn construction than to the segmentation of TCUs, when Schegloff (1996) maintains that the production of units is contingent on the constitution of activities in conversation, or when I come to the conclusion that the signalling and constitution of 'units' is an epiphenomenon of activities such as turn- and/or unit-holding, yielding, starting and ending (see below), these activities nevertheless result in retrospectively recognizable 'units' which have to be deconstructed and reconstructed as resources of activity constitution in conversation. Internal cohesion of such units is displayed by deploying and continuing recognizable syntactic and intonational/prosodic construction schemata, delimitation of such units is achieved by displaying syntactic and prosodic breaks in talk (cf. also Local/Kelly 1986, Local 1992). Clear cases of units are produced by using converging practices; the use of diverging practices or signalling cues results in larger units, unclear cases of units, camouflage of boundaries, split-up units, etc. (see below).

Since the possible completion of turns presupposes the possible completion of TCUs, we can start by analyzing TCU-formation in general, and then later ask under what conditions TCUs are interpreted as possibly complete turns that end in a TRP.
For TCUs in general, we have to answer the following questions: How are units formed and made recognizable at all? Why can units not be defined with reference to either only syntax or only prosody? What are the construction methods or practices that participants use to make TCUs and possible turns with their TRPs interpretable?
The simplest case is the case in which a simple sentence co-occurs with an intonation contour and the designed completion of the syntactic construction co-occurs with the designed completion of the intonation contour, i.e. a turn-yielding final fall or rise in pitch, in order to signal and delimit a single-unit TCU and turn. As this simple case is unproblematic, I will not deal with it any further here.

In a previous paper (Selting 1996), I dealt with TCUs that could be described syntactically as flexible possible sentences and their expansions which are configured as units via the co-occurrent use of flexible possible intonation contours. I will take this as a starting point here and then focus on more difficult cases in which possible syntactic structures and possible intonation contours are in conflict.

I will use the terms 'schema', or 'construction schema', and 'gestalt' in the following way. With reference to linguistic resources of social interaction, 'construction schema', or simply 'schema', is used in order to denote the way in which a flexible, dynamic, and situationally adaptable linguistic structure is organized. Construction schemata provide knowledge about constitutive entities of a structure which can be expectably linked in more or less tight and in more or less varied ways, their exact relation and enactment being dependent on and open to the task at hand. Schemata are assumed to be cognitively and interactionally relevant.[2] 'Gestalt' is a particular kind of construction schema that foregrounds the holistic - and yet analytically decomposable or deconstructable - nature of a 'unit'. Linguistic gestalts typically have a beginning, a trajectory, and an end. The initiation of a particular gestalt-type configuration or activity as well as the ongoing emerging production of it, project gestalt closure or completion. As gestalts are flexible schemata, however, this projected completion can be flexibly organized and can be adapted to the task at hand. Both syntax and prosody provide holistic construction schemata or gestalts that are realized with flexible beginnings and ends as well as flexible details of their internal structure. Irrespective of the flexible andvariable details, the actual tokens are recognizable as realizations of a particular holistic schema or gestalt that participants rely on for their orientation in constructing and interpreting units: for instance, the schema of a 'possible sentence', a 'possible phrase', or a particular kind of 'intonation contour' with a 'possible unit or turn ending pitch(movement)'.

In the next sections, I will first deal with cases in which the differential prosodic packaging of possible syntactic constructions and their expansions shows that TCUs in general and possible turns ending in a TRP in particular cannot be determined with reference to only syntax. Then I will deal with cases in which the splitting up of syntactic constructions into several prosodic units shows that units in general and possible turns in particular cannot be determined with reference to only prosody.

3.1 Units cannot be determined with reference to only syntax

The easiest cases to deal with, and therefore our starting point, are possible sentential TCUs and turns. In a previous paper (Selting 1996), I looked at possible sentential TCUs and their expansions. I demonstrated that for the construction of these kinds of units participants rely on the possible sentence as a syntactic construction schema or gestalt that is prosodically contextualized. Expansions of the possible sentence may be prosodically organized as either integrated into the same unit or as exposed into a new unit. In my view, the prosodic packaging of expansions of possible sentences determines whether the expansion is integrated into the same or displayed as a new TCU.

As an example of an extended possible sentence with expansions organized both as prosodically integrated and as prosodically exposed, cf. the following extract:

(2) K4: 824-833 (from Selting 1996, transcription adapted here)

```
824 Eli:    ich HAB mir keine geDANkn darüber gemacht;
               M(/            \                        )
            I didn't think about that

825 Lea:    mhm,
             \/

826 Eli:     zuMAL ich auch ÜBERwiegend studentn hab die:*
            <u>M(\           \
            since I also overwhelmingly have students who
            ((schluckt))
            ((swallows))

827 Eli:    die also schon ÄLter sind; di[e:: [schn ein
                              \              )
            <c>            <f >        <d>
            who are older already     who already
828 Lea:                               [mhm,
                                         \/
829 Cis:                                  [mhm,
                                            \/

830 Eli:    studium A:Bgeschlossen ha[m; oder: faMI:lie habm;
               M(\                    )<d>     M(\          )
                 <f >
            finished one degree          or have a family
831 Lea:                               [mhm

832 Eli:    im  beRU:F stehn;
            <d> M( \        )
            are working
```

20

```
833 Lea:    mhm,
              \/
```

While the relative clause in line 826f. is prosodically integrated and therefore part of the same TCU as the prior clause, all the other subsequent expansions in lines 827-832 are prosodically exposed and in separate TCUs, all also ending in TRPs, which are nonetheless formulated as grammatically cohesive with the prior TCUs. (For details see Selting 1996.) See also the more detailed representation in Figure 2, Appendix I.

My argument is that possible completion points of syntactic structures constitute potential completion points of TCUs and/or possible turns, but it is the prosodic contextualization that signals whether possible completion points of such structures, albeit being loci of participant responses such as recipiency tokens and early starts, are designed to be actual TRPs or not. If the speaker deploys continuing prosodic devices in order to contextualize continuation of the unit-under-production for another clausal or phrasal expansion, then this expansion is indeed contextualized as an expansion of the same unit beyond its prior possible syntactic completion point. If, however, prosody is used in order to constitute a prosodic break between a possible syntactically complete construction and its grammatically cohesive expansion, then this grammatically cohesive expansion is packaged and contextualized as a new unit and, if it completes a possibly complete turn, this is also a new TRP. The contextualization of expansions as either prosodically integrated into the same or as exposed in a new TCU can of course be used as a resource for quite different interactional purposes. (For more detail, see Selting 1994, 1995, 1996.)

An example that shows even more clearly that syntactic units themselves can only be recognized by attending to their prosodic packaging is the following in which an instance of the same wording is used twice but with different prosodic packaging. This example shows the relevance of the interaction of syntax and prosody for the constitution of units.

(3) K1: 980ff

```
979 Nat:    ach dieses beneFIZkonZERT,
            \              F(\     /   )
            <l                        l>
            oh this benefit concert


980 Ron:    ja;
             \
```

```
                    <all>
                     yea

                    (.)

981 Nat:     JAA:;   geNAU;   da mußt ich ARbeiten;
—>           M(\   )    M(\ )            M(\        )
              yeah    right    at that time I had to work

                    (.)

982 Ron:      AH:[JA;
             M(/    \)
               oh yeah
983 Ida:          [mhm,
                    \/

                    (.)

984 Nat:    genau da mußt ich ARbeiten un dann: war ich noch
—>                              F(\
             right at that time I had to work and then I was

985 Nat:    auf ner ANdern fete einge[ladn.
                       \_                    )
             invited to another party
986 Ron:                             [da kann NICH viel
                                         F(\
                                     there can't have been

987 Ron:     LOS gewesen sein inner FANNkuchenstube.
              \                      \_                )
             much going on in the pancake studio at that time
```

The extract shows two different turn-beginnings involving the words *genau* ('right') and *da* ('at that time') in lines 981 and 984. Prosody is used to signal whether *genau* ('right') should be heard as constituting a separate unit or as being integrated into the following unit. In the first instance, it is constructed as a separate unit and is thus given the status of an interjection. In the second instance, it is integrated into the following sentence and now is to be heard as an adverbial specifying the temporal adverb *da* 'at that time', yielding the temporal *genau da* 'right at that time'.

As, however, the turn could very well be possibly complete after *genau*, the syntactically and prosodically possibly complete TCU in line 981 is also a possible turn, while the prosodically integrated item in line 984 is presented as neither a possibly complete TCU nor, consequently, a possibly complete turn. This example thus shows cases in which syntactically possible TCUs and/or possible turns ending in a TRP are only recognizable because of their prosodic packaging. It is only by producing a

prosodic break between *genau* and *da* that the speaker signals and the recipient can retrospectively infer that *da* is the beginning of a new TCU.

Furthermore, while by using falling terminal intonation and by pausing after the possible sentence *da mußt ich ARbeiten* in line 981, speaker Nat clearly signals the possible end of her TCU and possible turn, which Ron and Ida respond to in lines 982f., her second occurrence of the possible sentence *da mußt ich ARbeiten* in line 984 is expanded by adding another possible sentence in a coordinated construction. These two coordinated possible clauses in a sentence are not separated by any kind of prosodic break. On the contrary: they are integrated into one prosodically cohesive intonation contour. By not producing a terminal falling pitch accent in the word *ARbeiten*, Nat can be analysed as preventing her recipients from interpreting this possible end of a possible sentence and a possible TCU and complete turn as an actual operative TRP. And this method seems to be understood by her recipient Ron. Even though he arguably starts early, he does not start earlier than near the end of the coordinated construction. This supports the view that -- even though the end of the possible sentence constitutes the possible end of a syntactic unit -- the prosodic packaging would suggest that it is here not intended and also not displayed as an operative ending of a TCU or turn. This means that even though there might be earlier points of possible completion on syntactic grounds, the prosodic packaging here displays whether these are designed to be TRPs or not.

The next two extracts show how the clauses of a complex sentence can be prosodically displayed in different ways:

(4) K0: 37:7ff. ((after Dor has told a story))

```
07  Mar:   NAja; is wahrSCHEINlich DESwegn weil die BRONchien
           M(\ )         F(  \        /               \
           well it's probably like that    because the bronchia

08         da IMmer drunter l[eiden.
             ↑\_               )
           always suffer from that
09  Dor:                    [JAA;
                            yes
```

(5) K1: 431-437

```
431 Nat:   in WELchem semester BIS du denn;
           S(  \              \           )
           what semester are you in then
```

```
432        (0.8)

433 Ida:   also im (0.2) in KUNST im DRITten;
                        S( /          \      )
           well in      in arts in the third

434        und im (0.2) in DEUTSCH im VIERten.
                        F( \          \      )
           and in       in German in the fourth

435 Nat:   hm,
           \/

436 Ida:   weil ich am anfang mal geWECHselt hab hin und her (und);
           <all>                  M( \                            )
           because at the beginning I changed here and there (and)

437 Nat:   hm,
           \/
```

While in the first example, a causal clause is formulated prosodically integrated with the preceding main clause in which it is already cataphorically referred to with *DESwegn* ('like that'), in the second example the causal clause is added later, i.e. after the recipient's continuer *hm*. In contrast to the first case, in which the causal clause seems to have been designed as a part of the TCU at least as early as the speaker approached the end of her main clause, in the second case the speaker seems to be reacting to her recipient's continuer by extending her prior main clause by a causal clause. Although in this case the causal clause is also built to cohesively connect with and continue the main clause, it is here displayed as a new TCU by leaving space for Nat to provide her recipiency token and by starting anew prosodically. While in the first instance, the main clause and the causal clause are presented as one single TCU, in the second instance, the main clause and the causal clause are presented as two TCUs. Here, the causal clause has not been projected before. As the main clause could well have been a complete turn, both TCUs end in TRPs. (For an analysis of the different discourse-pragmatic meanings that these different kinds of causal constructions have, see Günthner 1996; for similar cases in English cf. Couper-Kuhlen 1996.)

This shows that syntactically cohesive continuations of possible TCUs can be constructed in different ways and that a syntactically cohesive complex sentential construction can be displayed as one or more than one TCU by means of prosody. The kind of prosodic display of a complex sentence in one or in more than one TCU must be analyzed as an interactionally relevant resource.[3]

All the given examples show that a TCU cannot be analysed with reference to only syntax. Neither can it, as the following section will show, be analysed with reference to only prosody. Apart from this, it has to be kept in mind that of course not every point of context-free possible syntactic completion is a point of context-sensitive possible completion (cf. below).

3.2   Units cannot be determined with reference to only prosody

While in the extracts discussed so far prosodic units are co-extensive with possible syntactic units and/or their possible expansions, there are other cases in which a syntactically possible unit is virtually split up into different prosodic units. See the following examples in which syntactically possible units are produced with self-repairs and with internal prosodic breaks:

(6) K2: 30-33

```
30  Ida:   und: (.) SECHS stunden;
              F[M(\              )
                 <c>
          and      six hours

31         man kann das nur SECHS stundn:, (.)
           <u>               (\           / )
           you can only for six hours

32          INnerhalb   ä:hm (..) von den FOLgenden sechs STUNden.
           F(\                            \                \_   )
            <u>       <c.> <d>       <c.>
           within         uhm       the following six hours

33         nachDEM es passIERT ist.  NÄhen.=ne,
             F(\           \_       ) (\      /)]
           <u>                         <u>
           after it happened        sew it up you know
```

See also the more detailed representation in Figure 3, Appendix I.

Here the sentence is split up into five prosodic units. The upstep for *man kann das nur SECHS stundn:* ('you can only six hours') seems to present this as the beginning of a new prosodic unit. Another beginning of a new prosodic unit seems to be displayed, when the upstep for *INnerhalb* signals a new beginning of a new prosodic unit for this repair of the prior formulation. And, likewise, *nachDEM* and *NÄhen* are displayed as

25

the beginnings of new prosodic units via upsteps in pitch. Almost all component parts of the entire turn, except *stundn:* at the end of line 31, end with possible prosodic and intonational completions. While the first two prosodic units have one pitch accent each and end in falls to mid pitch, the phrase *INnerhalb ä:hm (..) von den FOLgenden sechs STUNden* is presented as a phrase that has three pitch accents on a descending line, ending with possible turn-yielding pitch. The same is true for the two falling pitch accents in *nachDEM es passSIERT ist.* Here, then, possible turn-yielding pitch contours are used in order to configure phrases that do not by themselves constitute possible syntactic phrases in this context; a possible syntactic construction is split up into several component prosodic phrases. Nevertheless, in spite of this prosodic incohesiveness, the entire clause is understood as only one syntactically cohesive complex sentence with an embedded temporal clause *man kann das nur INnerhalb von den FOLgenden sechs STUNdn nachDEM es pasSIERT ist NÄhen ne* that is produced after several self-repairs. Only the entire complex sentence is interpretable as a TCU. The same happens in the next example:

(7) K1: 947-952 (from Selting 1995: 77f.) ((on Ron's music band))

```
947 Ron:    wir HAM in diesem semester EInige AUFtritte geHABT;
            M( ↑\                    \      \          \  )
            we did give several performances this semester

948         ((räuspert sich))
            ((clears his throat))

949           AUCH: ähm:-  (1.0)
            M(\    ) -
            <d>
              also uhm

950           ÜBERwiegnd muß ich sagn-  (0.5)  ANläßlich ähm:- (1.5)
            M(\          ) -                  M(\        ) -
            <c>                              <c>
              mainly I must say                occasioned by uhm

951          JAA des STREIKS der geWEsen is:.  (0.5)
            T,F(\          \        \_       )
              <d>
              well the strike that was going on

952         m:[uSIK soll ja[  (.)  hier ganz ver[SCHWINDEN.=
              T(\                                 \_   )
            <u><all>
            music is as you know  threatened to be abolished here
953 Nat:    [mhm,         [mhm,mhm,mhm,          [mh[m,
              \/
```

26

```
954 Ida:                                          [mhm,
                                                    \ /

955 Ron:    =die LEHrerausbildung.=nech,
            <c>T(\_                    /   )
            the teacher training you know
```

See also the detailed prosodic transcript in Figure 4, Appendix I.

Here, the speaker Ron produces numerous signallings of little 'trouble' and parentheses in the course of the production of his complex sentence *wir ham in diesem semester einige auftritte gehabt, auch überwiegend anläßlich des streiks der gewesn is*. Besides inserting the parenthetical phrase *muß ich sagn* ('I must say'), the hesitation signals *ähm:* and the discourse marker *JAa*, the speaker seems to begin a new 'attempt' with each of the phrases *AUCH ähm:* ('also ähm'), *ÜBERwiegend muß ich sagn* ('mainly I must say'), *ANläßlich ähm* ('when ähm') and *JAa des STREIKS der gewesn is* ('yeah the strike that was going on'). The pitch peaks in each of the first three beginnings reach about equal height and thus do not configure the pitch accents as constituting a cohesively falling global pitch contour with descending pitch peaks. The fourth beginning at *JAa des STREIKS der gewesn is* steps down in pitch and starts a new contour that itself then is constituted by three successively falling pitch accents. Even if in some of these component parts of the sentence the speaker uses holding devices - such as *ähm*, sound stretches or level pitch - before pausing and starts the next prosodic unit with continuing pitch (denoted by <c>), the entire utterance is not hearable as an intonationally and/or rhythmically cohesive prosodic unit. The sentence is packaged into different prosodic units with each prosodic unit initially seeming to signal the start of a new sentence and TCU which then, however, turns out to be the syntactic continuation of the previously begun complex sentence. Even though this clause may be heard as one that is produced hesitatingly, the syntactic projections brought under way and continued in each successive prosodic phrase are stronger and thus the clause is still heard as a clause and the entire unit as one TCU. Nat's recipiency tokens *mhm* are only given after this entire possible syntactic clause. In this case, prosody turns out to not package possibly complete TCUs, but only component parts of a possibly complete unit.

In contrast to the examples given so far, in which the splitting up of TCUs into several intonation units is used to contextualize hesitant speech, in the following extract the splitting up is used in order to display emphasis:

(8) K2:


```
697 Ron:    ich DENke auch daß: verSCHIEdene tagesspau
           F[ F(\                    ↑\
           I also think that different speakers of the daily ne

698         SCHAUsprecher öh (..) oder überHAUPT öh:
              \           <d            T(\
                             <all      all>
           daily news show uh   or news speakers uh

699         NACHrichtensprecher, (.) dieSELbe NACHricht;
            /                  )d>     M,F(\      \         )
           <all           all>
           in general                 read the same news item

700           GANZ unterschiedlich VORlesen; (..)
           M,F(\                          \      )]
              <u>
              quite differently

701           AUCH was beTOnungen zum beispiel angeht;=
           H,F(\             \                          )
              <u>
              also with respect to for example stressing

702 Ron:    =WO: s[ie: jetz (.) akZENte setzen und wo NICHT;
           M(\                    \                    \   )
           <u>
           where they place their accents and where they don't
703 Nat:          [MEINS DU:?
                  H(\       /¯)
                  <f    f>
                   do you think so

           (.)
704 Nat:     also ICH würd jetz sagen NICH;
           <c> M(/                    \   )
           <all>
            well I would now deny that
```


The possible sentence in lines 697-700 is produced incohesively. Firstly, after the beginning of a possible sentence, *ich DENke auch daß: verSCHIEdene tagespau SCHAUsprecher* ('I also think that different speakers of the daily news show') (with a self-repair *tagespau SCHAUsprecher*), ending with the 'hesitation signal' *öh*, already with downstepped pitch, and a pause, the speaker produces the parenthetical phrase *oder überHAUPT öh: NACHrichtensprecher* ('or news speakers in general'). This is a self-repair substituting the prior reference to speakers of a particular news programme

for speakers of all news programmes. The parenthetical phrase is already begun with a downstep for the *öh* that signals the interruption of the possible sentence, and low pitch is continued for the rest of the parenthetical phrase. After another pause, the speaker resumes the suspended sentence and continues it with *dieSELbe NACHricht GANZ unterschiedlich VORlesen* ('read the same news item quite differently'). This latter part, however, is produced with two different global contours with two falling pitch accents each, and an upstep in between, and thus the prosody here seems to suggest two different prosodic units. These seem to be constituted here in order to signal emphasis: after Nat has voiced her opinion that all news speakers speak in a very similar way, Ron is here emphasising his argument against Nat's. Here, too, in spite of the prosodic lack of cohesion, the entire construction is heard as one possible sentence and TCU with an internal repair phrase. Ron's further addition of another expansion in a new prosodic unit in line 701 confirms the interpretation of emphasis for his device of splitting up a possible syntactic unit into several prosodic units.

In contrast to the possible sentences and their expansions looked at before, the examples looked at here present cases in which the prosodically packaged stretches could not be analysed as possible TCUs by themselves. Examples such as these show that in cases of conflict between the syntactic and the prosodic signalling of possible units, i.e. when possible prosodic completions are used at other places than possible syntactic completions, syntax might be stronger and might override the more local prosodic signalling. Discrepancies and divergences between the syntactic and prosodic signalling of units can be used for interactive purposes: e.g. in order to contextualize hesitating speech and/or self-repair with the new beginning of a unit after the old one has been relinquished and left unfinished - in this case, this is also contextualized by hesitation signals, recycled beginnings etc. -, or emphasis - in this case a syntactic unit is often configured as more than one prosodic unit without signals of hesitation or self-repair (cf. also, e.g. Halliday's 1967 notion of 'tonicity'), etc. In both cases of discrepancy, syntax will override prosody and a syntactically cohesive construction will nevertheless be heard as a TCU or, in the appropriate context, a possible turn. This analysis is also attested by the recipient responses that, if provided at all, are normally provided around the ends of such entire TCUs.

This shows that TCUs cannot be determined with reference to only prosody, because even though the prosody packages different phrases, as long as in yet unfinished units syntax has projected a continuation that is continued and fulfilled in the following constructions, then syntax overrides prosody for the interpretation of units. And as it is here only the entire syntactic unit that "*can* constitute possibly complete turns"

(Schegloff 1996: 55), it is in these cases the syntactic unit that must be analysed as a TCU and/or possible turn. This analysis corroborates my earlier analysis of syntax as the more far-reaching and global and prosody as the more local contextualization device (Selting 1996).

Both the examples in this and the prior section show that neither a syntactically possible unit nor a prosodically possible unit need to be co-extensive and thus constitutive of TCUs or possible turns. In one set of cases, prosody seems to override syntax, in another set of cases, syntax seems to override prosody. A 'TCU' is thus a unit that is constituted and delimited by the interplay of syntax and prosody: it is constituted as a cohesive whole by the deployment of syntactic and prosodic construction schemata, and it ends with the co-occurrence of a possible syntactic and a possible prosodic unit completion in its sequential context.

In most cases, a TCU is indeed co-extensive with an intonation unit. However, as there are the other cases in which syntactic segments smaller than a syntactically possible construction in its given sequential context is displayed in a prosodic or intonation unit but this intonation-unit-packaged stretch of talk cannot be interpreted as a possibly complete TCU, because it is syntactically not possibly complete in the given context, we cannot equate prosodic or intonation unit with TCU. It is precisely cases like these that make it necessary to distinguish between prosodic or intonation phrases and TCUs. A TCU may, but need not, be co-extensive with a semantic or pragmatic unit or with a possibly complete turn. Complex or compound TCUs are in many cases being built by incrementally producing more than one TCU.

3.3   The projection of multi-unit turns with internal TCUs

The projection of single units is achieved both syntactically and prosodically. Now I want to turn to larger turns in order to show that if we accept and take seriously the projection criterion for the turn, then we have to recognize different kinds of projection that result, besides single-unit turns, in larger multi-unit turns. In these cases, non-final TCUs in the turn do not end in operative TRPs, the projection of multi-unit turns thus resulting in blocking TRPs at the ends of the non-final TCU(s) in the projected turn.

For the projection of multi-unit turns, speakers can use lexico-syntactic, semantic, pragmatic or activity-type specific devices. I will present examples of each type.

30

3.3.1 Lexico-syntactically projected larger turns

Lexico-syntactic devices of projecting more than a single clause are the initiation of complex sentences which are constructed of two clauses, i.e. 'if - then' and 'when - then' clauses that construct a compound sentence and that also form a complex turn (cf. Lerner 1996, cf. above). Although these kinds of syntactic constructions, too, can be constructed in one prosodic unit (cf. the causal clauses given above, also for instance the prosodically integrated construction *wenn die dich Abhörn dann HÖRN die ob du rauchs* (Selting 1995: 348)), they are often produced in two component parts. See example (1) again:

(1) K3: 103-104ff. ((Nat has told that she helped her father a lot))

```
1   Nat:    bloß wenn es darum ging
            only when it happened

2           daß ICH seine hilfe BRAUCHte?   .hh
              (\                   /¯      )
            that I needed his help

3           is egal WIE?  (.)
                    (/¯)
            doesn't matter how

4            dann GING das I:Rgndwie GINGS dann nich;
                M(\      H(/           \                )
            then it worked somehow it didn't work then

5            dann gabs IMmer irgndwelche GRÜNde bei ihm
            then there were always some reasons

6            warum er mir nich HELfen konnte; ((etc.))
            on his side why he couldn't help me ((etc.))
```

After the topic of complaining about their fathers has been established before, and after Nat has told her recipients that she helped her father a lot, Nat's first complex sentence represented here, *bloß wenn es darum ging daß ICH seine hilfe BRAUCHte*, is not a possible turn, because by beginning with a 'when-clause', more than this has been projected, namely a 'then'-part of this complex sentence and turn. The next line, *is egal WIE*, is a kind of parenthetical side-remark before the projected next component of Nat's turn. Nevertheless, both after the first complex sentence as well as after the side-remark a prosodic or melodic break is clearly displayed which thus suggests several TCUs that combine to form the turn.

31

3.3.2 Lexico-semantically or pragmatically projected larger turns

The prior example can also be analysed as a case of semantically projected larger turns, because it is not only that the starting of a lexico-syntactic construction with a 'when'-component makes its component syntactic 'then'-component expectable, but furthermore, Nat's talk in her prior units has also made some specific semantic-pragmatic relation expectable. Nat has just before told her recipients that in contrast to former times, she now does not have a good relationship with her father. After then she has told that she has helped her father a lot, i.e. a positively evaluated piece of information, she has thereby made some complainable, some piece of negatively evaluated information, expectable which warrants the change of her feelings towards her father. This is why in this sequential context, the first part of her construction in line 4, *dann GING das*, cannot be heard as a possibly complete TCU here.

Other kinds of lexico-semantically or pragmatically projected complex turns that may be produced with one or with more than one TCU are the following:

(9) K1: ((Ida explains why she does not want to change universities))

```
441 Ida:   das: MÖCHT ich nich;=das LOHNT sich nich  (..)  für mich.
           I don't want that    that's not worth it        for me

442        (.)

443 Ida:    ERSmal m: würd ich dann irgndwo HINkommn::
           M(\                                    \
           first of all I would be sent to somewhere

444        woMÖGlich noch in ein anderes BUNdesla:nd,  (..)
             \                            \     /   )
           maybe even in another state

445        und dann    da MÖCHT ich nich BLEI:bm,  (.)
                         M(\                \  / )
           < all  >  <         all         >
           and then    I don't want to stay there

446        weil LEHrer ja wohl (.) NUR in DEM bundesland
           because from what I know teachers are only employed

446        angestellt werden wo se auch stuDIERT habm.=ne,
           in that state in which they also studied you know

447        (.)

448 Nat:   JA:,
           really
```

(10) K1: ((Ida explains why she commutes every day))

```
820 Ida:    das KAM auch-  (.)  ich MUßte mich entSCHEIDEN.
               (\ )-              F(\            \_    )
             that was because   I had to take a decision

821          entweder (0.7) zuHAUse wohn und fürn AUto arbeiten,  (.)
                            M(/                  /            )
             either         live at home and work for a car

822          oder HIER wohn und für ne WOHnung arbeit[n.
               F(\                     \_             )
             or live here and work for a flat
823 Nat:                                            [mhm,
                                                     \/

             (1.0)

824 Ida:   un da hab ich mich LIEber für das AUto entschieden;
                            M(/           \               )
           <all                                          all>
           and then I decided in favour of the car
```

In (9), in her explanation why she does not want to change to another university, Ida uses the expression *ERSmal* ('first of all') for a first component of her explanation and thus projects another component which she provides with the unit beginning with *und dann* in line 445. Similar projections can be made with expressions such as *erstens - zweitens* ('firstly - secondly'), *einerseits - andererseits* ('on the one hand - on the other hand'), etc. In (10), Ida first introduces the fact that she had to take a decision and then elaborates on this by formulating the alternatives: by first providing an *'entweder'* ('either')-component, she projects an *'oder'* ('or')-component.

While in the prior two examples the projection was achieved by using particular lexical expressions which form one part of a paired sequence, the projection in the following examples is achieved by relying on pragmatically conventional sequencing devices.

(11) K4: 107-111

```
107 Cis:  man k'  (..)  aso FRAU kann eignlich nich SAGN:
                       F(/                     \
          you c       well women can't really say

108       daß es so: äh DIE feministische theoloGIE gibt.=
                       /                     \_      )
          that there is the uniform feminist theology
```

33

```
109        =sonnern da gibts GANZ viel verschiedene STRÖmungn- und*
           <all          >M(\                          ↑-     )  -
            but there are very many different branches        and

110 Eli:   mhm,=
            \/

111 Cis:   =VIEle arbeiten halt auch so mit ((usw.))
            many work with ((etc.))
```

In (11), Cis first rejects a presupposition inherent in the participants' prior talk about feminist theology (*'women can't really say that there is a uniform feminist theology'*) and thus projects a correction to come, a *'sondern'* ('but')-component, namely the information given in lines 109ff., that there are very different branches of feminist theology.

An even more locally occasioned projection is built up and fulfilled in (12). Before the start of the extract presented here, Nat has been complaining about her fellow students who do not want to move to their university town but commute from their home towns every day, with the result that those who do move feel lonely, especially at weekends. After this, Ida agrees with Nat and describes the same situation for her own fellow students from her own home town.

```
(12) K1:      ((Ida describes that, in parallel to what Nat told about her situation
               before, many of her fellow students also do not live in their university
               town Oldenburg but in their hometown Wilhelmshaven))


827 Ida:   weil ich mein: WIE: bei dir AUCH;=ne,  (.)
                          M(/             \      /)
           because I mean just like in your case you know

828        die MEIsten die WOHnen hier n paar wochen?  (.)
             H(/              /‾                        )
           most of the students only live here for a few weeks

829        un  DANN sind sie wieder in wilhelmsHAVN.
             F(\                            \_ )
           <all                             all>
           and then they are back in Wilhelmshaven

830 Nat:   mhm,
            \/
           < p>

831 Ida:   also jeder FLUCHT auf wilmsHAven?
```

```
                       S(/                /‾  )
              so everybody curses Wilhelmshaven

832 Ida:   aber [ALle komm se zu(h)RÜCK.=ne,  ((lacht kurz))
             T,F(\                    \     /)
             but they all come back you know
833 Ron:        [((heh))

834        (0.6)

835 Nat:   na ALle kommen se beSTIMMT nich zu[rück.
           well it's not all of them who come back
```

Here, by initiating the first components about 'most of the students only live here for a few weeks' (*die MEIsten die WOHnen hier n paar wochen*, line 828) and 'everybody curses Wilhelmshaven' (*jeder FLUCHT auf wilmsHAven*, line 831), Ida projects second components in which she formulates the nevertheless predictable outcome, namely 'and then they are back in Wilhelmshaven' (*un DANN sind sie wieder in wilhelmsHAVN*) and 'but they all come back' (*aber ALle komm se zu(h)RÜCK*). Ida imitates the formulation schema that Nat has used immediately before.

In all the latter cases, the continuations in the second component parts of the larger 'projects' are neither projected syntactically nor formulated as syntactic continuations. The single component parts are all formulated as separate sentences in separate prosodic or intonational units. Nevertheless, the first parts of the respective 'projects' project second component parts and thus could not be complete turns by themselves. As a consequence, they must be separate TCUs the TRPs of which must be blocked till the end of the projected multi-unit larger 'project'.

3.3.3 Activity-type projected larger turns

The last kind of projection is the one that results from participants' knowledge about activity types such as story telling, describing, direction giving, argumentation, etc. and their normal trajectory in interaction. As said before, these 'big projects' are usually prefaced by 'invitation/ announcement' and 'ratification' in order for the prospective speaker to gain the floor for an extended multi-unit turn at talk (cf. above and Houtkoop/Mazeland1985).

For story telling the story teller who has been yielded the extended turn is expected to 'make the point of the story' in as many TCUs as necessary; this 'point' may be the

climax of the story or another 'tellable point'. As long as this far-reaching projection is underway and the story thus recognizably not complete, the turn only needs to be held with particular turn-holding devices when possible internal syntactic and/or semantic completion points need to be prevented from being interpreted as, e.g. premature, TRPs. In (1'), after the initiation of story telling in lines 23-24 the telling of the complainable is projected; after the first mentioning of this complainable in *I:Rgndwie GINGS dann nich* in line 43, a further explanation and thereafter a kind of assessment or coda is expectable in order to complete story telling. And this is indeed provided by Nat in lines 46ff. At places at which no manifest turn holding signals are being used, the projection of the story is still valid because of the participants' knowledge about the activity of story telling. In cases of e.g. argumentation, the activity-type specific projections also include the distribution of tasks for the proponent and the opponent (cf. also Kallmeyer/Schütze 1977).

3.3.4 Local prosodic projection of 'more-to-come'

Apart from the more far-reaching syntactic, lexico-syntactic, lexico-semantic, pragmatic and activity-type specific projection, there is the more local prosodic turn-holding for the projection of more-to-come at the end of otherwise possiby complete turns.

In previous work, I have used the following example to demonstrate a particularly clear case of prosodic turn-holding at the end of syntactically, semantically and pragmatically possible turn completion. Here, level pitch accents, i.e. pitch accents which may be used as final pitch accents in non-final TCUs but not as final pitch accents in designedly complete final TCUs in the turn, are used in order to signal turn-holding and to project a continuation of the turn with, e.g., further TCU(s) ending in falling or rising pitch, then signalling designed turn completion.

(13) K1: 422-431 (from Selting 1996: 376)

```
422 Nat:   aber KUNST is aber nich kein gutes ANgebot hier.=oder,
            L,F(\                            \            /   )
           but there's not much offered in art here is there

423 Ida:   (0.5)  ES GE:HT.  NEE:; (0.3)  NICH so SONderlich GUT.
            F(\    \_   ) M(\  )       F(\         \            \_)
              it's alright no       not so very good

           (0.5)
```

```
424 Nat:     mhm-
                -

           (1.0)

425 Ida:     A:ber ich mach das jetzt hier zuENde-  (0.7)
->          M(-                            ↑-   )
             <f>
              but I'm going to finish this now here

426 Ida:     WEIL: eine ausbildung BRAUCH der mensch-  (1.4)
->          M(-                    ↑-              )
              because everyone needs an education

427 Ida:     aso s HAB ich mir jetzt so geSA:GT.  (0.2)
            <all> F(\                  \_   )
              or so I've said to myself now

428 Ida:     und:  (0.2)  ich KÜMmer mich da nich WEIter drum-  (0.7)
->                        M(\                   ↑-          )
            and            I'm not going to worry about it any more

429 Ida:     ich MACH das hier zuENde-  (0.7)
->            M(-              ↑-   )
            <  all  >
            I'm going to finish this here

430 Ida:     un mal SEHN was DANN kommt.  (1.0)
                 F(\          \_           )
            and I'll see what happens then
431 Nat:     in WELchem semester BIS du denn;
              R(\                 \          )
            what semester are you in anyway
```

"On syntactic, semantic and discourse-pragmatic grounds, Ida's turn could be complete after each of the TCUs in lines 425, 426, 427, 428, 429 and 430. They all end after syntactically possible sentences, present semantically complete pieces of information, and no announcement or preface has projected a longer contribution. Yet, the TCUs in lines 425, 426, 428 and 429 are produced with last level pitch accents which the speaker jumped up to from lower pitch prior to these accents. After each of these units, the speaker even leaves quite long pauses without the recipients taking the floor. In each case, the level pitch accent is used as a prosodic turn holding device" (Selting 1996: 376f., further warranting and evidence of the interactional relevance of this analysis of level pitch accents can be found there, too.)

This example shows that, even if syntactically, semantically and discourse-pragmatically a TCU is complete, prosody can be used on its own in order to project

turn continuation. Prosody is here thus manifestly used in order to prevent an interpretation of the completion points of the TCU as TRPs. At the same time, we can clearly recognize the internal TCUs which in this case are even followed by in some cases quite long pauses. The recipient holds off her response until after the prior speaker has clearly produced a syntactic, semantic, discourse-pragmatic and prosodic completion in which she has also oriented away from the point elaborated on here and oriented towards the future by using the commonplace expression *un mal sehn was dann kommt* ('and I'll see what happens then'). For a further example see extract (1'): in lines 26-33 mid rising intonations and in lines 35-39 level intonations are used as prosodic turn holding devices in order to display the current TCU as non-final in the turn and to project continuation.

4.   Conclusions

All the 'larger projects' that I have looked at are organized internally in several TCUs. Most of them do not end in TRPs. In the examples given here, recipients seem to show their orientation to the entire larger projected turn by providing their recipiency tokens or other responses at the ends of the turn-final TCU that ends in a TRP. Yet, the single internal TCUs without TRPs fulfill important functions in the construction of the turn. This is evident for the following reasons.

(1)   In their production of larger turns, speakers manifestly and recognizably configure TCUs as units: they produce them as internally cohesive units and delimit them from neighbouring units.

(2)   As I have shown, neither TCUs nor possible turns can be defined with reference to only syntax or prosody. Rather, TCUs and turns are the result of the interplay of syntax and prosody in the given semantic, discourse-pragmatic and sequential context. Syntactic and prosodic construction schemata are flexible schemata which participants deploy and exploit in a flexible and recipient-designed way in their practices of unit construction and interpretation in talk. As, in principle, units are always flexible and expandable, the actual completion of units can only be recognized retrospectively. - The differential combination of syntactic and prosodic construction schemata in the given context differentiates between different kinds of activities that have different semantic and interactional meanings: e.g. different kinds of causal and other subordinate or coordinate clauses, different kinds of relative clauses (see also

Halliday 1967), different kinds of continuations of prior syntactic constructions that can be used as a resource for different interactional purposes (see also Selting 1994, 1995).

(3)   Just as larger turns are projected with various kinds of devices and schemata, so also fragments of units can be incomplete for different reasons (Selting 1998). This in turn corroborates my analysis that we have to analyse TCUs as units that are the result of the interplay of possible syntactic and prosodic construction schemata within their semantic, discourse-pragmatic and sequential context.

(4)   Recipiency responses within turns orient to TCUs: They are placed around the ends of TCUs.

(5)   Speakers and recipients in general do not orient to the production of TCUs as such, but to the organisation of interpretable activities that are constituted with and via such units. The production of units is only an epiphenomenon of the production of activities. So it is not surprising that participants do not show a manifest verbal orientation to each single TCU of larger turns that constitute activities. Recipients show their orientation to possible turns or larger parts thereof, such as for instance component-parts of the projected story telling. This, however, does not preclude that by chunking the entire turn or component parts of projected activities into more than one internal TCU, the speaker orients to the recipients' non-verbal responses and/or designs the formulation of the single and successive TCUs for the particular recipient(s) and her/his responses, as, e.g., Goodwin (1981 etc.) has shown, even if these do not end inTRPs.

(6)   The activities of unit production do not contextualize and project TCUs as such, but TCUs as epiphenomena of the activities of turn construction and activity constitution and organisation. In the organisation of conversation, participants are not concerned with the construction of units, but the construction of units is contingent upon activities such as holding, organizing and yielding the turn, organizing turn transition, organizing question-answer sequences, assessments, the telling of stories etc. It is thus not the TCUs as such that are relevant for participants, but the activities of turn taking and activity constitution. TCUs are only contingent on these activities (cf. also Ford/Fox/Thompson1996).

Yet, as I have tried to show, this epiphenomenon is by no means irrelevant for the external and internal organisation of turns in conversational interaction. They have to be conceived of as the smallest interactionally relevant complete linguistic units. They either end in TRPs (single-unit turns), or they use linguistic and interactional resources in order to project and postpone TRPs till the end of larger turns.

The separation of the two defining criteria for the TCU, (1) the interaction of syntax and prosody/intonation to constitute TCUs, and (2) the (cap)ability to constitute a complete turn, yields a clarification of the notion of the TCU and a slightly revised model of the turn-constructional component of the Sacks/Schegloff/Jefferson (1974) turn-taking system. Besides defining TCUs as smallest possible linguistic units in interaction, as Sacks/Schegloff/Jefferson despite their scarce treatment of prosody in principle did, we would admit different kinds of projection that result in single TCUs ending in TRPs or in multi-unit turns in which the TRPs of internal TCUs are blocked till the final TCU of the turn that ends in a TRP: syntactic, lexico-syntactic, lexico-semantic, discourse-pragmatic, activity-type specific and prosodic projection.

The system of turn taking now works as follows: The interplay of syntax and prosody in their semantic, pragmatic and sequential context is used as a resource by participants in order to construct single TCUs and in order to project possible and designed ends of current TCUs as well as larger projects that extend the current TCU. Possible turns are the result of these different kinds of projection. Syntax only has scope for single TCUs, prosody reaches beyond the current TCU and can be used to project a TCU to follow, lexico-semantic, pragmatic and activity-type specific schemata can be used to project larger turns. After a TRP at the possible completion of a turn, the turn may end or may still be continued by adding new material in a prosodically and syntactically integrated or exposed way. If this expansion of the inherently and fundamentally flexible TCU or turn is displayed as prosodically integrated, speakers present it as the continuation of the prior TCU. If this expansion is displayed as prosodically exposed in a new prosodic unit, the speaker presents it as a new TCU. Every complete turn is by definition also a TCU, but not every TCU is a possible turn.

This proposal modifies only the turn constructional component of Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson's (1974) turn-taking model. The rules of turn allocation operate exactly as proposed by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson: they become relevant at every TRP.

Appendix I:

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Appendix II:

Transcription conventions

<u>Sequential structure</u>
```
[   ]                  overlap and simultaneous talk
[   ]
=                      latching
```

<u>Pauses</u>
```
(.)                    micropause
(-), (--), (---)       brief, mid, longer pauses of ca.  0.25 - 0.75
                       secs.; until ca. 1 sec.
(2.0)                  estimated pause, more than ca. 1 sec. duration
(2.85)                 measured pause (notation with two digits after
                       the dot)
```

<u>Other segmental conventions</u>
```
und=äh                 assimilations within units
:, ::, :::             segmental lenghtening, according to duration
äh, öh, etc.           hesitation signals, so-called 'filled pauses'
'                      cut-off with glottal closure
```

<u>Laughter</u>
```
so(h)o                 laugh particles within talk
haha hehe hihi         laugh syllables
((lacht))              description of laughter
```

<u>Recipiency tokens</u>
```
hm,ja,nein,nee         monosyllabic signals
hm=hm,ja=a,            disyllabic signals
nei=ein, nee=e
'hm'hm                 with glottal stops, usually used for negative
                       responses
```

<u>Accentuation</u>
ak**ZENT**   strong, primary accent
ak!ZENT!   extra strong accent
akZENT   weaker, secondary accents

<u>Pitch at the end of units</u>
?   rising to high
,   rising to mid
–   level
;   falling to mid
.   falling to low

<u>Conspicuous pitch jumps</u>
↑   to higher pitch
↓   to lower pitch

<u>Changed register</u>

<<l>   >   low register
<<h>   >   high register

<u>Notation of pitch accent movements</u>
\   falling to mid
_   falling to low
/   rising to mid
/⁻   rising to high
—   level
/\   rising-falling
\/   falling-rising

↑\   small pitch jump up to peak of accented syllable

↓/   small pitch jump down to valley of accented syll.

↑ˋSO, ↓ˊSO   large pitch jumps up to peak or down to valley
                  of accented syllable
↑⁻SO, ↓⁻SO   pitch jumps to conspicuously higher or lower
                  syllables with level pitch accents

<u>Notation of global pitch realised in the stretch of speech notated</u>
<u>above the brackets</u>
F(   )   falling
R(   )   rising
M(   )   mid
H(   )   high
L(   )   low
M,F(   )   falling within mid register
H,R(   )   rising within high register
[(   )(   )]   combined contours constituting a paratone
({   }   ]   embedded contour, e.g. for parentheses

<u>Changes in loudness and speech rate</u>
<<f>   >   =forte, loud
<<ff>   >   =fortissimo, very loud

```
<<p>     >          =piano, soft
<<pp>    >          =pianissimo, very soft
<<all>   >          =allegro, fast
<<len>   >          =lento, slow
<<cresc> >          =crescendo, continuously louder
<<dim>   >          =diminuendo, continuously softer
<<acc>   >          =accelerando, continuously faster
<<rall>  >          =rallentando, continuously slower
```

<u>Breathing</u>
```
.h, .hh, .hhh       inbreath, according to duration
h, hh, hhh          outbreath, according to duration
```

<u>Other conventions</u>
```
((hustet))          para- und extralinguistic activities and events
<<hustend>     >    concomitant para- und extralinguistic
                    activities and event with notation of scope
<<erstaunt>    >    interpretative commentaries with scope
(     )             unintelligible according to duration
(solche)            uncertain transcription
al(s)o              uncertain sounds or syllables
(solche/welche)     possible alternatives
((...))             omissions in the transcript
—>                  indication of relevant lines for the discussion
```

Endnotes

[1] In recent research, the relevance of prosody for the organization of turn-taking and other sequencing in conversation has been given attention by some researchers in England and Germany, see, e.g., Local/Kelly/Wells (1986), Local/Wells/Sebba (1985) and some of the papers presented in Couper-Kuhlen/Selting (1996) and Pragmatics 6,3 (1996). In particular, work in the German research context is trying to bring together work in CA and John Gumperz' (1982, 1992) work on 'contextualization', for the latter allows a more flexible view of the relation of prosody and other linguistic structuring than other approaches to the study of prosody and intonation (cf. Couper-Kuhlen/Selting 1996).

[2] Cf. Gumperz (1984) and Tannen (1979) on the notions of 'schemata' and 'frames'. Although the notion of 'frame' seems to have become more widespread than that of 'schema' recently, to me 'schema' seems to be more appropriate than 'frame' to denote the kind of rather formal linguistic construction devices that I have in mind.

[3] Nevertheless, there are some cases in which recipients do seem to react to only syntax in a kind of context-free manner. Cf. the following cases in which recipients react to minimal syntactic clauses which - in another context - could very well be syntactically complete but are not complete in this context:

K4: 809-812

```
809 Lea:   also ich hab NIE n eindruck [daß die (..) GRUNDsätzlich
                          R(\                          \
           well I never have the impression that they principally
810 Eli:                               [mhm,
                                        \/
                                        <p>
```

```
811 Lea:    poLItisches denkn oder handeln AB[lehn:;=ne,
                \                        \          /)
           object to political thinking or acting you know
812 Eli:                                     [mhm,
                                               \/
                                              <p>
```

In this extract, the first clause, after which the *mhm* is given, *also ich hab NIE n eindruck*, is not complete; the subordinate clause is an obligatory verb complement here. This fragment thus shows that the recipient does not orient to a larger syntactic-semantic information unit here, which would be interpretable as a TCU, but to a minimal syntactic clause. Here, Lea has been giving her views about her students for some time now. While her recipient has just challenged Lea's views, Eli has refrained from reacting so far. In the TCU prior to the one given in lines 809f., Lea has started explicating her position in a rather emphatic and insisting way, and in line 809 she has just produced the hyperbolic expression *NIE* ('never'), here thus continuing to display emphasis. It might be that Eli by now is under some pressure to react if she wants to avoid that her behaviour is interpreted as non-compliance.

K1: 500-501

```
498 Ida:    da KRISS ja bald EIne daZU.
                F(\              \        \_)
           you'll get one more there


           (...)


500 Ida:     ICH KENN eine ]S [die (?)
            F(/     \
              I know a girl     who
501 Nat:                       [KATrin;=
                              M(\      )
                               <f    f>
```

Here, Ida has been telling Nat that another student that she knows but not names (*EIne*) will start working at her job place. Nat, however, cannot identify the referent of this *EIne*. After a pause, Ida produces the beginning of an identification sequence with the minimal syntactic clause *ICH KENN eine* and the beginning of a relative clause *die* which projects further identification talk. Nat, in order to prevent continued talk by Ida because she now has identified the referred-to person as *KATrin*, comes in exactly at the first possible end of Ida's possible syntactic clause or sentence, although this is not a possible completion of a TCU in this context. The early start could in this case be interpreted as a prevention of identification talk that is signalled as early as possible and thus orients to the rather formal first possible completion point of a possible syntactic construction.

So, in both cases, there seem to be interactional reasons that explain why the recipients react as early as possible and thus choose a place where a syntactic clause is, as it were, formally complete, although it is not a semantically and prosodically complete phrasing unit or TCU in the present context.

At the same time, these two examples also show that, regardless of the participants' early responses, the completeness of a TCU is a context-sensitive inference. In other sequential contexts, *ich hab NIE n eindruck* and *ICH KENN eine* could very well constitute complete TCUs.

References:

Chafe, Wallace L. (1993): Prosodic and functional units of language. In: Edwards, Jane A./Lampert, Martin D. (1993): *Talking Data. Transcription and coding in discourse research.* Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum, 33-43

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth (1996): Intonation and clause combining in discourse: The case of *because*. In: *Pragmatics* 6,3: 389-426

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth & Selting, Margret (1996): Towards an interactional perspective on prosody and a prosodic perspective on interaction. In: Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth & Selting, Margret (eds.) (1996), *Prosody in conversation. Interactional studies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 11-56

Ford, Cecilia/Fox, Barbara A./Thompson, Sandra A. (1996): Practices in the construction of turns: The 'TCU' revisited. In: *Pragmatics* 6,3: 427-454

Goodwin, Charles 1981: *Conversational Organization. Interaction between speakers and hearers.* New York etc.: Academic Press

Gumperz, John 1982: *Discourse strategies.* London: Cambridge University Press

Gumperz, John 1984: Comment on Peter Auers "On the meaning of conversational code-switching". In: Auer, Peter/di Luzio, Aldo (eds.): *Interpretive Sociolinguistics.* Tübingen: Narr, 108-112

Gumperz, John J. 1992: Contextualization revisited. In: Auer, Peter/di Luzio, Aldo (eds.): *The Contextualization of Language.* Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: Benjamins, 39-54

Günthner, Susanne (1996): From subordination to coordination? Verb-second position in German causal and concessive constructions. In: *Pragmatics* 6,3: 323-356

Halliday, Michael A.K. (1967): *Intonation and Grammar in British English.* The Hague: Mouton

Houtkoop, Hanneke/Mazeland, Harrie (1985): Turns and discourse units in everyday conversation. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 9: 595-619

Jefferson, Gail (1978): Sequential Aspects of Storytelling in Conversation. In: Schenkein, Jim (ed.): *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction.* New York: Academic Press, 219-248

Kallmeyer, Werner/Schütze, Fritz (1977): Zur Konstitution von Kommunikationsschemata der Sachverhaltsdarstellung. In: Wegner, Dirk (Hrsg.): *Gesprächsanalysen.* Hamburg: Buske, 159-274

Lerner, Gene (1996): On the "semi-permeable" character of grammatical units in conversation: conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In: Ochs, Elinor/Schegloff, Emanuel A./Thompson, Sandra A. (eds.): *Interaction and grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 238-276

Local, John (1992): Continuing and restarting. In: Auer, Peter/di Luzio, Aldo (eds.) (1992): *The Contextualization of Language.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 273-296

Local, John/Kelly, John (1986): Projection and 'silences': Notes on phonetic and conversational structure. In: *Human Studies* 9, 185-204

Local, John/Kelly, John/Wells, William H.G. 1986: Towards a phonology of conversation: Turn-taking in Tyneside English. In: *Journal of Linguistics* 22: 411-437

Local, John/Wells, William H.G./Sebba, Mark 1985: Phonology for Conversation. Phonetic aspects of turn delimitation in London Jamaican. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 9: 309-330

Psathas, George (1995): *Conversation Analysis. The Study of Talk-in-Interaction.* London etc.: Sage

Sacks, Harvey (1992): *Lectures on Conversation.* Volume II. Edited by Gail Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell

Sacks, Harvey/Schegloff, Emanuel A./Jefferson, Gail (1974) A simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50: 696-735

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1996): Turn-organization: one intersection of grammar and interaction. In: Ochs, Elinor/Schegloff, Emanuel A./Thompson, Sandra A. (eds.): *Interaction and grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 52-133

Selting, Margret (1994): Konstruktionen am Satzrand als interaktive Ressource in natürlichen Gesprächen. In: Haftka, Brigitte (Hrsg.): *Was determiniert Wortstellungsvariation? Studien zu einem Interaktionsfeld von Grammatik, Pragmatik und Sprachtypologie.* Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1994: 299-318

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

Selting, Margret (1996): On the interplay of syntax and prosody in the constitution of turn-constructional units and turns in conversation. In: *Pragmatics* 6,3: 357-388

Selting, Margret (1998): Fragments of units and/or TCUs. Manuscript, University of Potsdam

Selting, Margret/Auer,Peter/Barden, Birgit/Bergmann, Jörg/Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth/Günthner, Susanne/Meier, Christoph/Quasthoff, Uta/Schlobinski, Peter/Uhmann, Susanne (1998): Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem (GAT). In: *Linguistische Berichte* 173: 91-122

Tannen, Deborah (1979) What's in a frame? Surface evidence for underlying expectations. In: Freedle, R.O. (ed.): *New directions in discourse processing.* Norwood: Ablex, 137-181

Previously published in this series:

No.1 Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, Coherent Voicing. On Prosody in Conversational Reported Speech (1998)

No.2 Peter Auer, Zwischen Parataxe und Hypotaxe. 'Abhängige Hauptsätze' im gesprochenen und geschriebenen Deutsch (1998)

No.3 Susanne Günthner, Polyphony and the "Layering of Voices" in Reported Dialogues. An Analysis of the Use of Prosodic Devices in Everyday Reported Speech (1998)