Published in final edited form as:

Discourse Process. 2012 ; 49(3-4): 192–212. doi:10.1080/0163853X.2012.654761.

Bodily-visual practices and turn continuation

Cecilia E. Ford,

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Sandra A. Thompson, and

University of California, Santa Barbara

Veronika Drake

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Abstract

This paper considers points in turn construction where conversation researchers have shown that talk routinely continues beyond possible turn completion, but where we find bodily-visual behavior doing such turn extension work. The bodily-visual behaviors we examine share many features with verbal turn extensions, but we argue that embodied movements have distinct properties that make them well-suited for specific kinds of social action, including stance display and by-play in sequences framed as subsidiary to a simultaneous and related verbal exchange.

Our study is in line with a research agenda taking seriously the point made by Goodwin (2000a, b, 2003), Hayashi (2003, 2005), Iwasaki (2009), and others that scholars seeking to account for practices in language and social interaction do themselves a disservice if they privilege the verbal dimension; rather, as suggested in Stivers/Sidnell (2005), each semiotic system/modality, while coordinated with others, has its own organization. With the current exploration of bodily-visual turn extensions, we hope to contribute to a growing understanding of how these different modes of organization are managed concurrently and in concert by interactants in carrying out their everyday social actions.

1.0 Introduction

In this paper, we investigate points in interaction where conversation researchers have shown that talk routinely occurs, but where we find bodily-visual behavior not only coordinated with talk but, interestingly, also extending beyond the possible completions of verbal formulations.¹ We'll call these 'BVPs' = bodily-visual practices. Research on turn extension has concentrated on verbal, i.e., lexico-grammatical, material added after the possible completion of turns (transition relevance places or TRPs). Independent of studies of turn extension, analysts of human interaction have long attended to BVPs and their coordination with, and indeed co-organizing of, turns and sequences of action (see section 2 of this paper for a review).

In the current study, we offer a typology of BVPs used in positions shared by what are traditionally considered turn extensions or turn increments, that is, in post-completion positions. We find that BVPs may extend beyond canonical verbal TRPs, and we also find that BVPs are employed at what Gene Lerner has termed "semi-permeable" points within turn-constructive units (Lerner 1991, 1996, 2002), points where, in our data, BVPs may

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Cecilia E. Ford, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI. ceford@wisc.edu.

¹In this paper, we use the term 'verbal' to indicate both lexico-grammatical and prosodic formulations.

continue and verbal turn construction may cease. Thus, analysis of BVPs in relation to turn construction reveals that BVPs are capable of beginning within on-going verbal TCUs, that is they may accompany and indeed elaborate the actions of verbal turns and then extend past verbal TRPs. Finally, in analyzing those BVPs that begin simultaneously with verbal turn construction, we have discovered that the coordination of bodily-visual with verbal turn constructional practices may create conditions for the abandonment of a verbal turn with its action being completed only bodily-visually.

In accounting for BVPs extending beyond verbal TRPs, our research has thus naturally broadened our domain of analysis from turn continuation to turn construction proper and indeed to sequence construction. While our cases and our findings are presented in terms of the theme of this special issue of *Discourse Processes*, namely their relevance to turn extension, we present a typology of BVPs as they are deployed not only in post-completion position but also in turn and sequence construction, more broadly viewed. We will show that BVPs and verbal formulations are systematically different from verbal extensions alone after possible turn completion, and that BVPs and verbal formulations are coordinated in ways relevant to, and functionally overlapping with, what we think of as turn extensions. Based on analyses of a progression of cases, we argue that BVPs can do the same work as verbal turn extension and, in fact, that, at specific points in the interaction, BVPs *can do work that verbal units cannot*.

Our study of BVPs, turn continuation, and turn construction began when we noticed extensions being formed up with bodily-visual rather than verbal material. Our study has thus grown out of attention to the ends of verbal turns. However, though we contextualize this research within the study of verbal turn construction, we do not view BVPs as a set of practices secondary or supplemental to verbal practices. Our interest is in the coordination of BVPs with verbal action.

In prior accounts of verbal practices through which speakers add on to their own possibly complete turns (Davidson 1984, Ford et al. 2002, Walker 2004, Couper-Kuhlen and Ono 2007), one common form of extension involves the addition of grammatical material that extends the previous turn structure in a manner that is integrated with the previous grammatical structure. Couper Kuhlen and Ono (2007) term such continuations “glue ons”, as exemplified in (1):

(1) **Glue-on** (Holt: 1988 Undated: Side 1: Call 9)

```

1->   Gor:      .t O:kay. .h I: sh- I shall leave you. .h
2=>           to get on with your hard studying.
3=>           that I know I interrupted. .hhhhhh
4=>           rather[rudely
5       Dan:      [(Oh yes.)

```

In (1), Gordon's turn comes to possible completion with 'you', line 1. The addition of 'to get on with your hard studying' forms a purpose clause grammatically integrated with the previous TCU. A further extension past a TRP comes at line 3, with 'that I know I interrupted' forming a relative clause modifying 'your hard studying'. Finally, the addition of 'rather rudely' creates further adverbial modification. Comparable to this type of verbal turn continuations, in our research, we have found points of possible verbal turn completion after which the same 'speaker' produces what is arguably a turn extension but one done through bodily-visual means.

In examining cases of BVPs beyond points of possible turn transition, we have also found cases for which Lerner's notion of the “semi-permeability” of components of emerging TCUs is relevant (1996). In a number of studies, Lerner has demonstrated that interactants produce smooth speaker transition not just at canonical TRPs but also at other structural

points in unfolding TCUs. One speaker produces a (grammatically incomplete) preliminary component of a turn and another speaker produces a collaborative completion of the turn unit. Lerner's research draws attention to collaborative parsing and forming up of turns-in-progress (1991, 1996, 2002). For example, (2), Vera is describing to Cindy her father's recent knee operation. Her turn comes to a TRP at line 3, but a gap emerges at line 4. In line 5, just as Vera is adding 'a whole knee replacement', an appositive extension (a free NP) beyond her TRP, Cindy adds an *if*-clause to the syntax of Vera's turn (second arrow). Cindy's *if*-clause functions as a B-Event statement (Labov & Fanshel 1977), in this instance a check of her understanding of what Vera has been explaining and to prompt Vera to produce the projected other option (besides what is "normally" done by the surgeon):

(2) knees 83 (Ford 1993)

1 V: If he: (0.5) didn't wanna keep being active, an' do sports n' things, right
 2 now, at his age, an' with the ba:d condition of his knee, they normally put
 3 in a plastic knee.
 4 (0.2)
 ⇒ 5 V: A whol:e kn[ee replacement].
 ⇒ 6 C: [If he didn't wanna be active.
 7 V: If he didn't want to be active, but since he wanted to be active,

Cindy's appendor question (Sacks 1995a:528, Schegloff 1997:511, Sidnell, this volume) reproduces part of Vera's line 1, and it also forms an adverbial clause extension beyond the TRP at line 3. In this and in other instances, then, extensions of turn units can be produced both by same speakers and by other speakers, even where both speakers are adding talk past the same TRP.

Whereas Lerner's research on collaborative turn construction and semi-permeability of TCUs has focused upon sharing of lexico-grammatical turn construction between different participants, the notion of semi-permeability of turn-constructional units is also useful in understanding cases where the same participant shifts to a BVP in completing an ongoing turn. In our collection, in the midst of verbal turn construction, a speaker can shift to a BVP alone, and we find these points are comparable to the structurally permeable grammatical points where Lerner finds collaborative syntax to be used.

We have found five temporal positions of verbal and visual semiotic systems to be particularly striking in our data:

Type 1: After a possibly complete verbal turn, a BVP is initiated in the same interactional space where a verbal increment might be used

Type 2: At a TRP after a preliminary turn component (Lerner 1996), the speaker treats the turn as permeable, using a BVP to 'gesture' toward completion.

Type 3: A BVP is initiated during the course of a verbal turn, and it is continued into the pause following a TRP.

Type 4: A BVP is initiated within a verbal turn or at a TRP and continues, paralleling a verbal action sequence

Type 5: Beginning within a verbal TCU, a BVP is initiated by the current speaker and responded to with a BVP by a recipient within the same TCU and before a TRP is reached. On 'reading' the recipient's bodily-visual response, the current speaker then abandons the verbal TCU-in-progress, as the action has been treated as complete through the recipient's bodily-visual response.

We will show how each of these constellations of verbal practices with BVPs has implications for turn construction and turn continuation.

Our paper demonstrates our commitment to taking seriously the point made by Goodwin (2000a, b, 2003), Hayashi (2003a, b, 2005), Iwasaki (2009), Mondada (2006, 2007), and others that researchers seeking to understand language and social interaction do our field a disservice if they privilege the verbal dimension; rather, as argued in Stivers and Sidnell (2005), each semiotic system/modality, while coordinated with others, has its own organization. We suggest that our job, as interactional linguists, is to come to understand how these different modes of organization are managed concurrently and in concert by interactants in carrying out their social actions.²

We are clearly narrowing our investigation to those BVPs that occur at or near a place of possible turn completion (Sacks et al. 1974), well aware that bodily-visual behavior is occurring all the time in social interaction and is not necessarily organized relative to verbal turn constructional practices.³ In what follows, we begin with those BVPs that share features with verbal turn-constructional practices, and then move to BVPs that have constructional properties that distinguish them from verbal practices. In our conclusion we suggest that such differences may motivate particular uses of verbal and bodily-visual modalities.

We first review research on multi-modality in turn construction. We then examine the five types of temporal relation between verbal and bodily-visual practices that we have observed in our data, considering how BVPs relate to turn construction and turn continuation. Finally, we present our conclusions and their implications for our understanding of talk and BVPs.

2.0 Research on multi-modality in turn construction

Much research has been dedicated to the verbal properties of talk-in-interaction and on how participants achieve social actions verbally and through talk (Heritage 1984, 2002; Pomerantz 1984; Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974; Sacks and Schegloff 1979; among others). In addition, a growing body of conversation analytic research has focused on multimodality and talk-in-interaction. These studies have found that speakers rely not only on verbal resources, but also on a range of non-verbal resources, such as gaze (C. Goodwin 1979, 2000b; Lerner 2003; Rosanno 2006), gestures (C. Goodwin, 1986; M. H. Goodwin, 1980; M.H. Goodwin and C. Goodwin, 1986; Heath 1982; among others), prosody and intonation (Couper-Kuhlen and Ford, 2004, Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, 1996, Ford and Thompson, 1996; Selting, 1996; among others), and other forms of bodily conduct (Hayashi 2003a, b, 2005; Iwasaki 2009; Kendon 1990; among others).

Our research contributes to this growing body of work on multimodality and talk-in-interaction; instead of privileging talk, we look at how bodily-visual practices are oriented to by the participants and how such practices contribute to the unfolding talk on a moment-by-moment basis. Before we turn to the five relationships between verbal turn construction practices and the types of BVPs we have found in our data, we will highlight some parallels to, and similarities with, other research in the field, namely Iwasaki (2009), Hayashi (2003a, b, 2005), and Goodwin (2000a, b, 2003).

Conversation analytic research has consistently shown that talk and other modalities can mutually elaborate and contextualize one another. As Hayashi (2005: 21) notes, the turn-at-talk is an “interactively sustained domain of multimodal conduct”, and these “multimodal packages” (21-22), of which BVPs are a crucial part, contribute to the unfolding of talk-in-interaction. Hayashi shows how a speaker begins a description verbally and ends with a

²We acknowledge that, as part of a symposium and special issue on ‘turn continuation’, our paper does indeed privilege the verbal, as our point of departure in the our research process involved attending to the possible ends of verbal turns, i.e., the site for turn extensions as examined in previous research.

³We return to this point in our conclusion.

gesture, followed by the recipient producing a turn that linguistically interprets what the speaker had indicated gesturally. Thus, the pre-positioning of a gesture before talk occurs across speakers, not only within one speaker's turn, and the projection space can be utilized by a co-participant. The crucial aspect of projectability of possible next items due hence results not only from talk-so-far, but also from visual and bodily conduct so far.

Hayashi argues that in addition to speakers' ability to produce the verbal equivalent of another speaker's gesture to show and/or test their understanding of that gesture, speakers can also mirror each others' bodily conduct to show understanding via BVPs. BVPs can move the talk forward such that the progress of a current verbal TCU may be abandoned if the participants have established mutual understanding displayed through an exchange of BVPs. Our work also corroborates prior work on the importance of participant frameworks and projectability, which results not only from talk, but also from visual and bodily conduct (Goodwin 2000a, b, 2003; Hayashi, 2003a, b, 2005; Schegloff, 1984). Lerner's (1996, 2002) work on the permeability of turns has been taken up by Iwasaki (2009), who shows that multimodal practices can open up turns for other participants, creating interactive turn spaces within TCUs. Displays of understanding, recognition, and/or affiliation are made relevant before the current speaker finishes a TCU. In our study we also examine how BVPs may be organized relative to semi-permeable points in emerging TCUs, i.e., how a participant makes relevant a next action by a co-participant at a place where a current verbal TCU is not yet (possibly) complete.

3.0 Interactional linguistics and multimodal turn construction: five relationships between verbal and bodily-visual practices

Let us begin with types of BVPs *sharing features* with verbal turn-constructional practices. As we progress, we will introduce BVPs that have constructional properties *distinct* from verbal turn units.

Recall that the first type of temporal positioning between a BVP and verbal turn-constructional practices is the circumstance in which a BVP is initiated in the same interactional space where a verbal increment might be used.

Type 1: After a possibly complete verbal turn, a BVP is initiated in the same interactional space where a verbal increment might be used

Extract (3) illustrates a bodily-visual turn extension that uses the same interactional space in which a verbal turn extension could be used. In (3), Molly and Brian, a heterosexual couple, are having dinner. As part of Molly's graduate study, they are allowing themselves to be videotaped, and the videocamera becomes a focus of their talk. Leading up to this extract, Brian has been arguing that the videocamera is affecting their interaction. His claim is that pretending they are not aware of the camera is worse than focusing on it:

(3)

1 Brian: That's worse offense than- focusing on its: presence.
2 ⇒⇒ (1.6) ((B raises eyebrows, moves chin back, head slightly left))
3 Molly: >D'you< hear that? ((spoken with gaze to camera))
4 (0.4)
5 Brian: Yeah? You think? ((still holding eyebrow raise & forehead wrinkle))
6 (1.5) ((B forehead still wrinkled, moves head and looks at camera; gazes back at M))

Brian's comment in line 1 comes to a TRP, whereupon he raises his eyebrows and moves his chin back and his head slightly left (line 2), a complex BVP visible in Figure 1. In other

words, after a possibly complete verbal turn, Brian's BVP initiates a new unit in the same interactional space where a verbal turn-extension might also be used

Let's compare the BVP exemplifying Type 1, example (3), with what we know about *verbal* turn extensions. We note first that, like verbal turn extensions, this BVP is added *after a TRP* during an emerging gap, just where lexico-grammatical-prosodic extensions have been found to occur. Second, again as with verbal turn extensions, the BVP comes where a recipient response is relevant but delayed. Third, and unlike "glue ons", the explicitly integrated verbal turn increments, the BVP does not constitute a 'dependent' structure in grammatical terms, as verbal turn-extensions have been argued to do (e.g., Couper-Kuhlen and Ono 2007). Finally, we note that at the possible end of the BVP in (3), Brian's facial expression and head position are held, and they are held *into* the talk of the recipient, with the overlap not treated as problematic, whereas verbal overlap has been shown to consistently do interactional work and to regularly involve targeted resolution (Jefferson 1983, 1986, Lerner 1989, Schegloff 2000, 2002). Thus, the fact that one can continue to hold a BVP even into the next speaker's verbal turn without leading to problems and overlap resolution (e.g., raised volume of speaker during overlap, repair initiation (Schegloff 2000)) is evidence for the distinct status of overlapping BVPs as compared with overlapping talk, as schematized in Figure 2.

Let's turn now to the second type of temporal positioning between a BVP and turn-constructional practices.

Type 2: At a TRP after a preliminary turn component, the speaker treats the turn as permeable, using a BVP to 'gesture' toward completion.

In Extract (4), a BVP is used after what Lerner has called a 'preliminary turn component' to gesture toward a 'final turn component' (1996). Lerner has shown that preliminary turn components not only make relevant a final turn component, but that the latter are often in fact produced by the co-participant. Thus, preliminary turn components provide an opportunity for collaborative completion and testify to the fact that turns are 'semi-permeable', that is, a next speaker may begin a collaborative completion at precise points in the unfolding of a TCU. Extract (4) shows that BVPs can be used following such a preliminary turn component at a point in the interaction where collaborative completion is possible, but is *not* taken up by a co-participant. Instead the BVP 'gestures' toward the final component. The focal segment begins at line 10:

(4) Molly is telling Brian about an email she received from the caterer for the couple's upcoming wedding reception. It seems the two will need to tip the bartender, but Brian suggests that the caterer hire the bartender and take on paying the tip himself.

```

1 B:=Let's- Let's have him, Let's have him provide his own then.
2      (0.3)
3 B: .hh That way the ti-it'll be that'll: ov- Get us out of:
4      (.) havin' thi extra tip [on top,=
5 M: mm, He said the bartender would make the [tips then.
6      (0.5)
7 M: >tk< In either- In either case, in his scenario,
8      (0.7) the bartender, (0.3)
9 B: gets everything at the b[ar? ]
10 M: [Well] (0.3).h Depending
11      on what happens, if some of the servers end up
12 bartending, then they'll probably split some of
13 the bartending tips,= [but if they don't bartend at all:,
14      [(M=rightward gesture)]
15      (.)
16=> (.) ((M=nd rightward gesture with head dip, gaze toward B; B='blank' face))

```


In lines 10-13, seeing the contingency in Brian's suggestion, Molly constructs a two-part contrast formulated with two hypothetical *if*-clauses, only the first of which has an expressed main clause (at least up through lines 15-16). At *but if they don't bartend at all::*, she dips her head and gazes at Brian with widened eyes and a rightward hand gesture, as shown in Figure 3a-b, inviting him to infer the consequent of her verbal *if*-clause. As we will discuss later, by inviting inference here, Molly is arguably treating the consequent, which could be verbalized, as obvious and projectable.

We might compare Molly's BVP at line 16 in this extract to Brian's eyebrow raise and chin retraction in Extract (3), and to the position and function of verbal turn extensions. Just as in Extract (3), Molly's BVP is added after a possible TRP and an emerging gap. As with verbal turn extensions, the additional action of the BVP comes where a recipient response may be relevant but delayed. However, in this instance, Molly produces a BVP at a semi-permeable point in the unfolding verbal turn structure. The BVP does not constitute a 'dependent' structure in grammatical terms, but it comes where a grammatical unit could be placed.

So far, we have examined BVPs that occur in the same places as verbal units could occur. Extract (3), with Brian and Molly talking about the camera, illustrated Type 1, where a BVP occurs in the same interactional space as a verbal turn-extension could. Type 2 captures the occurrence of a BVP at a semi-permeable point in the unfolding of a TCU. Here, just as described by Hayashi for his Japanese extract, the BVP follows a 'preliminary component' and it 'gestures towards' the 'final component'. To illustrate this, we provided Type 2, extract (4), wherein Molly's gaze, head dip, and blank face follow the verbal preliminary component: *if they don't bartend at all::*

These examples have demonstrated how gestures and talk can occur simultaneously and without interfering with each other (cf. Kendon, 1985: 217). As we have noted, it is well-established that participants orient to verbal actions as temporally and linearly bounded, such that overlaps are avoided, do particular actions, and/or are subject to accounting and repair. In contrast, BVPs (such as Brian's gaze, head position, and facial expression in (3)) freely extend into the talk of a next speaker, without accounting or repair. Hence, BVPs can form relationships with verbal turns and units without impeding the unfolding talk, but rather extend the talk and co-organize the action.

We now turn to cases in which BVPs begin during verbal turn construction, again overlapping – and deployed simultaneously with – talk, and forming relationships with, verbal turns and units in ways that verbal formulations could not.

Type 3: A BVP is initiated during the course of a verbal turn, and it is continued into the pause following a TRP.

In extract (5), Abbie has just reported that her father is going to Norway to visit his ailing mother. As an expansion of the sequence, Maureen does a questioning action (line 1) by forming a B-Event statement, a candidate understanding, based on her inference that Abbie is of Norwegian heritage. After further sequence expansion, involving pursuit of elaboration on the part of Maureen but withholding of elaboration by Abbie, in lines 7 and 8 (representing verbal and bodily-visual formations respectively), Abbie produces a verbal turn accompanied by a cluster of BVPs (head shaking, eye widening and eyebrow raising, Figures 4a and b):

(5) Norveegian girl (Game Night)

1 Maureen: So you're a Nor-Nor[↑]wegian girl.=
 2 Abbie: =No.
 3 (0.4)
 4 Terry: [No-
 5 Abbie: [No, Absolutely not a drop.
 6 Maureen: ↑No?
 7⇒ Abbie: [*Nope.⁰
 8⇒ Abbie: [((gaze twd M; eye-brows up; slight head shake; tight-lipped smile)]=
 9 ⇒ (.) = ((d gaze and facial expression held through pause))=
 10⇒ Abbie: =[((face expression & gaze held through start of M's turn (line 11))]
 11 Maureen: [How's that possible.

Abbie's response to Maureen's question is done as a simple denial, that is, without an account or elaboration, as would be relevant and even projectable (Ford 2002). By withholding elaboration, Abbie initiates a little interactional 'game', 'doing withholding of talk' (see below), in which Maureen further pursues and even guesses at the explanation for Abbie's denial that she is of Norwegian heritage. As part of the game, Abbie accompanies her *nope* in line 7 with widened eyes, raised-eyebrows, a slight headshake, and a tight-lipped smile, as shown in Figure 4b. Her tightly closed lips with the production of the final sound of *nope* potentiate her action of withholding, as the unreleased final voiceless bilabial both visually and acoustically demonstrate refusal to say more.

There are three key differences between Abbie's BVP in Extract (5) and the verbal turn extensions considered in previous research on turn extension; in examining these differences, we can further see how BVPs can work in ways that verbal turn extensions cannot.

The first key difference is that the BVP begins *within* a verbal TCU, and extends *beyond* the verbal TRP into the emerging silence. The second difference is that Abbie's BVP does not constitute a 'dependent' structure in grammatical terms. On the contrary, it is deployed *simultaneously* with a verbal TCU, and shares post-TRP interactional territory with a turn extension. But, we emphasize, it begins where a separate verbal unit could not, namely *within* Abbie's own TCU. Third, as illustrated in Figures 4a-b, Abbie's facial expression and gaze are held through the talk of the recipient, with the overlap not treated as problematic.

Because it is carried out simultaneously with a verbal action, the complex BVP in Extract (5) thus reveals a set of properties which allow it to play an interactional role not possible with a verbal turn continuation, as schematized in Figure 5.

We turn now to a further instance of a BVP doing work which a verbal turn continuation could not do.

Type 4: A BVP is initiated within a verbal turn or at a TRP and continues, paralleling a verbal action sequence

Let us consider extract (6), a continuation of extract (5). Here, a continuing and dynamic set of BVPs *parallel* Abbie's verbal turn continuation. Further, with the continuing BVPs, Abbie proposes a shift in the participation framework, introducing a simultaneous side sequence or by-play (Goffman 1981; M.H. Goodwin, 1997), with a third party to the interaction, Terry. Importantly, Terry is a knowing recipient (Goodwin 1979, 1981, 2007) with respect to the information Abbie is withholding. Terry knows Abbie's ancestry, and she therefore knows the solution to the puzzle of Abbie's not being Norwegian but having a grandmother in Norway.

Notably, the series of BVPs in (6) shares territory with verbal turn-extension in (5) at its beginning, in that it emerges within Abbie's verbal TCU (line 7) and extends the overall action beyond the verbal TCU into a post-TRP pause, and in that elements of Abbie's facial

expression are continued into the post-TRP gap, with variations of the tight-lipped smile and eyebrow raise:

(6) In a continuation of Extract (5), Abbie invites Terry to co-conspire in the guessing game:

4 Terry: [No-
 5 Abbie: [No, Absolutely not a drop.
 6 Maureen: ↑No?
 7 Abbie: °Nope.°
 ((BVP described in extract (-), not repeated here))
 9 (.)
 ((BVP described in extract (-) not repeated here))
 11 Maureen: [How's that possible.
 12 Maureen: [He's not [your father,
 13 ⇒ ((A turns toward [T, same face expression; A moves to meet A's gaze))
 14 ⇒ ((T moves head to meet A's gaze))[Figure 6]
 15 Abbie: [He is my father.
 16 ((A turns back to M with a nod))=[Figure 7a]
 17 (0.4) =(A holds gaze toward M))[Figure 7b]
 18 Abbie: But they're not Norwegian.
 19 (0.4)
 20 Terry: They just live-
 21 Abbie: They just live [(in Oslo).

Extract (6) illustrates the fourth type of positioning between a BVP and a verbal turn that we find in our data.⁴ Abbie's continuous BVP, with changing elements, begins within a verbal TCU (with her *nope* in line 7), continues through a silence (line 9) and through Maureen's following question (line 11). At this point, and in overlap with Maureen's guess at line 12, Abbie extends her BVP further to initiate a bodily-visual sequence, a side sequence, in the form of by-play, with Terry. Through this extended BVP, Abbie produces a shift in the participation framework by initiating a bodily-visual *sequence* that parallels the verbal sequence. Abbie's sequence-initiating BVP is minimally responded to by its recipient, Terry, whose responsive BVP involves her move to meet Abbie's gaze (Figure 6).

As with the BVPs discussed so far, those in extracts (5) and (6) do not represent 'dependent' grammatical structures. In addition, as the BVPs are started and continued, they overlap with two verbal turns by another speaker, without occasioning repair or other accounting for the overlap.

We come now to the last relationship between verbal and bodily-visual actions that we will illustrate, showing how BVPs can, in certain contexts and for particular purposes, be better fitted to an action than can speech, in this case where a comparable verbal action might be regarded as too explicit or even taboo.

Type 5: Beginning within a verbal TCU, a BVP is initiated by the current speaker and responded to with a BVP by a recipient within the same TCU and before a TRP is reached. On 'reading' the recipient's bodily-visual response, the current speaker then abandons the verbal TCU-in-progress, as the action has been treated as complete through the recipient's bodily-visual response.

Extract (7) is taken from a meeting of medical professionals' discussion of drug trials by pharmaceutical companies for the treatment of osteoporosis. Ned, a clinician and researcher, has indicated that he has doubts about the experimental protocol used in the study they are currently considering. Gwen, a medical researcher, has taken up this skepticism and asked if

⁴It comes out later (beyond the extracts) that Abbie's grandparents were refugees from Hungary who settled in Norway after the 1956 uprising in Hungary.

there was any scientific rationale offered for the problematic method in the study. As the extract begins, Ned has just reported the drug company's rationale, but he has done so with an emphasis on the fact that this is not a rationale that he fully endorses. Ned has indicated skepticism regarding the drug company's methods, and he has done so both verbally and through a side-to-side rocking of his head as he produces the assessment that the method "just smells ba:d". It is at this point that Gwen produces the question with which extract (7) begins:

(7)⁵ Meeting of medical clinicians and researchers; the topic is bone-density treatments

19⇒Gwen: So, at [least there would be some scientific
 20⇒ ((G=wavering hand gesture & nod | Ned=mirrors G's
 21 | gesture & nods))
 22 (.)
 23⇒Gwen: [myeh: okay,
 24 Ned: ((nodding & continued hand gesture))

As Gwen is forming up her verbal action, a first pair part doing an understanding check, she is simultaneously producing a wavering hand gesture that, in this context, suggests a skeptical epistemic stance with regard to the proposition she is checking out (see Figure 8). Recall that Ned has just expressed skepticism both verbally and bodily. Simultaneous with Gwen's verbal turn-in-progress, and simultaneous with Gwen's continuing hand gesture, Ned does the same hand gesture, though a bit lower and closer to the table, and he also produces a series of repeated vertical head movements or nods. Thus, Gwen's BVP initiates an adjacency pair in which Ned responds with an affirmative head movement and an echoic gesture. We call attention to the fact that here, not only is the original speaker's verbal turn simultaneous with her BVP, but her recipient's response is also produced within the same emerging verbal TCU. Ned's BVP response occasions Gwen's abandonment of her verbal turn-in-progress. In leaving her syntactic and prosodic trajectory incomplete, Gwen is precisely treating Ned's response as sufficient to show that the action conveyed by the combination of Gwen's verbal construction and by the simultaneous BVP has been successfully accomplished. Thus, though the verbal trajectory of her turn is not completed, the action is clearly completed, and she moves on to produce a sequence-closing third with *myeh: okay*.

The key observation we take from this case with respect to turn construction and turn continuation is that Gwen's initiating BVP and Ned's responsive one both differ from verbal turn extensions, not only in their simultaneity with the verbal TCU, but also in that together, as a sequence *within* an unfolding TCU, they jointly establish the irrelevance of completing the verbal TCU formulation in progress. In a sense, the combination of the verbal trajectory and the BVP creates a condition under which a bodily-visual response from the recipient serves to complete the adjacency pair. Once again, the BVPs cannot be considered grammatically 'dependent' structures, as verbal turn continuations are. BVPs, then, have their own organization and constitute a resource for participants for a range of positions and forms of action that verbal turn extensions cannot do.

Our data have revealed five types of temporal positioning of verbal and visual semiotic practices. Types 1-4 involve BVPs occurring past TRPs or continuing through a sequence, each progressively more distinct from what verbal turn extensions do. Type 1 occupies a position just past a TRP, much like a verbal increment, but the BVP itself is continued into, and through, the recipient's verbal response. Type 2 involves a semi-permeable point in the

⁵See Ford (2008) for a fuller analysis of this sequence.

construction of a turn, with the BVP gesturing toward completion of an action that is grammatically or verbally incomplete. Types 3 through 5 are all begun within a verbal TCU, with type 3 extending the action through a BVP past a TRP, and type 4 producing a parallel sequence, distinct from, though related to, the on-going verbal sequence. With type 4, we see how the fact that BVPs can be deployed simultaneously with verbal actions supports the opportunity for BVP side sequences, in this case, by-play. Finally, type 5 demonstrates that since a BVP can be initiated during a still emerging TCU, a recipient's responsive BVP at this moment, before the speaker reaches a TRP, can occasion abandonment of the verbal action formulation.⁶

4.0 Conclusion

Our aim in this paper has been to highlight the role of bodily-visual practices in the management of turn continuation and turn construction. We have accomplished this by explicating the consummate skill with which participants in everyday interactions coordinate bodily-visual practices with verbal practices, and we have considered the temporal and interactional properties of BVPs in comparison to verbal practices, particularly attending to how BVPs relate to possible transition-relevant places and occasions.

We have presented extracts illustrating five types of coordination between BVPs and verbal turns in relation to possible turn transition. Each shows a different way in which verbal and bodily-visual systems interact to enhance meaning-making and action-doing among participants. We have endeavored to demonstrate that each semiotic modality, while coordinated with others, *has its own principles and properties of use*.

As promised, we now turn our attention to the question of why BVPs might be *preferred* for some types of actions in interaction. The fact that BVPs allow *two courses of action to be pursued at once* provides one answer to this question.

Ekman (1976: 22) has shown that gestures can be used in instances where verbal resources are somehow restricted. For example, a hairdresser involved in talk on the phone may use bodily-visual means to invite a customer to come in and sit down. Kendon has argued that gestures can be used when a speech channel is blocked either by noise or because it is already in use, because they “evidently, need not intrude upon the sustained forms of talk” (Kendon 1985: 222). We are not convinced that bodily-visual actions always serve as secondary resources in place of verbal actions. Indeed, our cases strongly suggest that BVPs have functional capabilities making them uniquely fitted to particular actions.

BVPs allow speakers to produce action such that the speaker adeptly indexes something that *could* be verbalized, but, by using a bodily-visual modality, s/he displays an orientation to the action as one that should be obvious and therefore inferable, one that is best done as a BVP to maintain a playful withholding and initiate by-play, or one that should not be verbalized for reasons of professional conduct. In other words, our data show that participants have well-founded social motivations for drawing on non-verbal practices in the places we find them.

We've seen these motivations illustrated throughout the analysis of our extracts. In the case of Abbie's guessing game in extracts (5) and (6), for example, the BVPs contribute to the playful action she constructs while withholding verbal information from Maureen. In (7), we see that for both Gwen and Ned, the possibility of doing a BVP *instead of* finishing a vocal

⁶Our use of the word 'types' implies that each type has several exemplars; this is indeed the case, though we have had space to illustrate only one instance of each type in this paper. We hope that our typology will encourage further research into the ways in which the body is used in formulating turn extensions.

turn allows them to stay ‘off the record’ to avoid verbalizing assessments that their professional code may forbid stating explicitly.

The temporal-interactional properties of BVPs thus make them particularly useful for managing delicate issues, as with Gwen and Ned in (7), and stance displays. For example, Brian, in extract (3), expresses his stance towards the intrusiveness of the video camera, and Abbie in (5) and (6) displays herself as momentarily ‘in control’ of giving out information.

We hope to have made a convincing case for embracing BVPs in the study of turn extension and turn construction. We have seen that BVPs do occur in the ‘territory’ of turn extensions, and that BVPs have specific properties that are skillfully co-ordinated with verbal turn-constructional practices. Finally, we have suggested that motivations for the use of BVPs involve exploiting their particular temporal-spatial-interactional properties to perform actions that, at a particular point in the interaction, could be, but need not or should not be, verbalized.

As interactional linguists, we welcome, and hope to have made a modest contribution to, the challenge of coming to understand how these different modes of organization interact and are deployed by people as they construct turns and manage transition relevance in carrying out social actions.

Acknowledgments

We are happy to acknowledge helpful input to our thinking from the participants at the Edmonton Workshop on Turn Continuation and from Jack Sidnell in particular for his valuable feedback. We also thank Doug Maynard, Lorenza Mondada, Junko Mori, and Trini Stickle for helping us think about these data. We hope to have made good use of the input of our colleagues.

References

- Couper-Kuhlen, E.; Ford, CE. Sound patterns in interaction. Amsterdam: John Benjamins; 2004.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E.; Selting, M. Prosody in conversation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1996.
- Couper-Kuhlen E, Ono T. Turn continuation in cross-linguistic perspective. *Pragmatics*. 2007; 17(4): 505–512. Special issue.
- Davidson, J. Subsequent versions of invitations, offers, requests, and proposals dealing with potential or actual rejection. In: Atkinson, JM.; Heritage, J., editors. *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1984. p. 102-28.
- Ekman P. Movements with Precise Meanings. *Journal of Communication*. 1976; 26(3):14–26.
- Ford, CE. Grammar in interaction: Adverbial clauses in American English conversations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1993. 2007 paperback reissue
- Ford, CE. Denial and the construction of conversational turns. In: Bybee, J.; Noonan, M., editors. *Complex Sentences in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins; 2002. p. 61-78.
- Ford, CE. Women speaking up: getting and using turns in workplace meetings. Houndsmills and New York: Palgrave MacMillan; 2008.
- Ford, CE.; Fox, BA.; Thompson, SA. Constituency and the grammar of turn increments. In: Ford, CE.; Fox, BA.; Thompson, SA., editors. *The language of turn and sequence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2002. p. 14-38.
- Ford, CE.; Thompson, SA. Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In: Ochs, E.; Schegloff, EA.; Thompson, SA., editors. *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1996. p. 134-184.
- Goffman, E. *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; 1981.
- Goodwin, C. The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In: Psathas, G., editor. *Everyday language: studies in ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington; 1979. p. 97-121.

- Goodwin, C. Conversational organization: interaction between speakers and hearers. New York: Academic Press; 1981. available at <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/clic/cgoodwin/publish.htm>
- Goodwin C. Gesture as a resource for the organization of mutual orientation. *Semiotica*. 1986; 62(1/2): 29–49.
- Goodwin C. Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2000a; 32(10):1489–1522. look up issue in volume.
- Goodwin, C. Practices of Seeing, Visual Analysis: An Ethnomethodological Approach. In: van Leeuwen, T.; Jewitt, C., editors. *Handbook of Visual Analysis*. London: Sage; 2000b. p. 157–82.
- Goodwin, C. The Body in Action. In: Coupland, J.; Gwyn, R., editors. *Discourse, the body and identity*. New York: Palgrave/Macmillan; 2003. p. 19–42.
- Goodwin, C. Interactive footing. In: Holt, E.; Clift, R., editors. *Reporting talk: reported speech in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2007. p. 16–46.
- Goodwin MH. Processes of mutual monitoring implicated in the production of description sequences. *Sociological Inquiry*. 1980; 50(3/4):303–317.
- Goodwin, MH. By-play: negotiating evaluation in story-telling. In: Guy, GR.; Baugh, J.; Schifffrin, D.; Feagin, C., editors. *Towards a social science of language: papers in honour of William Labov*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins; 1997. p. 77–102.
- Goodwin MH, Goodwin C. Gesture and co-participation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica*. 1986; 62:51–75.
- Hayashi, M. Joint utterance construction in Japanese conversation. Amsterdam: John Benjamins; 2003a.
- Hayashi M. Language and the body as resources for collaborative action: A study of word searches in Japanese conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*. 2003b; 36(2):109–141.
- Hayashi M. Joint turn construction through language and the body: Notes on embodiment in coordinated participation in situated activities. *Semiotica*. 2005; 156(1/4):21–53.
- Heath C. The display of reciprocity: An instance of sequential relationship between speech and body movement. *Semiotica*. 1982; 42(2/4):147–161.
- Heritage, J. A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In: Atkinson, JM.; Heritage, J., editors. *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1984. p. 299–345.
- Heritage J. The limits of questioning: Negative interrogatives and hostile question content. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2002; 34(10/11):1427–1446.
- Iwasaki S. Initiating interactive turn spaces in Japanese conversation: Local projection and collaborative action. *Discourse Processes*. 2009; 46(2):226–246.
- Jefferson, G. Notes on some orderlinesses of overlap onset. In: d'Urso, V.; Leonardi, P., editors. *Discourse analysis and natural rhetoric*. Padua: Cleup; 1983. p. 11–38.
- Jefferson G. Notes on 'latency' in overlap onset. *Human Studies*. 1986; 9(2/3):153–183.
- Kendon, A. Some uses of gesture. In: Tannen, D.; Saville-Troike, M., editors. *Perspectives on silence*. Norwood, N. J: Ablex Publishing Corporation; 1985. p. 215–234.
- Kendon, A. *Conducting interaction: Patterns of behavior in focused encounters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1990.
- Labov, W.; Fanshel, D. *Therapeutic discourse*. New York: Academic Press; 1977.
- Lerner GH. Notes on overlap management in conversation: the case of delayed completion. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*. 1989; 53(2):167–177.
- Lerner GH. On the syntax of sentences in progress. *Language in Society*. 1991; 20(3):441–458.
- Lerner, GH. On the 'semi-permeable' character of grammatical units in conversation: conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In: Ochs, E.; Schegloff, EA.; Thompson, SA., editors. *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1996. p. 238–271.
- Lerner, GH. Turn-sharing: the choral co-production of talk-in-interaction. In: Ford, CE.; Fox, BA.; Thompson, SA., editors. *The language of turn and sequence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2002. p. 225–256.
- Lerner GH. Selecting next speaker: The context sensitive operation of a context-free organization. *Language in Society*. 2003; 32(2):177–201.

- Mondada L. Participants' online analysis and multimodal practices: projecting the end of the turn and the closing of the sequence. *Discourse Studies*. 2006; 8(1):117–129.
- Mondada L. Multimodal resources for turn-taking: pointing and the emergence of possible next speakers. *Discourse Studies*. 2007; 9(2):194–225.
- Pomerantz, A. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In: Atkinson, JM.; Heritage, J., editors. *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1984. p. 57-101.
- Rossano, F. When the eyes meet: Using gaze to mobilize response. Paper delivered at the International Conference on Conversation Analysis; Helsinki, Finland. 2006.
- Sacks, H. *Lectures on Conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell; 1995.
- Sacks, H.; Schegloff, EA. Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons and their interaction. In: Psathas, G., editor. *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington Publishers; 1979. p. 15-21.
- Sacks H, Schegloff EA, Jefferson G. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*. 1974; 50(4):696–735.
- Schegloff, EA. On some gestures' relation to talk. In: Atkinson, JM.; Heritage, J., editors. *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1984. p. 266-296.
- Schegloff EA. Practices and actions: boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes*. 1997; 23:499–545.
- Schegloff EA. Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language in Society*. 2000; 29(1):1–63.
- Schegloff, EA. Accounts of conduct in interaction: Interruption, overlap and turn-taking. In: Turner, JH., editor. *Handbook of sociological theory*. New York: Plenum; 2002. p. 287-321.
- Selting, M. Prosody as an activity-type distinctive cue in conversation: The case of so-called 'astonished' questions in repair initiation. In: Couper-Kuhlen, E.; Selting, M., editors. *Prosody in conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1996. p. 231-270.
- Stivers T, Sidnell J. Introduction: Multimodal Interaction. *Semiotica*. 2005; 156(1/4):1–20.
- Walker, G. On some interactional and phonetic properties of increments to turns in talk-in-interaction. In: Couper-Kuhlen, E.; Ford, CE., editors. *Sound Patterns in Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins; 2004. p. 147-169.

Figure 1.
Brian raises eyebrows, moves chin back & head slightly left

Figure 2.
 Visualization of temporal emergence of BVP in (1)

a. end of line 13/14

b. 2nd right gesture, head dip, gaze held

Figure 3.

a-b: M= rightward gesture with head dip, gaze toward B; B= 'blank' face (line 16)

Maureen

Abbie

a. Abbie at the start of “nope”

b. As Abbie completes “nope” (arrow indicates eyebrow shift upward)

Figure 4.
a-b: Beginning and end of *nope* (lines 7-10)

Figure 5.
Visualization of temporal emergence of BVP in (5)

Figure 6.
Lines 13-14: Turning toward Terry, Abbie maintains eyebrow raise and tight-lipped smile;
Terry turns to meet Abbie's gaze.

a. Abbie turns back toward Maureen

b. Abbie nods & holds gaze toward Maureen

Figure 7.
a-b: Lines 15-16:

Figure 8.
Lines 20-21, Gwen's wavering gesture and Ned's responsive wavering gesture