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ABSTRACT

The dialogic nature of spoken interaction comes about not only by a regular transition of speakership among the participants but also by the constant production of responses of various kinds by the current recipient(s). While the phenomena facilitating the taking of turns have been well described, less attention has been paid to the organization of response. This paper describes prosodic-phonetic details of current speaker talk in the vicinity of a response. It attempts to unravel some of the cues leading the current recipient to produce certain types of response at certain points in the extended turn-at-talk. Based on excerpts from private American English telephone conversation, it shows that the occurrence of response or non-response systematically correlates with two distinct clusters of specific prosodic-phonetic parameters. Moreover, the specific strength of the response-allowing features in turn helps to contextualize specific degrees of pragmatic completion and co-occurs with specific types of responses.

*To access supplementary sound content for this chapter, go to http://intouch.emeraldinsight.com/sip8. See page viii for details.
1. INTRODUCTION

Smooth speaker transition is a task which is central to all participants in talk-in-interaction. Starting from observations such as that usually only one speaker speaks at a time, and that overlap and gaps between turns are brief, Sacks et al. (1974) claimed a system of turn-taking to be operative in conversation.\(^1\) For this ‘the smallest complete linguistic units that are interactively relevant’ (Selting, 2000: 114), turn-constructional units (TCU), are crucially important, since how they begin projects the kind of unit that is underway – a lexical, phrasal, clausal, sentential construction or even discoursal unit such as a story – and what will be required for that unit to be completed. This, in turn, is a basic pre-requisite for turn-taking, as the first possible completion of one such unit is a transition-relevance place (TRP), i.e. a place where turn-taking by the co-participants becomes relevant (Sacks et al. 1974: 703).

Projection itself, as has been pointed out by, e.g., Ford and Thompson (1996), Selting (1996, 2000), Lerner (1996) and Auer (1996), is accomplished by various language-organizational systems: syntax, lexis, prosody and pragmatics. Syntax makes it possible to infer the completion point (henceforth CP) of a unit on the basis of the obligatory elements of that unit and the specific co(n)text of the turn. Thus, a clausal unit is usually complete when all obligatory clausal elements that could not be retrieved from earlier turns, or from the general context of the utterance, have been produced (cf. Thompson and Couper-Kuhlen, 2005). Specific prosodic configurations indicate the end of a prosodic unit. Among these are a prosodic break, i.e. a pitch up-/down-step, changes in tempo etc. (e.g. Selting, 2000: 493), main pitch accents (e.g. Wells and Macfarlane, 1998) and final versus continuing intonation (cf. Sacks et al., 1974: 722; du Bois et al., 1992, 1993). Lexical cues can project compound TCUs such as if-then clauses (cf. Lerner, 1991, 1996) and multi-clausal TCUs, such as lists and stories (Selting, 2000). Pragmatic projection (or sequential projection, Lerner, 1996) takes account of the fact that certain conversational actions have action-specific endings, or make other conversational actions immediately relevant. Thus, a disagreeing response is usually followed by an account for the disagreement (cf. Ford, 2001; Ford et al., 2004); a joke is usually followed by a punchline, and a story by a point that makes the story worth telling (‘tellable point’, Selting, 2000). These necessary endings are projected by the preface (e.g. Schegloff, 2007) of the larger activity (did you hear what happened; there was an X who). Cues such as these, often in collaboration, ensure smooth turn-taking.

However, current recipients\(^2\) do not only come in by taking a turn – they can also produce continuers, for instance – and, in addition, they do not only come in at TRPs, even if competitive

---

1 See also my summary of this in Barth-Weingarten (2009).

2 In this paper, the terms (current) recipient and (current) listener are used interchangeably as short-cut ways to refer to the participant who is not producing the extended turn-at-talk under discussion. This implies no claim as to the fixedness of roles in conversation.
incomings (French and Local, 1983) are left aside for the moment. Producing non-turn contributions regularly at non-TRPs becomes particularly relevant during the current speaker’s accomplishment of multi-unit turns, i.e. compound TCUs (cf. Lerner, 1996), such as if/when-then- or pseudo-cleft constructions, and extended turns-at-talk, such as stories, descriptions, complex arguments, jokes, direction-givings etc. (cf. Selting, 2000). Here then, possible current listener activities range from taking full turns via producing assessments and brief questions, the taking of non-turns, such as anticipatory completions as well as continuers (Lerner, 1996; Gardner, 2001) to actually refraining from any verbal utterance at all.3

With this variety of possible responses, the question arises as to when current listeners produce what as responses to extended turns-at-talk; and further, whether there are any cues in the current speaker’s talk leading them to produce specific items at a particular point in the turn.

Research literature already provides some initial answers. It seems that while listener activities are not necessarily tied to TRPs, this does not mean that they are scattered across extended turns at will. Rather, they are frequently produced at specific points in the turn, and TCUs and TRPs play a major part in this.

For Selting (1996, 2000), a TCU ending is determined by a syntactic CP co-occurring with a prosodic CP, i.e. a prosodic unit ending. TRPs, in turn, are determined pragmatically/sequentially: they are potential CPs of activity types. If the activity is accomplished by an extended turn-at-talk, a TRP occurs only at the end of the TCU which resolves the projected end of the activity. Hence, we need to distinguish between TCUs with TRPs, such as, e.g., the final TCU of a story, and TCUs without TRPs, such as story-internal TCUs. On this basis then, Selting (2000: 511, my emphasis) observed that in German TCUs with TRPs are regularly followed by ‘recipiency tokens and other responses’, while TCUs without TRPs are followed by recipiency tokens only. Hence, in German, TCU endings (i.e. syntactic CPs with prosodic breaks) are of vital importance to the placement of responses of all kinds, while TRPs (i.e. syntactic CPs with prosodic CPs which are also possibly pragmatically complete, i.e. a possible ending of the activity type) appear to be relevant for the placement of the type of responses produced, in that they are a pre-requisite for the production of responses other than response tokens with multi-unit turns.

While Selting made no attempt at relating certain kinds of response tokens to specific prosodic-phonetic unit endings, Kern (2007) studied the employment of prosody, in particular unit-final pitch movements, in German children’s game explanations as a resource for making specific response activities relevant: while final rising-to-mid pitch projects more to come and signals no expectation of response, final-high pitch can, but need not, project continuation and

---

3 Visual responses are equally important. Yet, with the kind of material investigated here (cf. Section 2), they have been disregarded.
makes response relevant. Final-falling-to-mid pitch, in turn, signals turn-ending and makes more elaborate responses relevant. Other cues, such as phonetic features, were not taken into account.

In (American) English, too, we can assume that recipient responses within turns are placed in an orderly fashion. Lerner (1996, cf. Gardner, 2001) observed them to occur at or around\(^4\) TRPs and at specific places within TCU$s$, namely at (or around) so-called ‘opportunity places’. An opportunity place occurs at the point of completion of the preliminary component of a compound TCU (Lerner, 1991), such as the end of the *if*-part of an *if-then*-construction, but also at the end of the first part of two-part formats, such as complaints with disparaging reference and complainable action (Lerner, 1996: 25), i.e. it is indicated lexico-syntactically and/or pragmatically. Lerner also considers prosodic features, if in a somewhat subordinate role: in brackets he mentions that they are used to indicate preliminary component completion, and thus a place for current recipients to come in ‘in a fashion similar to those used to produce and recognize TCU completion’ (:241).

Among the prosodic parameters he describes are phenomena which are assumed to be indicative of prosodic unit endings in English (cf. Cruttenden, 1986; du Bois et al., 1992, 1993), namely a slight pause, and sound stretch (final lengthening). To these, he adds the terminal intonation contour, which ‘can certify . . . syntactic constituents as complete’ (Lerner, 1996: 243). There is, however, no detailed study of the relationship between prosody and response.

While Lerner focuses on specific points within a larger turn, Ford and Thompson (1996) study speaker change in general in American English face-to-face conversation. They stress the relevance of the combination of syntactic, prosodic and pragmatic completion in this regard (see also Oreström, 1983; Ford, 1993): speaker change occurs overwhelmingly when all three types of completion are present, i.e. where syntactic units, in their discourse context, can be considered complete (Ford and Thompson, 1996: 143), where an intonation unit ends (with boundary features such as pitch and speech rate changes) with a clear final contour (falling to low or rising to high in the speaker’s range) (:145–146) and where the conversational action could be considered complete within its specific sequential context (:150). The latter, is reminiscent of Selting’s notion of pragmatic completion. Yet, Ford and Thompson, in fact, distinguish between two types of pragmatic completion: local and global. Global pragmatic CPs are points at which ‘the utterance is not projecting anything beyond itself’ (:151), for instance the punchline of a joke. Local pragmatic CPs are points at which ‘the speaker is projecting more talk, but at which another speaker might reasonably take a minimal turn, such as offering a continuer, display of interest or claim of understanding . . . [i.e.] a small non-floor taking turn’ (:150), for instance the end of a story-preface. Whether this difference in the degree of pragmatic completion, or in terms of any of the other cues potentially correlating with it, makes any difference with regard to the type of response produced, cannot be inferred from Ford/Thompson’s paper as they subsume the taking of full

\(^4\) This means within the normal space for transition (Sacks, 1992: 746).
turns and the production of all sorts of non-turn-claiming utterances, such as continuers, claims of understanding, collaborative completions etc. under the notion of speaker change.

In sum, for American English there has so far been no systematic study of the correlation between certain types of responses and certain pragmatic CPs in extended turn-at-talk and/or certain cues, potentially prosodic in nature, co-occurring with them. Also, studies of the prosodic features in the vicinity of current listener’s responses have often focused on final pitch movements only (cf. Ford and Thompson, 1996), even though there have been doubts as to pitch being the only discriminating factor (Szczepek Reed, 2004; cf. Wells and Macfarlane, 1998; Schegloff, 1996, 1998). Moreover, phonetic features, such as glottal closure, creaky voice quality, the aspirated release of final plosives and the like, whose relevance for turn-taking has been described for dialects of British English (e.g. Local et al., 1985, 1986; Local and Kelly, 1986; Walker, 2004) and other languages, such as Finnish (e.g. Ogden, 2004), have also hardly been considered in studies of speaker change in American English conversation.

This paper presents a number of observations on the placement of responses to extended turns-at-talk in American English. In particular, it will focus on the placement and type of responses produced in multi-unit turns, and correlate them with the form and function of prosodic-phonetic parameters in current speaker’s talk preceding such responses. It will be noticeable that, firstly, it depends on the type of pragmatic completion in combination with the kind of prosodic-phonetic packaging of the ends of the individual TCU-sized constituents of the extended turn whether, one, a token of response is produced or not, and, two, of what sort this token of response will preferably be. This paper will thereby contribute to describing the exact fashion in which prosodic-phonetic features can be used as cues by the current listener to infer where which type of response is appropriate.

The remainder of the paper will first present a description of the data and method used (Section 2). This will be followed by a detailed analysis of the placement of responses and the prosodic-phonetic features accompanying them in four sample excerpts (Section 3). The observations made will be summarized and discussed in Section 4. The paper concludes with a brief consideration of some wider implications of the findings (Section 5).

2. DATA AND METHOD

A considerable number of studies have pointed out the relevance of body movements and gaze in the organization of turn-taking (e.g. Duncan and Fiske, 1977; Goodwin, 1979, 1995; Streeck and Hartge, 1992; Ford et al. 1996 etc.). These cues can be expected to be similarly important for the organization of responses to multi-unit turns. However, to be able to focus on prosody, syntax, lexis and pragmatics alone and to have all communicative channels of the participants available as an analyst, it was decided to restrict the material for the study to telephone conversations only.
In particular, the study made use of material from the CallHome corpus. This corpus is a collection of telephone conversations of native American English speakers with relatives or friends abroad and was recorded in the 1990s. The current study included 10 recordings totaling 4 h 10 min of American English (speaker) talk.

The analysis draws upon the approaches of Phonology/Phonetics for conversation and Interactional Linguistics. Phonology/Phonetics for conversation aims at ‘an integrated account of the communicative function of parametric phonetic detail and its relationship with interactional organization’ (Local and Walker, 2005: 120). For this, it employs ‘a thoroughgoing phonetic and sequential analysis of talk-in-interaction’ (ibid., my emphasis) considering all details potentially relevant (cf. Local et al., 1986; Kelly and Local, 1989; Ogden, 2004; Walker, 2004). Interactional Linguistics attempts to uncover the participants’ orderly use of linguistic patterns to achieve particular goals in natural interaction, i.e. it treats linguistic devices as resources. Interactional Linguistics takes into account all aspects of language structure and use. It is, for the most part, based on theoretical assumptions and methods of Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis,5 such as using detailed single-case analyses to inductively uncover the participants’ categories and resources (members’ devices) and to warrant its claims via the participants’ behavior (cf. Wootton, 1989; see also Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, 1996, 2001; Selting and Couper-Kuhlen, 2000, 2001; Couper-Kuhlen and Ford, 2004; Barth-Weingarten, 2008).

Case studies provide an ideal starting point to develop hypotheses on a new object of study with ample consideration of the specific sequential context of their instances (cf. Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). In the main part of this paper I will therefore present four detailed case studies of sample excerpts in order to illustrate the placement of responses to extended turns-at-talk in American English telephone conversation, and highlight the prosodic-phonetic parameters of current speaker’s talk in the vicinity of these responses by means of specific examples. A summary and discussion of the observations is provided in Section 4.

In terms of prosodic-phonetic parameters, the analyses have yielded pitch (movement, range and peaks), intensity and speech rate changes, breathing and aspiration and voice quality as parameters relevant at the possible CPs. In an attempt to pin down pragmatic completion in terms of pragmatic criteria and to dismiss prosody and response type as (potentially circular) criteria in the framework of the current study, the CPs have been identified from an on-line perspective (cf. Auer, 2000) using pragmatic criteria drawn from sequence analysis (cf. Schegloff, 2007). Thus, local CPs are points in the extended turn-at-talk where some action contributing to some larger action/activity is possibly complete, such as the preface of a story making a story relevant or the rejection of an offer making an account relevant. Global pragmatic CPs, in turn, are the endpoints of some larger action/activity, which deals with the relevancies set up by (a) the previous turn (cf. Ford et al. 1996: 437; also
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5 For an introduction to CA, see Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998), ten Have (1999) and Schegloff (2007).
Jefferson, 1973), such as the answer to a question, or (b) the onset of the current turn, such as the
tellable point of a story or the account of the rejection of an offer.

The prosodic-phonetic analysis is, first and foremost, based on auditory inspection, as this method
yields ‘data’ which are most similar to those the participants have at their disposal in interaction.
Acoustic prosodic-phonetic measurements using PRAAT (5.0.12, Boersma/Weenink 1992–2008,
http://www.praat.org) have been carried out to quantify the auditory impression for the sake of the
argument. This complementary method has in this paper only been applied to the pitch phenomena,
but should ideally be extended to intensity and speech rate in further work. All examples discussed
can be accessed at (the volume’s webpage) (http://intouch.emeraldinsight.com/).

3. Case Studies

This section presents four case studies on the placement of responses to extended turns-at-talk
and the prosodic-phonetic parameters accompanying them. It will show that specific types of
responses are produced at specific places in the turn and that these correlate with certain clusters
of prosodic-phonetic features.

Excerpt 7.1 is taken from a conversation between two nuns, Bonny and Ann. Bonny, currently
in South America, is trying to arrange for a missionary to meet Ann and her colleagues at
Rosemount College in the United States. The missionary is hoping to attract some of them to go
and work in the South American mission station. The excerpt begins just after a lengthy report by
Bonny praising the missionary’s qualities and suggesting how they might proceed, including the
possibility that Ann might phone him.

Excerpt 7.1. Sunday evening liturgy (CallHome, 4705, 866–909 sec)\textsuperscript{a}

\begin{verbatim}
866 Bon:  so
867 Ann:  how does that sound to you
868 Ann:  well
869 Ann:  I would be delighted to call him
870 Bon:  \[yes\[ 
871 Ann:  \[uhm we have a (.) great
873 not a great but
875 there is a significant minority
877 of students on campus
879 who are interested in spanish speaking
880 or
881 who are spanish-speaking
883 \[uhm and who also have an interest
\end{verbatim}
At the end of her lengthy report, Bonny enquires about Ann’s opinion on the matter (lines 866–867). Ann responds with a syntactically possibly complete acceptance of Bonny’s suggestion (lines 868–869). However, this acceptance is marked as dispreferred by lexico-syntactic means (well and would – note the difference to ‘I’d be delighted’), which make relevant continuation with some kind of account or other explanation for the dispreferred format (cf. Ford et al., 2004). In expectation of this, Bonny greets Ann’s acceptance of the suggestion as initial to further talk and produces an acknowledgement only (line 870). Ann then continues with a multi-unit description of how the plan could actually be put into practice. Preceded by a description of the situation at Rosemount which provides the accounting background for her further suggestions (lines 871–881 (with repairs in lines 873 and 880–881), 883, 885), it complements Bonny’s suggestions with further possible details (lines 888–893, 896–900). In the course of this multi-unit description we find a number of possible syntactic CPs (e.g. at the ends of lines 875, 877, 881 etc.). Of these, a number can be singled out...
again as possible pragmatic CPs from an on-line perspective. Local pragmatic CPs can be identified at the end of

- line 881: Ann announced a piece of background information relevant in the current account of an arguably dispreferred response to Bonny’s idea including a repair of a first attempt at line 879.
- line 885: Ann announced another piece of background information relevant in the current account of an arguably dispreferred response to Bonny’s idea.

Global pragmatic CPs can be identified

- at the end of line 892: Ann made another suggestion as to the further proceedings with regard to Bonny’s idea and thereby provided a possible account for the dispreferred format of the initial response. Provided Bonny knows who Joanne Sullivan is, Ann’s turn could stop here.
- at the end of line 893: Ann extended her additional suggestion with some information allowing recognition (Sacks and Schegloff, 1979; Schegloff, 1982; Stivers et al., 2007).
- line 896 after deal: Ann has made a second suggestion as to the further proceedings with regard to Bonny’s idea and thereby provided another possible account for the dispreferred format of the initial response.
- line 896 after comes: Ann has extended on the second suggestion as to the further proceedings with regard to Bonny’s idea.
- line 896 after liturgy: Ann has further extended on the second suggestion.
- line 900 after students: Ann added a second aspect to the second suggestion accomplished by line 896.
- line 900 after before: Ann provided a detail on this second aspect.
- line 900 after after: Ann provided a further detail on this second aspect.

Line 888, in contrast, should not be counted as pragmatic CP, as it only repeats part of Bonny’s idea, for which the extensive introduction of background information would not have been necessary. Moreover, the end of line 869 is janus-faced in terms of its status as a pragmatic CP: on the one hand, it deals with the relevancies set up by the previous turn (answering Bonny’s enquiry as to her accepting of the suggested further proceedings). On the other hand, this action is accomplished in a dispreferred format, which makes an account relevant and therefore blocks the potential TRP. Therefore its ends (…) delighted, …him), too, can be counted as a local CP.

In sum, schematically, and in retrospect, the local and global pragmatic CPs of Ann’s response to Bonny’s enquiry could be pictured as shown in Schema 7.1a.

If we add to this the responses provided by Bonny, we obtain a picture as shown in Schema 7.1b.

We see that mere continuers (yes, yeah) occur at local pragmatic CPs, while global pragmatic CPs, that is those where the response to Bonny’s question could be complete, are responded to
with more elaborate responses, including assessments and full turns. These findings are largely consistent with those by Selting for German (cf. Section 1).

It is notable, however, within their type, neither all local nor all global pragmatic CPs are responded to in the same way: the first additional suggestion (line 892), for instance, needs to be extended (line 893) to receive a then very enthusiastic response with change-of-state token, agreement and assessment, while the second suggestion (line 896) initially only gets an oh and...
that also only at its third possible CP. The end of the detailing extension of this suggestion (line 900c), in contrast to these two earlier CPs, is responded to with an assessment which comes close to a full turn, while the initial possible CPs in this line, *students and before*, are not greeted by responses. Yet, none of these different responses are treated as problematic by Ann. Hence, although these TCU-endings are similar within their type in terms of syntactic and pragmatic completion, they nevertheless are differently oriented to by the current listener.

To figure out potential cues for Bonny to infer what may be appropriate at these particular points in the extended turn-at-talk, we can turn to prosodic-phonetic parameters. With detailed analyses of this and the following examples I will argue that, just like turn-endings, also syntactic-pragmatic CPs *within* the turn are co-occurring with certain clusters of prosodic-phonetic parameters.

Table 7.1 gives a detailed survey of the prosodic-phonetic phenomena observable. From this we can see that, given syntactic and pragmatic completion, responses are produced when at the possible CP we find

- more extensive pitch falls to near the bottom of the speaker’s pitch range,\(^6\) or pitch rises,
- intensity decreases,
- latched inbreaths,
- outbreath or aspiration of the unit-final phonic segment,
- glottalization\(^7\) and/or
- final lengthening.\(^8\)

---

\(^6\) This phenomenon often co-occurs with the auditory impression of glottalization (cf. Footnote 7). As PRAAT is unable to obtain reliable values in these cases, the relevant hertz values and semitone figures in the tables have been hand-calculated based on manually measuring the distance between similar pitch events in the PRAAT F\(_0\) trace and pulses in the spectrogram and, depending on the glottalization phenomenon involved, using a median (with aperiodicity), the lowest hertz value (with creak), or a range of values (with diplophonia/creaky voice and glottal squeak).

\(^7\) For want of a better term (cf. the uses and discussion of glottalization and laryngealization in Abercrombie, 1971; Laver, 1980, 1994, for instance) and following Redi and Shattuck-Hufnagel (2001), “glottalization” is used here as a cover term for various kinds of (possibly related, cf. Laver, 1994: 195) voice qualities (such as creak, aperiodicity, diplophonia/creaky voice and glottal squeak) around CPs, whose auditory effect is – to a greater or lesser degree – that of a tap running along railings (Catford, 1964: 32). Acoustically, it presents itself, for instance, as a series of irregularly spaced pitch periods (aperiodicity), alternation of longer and shorter periods (diplophonia/creaky voice), pulses with increasingly greater periods (creak) or a sudden shift to higher sustained F\(_0\) (glottal squeak), with often, but not necessarily, low amplitude (cf. Redi and Shattuck-Hufnagel, 2001). Also, unusually low voice (with periodic F\(_0\)) yields a similar impression, yet no attempt has been made to differentiate between them, as there are as yet no hints as to their functionally different employment.

\(^8\) This refers to an audibly prolonged production of the unit-final syllable(s) in comparison to its/their unit-internal realization. At this stage in the study, no acoustic measurements have been employed to check this yet.
Table 7.1. Prosodic–phonetic features at syntactic–pragmatic CPs in Excerpt 7.1, lines 867–904

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible syntactic–pragmatic CPs</th>
<th>Type of CP projection</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pitch movement final peak-end</th>
<th>Pitch ending</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Lengthening</th>
<th>Latching</th>
<th>Held glottal closure</th>
<th>Out-breath/aspiration</th>
<th>In-breath</th>
<th>Glottalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...I would be delighted (line 869a)</td>
<td>local account</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>−5 ST down-step + level</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>&lt; =</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...to call him (line 869b)</td>
<td>local account</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>(−15 ST) down-step</td>
<td>(74)</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>(aperiod.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...who are Spanish-speaking (line 881)</td>
<td>local repair/addition account</td>
<td>yeah</td>
<td>(+2 ST) early peak down-step + level + slight final rise</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>(x) (2 syll.s before end)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...in some kind of social outrage (line 885)</td>
<td>local account</td>
<td>yeah</td>
<td>(−13 ST) down-step + level</td>
<td>(250–260)</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>(x) (diploph.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...calling joanne sullivan (line 892)</td>
<td>global</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>(−6 ST) down-step</td>
<td>(160)</td>
<td>&lt; =</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...who is the campus minister at</td>
<td>global</td>
<td>&lt;oh ye&gt;great</td>
<td>(−20 ST) down-step + level</td>
<td>(74)</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x (aperiod.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rosemount](line 893)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...and maybe working out some kind of a deal (line 896a)</td>
<td>global</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...whereby he comes (line 896b)</td>
<td>global</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... and ... offers a Sunday evening liturgy (line 896c)</td>
<td>global</td>
<td>oh</td>
<td>(−19 ST) down-step + level</td>
<td>(G 65)</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x (aperiod.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... and visits with the students (line 900a)</td>
<td>global</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>(−1 ST down-step)</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... before (line 900b)</td>
<td>global</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... or after (line 900c)</td>
<td>global</td>
<td>full turn assessment</td>
<td>(−19 ST) down-step</td>
<td>(G 62)</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x (aperiod.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In contrast, response signals are lacking when at the possible CP we find
  
  - pitch remaining level,
  - intensity remaining the same,
  - latching of the beginning of the next unit,
  - no outbreath/aspiration,
  - no glottalization and/or
  - final lengthening.

From this example it seems that not only certain pitch movements but a variety of prosodic-phonetic features are observable in the vicinity of responses in multi-unit turns, and that these are systematically distributed – even if not all of them need to be present simultaneously. Apart from final lengthening, the prosodic-phonetic features seem to be divisible into two basic feature clusters, one occurs with responses (therefore response-‘allowing’), the other occurs without responses (therefore response-‘blocking’). Their effect is observable in the context of both local and global CPs: compare, for instance, lines 869a and b, and lines 892 and 893 for the distribution of response-blocking and response-allowing features respectively.

It is also interesting to note that the more turn-like responses (after lines 893, 896c and 900c) do not only follow global pragmatic CPs, but also a specific realization of the response-allowing prosodic-phonetic features, as the global CPs are marked by a more extensive set of features than local CPs, such as line 881. Some exceptions to this distribution are local CPs with an open projection (line 869b, line 885). Apparently, they can occur with extensive response-allowing marking – though note that the pitch ranges covered are not quite as large as with the projection-resolving CPs – yet, at the same time, the larger projection secures the floor (cf. Selting, 2000: 508), so that the current recipient still only produces a continuer. In terms of this potential kind of organization of the display of understanding, it is interesting to note that it is these ‘intermediarily marked’ CPs in particular which can be considered some kind of higher level local pragmatic CP: the end of line 869b is the end of the preface of the multi-unit turn; line 885 is the end of a larger sequence of background information. With both of these CPs, displaying understanding or acknowledgement is relevant for the further course of the multi-unit turn, and the more extensive prosodic-phonetic marking of these points seems to pursue these displays, while at the same time the floor is secured. Hence, it seems that there are iconic parallels in the strength of prosodic-phonetic marking and the degree of completion of units of syntax, semantics and pragmatics or action organization in interaction. In this regard, it is also revealing that syntactic CPs which are

---

9 Some of these features have already been mentioned in the context of rush-through (cf. Schegloff, 1996; Barth-Weingarten, 2003; Walker, to appear).
not at the same time pragmatic CPs, such as line 877, usually do not receive a response, and, at the same time, are also usually marked by an even less extensive set of response-allowing markers. However, due to space restrictions of this paper the issue of iconicity can only be touched upon here (but cf. Barth-Weingarten and Couper-Kuhlen, to appear).

In sum, from Excerpt 7.1 we have seen evidence for the realization of two distinctive clusters of prosodic-phonetic features at CPs and their co-occurrence with certain types of responses at specific points in the multi-unit turn. The placement and extent of the cluster features seems to correlate with the distinction between global and (certain types of) local pragmatic CPs, which, in turn, correlates with responses ranging between full turn-taking, at one extreme, and no response at the other. Figure 7.1 depicts the relationship between the extensiveness of prosodic boundary marking, the occurrence of global and local CPs and the elaborateness of responses.

While this first example suggests a rather straightforward relationship between pragmatic completion and prosodic-phonetic realization, the next example, although it in general supports the earlier observations, also shows that the prosodic-phonetic marking of CPs is not quite as simple. Here Barbra and Anita are talking to each other. They are teacher friends, who had the opportunity to work abroad. Whereas Anita chose to do so, Barbra decided against it, but has now opted for a sabbatical year, though not at the place where Anita is staying. When Anita teases her about that, Barbra feels the need to lay out the decision process again (Excerpt 7.2).
Excerpt 7.2. Huge decision (CallHome, 6479, 289–335 sec)

285 Bar: [((laughing))]
285.5 Ani: [Barbra]
285.8 you’re making a big mistake
286 by not r[unning on over here] [(.)] [((laughing))]
287.4 Bar: [((laughing))] [.hhh[h I know]
289 I kn-h-ow
290 well it was
292 .h it was such a huge decision a[nita]
293 Ani: [yeah]
294 [oh I totally understand]
294.7 Bar: [I (was/wish) like I a]gonized over it
296.2 Ani: uh-huh
296.7 Bar: and then (. I thought okay
298.7 I I
299 and part of the thing was
300 I realized (well/what) you (have to) (is) such a b-
302 if you’re agonizing over this so much
303 then maybe I should just take a year off
305 an[
306 Ani: [m-h[m m] m-hm]
307 Bar: [.hh]h[hhhh]hhhh you know travel
309 an work
310 or (. just do whatever
311 Ani: m-hm[
311.6 Bar: [so I’m (. I mean a at first I’ve
313 (well/when) I first .h said okay
315 that’s what I (wanna) do
316 .h I felt like such a cop-out
318 Ani: [rea[lly ]
319 Bar: .hh[h [and th]en
320 I was like
321 no way
322 this would be really fun
323 Ani: (0.4)
324 Bar: well I think it would be really good for me too
325 bec[ause i’m] afraid i’m getting so boring
In the excerpt, Barbra, after having acknowledged the tease in a playful way (lines 287.4–289), provides an assessment of the difficulty of the decision and then starts an account as to what made it so difficult (lines 290–292, 294.7). The first part of this two-part structure (cf. Schegloff, 1996) is greeted by Anita with an immediate affiliative response in overlap with a term of address (line 293) and the beginning of the following account for the assessment (line 294), which is the multi-unit turn to be discussed here in more detail (lines 294.7–325). It is only interrupted by a range of response tokens and it ends with a topic-shifting assessment of the kind of decision Barbra took and an account for this assessment, which is a self-deprecation and thus makes a counter, i.e. a full turn, by Anita relevant. This, or rather a surprised topicalization of it, can be found in line 328.

Schema 7.2 summarizes the global and local pragmatic CPs and the responses produced upon their occurrence (see next page).

Again, as in Excerpt 7.1, the basic types of responses are clearly divided in their distribution: continuers co-occur with local syntactic-pragmatic CPs, while global CPs are accompanied by more elaborate responses. An exception to this clear division is the comparatively extensive response to the local CP in line 292, which points towards the complexity of the system: for an explanation, one arguably has to turn to the kind of action accomplished in the previous turn. Apart from it being a preface to a multi-unit turn, it has an evaluative character, which is also a serious reaction to Anita’s earlier tease (on po-faced responses to teases cf. Drew, 1987). Upon this then, immediate and possibly also extensive affiliation may be relevant, as is produced in lines 293–294. Hence, the prosodic-phonetic realization of this CP, which apparently goes against the hypotheses laid out before, can be explained by the sensitivity of the prosodic-phonetic features to the action accomplished by the unit at hand (for similar observations cf. below and Excerpt 7.4). With this in mind, we can return to checking the other hypotheses: here, too, we find differences in the responses to the CP within each type: global CPs are responded to by a continuer acknowledging news (uh-huh), a full turn or no response at all. Local CPs are receipted with continuers, a low and flat news receipt (really) or no response at all. Table 7.2 shows that, as before, certain prosodic-phonetic cues can explain these different types of responses.

As with Excerpt 7.1, final lengthening is unsystematically distributed, but responses are systematically produced after unit-final pitch falls to near the bottom of the speaker’s pitch range, or
pitch rises, intensity decreases, latched inbreaths, outbreath or aspiration of the unit-final phonetic segment and/or glottalization. These prosodic-phonetic features making response relevant can even override syntactic projection as in line 316. The only exception to this is the global CP in line 322. Here, the response-allowing marking receives no response. Yet, note that the current speaker orients to this by pursuing response by shifting the focus to a topic more accessible to her interlocutor from this would be really fun (line 322) to it would be really good for me too (line 324). Hence, at least for the current speaker response was relevant here, too. This pursuit of response, in fact, suggests that the giving of response is potentially similarly accountable as the taking of a turn.

A lack of response (signals) correlates with pitch ending mid and lack of outbreath/aspiration and/or glottalization; and, again, originally response-allowing cluster features, such as more extensive pitch movements (line 321), pitch rises (lines 307, 309), intensity swells (line 309), are blocked by latching and this time also held glottal closure (Local and Kelly, 1986). These features also block the global pragmatic CP in line 296.7.

**Schema 7.2.** Summary of global and local CPs with their respective responses in Excerpt 7.2. (Gardner (2001) categorized *uh huh* as a continuer. However, in my data it seems to also be used as a change-of-state token which is more neutral than *oh*. This point, however, awaits further study.)
| Possible syntactic–pragmatic CPs | Type of CP projection | Response | Pitch movement final peak-end | Pitch ending | Intensity | Lengthening | Latching | Held glottal closure | Out-breath/aspiration | In-breath | Glottalization |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|------------------------------|-------------|-----------|------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|----------------|---|
| it was such a huge decision    | local → account       | fyeah oh i totally understand | −25 ST but early peak steady fall | 77          | =         |            |         |                     |                     |           |                |   |
| (line 292)                      |                       |          |                              |             |           |            |         |                     |                     |           |                |   |
| ...I agonized over it          | global                | uh-huh   | +4 ST rising                  | 340         | < >       | x          |         |                     |                     |           | ?              |   |
| (line 294.7)                    |                       |          |                              |             |           |            |         |                     |                     |           |                |   |
| and then I thought okay        | global                | −        | (−6 ST) step-down + level    | (150)       | < >       | x          | x       | x                   |                     |           |                |   |
| (line 296.7)                    |                       |          |                              |             |           |            |         |                     |                     |           |                |   |
| ...I should just take a year off| local → complete frame| m-hm     | (−10 ST) but early peak steady fall | (9/132)    | < >       | x          |         |                     |                     |           |                |   |
| (line 303)                      |                       |          |                              |             |           |            |         |                     |                     |           |                |   |
| and ...travel                   | local → complete      | −        | +4 ST fall-rise               | 258         | =         | x          | x       |                     |                     |           |                |   |
| (line 307)                      |                       |          |                              |             |           |            |         |                     |                     |           |                |   |
| and work                        | local → complete      | −        | +3 ST rise                   | 241         | < >       | x          | x       |                     |                     |           |                |   |
| (line 309)                      |                       |          |                              |             |           |            |         |                     |                     |           |                |   |
| or just do whatever            | local → complete      | m-hm     | (−19 ST +15 ST) fall-rise    | (83/200)    | >         | x          |         |                     |                     |           |                |   |
| (line 310)                      |                       |          |                              |             |           |            |         |                     |                     |           |                |   |

**Table 7.2.** Prosodic–phonetic features at syntactic-pragmatic CPs in Excerpt 7.2, lines 292–325

Speaker range in Hz

Min. = 72  Med. = 211  Max. = 486
Table 7.2. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible syntactic-pragmatic CPs</th>
<th>Type of CP projection</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pitch movement final peak-end</th>
<th>Pitch ending</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Lengthening</th>
<th>Latching</th>
<th>Held glottal closure</th>
<th>Out-breath/aspiration</th>
<th>In-breath</th>
<th>Glottalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>when I first … I felt like such a cop-out (line 316)</td>
<td>local-&gt; then</td>
<td>really</td>
<td>(-10 ST) down-step + final level</td>
<td>(≥ 103)</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>(more or less period.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… no way (line 321)</td>
<td>global</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+ 5 ST -13 ST rise-down-step</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this would be really fun (line 322)</td>
<td>global</td>
<td>- but pursuit</td>
<td>(-18 ST + 11 ST) fall-rise</td>
<td>(≥ 127)/238</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(aperiod. + squeak)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well ... it would be really good for me too (line 324)</td>
<td>local-&gt; account</td>
<td>[m-hm]</td>
<td>-10 ST but early peak + fall -2 ST + 2 ST final fall-rise</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>&lt; =</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because ... I'm getting so boring (line 325)</td>
<td>global (self-deprecat.)</td>
<td>(-) full turn</td>
<td>(upto -11 ST + 18 ST) fall-rise</td>
<td>(147 ≥ 164/83–200/217)</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>(period. + aperiod. + diploph. + squeak)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible syntactic-pragmatic CPs</th>
<th>Type of CP projection</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pitch movement final peak-end</th>
<th>Pitch ending</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Lengthening</th>
<th>Latching</th>
<th>Held glottal closure</th>
<th>Out-breath/aspiration</th>
<th>In-breath</th>
<th>Glottalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>when I first … I felt like such a cop-out (line 316)</td>
<td>local-&gt; then</td>
<td>really</td>
<td>(-10 ST) down-step + final level</td>
<td>(≥ 103)</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>(more or less period.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… no way (line 321)</td>
<td>global</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+ 5 ST -13 ST rise-down-step</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this would be really fun (line 322)</td>
<td>global</td>
<td>- but pursuit</td>
<td>(-18 ST + 11 ST) fall-rise</td>
<td>(≥ 127)/238</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(aperiod. + squeak)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well ... it would be really good for me too (line 324)</td>
<td>local-&gt; account</td>
<td>[m-hm]</td>
<td>-10 ST but early peak + fall -2 ST + 2 ST final fall-rise</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>&lt; =</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because ... I'm getting so boring (line 325)</td>
<td>global (self-deprecat.)</td>
<td>(-) full turn</td>
<td>(upto -11 ST + 18 ST) fall-rise</td>
<td>(147 ≥ 164/83–200/217)</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>(period. + aperiod. + diploph. + squeak)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interestingly, the response-blocking features seem to work less well at the end of line 324. Yet, note that here, again, the specific action accomplished may play a role: this response follows an assessment, which may make response relevant no matter what kinds of prosodic-phonetic signals are produced at its ending. As a result, a rhythmically integrated (cf. Couper-Kuhlen, this volume), overlapped continuer is produced in spite of Barbra’s continuation. This provides further evidence as to the possible effect of the specific kind of action carried out by the response-preceding unit.

Moreover, similar to Excerpt 7.1, there is a somewhat iconic relationship between pragmatic completion and prosodic-phonetic marking: we find global CPs to be accompanied with more extensive prosodic-phonetic markings (e.g. line 322 vs. 303), even though some of them are afterwards blocked from response (lines 296.7, 321). An exception to this is, as in the previous example, a relatively extensive marking of a local pragmatic CP which constitutes a higher level local pragmatic CP: line 310 is the end of a larger insert on the background (also marked by a list completer and the discourse marker so by the current speaker herself), the understanding of which is relevant for the further course of the multi-unit turn. Therefore, acknowledgement may be ‘pursued’ by extensive prosodic-phonetic marking while the floor is secure.

Finally, one needs to note the relatively ambivalent marking of line 325 with glottalization, intensity swell and large pitch movements on the one hand and average pitch values remaining relatively high as well as pausing and an inbreath – arguably preparing a sigh – on the other, which could question the relevance of response. Yet, note that the action accomplished by this TCU is a self-deprecation, which prefers immediate disagreement. By keeping the end of her turn ambiguous as to whether it will be continued, Barbra could be assumed to provide Anita with a response slot extended for the latter to produce that disagreement ‘immediately’, which Anita, after some delay filled by the longish, sigh-preparing in-breath by Barbra, does in line 328.

In sum, this example provides further support for our initial observations. Deviations can be explained by local contingencies.

The third example of a multi-unit turn is taken from a conversation between two men, Adam and Daryl, who are teachers of English in the United States and in Japan respectively. They have just been co-complaining about how bad students of English are. Daryl then moves on to reporting on potential job alternatives he found for himself. This example is revealing in terms of voice quality as the current speaker’s voice, due to its low range, gives the impression of overall creakiness, so that glottalization may lose its signalling value (Excerpt 7.3).

---

10 A similar observation has been made by Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (personal communication). She suggests that this may have to do with the special relevancies set up by first assessments (cf. Pomerantz, 1984).
Excerpt 7.3. Good possibilities (CallHome, 4792, 409–431 sec)

406 Dar: [(uh/well you] know thinking of that kind of teaching
position I can live without

408 Adm: [ ( )

409 [yah ]

409.3 Dar: [as a matter of fact I got I got a couple o’good possibilities
now

411 I told you

412 Adm: [m-hm;

412.8 Dar: ((nasal inbreath))

413 uh one h is uh you know doing media type uh ventures

417 Adm: m-hm

418 Dar: (0.6) and I’m negotiating with them

421 Adm: [yah

421.3 Dar: .h[and there’s this uh computer thing

423 Adm: [h]m

423.8 Dar: .hh[h] uh coming up in March

425 Adm: [.hh

426 Dar: [.hh and believe it or not

427 they want me to be the president h[h ]

428 Adm: [hu]h

428.5 .hh[hh ]

429 Dar: [.hh ] of the company hh

430 ( .)

431 Adm: wEl[1 you can be the next u]h Bill Gates

431.4 Dar: [(4 sylls )]

432 Adm: ( .) yah

432.3 (.33)

432.6 Adm: .hh[h

433.9 Dar: [excuse m[e

434 Adm: [h you’ll be the g the next Bill Gates h

With the announcement of his job prospects (line 409.3), Daryl projects that these are more
than one (a couple), but immediately afterwards he also says that he mentioned them to Adam
before (line 411). Therefore the end of his turn could be taken to be a global pragmatic CP, which
could be followed with an assessing turn by Adam, for instance. Yet, Adam only produces a
continuer (line 412). Daryl takes this as a go-ahead for a multi-unit turn listing the kinds of
job possibilities he found (lines 413 and 421.3) and details about them (lines 418 and 423.8 plus
The syntactically complete pragmatic CPs with, or without, responses from Excerpt 7.3 are shown in Schema 7.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>global CPs</th>
<th>local CPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+411</td>
<td>announcement(^a) of offers (→ listing of possibilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-hm</td>
<td>epistemically downgraded as known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>continuer/go ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>possibility 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-hm</td>
<td>acknowledgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>additional information on possibility 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yah</td>
<td>acknowledgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421.3</td>
<td>possibility 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hm</td>
<td>surprised acknowledgement/news mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+423.8</td>
<td>additional information on possibility 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.hh</td>
<td>?full turn (aborted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+427</td>
<td>newsworthy 2(^{nd}) piece of additional information on possibility 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{hu} .hh</td>
<td>surprised acknowledgement/news mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+429</td>
<td>2(^{nd}) increment to newsworthy 2(^{nd}) piece of additional information on possibility 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.) well you can be ...</td>
<td>full turn (assessing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schema 7.3. Summary of global and local CPs with their respective responses in Excerpt 7.3.

\(^a\)Despite the employment of the adjective good, this utterance is not primarily an assessment. Evidence for this interpretation can be gathered from the position of the ain accent on the noun rather than the adjective and the fact that apparently no second assessment is expected as the current speaker immediately continues with aomment on the epistemic status of the content of the previous utterance. Therefore, also, the lack of response to this utterance is no counter-evidence againstssessments being followed by responses regardless of prosodic-phonetic features.

426–427, 429 respectively). The syntactically complete pragmatic CPs with, or without, responses from Excerpt 7.3 are shown in Schema 7.3.

Again, as in the previous examples, the inspection of the cluster of prosodic-phonetic signals accompanying the CPs (cf. Table 7.3) provides us with further evidence for the division of prosodic-phonetic features into response-allowing and response-blocking clusters. The missing response to the syntactic-pragmatic CP in line 409.3 can be explained by the response-blocking latching of the beginning of the next unit, in contrast to the latched inbreaths which accompany other CPs with response (lines 411, 413, 418).

In terms of the specific prosodic-phonetic cues employed in this example, it is interesting that the auditory effect of glottalization, because it is almost omnipresent with this speaker, seems to play a more subordinate role while the final pitch close to the bottom of the speaker’s voice range, potentially in combination with lengthening, gains in importance.\(^{11}\)

---

\(^{11}\) For hints as to a potentially similar function of lengthening with level pitch, cf. Szczepak Reed (2004).
Table 7.3. Prosodic–phonetic features at syntactic-pragmatic CPs in Excerpt 7.3, lines 403.9–429

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible syntactic-pragmatic CPs</th>
<th>Type of CP projection</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pitch movement final peak-end</th>
<th>Pitch ending</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Lengthening</th>
<th>Latching</th>
<th>Held glottal closure</th>
<th>Out-breath/aspiration</th>
<th>In-breath</th>
<th>Glottalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...I got a couple’o good possibilities now (line 409.3)</td>
<td>local → listing</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>(−5 ST) down-step + level</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...I told you (line 411)</td>
<td>global</td>
<td>m-hm</td>
<td>(−8 ST) down-step</td>
<td>(62)</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one is... media type ventures (line 413)</td>
<td>local → second</td>
<td>m-hm</td>
<td>(−2 ST) down-step</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...I’m negotiating with them (line 418)</td>
<td>local → second</td>
<td>yah</td>
<td>(−4 ST + 7ST) fall-rise</td>
<td>(91/70-109)</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x (aperiod.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and there’s this computer</td>
<td>global</td>
<td>&lt;&lt; surprised &gt; hm &gt;</td>
<td>(−10 ST) down-step</td>
<td>(73-149/67)</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thing (line 421.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\ldots coming up in March (line 423.8)</td>
<td>global</td>
<td>.hh</td>
<td>(-12 ST)</td>
<td>fall</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x (diploph. + creak)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\ldots they want me to be the president (line 427)</td>
<td>global</td>
<td>\textless{} surprised\textgreater{} [hu]h</td>
<td>(-12 ST)</td>
<td>down-step</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x (creak)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\ldots of the company (line 429)</td>
<td>global</td>
<td>() full turn</td>
<td>(-14 ST)</td>
<td>down-step</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x (creak)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here, too, continuers are located with local pragmatic CPs (lines 413, 418), while more extensive and affectively loaded responses, or their preparation in the form of a longer inbreath, co-occur with global CPs (lines 421.3, 423.8, 427, 429).

The analysis also yields additional evidence for the iconic relationship between prosodic-phonetic marking and the degree of pragmatic completion: the global CPs are marked with a more extensive set of prosodic-phonetic features, with usually lower final pitch, greater pitch movements and a clear response-allowing/turn-yielding signal, namely an outbreath co-occurring (only) with the global CPs. The global CP in line 411 at least has a response-allowing latched sniff. Specifically, the ends of each of the job possibilities Daryl presents (lines 418, 427) have greater pitch movements than those of the units introducing these possibilities (lines 413, 421.3). Thus, here too we can observe that the prosodic-phonetic clusters are distributed systematically in the vicinity of certain types of responses.

Apart from this, it is particularly noteworthy that the extent of these pitch movements in lines 418 and 427 is even exceeded by that at the response-pursuing and turn-yielding global CP in line 429: the response Adam produced after the newsworthy additional information (line 427) is apparently not sufficient for Daryl as he produces a response-pursuing increment which upgrades the newsworthiness of the information given in terms of both content and prosody (line 429).

The final excerpt supports the observations made so far: art and Ben, two college students, are exchanging the latest news. These include Art’s visit to their mutual friend Alison. In the excerpt Art is telling Ben another story, about approaching a certain ‘chick’. For this purpose, he used the missing of a class in connection with the visit to Alison, and the resulting missing notes, as a pretext. This excerpt is interesting because, in contrast to the previous example, Art hardly uses glottalization at all. However, when he uses it, in a very slight form, it is to pursue response and to mark the global pragmatic CP (Excerpt 7.4).

**Excerpt 7.4.** (CallHome, 4521, 199–233 sec)

194 Art: ((exhales))
194.8 Ben: what else
195 (0.5)
196 Art: .h uhm
196.5 (1.3)
197 Art: ((labio-dental sound))
198 .hh
199 oh yEah dude
199.3 so I
199.5 [so I missed cl]ass right
200 Ben: [hhhh ]
After a bit of a lapse in the conversation (lines 194–198), Art initiates a new topic (line 199), which projects another story, i.e. a multi-unit turn. The beginning of it is formatted as resulting from some earlier talk (lines 199.3–199.5) and pursuing some response (right?). Ben delivers this with slight delay (lines 201.3–201.5), which induces Art to restart his story with more background information (line 201.7). This reformulation in fact nicely illustrates again the relevant differences
between response-allowing and response-blocking prosodic-phonetic features: *Class* is produced twice: once as a final item in the first unit just followed by a response-pursuing item (line 199.5) and secondly as a unit-medial item (line 201.7). In the first case it exhibits a range of response-allowing features (audible length, higher pitch, decreasing intensity) (cf. sound example 7.4a, http://intouch.emeraldinsight.com/sip8/) and Art leaves space for Ben to deliver the response. In the second instance, it is lower, intensity does not decrease at the end (cf. sound example 7.4b, http://intouch.emeraldinsight.com/sip8/) and Art talks through into the next syntactic unit. Hence, the prosodic-phonetic features we have been observing so far are also here working to allow or block response.

In the ensuing multi-unit turn we find a number of our previous observations confirmed. First, a list of the syntactic-pragmatic CPs with, or without, responses (Schema 7.4).

As with the previous examples, responses regularly occur at syntactic and pragmatic CPs. Full turn-taking occurs at the global CP at the end of the multi-unit turn, at first sight the tellable point of the story. However, from an on-line perspective, and just looking at semantic-pragmatic completion, there is in fact a point earlier in the story which could already be interpreted as ‘the’ tellable point, namely that related in line 210.1. It is here, again, where the relevance of the contextualization by prosodic-phonetic cues comes into play: note that Art does not produce the end of this unit with the full set of response-allowing features, but keeps the pitch level above the bottom of his range and avoids aspiration or glottalization (cf. Table 7.4). From what we have seen so far, we can assume here that he thereby indicates that this is not the global pragmatic CP and thus turn-taking is not relevant. At the same time, however, it is this of all points in the turn, where we can observe a response which comes closest to a complete turn, namely assessing laughter (cf. Jefferson *et al.*, 1987). Also, Art seems to have expected some response which may even go beyond pure laughter as he continues with a(n unsuccessful) pursuit of (perhaps a more appropriate) response (lines 211.1, 213, 213.2). The prosodic-phonetic contextualization of non-finality worked so well that the projection is maintained until the next tellable point. In retrospect then Art leads Ben through a series of local CPs, keeping him in suspense (very explicitly so with the unit in line 220.9) up to the actually tellable point of the story, namely his (lack) of progress with the ‘chick’.

As Table 7.4 shows, we see the by now familiar clusters of prosodic-phonetic features at work also at other CPs in this example: responses occur, or are pursued (lines 217, 218), after the response-allowing cluster with unit-final pitch falls to near the bottom of the speaker’s pitch range, pitch rises, intensity swells, outbreaths/aspiration and/or glottalization.¹² No response regularly occurs after features from the response-blocking cluster (no or small final pitch movements, pitch ending mid-range, and/or latching). Final lengthening, again, plays no discriminating role. Only at the end of line 210.1, extra-long final lengthening – together with an intensity swell – signals a

¹² The speaker employs a very weak kind of glottalization/diplophonia.
unit-ending upon which Ben produces laughter. That Art – despite the otherwise reduced response-allowing cluster – at that point indeed has expected a response, which is potentially also more than just laughter, is apparent from the fact that he pursues response with increments (line 211.1), a response-pursing right (line 213) and a self-evaluation of the previous tellable point (line 213.2). None of these however, make Ben produce more than continuers acknowledging the news, so that Art gets into another loop to eventually move to the actual tellable point.

Apart from the apparent potential of extra-long final lengthening (cf. Excerpt 7.3), there is also, again, some iconicity between the degree of pragmatic completion and the other prosodic-phonetic features, as in the previous examples: there is, for instance, a more extensive rise with the end of the story-preface in line 201.7b, while a pre-condition for a next story proper detail (line 216) is almost unmarked in terms of pitch (movement), intensity and voice quality.

The hypothesis that global CPs are marked more extensively than local ones is at first sight also not borne out in this example. However, here, again, we can find the influence of a certain affiliative, or affective, stance towards the unit in question: note that while the global CP in line 222 is clearly identifiable from a syntactic-pragmatic point of view, it is only marked by a small

Schema 7.4. Summary of global and local CPs with their respective responses in Excerpt 7.4. (*Since a tellable point has already been related, this could be interpreted as not a local pragmatic CP here but a global one.*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global CPs</th>
<th>Local CPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(201.7a +201.7b)</td>
<td>redoing of preparatory story detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yéáh-</td>
<td>...with more detailed background information → tellable point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208a</td>
<td>acknowledgement/go ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208b</td>
<td>redoing of preparatory story detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208c</td>
<td>pursuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uh-h[uh,</td>
<td>story proper detail 2 → tellable point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201.1</td>
<td>acknowledgement/go ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha-ha</td>
<td>a tellable point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+211.1</td>
<td>assessing laughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sniff) uh-huh:</td>
<td>a tellable point (extension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+213</td>
<td>delayed continuer acknowledging news</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+213.2</td>
<td>pursuit of response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uh-huh:</td>
<td>self-evaluation of the tellable point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>continuer acknowledging news</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>additional self-evaluation of the tellable point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.6)</td>
<td>reformulation of story proper detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+218</td>
<td>extension of reformulation of story proper detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+219</td>
<td>reformulation of the earlier tellable point as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uh-huh,</td>
<td>story detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>continuer acknowledging news</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was she?</td>
<td>tellable point of story (chick's response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>full turn (surprised news mark)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

pursuit of response
Table 7.4. Prosodic-phonetic features at syntactic-pragmatic CPs in Excerpt 7.4, lines 201.7–222

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible syntactic–pragmatic CPs</th>
<th>Type of CP projection</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Pitch movement final peak-end</th>
<th>Pitch ending</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Lengthening</th>
<th>Latching</th>
<th>Held glottal closure</th>
<th>Out-breath/aspiration</th>
<th>In-breath</th>
<th>Glottalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>I missed a class</em> (line 201.7a)</td>
<td>local → tellable</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>— level</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>... when I went down to go see alison</em> (line 201.7b)</td>
<td>local → tellable</td>
<td>yeah</td>
<td>+ 6 ST rise</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>...so I('d) missed it</em> (line 208a)</td>
<td>local → tellable</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>−6 ST down-step</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(right) (line 208b)</em></td>
<td>local → tellable</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>− level</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>... (('d) to come back the next day</em> (line 208c)</td>
<td>local → tellable</td>
<td>uh-huh</td>
<td>+ 3 ST rise</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>I asked the chick for the notes</em> (line 210.1)</td>
<td>?global/ local → tellable</td>
<td>assessing laughter</td>
<td>− level</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[that i missed] (line 211.1)</td>
<td>local → tellable</td>
<td>sniff uh-huh:</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>150 + ?</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>i was trying to do that strategy</em> (line 213.2)</td>
<td>local → tellable</td>
<td>uh-huh</td>
<td>(−4 ST) fall</td>
<td>(125–333)</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>(x) (diploph.) (very weak)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>...I got enough guts</em> (line 216)</td>
<td>local → tellable</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>I went up to her</em> (line 217)</td>
<td>local → tellable</td>
<td>but pursued</td>
<td>−4 ST but early peak down-step + level</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(after) class you know</em> (line 218)</td>
<td>local → tellable</td>
<td>but pursued</td>
<td>+2 ST but early peak down-step + rise</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>...and I asked for em</em> (line 219)</td>
<td>local → tellable</td>
<td>uh-huh</td>
<td>+1 ST rise</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>...she was absent the same day</em> (line 222)</td>
<td>global (neg. news)</td>
<td>full turn</td>
<td>(−2 ST) but early peak, fall</td>
<td>(125–333)</td>
<td>(&gt;)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>(x) (diploph.) (very weak)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pitch movement. This may be explainable by the fact that the current speaker is relating a lack of progress, i.e. bad news. Negative affect may be delivered with particular prosodic-phonetic features, among them a small pitch range (for a related phenomenon see Freese and Maynard, 1998). Hence, this example provides further evidence for the hypotheses on the organization of responding to multi-unit talk including the sensitivity of the prosodic-phonetic marking of slots for response to the local contingencies of talk-in-interaction.

4. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF THE OBSERVATIONS

Previous studies have pointed out that current-recipient responses regularly occur at syntactic CPs which are at the same time some type of pragmatic CP. The role of prosody had been acknowledged, yet no detailed study of prosodic-phonetic cues, especially in American English, had been conducted.

The analysis presented here of unscripted English talk-in-interaction yielded a number of observations on potential cues which current listeners can use to infer when they might appropriately produce which type of response to multi-unit turns. The four case studies provide support for three main hypotheses on the placement and type of response tokens in private American English telephone conversations:

1. The specific type of response produced (e.g. no response vs. minimal response vs. fuller response) depends on
   a. the type of pragmatic CP it occurs with, in collaboration with
   b. the prosodic-phonetic cues which accompany that CP.
2. The prosodic-phonetic cues occur in two types of clusters – response-blocking and response-allowing – which can select, or deselect, CPs as relevant for response.
3. The extensiveness of the response-allowing prosodic-phonetic parameters can indicate the response type relevant via a contextualization of the type of pragmatic CP.

(ad 1) The analysis has shown that local pragmatic CPs usually receive minimal forms of response, while global pragmatic CPs are oriented towards by more extensive forms of response, most of them being full turns. Local and global CPs, in turn, can, for the most part, be distinguished on the basis of pragmatic projection: global CPs are indicated by the point of resolution of the pragmatic projection with the greatest scope. The latter is set up by a previous turn (e.g. topic proffers, suggestions, offers etc.) or by the beginning of the extended turn-at-talk (e.g. story-prefaces projecting a tellable point, dispreferred responses or state descriptions projecting an account etc.). Local CPs, in contrast, are possible CPs of actions which contribute to the accomplishment of the larger action or activity projected (e.g. story-preface, details of a description, pieces of background information, alternatives to choose from etc.). Local and global CPs, can, however, be selected for, or deselected from, response-giving by certain prosodic-phonetic cues.
The relevant prosodic-phonetic cues include various phenomena connected with pitch, speech rate, intensity, breathing and glottalization. This means that pitch movements, though they play an important role, are not the only factors determining the placement of responses. The phenomena occur in two types of clusters:

(a) cluster I (response-blocking)
- pitch movements which cover smaller parts of the current speaker’s pitch range and/or which are accomplished over longer stretches of the utterance,
- final pitch values staying in the middle of the speaker’s pitch range,
- held (consonantal or glottal) closures and/or latching of the beginning of the next unit,
- maintained loudness/intensity,
- optionally, clipped lengthening of the final segment.

(b) cluster II (response-allowing)
- pitch movements which cover large parts of the current speaker’s pitch range and which are accomplished over short stretches of the utterance (steep slopes),
- final pitch values at the lower or upper end of the speaker’s pitch range,
- latching of the inbreath preparing the next unit,
- (increased) glottalization on the final segment(s),
- release of final segments and/or outbreath following them,
- loudness/intensity swell/diminuendo on the unit-final syllables,
- lengthening usually strengthens this cluster.

The co-occurrence of one of these clusters with a pragmatic CP can (de-)select that CP as relevant for response: CPs with features of cluster I are usually not followed by any response at all, hence cluster I is referred to as response-blocking. CPs with features of cluster II, in contrast, are followed by response (hence response-allowing cluster), unless they are immediately followed by features of the blocking cluster again, which levels out the effect of the earlier realization of the response-allowing cluster retrospectively.

(ad 3) The extensiveness of the realization of the features of the response-allowing cluster can help the current recipient to infer what type of response is relevant at a certain CP via the contextualization of the type of pragmatic CP. Global CPs, which ask for more elaborate responses to be produced, exhibit a tendency to co-occur with a more extensive set of response-allowing features than local CPs, which ask for more minimal responses. This includes
- falling pitch movements covering pitch ranges of more than 10 ST in contrast to up to 10 ST with local CPs, while with both CPs rising pitch movements can regularly be much smaller to still be receipted with response,
a greater overall number of features of the response-allowing cluster (intensity swell, lengthening, outbreath/aspiration etc.) being involved.

While these hypotheses describe the system of response-giving in general, three caveats are to be mentioned, which may also explain deviations from the system laid out above:

- **There is a mutual influence of syntactic and pragmatic completion/projection and prosodic-phonetic completion.**

  While prosodic-phonetic features contextualize different types of pragmatic CPs, pragmatic projection can restrict the effect of prosodic-phonetic features: local CPs, for instance, can occur with larger pitch movements (the reason for the latter needs yet to be studied) and still be responded to by minimal responses because the larger pragmatic projection blocks a full turn-taking. Responses to possible global pragmatic CPs can be blocked by realizing them with features of the response-blocking cluster. In addition, syntactic incompleteness usually overrides prosodic-phonetic completeness signals, although long stretches of ‘hesitation’ can prompt a response token (cf. Excerpt 7.2, lines 306–307).

- **The specific realization of the prosodic-phonetic cluster accompanying a CP is dependent on the specific action accomplished by the pragmatic unit at hand.**

  With the announcement of lack of success, for instance, pitch range is depressed.13 Pursuits of responses, even at local CPs, tend to be produced with more extensive prosodic-phonetic features.

- **The placement of responses to extended turns-at-talk in general is dependent on the current listener’s affiliation or disaffiliation with the talk produced.**

  Affiliative responses tend to be produced in preferred formats, i.e. they come early in the turn, also before actual CPs, and/or without the otherwise regularly co-occurring prosodic-phonetic cluster being produced fully or at all. Disaffiliation, in turn, may prevent the giving of response altogether.

Evidence for these hypotheses was derived from correlating auditory analysis, partially complemented by acoustic measurements, with participants’ behaviour, namely

- the (non-)occurrence of response, and
- the pursuit of response when none occurs at a specifically marked unit-ending.

These observations suggest that the organization of non-turn claiming responses to multi-unit turns in talk-in-interaction is comparable in its systematicity to that of turn-taking itself.

---

13 Similarly, (certain kinds of) complaints are accomplished with increased pitch movements (cf. Ogden, to appear).
5. WIDER IMPLICATIONS AND OUTLOOK

These findings have a number of implications, only some of which can be touched upon here.

The detailed single-case analyses of the placement of response tokens and the prosodic-phonetic features preceding them in their sequential context has shown – once again – that the organization of speaker change in talk-in-interaction is highly systematic. This applies not only to taking a turn but also to giving non-floor-claiming responses. In both systems of speaker change, saying something is crucially based on a close interrelationship between syntax, lexis, pragmatics and prosody-phonetics and their respective cues projecting the end of a unit. Hence, in studying speaker change, it is therefore absolutely necessary that pragmaticians take into account a range of systems of language organization, including prosody-phonetics. Conversely, those focusing chiefly on prosodic and phonetic phenomena should study them in their syntactic, lexical and pragmatic context. Research crossing boundaries can be most fruitful.

At the same time, sequential analyses, i.e. the close inspection of what exactly the participants are doing with what they are saying can indeed provide the key to instances which at first sight seem to counter the ‘system’.

Similarly, adopting an on-line perspective to talk-in-interaction can highlight the current needs of the participants and thus, much more so than a study in retrospect, unravel motivations for certain utterances being produced in certain ways. Thus, while the tellable point of the story may be clear in retrospect, in the course of its production participants have to signal, and understand, earlier potential tellable points as preparatory rather than projection-resolving. The parametric nature of prosodic-phonetic features plays a major role in this.

Finally, further studies undoubtedly need to investigate the hypotheses stated on the basis of the observations made in the case studies in terms of quantitative evidence. This should also include the relationship of the prosodic-phonetic cues observed to visual cues for when to say what in response to multi-unit turns. However, the detailed investigation of the intricate relationship between syntactic, lexical, pragmatic and sequential projection is a major step forward in this undertaking.
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