# Sequence Organisation in DVD Commentaries: a study of casual conversation as institutional talk

Brian P. Elliston

Supervisor: Dr Kevin Harvey

Total word count: 15,000 excluding Appendices and References

Date: 25/1/2010

# Contents

# Abstract

This study takes a conversation analytic approach to the study of sequence organisation within the 'Director's Commentary' that frequently appears as an extra on DVDs. The focus is on multi-party commentaries, which appear to intuitively comprise natural conversation yet constitute an entertainment product. The study exemplifies the wide range of observable sequence types and topical opening and closing structures. The former are seen to be typical of mundane conversation in an incipient setting, the latter making available the institutional character of the commentary. This is seen to revolve around the relative *indexicality* of the talk. This concept provides a locally understood and collaborative prioritisation which further informs shifts in the participation framework leading to a describable difference in the structure of talk aimed at different audiences within that framework. From this it is conjectured that similar patterns will be observable in other continuing states of incipient talk.

# Chapter 1: Introduction and theoretical background

Schegloff and Sacks (1973:292) note that 'not all conversational activity is bounded and collected into cases of the unit 'a single conversation'', adding that (ibid:324) a 'conversation as unit' will contrast with conversation occurring between 'members of a household in their living room, employees who share an office, passengers together in an automobile, etc.' These latter are seen as 'continuing states of incipient talk' (CSIT). Participants in CSIT will not employ all the same conversational tools observable in delineable conversations; those with specifiable beginnings and endings, which have formed the majority of work in conversation analysis (CA) and which have been termed 'continuously sustained talk' (hereafter CST).

This study analyzes 'cast and crew DVD commentaries' (a common 'extra' on DVDs) as examples of continuing states of incipient talk. Specifically, the study is restricted to consideration of *multi-party* commentaries (two to five speakers), evincing *spontaneous, natural talk-in-interaction*. The goals of this study are:

- To provide enough overall exemplification to locate, or anchor, the talk into a conceptual position relative to other varieties of talk.

- To reveal features of the talk differentiating it from, and linking it to, casual conversation.

- To trace those aspects of talk particular to the setting or context.

Whilst various approaches within CA (e.g. investigation of repair strategies, overlap resolution, or turn taking) might illuminate one or two of these goals, by investigating the patterns of *sequence organisation* within the talk all three goals can be achieved. However, it should be noted that limitations of space mandate the omission of 'preference structure' (see Boyle 2000) from this study.

## 1.1   Locating DVD commentaries theoretically

Heritage (1998:4) describes how, 'CA starts with the view that 'context' is both a project and a product of the participants' actions. The assumption is that it is fundamentally through interaction that context is built, invoked and managed'. My study assumes this definition of 'context', but differs significantly from most previous studies of 'talk in setting', (for examples of news interviews see Heritage 1985 and Schegloff 1992b, for doctor-patient interviews see Ainsworth-Vaughn 1992, for job interviews see Button 1992, for courtroom interaction see Drew 1992) in that such research focuses on question/answer formats, and the differences these contextual structures show from casual conversation.

This paper will suggest that talk in DVD commentaries (hereafter 'DCs') pursues its institutional goals, *as casual conversation*, albeit demonstrative of setting and incipiency. It will, however, employ Drew and Heritage's (1992:13) approach that analysis of institutional talk should start with 'the study of sequences of actions and the ways in which context forms a resource for their interpretation'.

I will consider DC talk as an institutionally modified example of what Carter and McCarthy (1997:74) term 'comment-elaboration' talk. Referring to their examples, Carter and McCarthy state that speakers 'switch topics relatively freely commenting on each other's statements and elaborating briefly in response to follow-up questions or further comments'. They note the frequency of evaluation in this elaboration, and also state of one example (ibid:87) 'This is typical of casual talk, where topics drift from one to another, sometimes provoked by what the speakers are doing...or objects in the immediate situation...or just something which springs to mind by association...or the whole present situation itself.'

Such a description closely matches multi-party DC talk, with the proviso that the talk orient around a specific group activity (watching a film or TV programme), a specific object (the film itself – but as *stimulus* for *related* talk rather than undeviating theme or subject), and an understanding that the talk is, or will become an 'entertainment product'. This final condition means we can expect to see both extended sequences in which the participants *collaborate* to achieve this goal, and individual contributions which may not be sequentialised but which support the same end. This corresponds with Myers (1998) work on 'focus group talk', in which he demonstrates how participants collaborate to achieve what they believe are the *goals* of such a group.

## 1.2    Sequences within conversation analysis

As a focus of analysis, sequence organisation envelopes features of talk at the level of intent, action and topic and provides a 'canonical model' against which a variety of extracts from a variety of commentaries can be tested.

Within CA, turns of talk with beginnings and endings identifiable by co-participants are termed 'turn-constructional units' (TCUs). These are formed and recognised grammatically, phonetically and also through their function in the talk. Schegloff (2007:4) describes TCUs as units of conduct, meaning TCUs provoke in co-participants both *recognition of completion* and an *understanding of next speaker selection*. By tracking what speakers intend TCUs to achieve, sequence shapes can be mapped. The term 'sequence' is viewed in CA as meaning such an arrangement of turns; one in which (ibid:3) a 'general pattern or structure' can be seen. It should be stressed that sequences are at all times deemed to be negotiated locally.

In contrast to speech act theory (see Austin 1962), CA identifies the action of a TCU as being defined in terms of its *relationship* with a *response* turn: the notion of 'action' or 'intent' becomes more abstract and not inherent within a turn itself – rather successive turns locally manage the talk without calling on predetermined exchange systems. This is important for DC talk which is not aimed at carrying out an identifiable act other than 'commenting' – without expectation of response or result. Defining speech acts for such talk may be impossible.

Two TCUs which 'necessarily go together' are said in CA to form an 'adjacency pair'; the first TCU is said to project the second, the second being projected by the first. Structurally, adjacency pairs are labelled as having a base first pair part (FPP) and a base second pair part (SPP) - though the parts need not be directly adjacent within the *talk* - the concept of 'adjacency' refers to a relationship in meaning between the participants' production of the turns. 'Expectable' responses (whose absence will be marked) are deemed 'conditionally relevant' in CA (Schegloff 1968:1083). Pre-sequences, insert sequences and post-expansion sequences of similar pairs can expand the base pair into longer sequences. Even the noticeable absence of an 'adjacent' response can be used by co-participants to infer 'meaning', as in the case for example, of reaction to an ignored greeting.

Chapter 2 will provide an exemplification of the range and nature of sequence structures evinced in DCs. Chapter 3 considers how topicality informs the institutional, contextual setting. Chapter 4 shows how the orientation of the talk further manifests context, but also explains how this interacts with those other sequences of talk structurally reflective of 'casual conversation'.

# Chapter 2: Sequence types in DVD commentaries

## 2.1   Minimal adjacency sequences

Researchers such as Schegloff (2007:22) view two turn adjacency sequences as the minimal form, exemplified by greetings and farewells, initial enquiries about health and other such ritual forms.  Schegloff's examples of *non-ritual* minimal pairs are interactionally unusual (ibid:24-25): one sequence deliberately cut short by the second speaker (attributed to embarrassment), and two 'mock requests'. He suggests (ibid:26) that it is likely research will show two turn sequences to be even more prevalent in CSIT than in CST due to its 'fits and starts' nature.

However whilst minimal two turn sequences do occur in DCs, the evidence does not support Schegloff's reasoning. In FB.00.14.25, Yuzna's compliment follows earlier talk centring on Crampton's 'on screen' glasses. Crampton is 'morally bound' to respond, but in a self-deprecating manner (see Pomerantz 1984a); the compliment coming publicly from a non-intimate acquaintance.

```
FB.00.14.25
    1   Y:   God look at those blue eyes
    2        (2.5)
    3   Cr:  How could you see anything through those (.) big ugly
             [glasses]
```

Whilst not rejecting the compliment outright, Crampton reorients the talk back to the (already fully discussed) glasses and away from a 'dangerous' personal topic. This is similar to Schegloff's example of someone not wishing to pursue a sequence.

In OJ.00.37.28 the dialogue references 'in-scene' (meaning audio/visual stimuli from the film, simultaneously existent with the commentary)  images of a comedy

news broadcast, the four lines of dialogue form a FPP by Sito (combining two TCUs) and a similar SPP by Kroon.

```
OJ.00.37.28
  1  S:    This is m- (.) this is everyone's favourite=
  2  K:    =This is -really cool yeah=
  3  S:    =Stuff that the newscasters=
  4  K:    =°Yeah°
```

Examples (taken from casual conversation) of such agreement SPP assessments to an assessing FPP are discussed by Pomerantz (1984a:59-60). See BIS.00.20.10 in Appendix 3 for a further example. I will at this point suggest that it is *assessment* minimal adjacency pairs which seem the most common form of two turn sequences in DCs.

## 2.2    Pre-sequences

Pre-sequences comprise adjacency pairs situated *before* the base pair (themselves constituting a base pair if no base pair is subsequently generated). They form part of the same overall sequence and occupy such roles as introducing invitations, requesting and offering. Such instances form 'type-specific' pre-sequences.

Pre-sequences serve a primarily phatic role in talk, orientating the talk and its participants. As 'performers', DC participants rarely account for the politeness (excepting compliments) or interpersonal subtleties of their co-participants (see Heritage 1985). The nature of 'comment' in DCs means what is visible in-scene can effectively perform the 'consciousness raising function' of pre-sequences, while time limitations to the talk may make pre-sequence deployment impractical. This would suggest pre-sequences having little role within DCs.

The exception to this concerns 'pre-telling' sequences. These lead in to announcements or news telling by gauging from the SPP whether something *is* new to the recipient (since it is a conversational maxim not to tell as new something that is already known to the listener), or gauging the recipient's (potential) stance on a 'new'. In addressing an effectively 'mute' audience listening at home, speakers cannot employ pre-sequences, but must *assume* that they are presenting something 'new'. There are however occasions when the participants address one another directly. Potentially these offer sites for pre-announcement sequences, as in RA.00.17.03.

```
RA.00.17.03
    1  Y     Did you ever see the the script that had the scene (0.3)
              where er Doctor Hill (0.2) holds his class after his
              head gets cut off
    2  Cr:   No=
    3  A:    =No=
    4  Y:    =He does it on TV (.) huh huh it's just his head
    5  A:    No
    6  Cr:   I didn't see that. (0.5) that was cut out?
    7  Y:    °Mm°
```

The pre-sequence FPP (a direct question) by Yuzna (line 1) checks whether his upcoming comment is already known to his co-participants. The two SPPs made by Crampton and Abbott (lines 2/3) give the go ahead for the base FPP at line 4.

Having exemplified *type-specific* pre-sequences we can examine a 'generic' pre-sequence; the summons/answer sequence. This involves getting or confirming the *attention* of potential respondents before starting a base sequence. Examples from DCs include RA.00.02.30 below, where a sequence is intersected by Sampson at line 5. Because Abbott is still engaged in the unfinished sequence with Combs, Sampson's turn is 'lost', but he makes another attempt at line 7, this time using a pre-sequence: he selects a particular co-participant as addressee.

11

```
RA.00.02.30
   1   A:    My son wears nothing but that green
   2         ((General laughter))
   3   Co:   That's sick
   4         ((General laughter))
   5   S:    Now has he seen this film
   6   A:    You're a fine person to be talking about sick (.)
               [Jeff ]
   7   S:      [Bruce]
   8         (0.5)
   9   S:    Bruce has your son seen this film
  10   A:    No not yet (.) er: (.) maybe when he's seven
```

There follows a pause which we can judge as an acknowledgement that the turn has passed and attention given. SPPs to summons/answer pre-sequences are often *non-verbal*, being shown by a look, gesture etc. Upon receipt of acknowledgement, Sampson re-launches his base FPP at line 9.

In a second example (RA.00.19.17 in Appendix 3) a quantity of overlapping talk between three other speakers twice prevents Combs' question being 'heard'. He then employs the summons 'wait', FPP in a pre-sequence, which does gradually gain co-participants attention, and from which he re-launches his question as base FPP of a sequence attended to by co-participants.

I therefore propose that pre-telling and summon sequences have a clear role to play in DCs. Other pre-sequences primarily employed interpersonally in CST display limited use.


## 2.3    Insert expansions

Insert expansions are a sequence type occurring between the base FPP and SPP. Specifically, when instead of the 'expected' SPP of the base pair, the projected second speaker responds with the (insert) FPP of a sequence aimed at establishing

some further information or clarification, before they provide the base SPP. They are a preliminary to the SPP, generated to help maximise the semantic contiguity of the FPP and SPP. Extract FB.00.11.32 below exemplifies this.

```
FB.00.11.32
   1   Y:    Barbara are you gonna leave those things on the whole movie
   2   ():   ((quiet laughter))
   3   Cr:   [[Leave what]] things on
   4   Co:   [[(She  digs]]
   5   Y:    These glasses=
   6   Cr:   =th- [the earrings or glass] [no I take it all off] (.)
   7   ():        [    ((laughter))      ]
   8   Y:                                 [The earrings are nice] (hhh)
```

Not understanding the reference 'those things', in the base FPP at line 1, Crampton delays the SPP response and seek clarification through an insert expansion. The FPP of *this* is her question in line 3; the SPP is Yuzna's clarification in line 5. Crampton then provides the base SPP at line 6, 'no I take it all off'. Expansions of this kind, which refer back to ambiguity in understanding the base FPP, are a *generic* expansion termed 'post-first inserts'.

'Pre-second insert' expansions are *type specific* (see Schegloff 2007:106). Rather than clarify some failure of understanding in the FPP they provide extra resources with which the respondent can formulate the SPP. Excerpt OJ.01.03.52 shows such an expansion. Hyman (line 1) makes the base FPP. Penn responds to the turn, but not with a SPP. The intonation of his response at line 2 is more than an exclamatory response and 'asks for' more information; it marks 'news' but sequentially as not yet 'enough' news for meaningful response. It becomes the FPP of the insert expansion. Hyman (line 3) responds in two ways.

```
OJ.01.03.52
   1   H:    Now one thing you should notice is these are (0.5) for
             those golfers out there these are some very expensive
```

13

```
                    golf clubs in the background
 2   P:     Are they re:ally
 3   H:     Yeah yeah I recently became a golfer and so now I know
            why they're in the shot because that way (.) they're
            they're definitely golf clubs that this character
            couldn't afford (1.0) er=
 4   P:     =Interesting=
 5   H:     =But I think somehow they were given free to the
            production (0.5) [I don't know] who has them right now
```

He initially reconfirms his statement ('yeah yeah'), but this does not fulfil the needs of the insert FPP; Penn still does not have sufficient relevant information to respond in a way sensibly connected to the FPP. This need generates the second part of Hyman's response, in which he first makes the remark *personal to himself* (he recently took up golf) and second makes it relevant to the *in-scene character.* Penn is now able to produce the base SPP at line 4.

This sequence could have finished after line 1 as a statement complete in itself, i.e. 'non-sequentialised'. It could have finished at line 2 if Penn's response had been read as a 'closing' one. Viewing the sequence retrospectively however, analysis clearly shows that Penn felt Hyman's comment 'worth' response but that the FPP lacked an orientation which would enable this – or that is how *Hyman* understands the insert FPP. This is the kind of expansion generated by phrases such as 'How do you mean?' or 'So what?'

This sequence is also useful in illustrating sequences as locally negotiated. We can see this local management at work even more clearly by contrasting OJ.01.03.52 with OJ.00.40.40 (Appendix 3) where a similar insert FPP ('He is?) is responded to very differently - with only a further agreement token as SPP ('He actually is'). It is the 'reading' of a previous turn by next speaker that drives the sequence towards the shape it finally takes.

14

## 2.4　Post-expansions

Post-expansions involve turns and sequences following after the base pair. The briefest expansion is the sequence closing third (SCT), usually produced by speaker of the FPP, it is designed to close, or *propose* closure of the sequence. Heritage (1984) discusses 'oh' as a SCT which demonstrates a change of state in the respondent, while Schegloff (2007) discusses 'okay' as showing acceptance of the SPP. Within DCs we see SCT 'yeah' take the role of a marker of filial positioning on an assessment or assertion.

```
WFG.00.04.24
   1   G:   You have those pyjamas now don't you didn't you take those
             (at the)=
   2   L:   =er I did take the pyjamas=
   3   G:   =yeah
             (0.5)
   4   L:   Mmhh (2.0) erm (2.0) had them cleaned (0.4)
   5   G:   Mmhh
```

In the extract WFG.00.04.24 the SCT at line 3 illustrates that while 'designed' to offer closure to the sequence, they do not necessarily do so. After three pauses Levy adds a further expansion (in the form of a continuation of his SPP from line 2) to the sequence at line 4. The sequence ends after a subsequent SCT at line 5 which structurally repeats that from line 3.

Ritualised SCTs are rare in DCs, but can occur. In OJ.00.34.40 (Appendix 3) Penn comments that it is his anniversary, prompting ritualised congratulations and a SCT 'thank-you' from Penn.

Assessments are another form of common SCT. They show the adoption of a position by the FPP speaker to the SPP speaker's position. RC.00.17.09 (Appendix

3) features a FPP description of a disused steelworks used as a location for filming as being an example of American economic problems. SPP speaker makes an agreeing assessment, to which first speaker responds after a pause, with a SCT, 'but it was a great set for us'. The 'contradictory' nature of this closing assessment explains the pause (see Pomerantz 1984a for how pauses often precede such assessment shapes).

A further minimal closing turn type is the post-completion musing (hereafter PCM). Such turns seem partially removed from the sequence, they lack consequence and are frequently made by a speaker who was not part of the sequence to which they are appended. They offer a disjoined reflection or evaluation, and are also termed 'post-mortems'.

```
RA.00.02.40
   1  S:    Bruce has your son seen this film
   2  A:    No not yet (.) er: (.) maybe when he's seven
   3        ((General laughter))
   4  Cr:   He'll be old enough by then
   5  ():   (°Yeah°)
```

In RA.00.02.40, Crampton is not involved in the previous sequence, which upon completion in line 3, she follows with just such a PCM.

More extensive sequence expansion occurs when the turn following the base SPP is the FPP of a new *pair* but still part of the same sequence. Some examples are discussed below.

First, other-initiated repair sequences, where repair of a SPP begins with post-expansion FPP. Repair can revolve around failures of understanding, though extract OJ.00.50.00 exemplifies 'disagreement implicated other-initiated repair'.

```
OJ.00.50.00
    1  K:    This character Chill was animated by Stephan Frank er
              the French er lead animator (0.2) we had
    2        (1.5)
    3  P:    If you notice he bears some similarity to: Thrax in
              the ge:neral=
    4  ():   =Right=
    5  P:    =(Way) I mean like in a very general way he's got
              kind of an a:ngular
    6  H:    Yeah
    7  P:    [[Face  ]]
    8  H:    [[Except]] for his horizontal erm ocular orientation
    9  P:    Phuh hu-right (0.7) ah but notice he has almost like
              dreadlocks like Thrax (0.3) am I wrong here (Piet)=
```

Line 1 opens the topic, which Penn accepts and elaborates in lines 3/5/7. At line 8,

a post-expansion FPP 'corrects' an aspect of Penn's elaborative description. At line 9

Penn responds with a post SPP. His initial stuttering is canonical of delay in replying

to having been corrected, after which he initially accepts the correction ('right').

After a further pause however, he attempts to *reintroduce* his description and

appeals directly to Kroon, the producer of the base FPP, as to its accuracy in the

startlingly overt form, 'am I wrong here'. The strength of this indignant response

may issue from Penn's original comparison of the design of the two animated

characters being repeatedly marked as *approximate* while Hyman's repair turn

focuses on one small inaccuracy. In essence, line 9 has the disagreement

implication almost *ritually* accepted, then upon 'second thought' appealed against.

A similar post-expansion involves a challenge to the base SPP. In FB.00.15.48,

Yuzna and Combs (lines 1 and 2) collaboratively produce a topic opening

expressing surprise at something in-scene.

```
FB.00.15.48
    1  Y:   Oh (.) a [doctor    ]
    2  Co:           [doctor smo]king (°I love that°)
    3  ():  er:::
    4  G:   Yeah well you wouldn't see that now
    5       (1.7)
```

17

```
6    Cr:   In Europe? you might (0.3) right? (.) that guy
           Lived in Europe=
7    G:    =Not any more (0.2) they don't even smoke in Italy
           any more er [er (even in France)]=
8    Cr:              [Oh they don't      ]
9    G:    =Yeah it's amazing I I couldn't believe it (1.0) but er::
```

Gordon responds topically at line 4. Crampton begins a post-expansion (line 6), overtly disagreeing with this SPP proposition. Gordon in line 7 is forced to elaborate deploying his authority on the subject (having worked recently in Europe) to counter the challenge. Key points here are that although neither Crampton nor Gordon began the topical base sequence, it is they who pursue the *post-expansions*. Further, we should note that it is Crampton who instigates the post-expansion, and *would* be expected to 'direct' it, except that *her* challenge is itself challenged and it is Gordon from line 7 onwards who directs the sequence through topical authority.

Other post-expansions involve *reworking* the FPP after the SPP. In FB.00.16.24, after Yuzna's base FPP at line 1, Gordon begins producing the SPP which pragmatically 'validates' the FPP. At this point (line 3) Yuzna decides to be more specific than his comment at line 1, rephrasing it as a post-expansion FPP.

```
FB.00.16.24
    1    Y:    What is it with this this sync here
    2    G:    Well you know what it is=
    3    Y:    =It's not in sync=
    4    G:    =No ye know what what what happened was because of the
              television thing I think they shot this a:t (1.5) 25
              frames instead of 24 frames (.) because it's on PAL (0.5)
              and that's why everybody's voice is a little bit lower
              in this
```

Gordon produces a relatively lengthy Expansion SPP to this (line 4), implying that the rephrasing *may* have projected a more detailed SPP. Other kinds of reworking

such as the addition of more information or a complete reorientation of the FPP are also typical.

## 2.5    Conclusions

Highlighting these examples of minimal, pre, insert and post-expansion sequences shows that DCs display a wide range of sequence structures; there is no evident contextually desirable or prevalent, sequence structure suggestive of goal orientated dialogue. This contrasts with, for example Coulthard and Brazil's (1992:50-78) classroom based exchange structure: initiation by the teacher, response by the student, follow-up by the teacher. Key to this is that goal orientation within institutional talk leads to an observable limitation or distortion of sequential features. What I propose based on the data described is that none of the sequences is contextually marked 'as DVD commentary'; the sequence organisation observed is typical of casual conversation within a setting for *incipient talk* (where for instance opening and closing sequences are unnecessary).

I will next consider 'topicalisation' within sequences, and it is only at this point that we will see how the DC setting becomes truly manifest in the talk.

# Chapter 3: Topicality in DVD commentaries

Atkinson and Heritage (1984:165) state that '"topic" may well prove to be among the most complex conversational phenomena'. I will limit examination of topic in DCs to sequences and structures of topic shift, openings and closings.

Gardener (1987) describes how topic can be conceptualised at 'sentence' level, in which the theme provides the 'known' part of the sentence, the rheme the 'new' (see Halliday 2004:64-67 for a theoretical discussion, Fries 1994:236 for an empirical study), and topic at 'discourse' level. Gundel (1985) also discusses the difference between syntactic topic and pragmatic topic. Since pragmatic, discourse level topic concerns the link between speaker, utterance and context, it is this 'topic' which informs *sequence* (rather than turn) structure.

Gardner quotes Hurtig's (1977:95) proposal that topics consist of 'one or more related propositions'. However Brown and Yule (1983:107) contest that the notion of 'proposition' becomes unclear in discourse studies, for two reasons. First, the term itself has varying definitions. More significantly, since there *is no* purely objective way to determine the proposition(s), at some point the analyst always provides an intuitive interpretation. It therefore becomes less valuable to investigate 'topic' as a concept than 'topical talk' as an interactive phenomenon.

Schank (1977) argues that topic shift is inherent within any relevant speaker response; an intersection of both old and new 'actions' and 'objects'. Hence only conversations, not sentences (or TCUs) can be said to have topic. He proposes that when the topic of an utterance and a response refer to separate 'events' that are alike in kind, the shared feature(s) constitute a potential 'supertopic'. 'Supertopic' can be viewed as a conceptual structure within which 'resonance' or 'relevance' (in terms of Grice's 1975 conversational maxims – speakers assuming a reason for 'why that now') become available to interactants in topical talk. Or as Sacks et al

(1974) describe, that topic turns manifest 'recipient design'; that objects within the talk are not only *recognisable* to co-participants, but relevant and meaningful within the context and the sequence.

West and Gracia (1988) succinctly describe topical talk as resulting from a combination of shared 'knowns' (presuppositions), relevant 'news' and felicitous relationships between turns.

A common approach to topic among CA analysts is exemplified by Drew and Holt (1998). They argue that empirical analysis of conversation can employ (rather than question) our intuitive understanding that topic does 'change', and look instead for the shared procedures employed by participants in talk at *those points in conversation*. Our concern therefore becomes 'topicality' and its development as a collaborative activity between speakers. As Brown and Yule (1983:95) propose, 'if we can identify the boundary of units ... then we need not have a priori specifications for the content of such units'.

Ainsworth-Vaughn (1992:412) suggests the use of 'cohesion' (surface level links between utterances) and 'coherence' (more abstract discoursal, semantic and inferential links) as useful markers of topic and change. She, like Maynard (1980), Maynard and Zimmerman (1984) and West and Garcia, also stresses the role of 'social activities' in topic change, e.g. new topic starts prefaced by agreement tokens linked to previous topic create a cohesive, 'minimal topic link', effectively a minimal form of 'closure' for the topic.

In the upcoming discussion I examine how 'topicality' shifts and changes in DCs. This will be seen to manifest the social relations and goal-orientation of the context as managed intersubjectively in the talk.

Gardner's (1987:138/139) model of topic development provides a partial typology for this discussion.

- *Topic introduction* is first topic in a 'conversation'

- *Topic continuation* occurs when the primary presupposition of a sequence links directly to the primary presupposition of the preceding sequence.

- *Topic recycling* involves the primary presupposition referencing a presupposition from an earlier discourse sequence.

- *Topic reintroduction* follows a 'break' in the topic; the primary presupposition links to one earlier in the discourse but only when there is not also a topic shift link.

- *Topic change* is similar to topic introduction (there is no link to previous suppositions) but can occur after topicalised talk at any point in a sequence.

'Stepwise' topic shift (see Schegloff and Sacks 1973, Schank 1977, Jefferson 1984a) occurs when a speaker references both existing and 'new' topic. Such shift may be imperceptible or may revolve around a 'pivotal' utterance (e.g. a 'summing up', see Jefferson 1984a:203). Responses to such moves, if co-operative, 'topically stabilize' the move. This is the 'general' definition of 'topic shift' I employ below (which differs from Gardner's definition concerning *reintroductions within* 'a topic'). I will also utilise the terms 'topic fading' (when shift specifically references preceding sequences *and* a new presupposition) contrasting with 'topic shading' (meaning shift which notably *broadens* the existing presupposition – Gardner 1987:139). Note that Schegloff and Sacks (1973:305) use 'topic shading' differently; synonymous with general topic shift.

## 3.1    Topic closure sequences

Levinson (1983:313), Schegloff and Sacks (1973) and Schegloff (2007:192) view stepwise shift as the 'usual' form of topic development, entailing no specific 'closing sequences' between topics.

Examining *other* forms of topical development, Schegloff (2007:193) proposes that lapses in talk can perform sequence closure, but that in CST (as opposed to CSIT) such lapses may also instigate topic closing sequences. Such sequences suggested by Maynard and Zimmerman (1984) include marked collaborative endings, summaries of topical content (see Drew and Holt 1998 for the use of figurative, idiomatic expressions as summaries), follow up arrangements between participants and minimal acknowledgements after long pauses. Jefferson (1984b) discusses shared laughter and Myers (1998) the use of minimal response tokens. Tannen (1989) details the use of repetition in contiguous turns.

The data for DCs however, show closing sequences to be extremely rare (for an extended example of DC talk illustrating repeated topic change without explicit closure see Appendix 2), though two examples are briefly elaborated below.

In extract FB.00.04.11 Combs at line 11, rather than further developing the topic, interrupts with an overly dramatic echo of what was just said in the film. Laughter response by the two previous speakers accepts Combs' turn as initiating a *closing sequence* rather than new topic.

```
FB.00.04.11 (see below) continued
    10   G:   Yeah th-=
    11   Co:  =It's running itself ((echoes dialogue in-scene))
    12   G:   [[((laughter))]]
    13   Y:   [[((laughter))]] That's (a) key
```

Such 'dialogue echoes' provide an immediately relevant 'in-scene reference' for the turn. As 'acceptable interruption' they may act as final closure of the topic (as in this instance) or see 'topic reintroduction'.

In OJ.01.02.34 topic is proffered (see section 3.2 below) by Penn at lines 4/6 (in an expansion of a base pair in lines 2/3). This turn potentially challenges the validity of the base pair assertion. Sito and Kroon (animation specialists) accept the proffer and respond to his question.

```
OJ.01.02.34
   1   P:     [[This scene ]]
   2   K:     [[This is so-]] this is some really grea- great
              animation on Thrax coming up
   3   S:     Yeah yeah
   4   P:     [[Why ]] (.) why is it so good (1.5) what's so=
   5   K:     [[(   )]]
   6   P:     =good about it I mean
   7   S:     It's just good performance (      ) it's it's a good
              combination of of good dialogue and strong acting at the
              same time (.) it's it's really shows the animator's
              craft at this point
   8   K:     All these guys get is is a bl- ye-know blank sheets of
              paper and some (.) and a line and they have to run (.)
              with it
   9   ():    Mmmhhh
  10   K:     And invent it it's amazing it looks like he's actually
              saying the lines
  11   P:     Ye like the way I fed that to you by the way that I gave
              you the [chance to    ] explain what's good
  12   K:              [('twas great)]
  13   K:     That was great Zak
  14   P:     I just want you to know I wasn't questioning you
```

At line 11 Penn initiates a closing sequence which humorously refers to his original proffer as having been 'deliberately provocative'. This is acknowledged at line 13, and at line 14 Penn closes the sequence with what amounts to an apology.

## 3.2   Topic openings

Naturally, topic opening in stepwise topic *shift* is integrated with the previous 'closing' (see above). Disjunctive topic *change* falls into three broad categories.

First, topic proffers (Schegloff 2007), involving one speaker inviting another to begin a new topic - often occasioned when the recipient of the proffer has 'authority' on a topic. In form proffers often occur as yes/no questions, with the response demonstrating speaker orientation to the proffer. Sequence structures around proffers can become more complex after the initial two turns if other participants choose to involve themselves. Schegloff (2007:179) also acknowledges the problem of 'encouraging non-verbal' responses to proffers, whose absence in transcribed talk can give a misleading impression of outright rejection.

Second, topic elicitation (Button and Casey 1984) via 'topic initial elicitors' which generate topic by asking a respondent to produce a 'newsworthy' reply (e.g. 'What's doin?'). A desired response would do so, and a 'topicalizer' (a turn accepting/encouraging the topic as orientation for the sequence) would follow in third turn position after which the preferable response would be further topical extrapolation. Schegloff (2007:169) stresses that within topical talk it is desirable for responses to extend and continue, rather than close the topic.

Third, unilateral topical opening, where a speaker produces a self-initiated topic-initial utterance (TIU). Such turns may be ignored, rejected (via reintroduction of previous topic or an alternate TIU), or accepted through a topicalizer. West and Garcia (1988) note that unilateral topic-initial utterances may follow topic extinction or occur *during* topical talk if the producer of the previous TIU refuses to develop the topic.

Jefferson (1984a) reports how existing/previous topic can affect a unilateral TIU. She notes within 'closed' topics (sensitive topics such as 'troubles tellings') topic

development is constrained; 'open' topics allow a participant to *interject* a new topic. Regarding the former, she highlights 'other attentive' conversation restarts.

Maynard and Zimmerman (1984) contrast the topicalisation of previous 'shared knowledge', with 'setting' in topical openings. Unacquainted persons were seen to employ topical pre-sequences to begin the generation of a shared knowledge after which a participant frequently made a *unilateral* TIU. There may however be a shared 'indexical quality' to the talk which connects them, both kinds of topicalisation calling on shared experience, either past or present.

These latter two studies focus on 'what the talk is about' as influencing unilateral topic change. Brevity prevents further discussion of this, and I assume here that DC topics are essentially 'open', and that participants are acquainted prior to the recording.

I will now consider DC topic openings in detail. Note that the extracts transcribed below follow topic extinctions without any marked closure of previous topic beyond a lapse in the talk.

### 3.2.1   Self-initiated topic openings

DG.00.00.43 shows a typical unilateral topic opening sequence. Elfman makes a self-initiated (but in-scene referent inspired) TIU at lines 1/3, Rachins responds with a topicalizer at line 4, and Elfman elaborates in lines 6/9.

```
DG.00.00.43
    1   E:    And that bag (.) those bags are er special=
    2   K:    =Yeah=
    3   E:    =TV show bags=
    4   R:    =Oh really=
```

```
5  K:    =°Yeah°=
6  E:    =They're not (.)normal [brown] [bags cos  ] those are=
7  R:                          [they ]
8  K:                                          [They spray]
9  E:    =too Loud= ((continues))
```

## 3.2.2   Topic proffer as first pair part

Extract BIS.00.14.13 shows topic *proffer* in first position line 1. Guest provides a

positive token ('oh yeah') at line 2 before the proffer is complete but does not

subsequently take up the topic. Following a pause, Levy continues the proffer at

line 5, then again (after further pauses) at lines 7 and 9, and *again* at line 11.

```
BIS.00.14.13
    1  L:    Now you actually fell in love with this dog on the set
             and e:r probably e:r would have taken (.) him=
    2  G:    =Oh yeah=
    3  L:    =Home
    4        (4.0)
    5  L:    had his owners wanted to sell him
    6        (3.0)
    7  L:    (boy) you had a real love affair with this dog
    8        (8.0)
    9  L:    He's a cute dog=
   10  G:    =Mmhh=
   11  L:    =One of those dogs e:r that er require a slop rag
   12  G:    Slob er rag
   13  L:    Slobber rag
   14  G:    Yeah (.) slop rag that's what pigs (.) use (0.5)°yes
             slobber°=
   15  L:    =What[ever (.) what] what the hell's=
   16  G:         [>No I'm just<]
   17  L:    =the difference it's a a slop it's a rag you put in the
             mouth when when you wipe up blood (or) drool
   18  G:    >Mmhh mmhh<=
   19  L:    =S::o e::r=
   20  G:    =The kind that Tovey ((fellow actor)) uses
```

The proffer is finally taken up by Guest at line 12, but as topic shading in the form

of a 'correction of Levy's vocabulary'. He further pursues Levy's error at line 14 by

expanding the correction. This provokes mock outrage from Levy in lines 15 and

17. Lines 18 and 19 display calming tokens, and at line 20 Guest employs topic fading to introduce a further shift from the 'dog topic'.

So topic proffers are contextually employable for topic introduction but may have a preferred position as FPP of an *expansion* after the potential respondent has *already demonstrated* a willingness to talk on the topic – this avoids 'putting someone on the spot'. Minimal response tokens can be used to try to close the topic but when the proffer becomes persistent, forms of topic shift can be used to bring the topic sequence to a 'collaborative' close. This works two ways. First by shifting topic away from the undesired topic and second, by using some 'other topic' until the undesired topic is no longer in-scene relevant.

### 3.2.3    Topic proffer as expansion first pair part

FB.00.04.11 combines what the previous two extracts have shown. Line 1 shows a unilateral TIU start, but after a second turn topicalizer, third position does not accept the opportunity to elaborate (showing only a, potentially sequence closing, acknowledgement token), and second position speaker (Crampton) uses a post-expansion to 'try again' to prompt topic continuation at line 5.

```
FB.00.04.11
    1    Y:    And Crawford Tillinghast actually in the short story was
               who Doctor Pretorius is in this=
    2    Cr:   =Oh is that right
    3    Y:    [[Yeah]]
    4    G:    [[Yes ]] (0.5) That's [right]
    5    Cr:                         [So   ] you made two characters
               (0.5) [out of] one=
    6    Y:          [We::ll]
    7    Y:    =Yeah (0.5) yeah (.) yeah kin- yeah (.) well no there wz
               a character that's nameless in the short story=
    8    G:    =But (s-)=
    9    Y:    =But he became the main character in the movie
```

This takes the form of a topic proffering expansion FPP. Are we to view this as a form of topic fading, or is it topic continuation, since Yuzna's SPP expansion in lines 6, 7 and 9 clarifies the premise of his original TIU not that of the proffer? This incidentally hints at a limitation in Gardner's framework, but more importantly signals that topicality (as described here) exists not in single turns, nor in whole sequences, but in the sequential relations between turns.

Topic proffers therefore need not start new topic, but can be used as expansion if TIU speakers do not expand their topic in the third turn when expected to do so (see also OJ.01.02.34 above). Structurally such 'proffers' reword the TIU in the typical yes/no question form.

## 3.2.4   Topic reintroduction

Extract RA.00.16.54 runs concurrently with an in-scene hospital operating theatre setting. Sampson makes an assessment FPP in line one, which projects a SPP response (lines 2/3/4). He provides a potentially closing third turn reorientation of his earlier assessment at line 5 (shifting topicality from the 'job done' to the 'man himself'). After a four second pause, Yuzna (line 7) references an in-scene character in a 'pre-telling' pre-sequence opening (and narrative 'abstract', see Labov 1992). This sequence runs from lines 7-13.

```
RA.16.54
   1   S:     Ye-know Mac did a terrific job on this
   2   Y:     He really [did   ]
   3   Cr:             [He did]
   4   Co:             [Really] did
   5   S:     He's a wonderful cinematographer
   6          (4.0)
   7   Y      Did you ever see the the script that had the scene
              (0.3) where er Doctor Hill (0.2) holds his class after
              his head gets cut off
   8   Cr:    No=
```

29

```
 9  A:    =No=
10  Y:    =He does it on TV (.) huh huh it's just his head
11  A:    No
12  Cr:   I didn't see that. (0.5) that was cut out?
13  Y:    °Mm°
14        (1.0)
15  Co:   Ye-know what's remarkable about what Mac did about all
          the medical (1.0) hospital stuff was (1.5) he shot it
          all with fluorescent light ((topic continues))
```

However, at line 15 we see topic reintroduction ('Mac'). This occurs unilaterally,

again in the form of an assessment. Note the topical sequence openings here all

reference in-scene features and make no marked 'concession' to previous topic; the

introduction is bald and direct. Also, that topic reintroduction is a contextually

acceptable practice if the referent still has pragmatic relevance.

A similar though not identical sequence relationship occurs in FF.00.43.17. The

'topic' is a visit to the set by Stan Lee. At line 2 Gruffudd makes a topic shading

move – switching from previous turns assessment 'he was very sweet', to 'he was

hysterical cos...' and begins to support this assertion. He is interrupted by a latched

comment from Chiklis at line 3 which, despite being abrupt, unilateral topic change,

successfully begins a new topic sequence (lines 2-11). Such a move would be

unusual (and probably unsuccessful) in everyday talk but is permissible here

because it makes *immediate* in-scene reference.

```
FF.00.43.27
    1   A     =Yes he was very sweet
    2   G     He was hysterical cos  (0.5) when when we see him come
              up now he's he just (.) hands me the:: er the post=
    3   C     =I love this mo[ment]
    4   A                    [Yeah]
    5         ((In-scene character 'The Thing' is asked if he has a
              message for the kids. Replies 'Don't do drugs'))
    6   C     Huh huh
    7   G     Does- huh
    8   A     They're terrified [huh huh]
    9   C                       [Doesn't] know what to do
   10         (1.5)
   11   C     >Wz funny<=
```

```
12  G     =And Stan was like ((continues))
```

Gruffudd's interrupted talk references an *upcoming* scene. The interrupting

sequence ends at the beginning point of the scene Gruffudd *is* referencing, and he

continues at line 12 by completing his interrupted sentence. This suggests,

regardless of sequence position, that speaking rights emerge from a topic

prioritisation oriented around the temporal proximity of the referent of talk. An

important conclusion we can draw from this is that returns to topic *still situationally*

*relevant* in 'comment(ary)', do not require further opening devices.


## 3.3    Comment interjections

Section WFG.00.03.48 lines 3 and 5/7 show two apparently topic-initial utterances

(TIUs) by Guest. Neither requires or receives any sequential response; they are

ideationally self-contained and do not explicitly attempt to make their subject

matter the topic of a sequence. The turns are unrelated, and separated by a 6

second lapse. Such turns, which I will term 'comment interjections' (hereafter CIs),

will be seen to form a significant part of DVD commentaries (DCs) and are a feature

which specifically emerge from the 'commentary' context rather than the immediate

interactional setting.


```
WFG.00.03.48
    1       ((unrelated topic))
    2       (8.0)
    3   G:  These are these are (0.5) some of the shows Corky did on
            the wall they were they were we spent a lot of time
            thinking of the names (.) of these off off Broadway
            shows that he would've .hhhhhh (.) e:r done
    4       (6.0)
    5   G:  A number of people asked me er: (1.5) after the film
            they said er: (1.5) so ye you had to get a really kind
            of a weird haircut for [that]=
    6   L:                         [mmm ]
```

```
7   G:   =movie (1.5) couldn't 've been more disappointing this
           is actually a er: (1.2) bad toupee that just sits on top
           of my er (0.5) hair
8          (2.5)((character of 'Corky' shown in-scene wearing
           striking pyjamas))
9   G:   You have those pyjamas now don't you didn't you take
           those (at the)=
10  L:   =er I did take the pyjamas=
```

Goffman (1981:33, citing Gunter 1974) argues that the 'meaningfulness and relevance' of such [topical] statements lies not in forward projection, but in the response they actually receive; in essence a TIU which is not sequentialised through other response cannot be seen as a TIU for it never achieves that status. The turns highlighted above may or may not be topicalized by co-participants, but when left to sequentially 'stand alone' they obtain a new status, they are not simply 'ignored TIUs'.

Such utterances feature little in the CA literature. Reference to such a structure is however made by Federico Rossano (2006). In an abstract to a presentation he states,

> ...certain types of assertions (not occurring in second position) (e.g., statements about personal feelings, intentions, announcements and noticings) do not make anything conditionally relevant next. The absence of response is not considered accountable and participants do not generally orient to responses as noticeably absent. Nevertheless sometimes these turns get responded to though often this response is delayed and further, it is often only a visible response.

This work concerned dyadic casual conversation between Italian speakers in a state of incipient talk and the role of gaze as a mark of sequence closure. Within a DC, it is 'feelings', and particularly 'noticings', which are the focus of such 'assertions'. While the data for DCs preclude considering the effects of gaze, the assumption must be made that while participants may at times make eye contact, at other

times such comments will be made when all participants are attending to the film. Hence gaze will *not* be considered a significant factor in the management of CIs.

CIs can be seen to be non-minimal turn structures. They do not simply register or acknowledge a noticing *as new*; but provide an assessment or some other extending elaboration – they are 'informational' rather than merely 'observational'.

This in part distinguishes CIs from what Drew and Chilton (2000) term 'noticings' (or more specifically 'oh prefaced noticings'), e.g. 'Oh thank goodness the line's clear tonight' (ibid:151), from which a *response* provides or prompts the elaboration. While both CIs and noticings are spontaneous and environmentally prompted, noticings specifically relate to changes of state. Additionally, noticings are considered by Drew and Chilton as a feature of talk within regular 'catching up on news' telephone conversations between intimates. Their deployment beyond this specific environment requires more study. It is also notable that all examples of noticings *do* initiate a sequence. It seems highly likely were they not to do so, then next turn would mark the fact. An 'oh noticing' in DCs comes in FB.00.15.48, lines 1/2.

```
FB.00.15.48
    1    Y:    Oh (.) a [doctor    ]
    2    Co:            [doctor smo]king (°I love that°)
    3    ():   er:::
    4    G:    Yeah well you wouldn't see that now
```

These two turns highlight some suddenly surprising or noteworthy event without further elaboration, and occasion a response. To constitute what we are calling comment interjections, the turn requires additional content. Put simply, the difference is between CIs as 'comment' (by definition explicated) and noticings as 'extended exclamations of surprise'.

In examining how CIs engage with sequence and discourse structure, two initial

points. In WG.00.03.48 (above) we see firstly that CIs are 'first position', follow and

precede gaps in the talk (they are sequentially separate), and secondly that having

made two consecutive CIs, at line 9 Guest produces a turn which projects a

response, indicating that there exist a locally acceptable number of successive CIs

before interactional talk resumes.

We should also note that the content of the CIs is in-scene indexical. In

BIS.00.15.14, following a pause between topics, Guest references (in-scene) first a

dog (line 2), then a house (line 4), then an upcoming song (line 6). The first two

contributions constitute CIs, the third a TIU responded to by Levy. Although the

second CI at line 4 refers to 'your yard' this references Levy's *character* and does

not make a response conditionally relevant from Levy as *co-participant*.

```
BIS.00.15.14
   1          (3.0)
   2   G:     This dog e:r in between (2.0) well actually whenever he
              wanted to he had this obsession with th- the er the boom
              (1.0) the pole that the microphone is on and he would
              look up at that and try to jump at it
   3          (0.5)
   4   G:     This? was also California (.) this was e::r (0.2) meant
              to be (.) your (0.5) yard
   5          (12.0)
   6   G:     And this com- coming up is the song that you wrote er
              (2.0) which is e:r sung (0.5) live (.) which you don't
              see in movies (.) I don't think people (.) sing (0.5) in
              movies (0.5) for real (.) they they they
   7   L:     [[E::r     ]] they Burt Reynolds attempted it once=
   8   G:     [[(Do they)]]
```

Line 6 initially appears to be turning into a CI. However Guest incorporates co-

participant Levy into the topicalisation ('coming up is the song that you wrote')

which crucially raises the turn as potentially *inter*active. This does not generate a

response and it is only when this turn expands further that Levy responds. In this

instance, apparent conscious efforts to increase the recipient design for co-participant Levy fail to provoke response, and it is only when Guest begins hesitating and repeating himself that a sequential response is forthcoming. This 'sequentialisation' of the TIU is also connected with the fact that if left to become a CI, this would be the third consecutive one; three extended turns in which only one participant would have spoken, a potentially undesirable occurrence contextually. We can also see at this point how their indexical nature means CIs are formed with immediate deictic references ('This is...', 'This was...' etc) to the film.

### 3.3.1    Comment interjections in multi-party talk

The preceding examples come from dyadic conversation. OJ.00.51.33 is a four speaker commentary. Here we see three consecutive CIs (arrowed). In this instance there are no pauses between the turns. It has been suggested (Schegloff 2007:193) that in CSIT, silences can function in lieu of closing sequences.

```
OJ.00.51.33
→   1   S     (Jus- Just to) explain digitally (too) what's happening
              here o- originally when you see these sort of large
              shapes moving (.)(an all) they're actually painted
              stationary backgrounds .hh and then the computer does a
              thing called elastic reality (0.2) where we can make
              buildings sway and things kind of move .hh without like
              animating them like in a traditional sense
→   2   K     This this whole sequence that is about to come up is a
              tribute to our di- digital erm effects er team they did
              amazing jobs >i- (in)< make the (0.3) the nightclub e:rm
              ye-know throb and bounce and come alive
→   3   S     This is a (Roger Shaison) did this scene (0.5) the
              transformation
    4         (3.5)
    5   K     And this er (0.3) the nightclub the The Zit used to be
              called The Cyst and used to be located on the lower east
              backside (0.5) so could have been a way different
              [movie]
    6   S     [That's] his tuchy  ((sequence continues))
```

Here there is neither silence, nor sequence. These contiguous turns are each immediate, in-scene indexical and display no links to one another. They display all the features of CIs and enable us to infer that gaps and lapses are *not* integral to CI's functioning in DCs.

### 3.3.2    Comment interjections versus topic-initial utterances

Whether a new topic turn becomes a sequenced TIU, or whether it assumes the status of CI depends partly on the topical in-scene referent. Referents remain potentially relevant *as long as they remain an available focus of the scene*, and a topicalizer or topic developing response remain possible next turns until that situation expires. So in extract OJ.00.40.15, although there is a 4 second pause after Sito's initial topic turn in line 1 (in which he explains the inspiration for a feature of the animation), because the referent is still prominent in scene, Hyman is able to offer a second turn (highlighting his opinion of the effectiveness of this animation feature) accepting Sito's turn as TIU and developing the topic sequentially through topic shading, line 3.

```
OJ.00.40.15
   1   S:    Th- em (.) this over here this is the homage to (.) erm
             I originally started as an animator in New York City in
             the seventies and our east coast labour rep e:r (.) he
             loved to grab you by the face and give you a good tug
             an' everything and he was like he:y ye- smart kid there
             he:y
   2         (4.0)
   3   H:    It works cos it's also the first time you really see
             where Osmosis's nose is
   4         ((laughter))
   5   H:    Ye-know I love that when you push him in certain
             directions all of a sudden features pop out of that
             blob=
   6   K:    =Uh huh
```

At line 5 he begins a sequence expansion (broadening from 'the nose' to other physical aspects of the character), and a third participant produces positive backchannelling; an agreement and encouragement to continue the topic at line 6.

I will also briefly reference two monologic DCs to support these arguments. In RAD.00.59.08 (Appendix 3), an initially in-scene relevant comment continues 'on topic' 18 seconds beyond the scene end. In contrast, BG.00.02.55 (Appendix 3) shows the commentator producing four 'in-scene relevant' topic turns during a section with rapid scene changes. Both patterns are observable with relative frequency in monologic DCs, but cross-scene talk is rare in multi-participant DCs, which we can attribute to its weakness in 'holding the floor'.

Extract OJ.00.50.40 further shows the distinction between stand alone CIs and turns intended to topicalize the talk. A CI at line 1 does not occasion a response turn; Penn's assessment at line 2 is FPP in an assessment sequence.

```
OJ.00.50.40
    1  K:    This is the scene where they actually (.) phuh like
              start working together for the first time (1.0) they
              kind of figure out that (0.3) ye-know (.) working
              together is the way to go
    2  P:    I love that shot too (.) Piet (.) the one where he
              you're sh- looking down his arm
    3  K:    (Right)
```

The suggestion here is that there is no relationship in the sequence organisation between lines 1 and 2. Because his turn immediately follows Kroon's turn, what Penn does in 'naming' Piet Kroon (the speaker of line 1) is to orient his turn to the previous *speaker* without it having any sequential or topical orientation to the previous *turn* (in doing so he invites Kroon to accept the role of respondent to *his* assessment, which he does at line 3 with an agreeing topicalizer).

## 3.4    Stepwise topic shift

OJ.00.44.01 begins with Sito's TIU (note the equivocation in the turn which 'projects' a response). Second turn is Penn's agreement response and third *turn* is his *continuation* at line 2 ('By the way...'). This turn constitutes a topical expansion (without projecting a response) incorporating topic shift back to 'the school gym' (NB where the 'fair' mentioned by Sito is being held) and topic fading to reminiscence on basketball 'contests'.

```
OJ.00.44.01
   1   S:    This entire erm this entire fair an'all i-this's all
             shot in a real er elementary school in Plymouth
             Massachusetts and er in the basement of the school we
             also like built some several other sets like the
             emergency room later in the picture and er er e:rm I
             think the split pea soup factory and a few of those
             things=
   2   P:    =You're absolutely right Tom (.) By the way er that in
             that gym (.) when we weren't shooting in there we used
             to have er three point shooting contests=
   3   ()    =mm=
   4   P:    =Bill Murray still owes me I think like forty bucks
             [from]=
   5         [((Laughter))]
   6   P:    =I hit like seven out of ten three pointers the greatest
             day of my life
   7   S:    There ye-go
   8   P:    And er he still owes me the money so=
   9   S:    =I hope [he's listening]
  10   P:            [If he's watch]ing this
  11   H:    I had a spelling bee with him and e:r I smoked him=
  12   P:    You did
  13   H:    Yeah (.) he still owes me a lot for that too
```

At line 4 this topic fades to 'money being owed'. At line 6 topic shifts back to the basketball. At line 7 Sito offers a potential PCM to close the topic but Penn responds with a further topic shift back to money being owed at line 8. Line 9 has Sito again trying a PCM which Penn incorporates into his own final topic turn. However we then see yet another PCM in which Hyman humorously shifts topic back to the basketball competition and also being owed money – humorous and a topic shift

38

because it is almost certainly not true (about the spelling bee), but rather a 'facetious revisit' to the earlier topic focus.

Jefferson (1984a) concludes that 'other attentiveness' is a general feature in maintaining interactional cohesion when topic shift is involved. She describes acknowledgement tokens prior to topic shift as heavily utilised features of other attentiveness, also shared laughter. These typical features are both present above (lines 3, 5 and 7). The importance of the stepwise topic shift here is how it immediately follows new topic introduction, and the *limited degree to which it can occur*. Topic does not shift far from the original opening, and in fact remains within Schank's notion of a 'supertopic'. Levinson (1983:315) rightly argues that topic is constructed/negotiated across turn boundaries, but concludes that there can exist no *identifiable* superordinate set of topical referents linking turns because of the infinite number of potential conceptual links. However, that participants implicitly recognise that shift can occur only to a restricted degree, empirically suggests in the above case there *does* exist for those participants some kind of supertopic beyond which talk should not stray.

## 3.5    Conclusions

As performance talk, with an inherent preference for 'continuation', sudden topic rupture is predictably more acceptable than in other settings. However unlike such talk as TV interviews, lapses too are an integral part of DCs. These are symptomatic of casual conversation in a CSIT. Hence we see topicality informed by two distinct modes of talk.

Disjunctive topic *change*, often through CIs, is the primary technique for introducing topical talk about some newly relevant in-scene features. Topic *shift* does not provide the means for talk to match such rapidly changing 'in-scene

39

referents'. Ainsworth-Vaughn (1992) notes that sudden topic shift, and presumably also topic change, requires 'cooperation'. In DC talk we can modify this to say that such development requires not cooperation so much as *no overt opposition*.

Topic proffers are common, though less for topic introduction than topic shift as an expansion. If structures usually seen by analysts as 'topic openings' function equally well as topic expansion, this emphasises topicality emerging, continuing or receding not over 'extended sequences', but over pairs of turns. Topic elicitors are rare. In this performance context they may be viewed negatively for two reasons. Firstly they *impose* on a participant the responsibility for topic production at a particular moment, and secondly, because referents for talk are contextually guided, there may be 'nothing to say' at that particular point.

Topic shift works only briefly in DC contexts and principally within a single scene 'frame'. This runs counter to Levinson's (1983:313) assertion that the preference for topic *shift* is shown by the marked nature of topic *change*. We see that such change here is in fact unmarked, because as we saw in extract FF.00.43.27, new scenes or significant in-scene referents *automatically* open the 'floor' to new topic introduction as 'priority'. The appearance and disappearance of in-scene referents plays a large part in openings and closings, by generating and removing relevance. Talk that is 'commentary' based draws on its setting to contextualise the talk; once that setting is gone, the talk quickly ceases to be contextually relevant.

Talk can legitimately cross scene boundaries (whether the topic is a continuation of 'previous scene relevant' or whether it has developed into non scene-relevant through topic shift), but in doing so the talk is open to abrupt interruption by TIUs referencing the new scene. This creates a tendency for the end of the topical sequence to occur by scene end. CIs explicit referencing of the scenic content (e.g. 'this is' or 'what's happening here'), lays claim to the priority position. The use of

these phrases is not only a semantic deictic marker within the turn; it has an interpersonal function in managing consecutive CIs by helping *label* them as such.

While I have stressed the topical importance of indexicality, limitations of space prevents consideration of the extent to which a referent as a *shared* versus *individual* experience influences topical sequences. Also, I have only superficially considered non-referential topic talk; general topic 'acceptability'. We must acknowledge that this may be significant in how topicality is developed.

Myers (1998:97/98) describes how when moderators of focus groups introduce topics via potentially provocative statements held up on a card, response often being abrupt and even rude, but that once interaction moves back to the participants, normal politeness strategies resume. There is a parallel phenomenon in DCs when a topic is begun by a turn responding to some in-scene action. The normal conventions of politeness or established intercourse are 'temporarily suspended' in both cases because the response is to a prompt external to the talk unconnected with any of the talk participants.

Myers also notes how assessments are typically followed by upgrading agreements, (see Pomerantz 1984a). By contrast in DCs we see second assessment more rarely upgrading, more frequently *matching* the first (typically 'Yeah', or 'mmm'). Conceivably this can be explained by the referent. While in focus groups this might be a broad concept drawing out differing perceptions among the participants, in DCs many of the referents are less likely to be subject to viewpoints which can be sensibly upgraded. However, upgrading is present in Carter and McCarthy's data (1997:85, where an assessment of a 'cherry Bakewell' as 'lovely' is, subsequently upgraded to 'gorgeous'). This suggests another possibility; that in DCs, assessments might be overly effusive in the *first* turn and for this reason, not upgraded further.

41

The limited extent of the phatic function within turns of topicalised talk in DCs reflects the degree to which topic can easily be developed without other attentiveness; using Jefferson's terminology we can conclude that DC topics are relatively 'open'. The near absence of 'closing sequences' shows that such structures serve a phatic role (not contextually relevant in DC talk) rather than a pragmatic one.

# Chapter 4: Footing and orientation

For Goffman (1981:128), 'footing' constitutes 'the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance'. Important for Goffman is that talk exists within a bounded, socially conceptualised space. This means that even when participants are not 'speaking', if the relations of the encounter remain, they are still in a 'state of talk' because they are 'ratified participants' in the setting.

Goffman describes 'subordinate communication' and 'dominating communication'. The former talk is generated so as not to interfere with the latter, e.g. small talk occurring during task related talk in a work environment. In DCs we can use these concepts to help explicate the relationship between talk which does and does not index the ongoing film scene; where indexical talk takes a sequential priority.

Within multi-party talk, Goffman claims, there usually exists a single 'addressed recipient'. 'Bystanders' are those persons in the presence of the talk, not ratified as participants, but whose presence is accounted for by the speakers and who themselves often acknowledge their status as not ratified (e.g. by displaying overt indifference). The importance of 'addressivity' is discussed by Bakhtin (1986:99) as a *constitutive* feature of an utterance, and I will show how varying speaker orientation behaves as a structuring element for discourse in DCs.

The relative positioning of persons involved with a piece of talk as a social situation at a given point in time is termed by Goffman (1981:137), their 'participation status', which when combined with that of others, forms a 'participation framework'. From this we can rationalise different and constantly changing roles, modes of address and 'types of talk' in DCs.

In this chapter I will examine how different footing among speakers orients the talk to different 'audiences' and how this manifests the context of the commentary setting.

## 4.1    Orientation to co-present audience

Goffman (1974:540) proposes that in theatrical contexts, words spoken are not said *to* the audience, but *for* them; 'appreciation not action is their proper response'. In this sense all DC talk is oriented towards the 'external audience' watching/listening at home. However DC's structuring as spontaneous, sequential talk-in-interaction does not always reflect this. Instead, patterns of orientation between 'speakers' and co-present fellow commentators as 'listeners' can also be described, and it is these shifts in positioning which helps explain what we have so far seen as constituting DC talk.

Chapter 2 examined the range of sequence types in DCs typical of casual conversation, with an orientation to those immediately co-present. The footing of speakers there assumes immediate shared knowledge and interest (marked by such tokens as 'ye-know', see BIS.00.20.10 (Appendix 3) and OJ.00.34.40) and a shared attitude with the interlocutor. The orientation of talk to co-present persons is explicitly marked in a number of ways.

Firstly, 'naming' (e.g. 'Barbara' in FB.00.11.32) specifies orientation to persons immediately present, as do deictic pronouns (e.g. 'you' FB.00.14.25 and RA.00.17.03, 'we' in OJ.40.40). Naturally, 'you' may alternatively orient talk to the plural, viewing ('external') audience. Not telling an 'already known' is a conversational maxim and turns *assuming* 'an ignorance' in the recipient without first employing a checking pre-sequence (e.g. RA.00.16.54 line 7) before imparting supposed 'news' can be assumed to employ 'you' to mean *'people generally'*.

44

However commentary colleagues remain ratified participants during this orientation and *may* respond to such utterances, e.g. OJ.01.03.52 line 2. It is highly likely that gaze too plays a role in 'you' distinction.

Secondly, direct response to an utterance targets the talk to an individual ('That's sick' RA.00.02.30), while jokes, projecting a laughter response (RA.00.19.17 line 12), must align to co-participants who can provide it.

My earlier assertion that the data showed relatively few examples of two turn sequences will now be reconsidered in view to Schegloff's remarks (2007:11) that 'sometimes an action done in talk gets as its response one not done in talk'. He notes there is 'no empirical basis for treating physically realized actions as being in principle organized in adjacency pair terms' but later brings these ideas together saying 'there are exchanges which at least initially appear to map onto adjacency pair organization: either an initial utterance being done in talk and a responsive action being physically embodied ... or an initial move being made non-vocally, and being responded to with talk'. He concludes that such instances are 'potentially relevant' to analysis of sequence structure, but does not elaborate.

This perspective raises an important issue regarding sequence structure: the role of semi and minimally verbal turns in sequence. 'Semi-verbal' refers to laughter, grunts etc which clearly map on adjacency pair organisation, while minimally verbal response describes word like utterances with recognisable meanings such as 'uh huh' and the various pronunciations of yes and no (often extensions of non-verbal response).

The data show a large quantity of two turn plus semi-verbal response sequences.

In WFG.00.06.16 below, Levy's laughter (line 3) falls on a possible SCT turn, but is not taken as such by either participant and the sequence continues.

```
WFG.00.06.16
    1  L:   Ye know in the initial edit when you cut this thing for
            the first time you had (0.3) literally cut yourself out of
            the movie
    2  G:   That's true
    3  L:   ((laughs))
    4  G:   I was er:: editing [this film  ]
    5  L:                      [I looked at]= ((continues))
```

In OJ.00.09.10 Penn gives the FPP and is responded to by two SPPs (lines 2/3).

Penn's laughter in line 4 is sequentially a SCT. In this instance the laughter *does*

close the sequence.

```
OJ.00.09.10
    1  P:   Who are the voice (.) are these guys (.) anyone the
            voice guys (.) [(the)]
    2  S:                  [No  ] they're no-o[ne]
    3  H:                                     [Th]ey're someone to
            somebody's mother
    4  P:   Hah hah hah (.) uh hah ((topic change follows))
```

Laughter therefore is clearly significant in DCs. Coates (2007) argues that within an

environment where humour is being collaboratively generated and appreciated,

laughter has four main roles. First, it signals appreciation and amusement, second,

laughter has a role in maintaining a non-speaking participant's presence on the

'floor' of talk. Third, it shows solidarity with co-participants by re-demonstration of

the shared knowledge needed to appreciate the humour. Fourth, it helps structure

talk by marking the establishment and closure of such environments of shared

humour (Coates suggests that participants all laughing together closes such an

environmental frame). The second and fourth points are most significant here

because they can be directly extended to inform the role of laughter in sequences. I

will argue that such semi-verbal linguistic features are capable of playing as much

of a role in sequence organisation as 'words'. If laughter marks a presence in talk,

that presence must be recognised by co-participants and may engender response, if

46

laughter can mark stages in sequences, it can logically project or be projected by a turn in sequence closure. The view that laughter communicates a participant's orientation to the talk means such an utterance may take a sequential role. This occurs in WFG.00.06.16 and OJ.00.09.10; laughter takes the role of a SCT, making a two turn sequence into an extended three turn sequence.

We will also briefly revisit RA.00.02.40 (Chapter 2.4). I did not earlier consider whether Crampton's PCM at line 4 followed a two or three turn sequence.

Given the arguments just outlined we are justified in claiming that line 3 operates as a SCT and that Crampton's remark continues a seemingly closed sequence and is projected not by Abbott's comment but by the *group response* to that comment expressed through their laughter. Hence the talk is structurally oriented to those other persons present.

Thirdly, footing orienting talk to co-participants can be shown by direct reference to the shared experience of the commentary environment (what Maynard and Zimmerman (1984) term 'setting talk'). Speakers in BIS.00.14.13 (continued) and RA.00.02.55 both follow a 'wittily negative' comment with the question 'where are you going?'

```
BIS.00.14.13 (continued)
    24  G:    Where are you going (0.5) where're ye going
    25  L:    Is it lunch
    26  G:    Huph
```

```
RA.00.02.55
    1   Co:   A:h I'm way back at the end.
    2         ((General laughter))
    3         (1.5)
    4   A:    Jeff where are you going (.) come back
    5   Co:   Nah I'm leaving
```

With this explicit reference to both the setting of the commentary task, and behaviour unacceptable in that environment, talk foregrounds the ongoing production process; emphasising with co-participants the experience of making the commentary.

Further setting reference is achieved through 'reflexive frame breaks' (Goffman 1974:502); where interactional or informational content is replaced by a self-referential reaction to a speaker's own words, e.g. OJ.00.33.00.

```
OJ.00.33.00
    1   P      I love this whole idea (0.5) these? are great comments
               by me right(0.2) oh I lo:ve this I l:ove this oh er
               yeah=
```

Penn's footing momentarily moves from general audience alignment to simultaneously self reflection and alignment to the co-participants present in their shared capacity as paid performers - an evaluation of his own commentary (see also OJ.01.02.34 line 11).

OJ.00.18.27 is a similar example; at line 5 Penn (in overlap) shifts footing from an externally oriented series of assessments of the film, to an assessment of the commentary, away from the external audience and aligned towards co-participants.

```
OJ.18.27
    1   S:     By the way that was also a cool shot=
    2   K:     =That was a pretty cool shot=
    3   P:     =Yeah
    4   H:     Yeah
    5   P:     [[That's the kind of commentary they're expecting]]
```

Of course during such alignment the talk is still implicitly speaking to the external audience too – the talk exists 'for' them.

## 4.2    Orientation to the film

There occurs one form of minimal two-turn sequence particular to the commentary setting. In FB.00.15.16 and FB.00.16.08 the speaker provides a response to a piece of 'in-scene dialogue' unrelated to the ongoing commentary. These responses are humorous both in content and in their nature – 'replying' (rather than simply reacting) to on-screen dialogue: it will be recalled that Schegloff's examples of non-ritual minimal pairs included two (humorous) mock question-answer sequences.

```
FB.00.15.16
    1         ((On screen dialogue: No machines))
    2    Co:  Yeah
```

```
FB.00.16.08
    1         (6.5) ((On screen dialogue: The pineal gland is oversized
              and extending through the optic thalami))
    2    Co:  You bet baby
    3         ((General chuckling))
    4    Y:   Yeah baby
```

Combs' turns in these extracts constitute what Tannen (1989:45) terms 'locally emergent expression'; the humorous effect of the words emerges from the context and does not exist beyond this immediate setting. Coates (2007:31) says of such situations, 'Where conversational co-participants collaborate in humorous talk, they can be seen as playing together' and (ibid:32) 'in the case of talk-as play, what seems to be most salient is the collaborative, all-in-together nature of talk'. The idea of a 'play frame', where participants in a conversation co-ordinate their talk to promote and generate humour, is a common feature of DCs. The example here is of collaborative humour emergent from two speakers. In this instance the first

49

speaker is the actor in-scene speaking dialogue, the second speaker is the same actor, but operating from a different footing, that of commentator. In FB.16.08 Yuzna's follow-up extends the play frame.

Such talk is dialogic in nature, speaking to both a general audience and, since the responses produce meaning via reflection back on the initial utterance, also to the speakers *in the film*. Such a turn is described by Goffman (1981:29) as an 'aside' *not intended* for response - an aside from the shared commentary production framework, oriented towards the film.

The significance of this for sequence organisation lies in its restricting the sequence to two turns. If we consider the dialogue from the film as FPP and Combs' response as SPP, the only extension conceivable is a similarly facetious remark from a co-participant, sequentially forming an 'alternative SPP'.

The significance for DC talk more generally is that *any* talk produced in reaction to a stimuli from the film speaks simultaneously, though differently, to external audience, co-commentators and 'the film'. Furthermore, this shows the simultaneous orientation of commentators as speakers *and* listeners (themselves audience), to one another, *and* to the audio/visual semiotic of the film; two simultaneous plains of reception.

Goodwin (1986:287) notes that those not the 'focused recipient' of talk may engage with talk differently, for example 'they might use it as a point of departure for playful, fanciful comments'. This we saw in FB.00.04.11 line 11 (section 3.1), where Combs is a 'non-engrossed recipient' of talk on the commentary plain (not involved in the developing topic sequence) but *is* a recipient on the movie plain, to which he responds. 'Production' of responsive talk however, such as Combs' in-scene dialogue echo, can *only* occur on the commentary plain.

## 4.3    Orientation to external audience

There is an implicit awareness of the external audience in DC talk; though it may develop without making relevant their presence. I discussed earlier how deictic 'you' *can* be used to orient talk explicitly to the external audience. A second method is 'direct identification' of an external participant. OJ.00.20.58 lines 5/7 address the actors from the film.

```
OJ.00.20.58
    5  P:    I mean I'm not picking favourites (.) any of you other
             actors who might be watching this but David (0.3) ye-
             know [(0.5)] David David improvised a lot of stuff=
    6  ():        [Yeah ]
    7  P:    =that ended up in the movies whereas a lot of you were
             just lazy hacks who just read your lines
```

In OJ.01.03.52, after a start with an ambiguous 'you', Hyman reformulates his utterance to address an audience subgroup (golfers).

```
OJ.01.03.52
    1  H:    Now one thing you should notice is these are (0.5) for
             those golfers out there these are some very expensive
             golf clubs in the background
```

The theme of his turn is scarcely of more interest to them than the audience in general though, and it is possible this 'orientation' is designed to further enable the topic introduction rather than 'genuinely' reorient the talk as 'exclusive'.

51

### 4.3.1    Orientation to external audience as contextually preferred

Earlier I suggested that pre-expansion sequences were rare in DCs. A potential

cause of this is contextually 'preferred' projection to a *general audience* (which

cannot provide the SPP response needed to construct a pre-sequence) rather than a

co-participant.

```
RA.00.04.39
   1  Co    This this w- this scene was a lot bigger= ((questioning
             voice))
   2  Y     =O:::h there [was a lo:    ]::ng version=
   3  Co                 [This is (big)]
   4  Y     =there was a lo:ng version=
   5  Co    =a long grotesque vers[ion  ]=
   6  Y                          [Uh hh]
```

In RA.00.04.39, rather than a directly addressed interrogative pre-sequence such

as 'Do you remember this scene being bigger', Combs formulates a 'comment

based' FPP at lines 1/3. Yuzna provides the SPP at 2/4, and Combs effectively

closes the sequence with an upgrading assessment third (line 5). This is a far more

common sequence formulation. It is briefer both temporally and in sequence length

*and* orients to the wider general audience as well as to co-participants (addressees

of any *direct* query). It is sequences such as this which most likely replace certain

pre-sequences in DC talk. This indicates, though further research will be necessary,

that orientation to the external audience has *preferred* status in sequence

structure.

### 4.3.2    Comment interjections as orientation to external audience

I have noted some techniques for orienting talk to the external audience, and have

suggested that such orientation is the 'generically' preferred form.  However it is

through comment interjection that this orientation is primarily assumed.

Wortham (1996:333) proposes that deictic markers are important in determining footing. The deictic markers within CIs I noted earlier, in addition to working denotationally, work interactionally – they *summon* and *direct* the audience to a referent (it should be noted that in this brief discussion I make no distinction between spoken language and any other aspect within the film as 'referent'). These markers also give CIs a significantly stronger footing *in relation to the film* than other turns. They 'chain' the commentary ('narrating event') *directly* to the film ('narrated event') and highlight CIs as fundamentally *responsive* in nature. This link creates a simultaneous dialogic communication to the audience of commentary: the referent becomes 'revoiced' as part of the speaker's utterance, but simultaneously speaks directly to the 'listener' (from its place within the film). It is then reformed within the experiential response of the listener (see Bakhtin 1986:92/93). The completeness of CIs as expressive utterances in this way means they *communicate* without projecting a verbal, sequential response from the recipient.

CIs do not typically manifest other features previously identified as orienting turns to co-participants – while they may display knowledge shared by co-participants this is not acknowledged but is presented as 'new' (a 'dispreferred' method if targeted at a co-present individual). They rarely display features explicitly orienting the turn to any audience, but align with the external audience 'by default' (OJ.00.51.33 line 1 is an exception). The fundamentally elaborative structure within CIs provides illocutionary force and pre-empts the possible retort 'So what?' The incorporation of detail in the elaboration further enhances CIs communicative strength, for as Tannen (1989:144) points out, detail need not add material or information of genuine significance but does increase listener involvement.

In discussing talk aimed at an 'audience', Goffman (1981:138) claims that speakers 'conjure up what a reply might be'. In DC talk, speakers must 'imagine' the audience. However they likely do not do this all the time; talk might be aimed

53

explicitly to the external audience, at other times those physically present at the recording. By contrast, 'oh noticings' (see section 3.3) call for a pre-elaboration response; they play a greater *interactional* role. CIs align the speaker with the absent audience by their very completeness (summoning, signalling, elaborating), and reject intersubjective devices which might align the utterance with persons within the production framework; for these persons they are rhetorical rather than dialogic and do not necessarily suggest further interactivity.

It might be argued that in performing a CI the speaker's footing is that of 'spokesperson' (Levinson 1988), their utterance conceived as a communication from the *group* rather than an *individual*, but that many CIs content is based on highly individual knowledge may count against this argument.

However we can suggest that (see Antaki, Diaz and Collins 1996) producing a 'stand alone' turn from which any development by co-participants must form (however subtly) topic shift rather than a 'completion' of the utterance, the speaker avoids any potential alteration to the footing of their utterance.

Goodwin (2000:1504) argues that different semiotic fields (e.g. the film being watched) involved concurrent with talk are not constant but move in and out of play. In this way the evocation of in-scene referents amends the contextual framework of the commentary. Sequential development tends to move topically away from the immediate in-scene referent and call on other contextual frameworks (e.g. shared reminiscences from the making of the film). This evolves, from an initial utterance within the dominant (indexical) sphere, one within the subordinate (non-indexical) which can be superseded by any turn calling directly on in-scene referents and therefore evoking the dominant framework.

## 4.4    Alignment of audience

Goodwin (1986:286) argues that the focus or orientation of talk to an audience can partition that audience into zones. So in DC talk we see speakers' talk moving subtly between specific and collective co-present participants, the external audience, and sections of that external audience (see also Clark and Carlson 1982).

Goodwin also shows how in multi-party talk, participants knowledge of, and interest in, the topic and the way that subject is talked of is central to the positioning both speaker and recipients (preferred and other) take to talk. For example in the conclusion to DG.00.00.43 (in Appendix 3) Kennedy, who has shown herself ignorant in a topic sequence on quiet 'non-crinkle' bags used in filming, closes the sequence with the line, 'Oh they put the sound in foley?', to reassert her position as a 'TV insider' with technical language at her disposal – the language of her utterance is oriented to the other participants, not the external audience.

Goodwin (1986:297) goes on to suggest that talk recipients consider three factors: an analysis of the actual utterances they hear, the alignment they take to them, and how they will participate in the field of action they create.

Listening participants in DCs must consider the prioritisation talk receives due to its relative indexicality, but also their own knowledge and interests. Those present at the commentary recording will simultaneously be doing this for talk from co-participants and the talk and other stimuli they receive from the film, but always with the understanding that they are there to create talk as an entertainment product. These considerations determine how a participant will align themselves with talk and how they will participate.

The external audience differs in that for them the relative audibility of commentary and film is dictated. When commentary is in progress, the sound for the film is almost inaudible, during gaps in the commentary the volume of the film returns to

55

normal, so only the *visuals* of the film offer an alternative focus to the commentary. Of course it then becomes necessary to consider how other factors in the external audience's environment (e.g. actions such as eating, other talk in their own individual setting etc.) are aligned with. It clearly becomes unmanageable to map such an attention relationship; hence in this study I have discussed only the footing of participants in the making of the commentary.

## 4.5    Conclusions

In treating orientation as an aspect of manifest context we are recognising that 'context' is not the background influence to talk but is rather a product within that talk which enables it to fulfil its goals. Therefore, the orientation of participants in a conversation is an essential feature.

Heritage (1985) discusses how reformulation of responses as questions in media interviews replace the local management of alignment found in *conversational* 'news' reporting. He describes how this results in interviewers becoming a conduit for the external audience rather than a recipient of the 'news'. While such techniques are readily manifest in this and other question/answer contexts, DC talk does not provide participants this strategy. Instead it is the techniques outlined above which enable speakers to alter their footing and alignment of their talk. DC communication creates an inclusive participation framework in which the speakers and audience can become reoriented to one another but never excluded.

The external audience 'seemingly' shift from being bystanders when the talk orients explicitly to other participants (manifest in the type of sequence organisation observable in casual conversation) to being ratified participants when talk orients to them in the ways described. However this must be modified to account for the talk at all times being produced 'for' the audience. This corresponds partly with

Goffman's (1981:134/135) suggestion that in 'open states of talk' (CSIT) a status crossing ratified participation and bystanding exists because entry and exit to 'the talk' are so weakly controlled.

In DCs, footing shifts are less the result of a fluid participation framework than they are the necessary result of contextual relevance - the goals of 'commentary' – being negotiated through the topical and sequence structure. Since the talk in DCs is natural and spontaneous, when oriented to co-participants it must involve interactivity in order to develop in a way comprehensible not only to those participants but to the external audience. When the orientation moves to the external audience, these interactive elements become redundant until a co-participant responds by drawing the talk back to the shared production framework.

# Chapter 5: Summary

The prioritisation given to 'immediately-referencing' talk (in topical opening and closing) and changes in the participation framework seemingly synchronous with this topical development, appear fundamental to DVD commentary as talk-in-interaction. Further research may show this generalizable to other 'commentary' settings. Both indexical and non-indexical talk display the 'context' of DVD commentary, but the former does so structurally, the latter in its restricted topical content – restricted in that indexical talk may always supersede it. Both forms demonstrate the incipient nature of the talk. Gaps and lapses play less of a structural role than might be expected, instead holding a status 'deferential' to the indexicality of the talk, i.e. silences cannot act as closings when the referent of the talk is still in-scene relevant. Canonical sequence structures are deployed in such a way that the relationship between indexical and non-indexical talk is collaboratively negotiated, creating locally coherent, relevant and meaningful sequences and interjections.

Interjections and topic change on the basis of immediacy within the film are elemental to the discourse structure with sequences incorporating or forming around them. Adjacency pairs are present but not pre-eminent in DC sequences. Schegloff (2007:11) notes just such an exception in talk complementing ongoing physical actions, and here I can perhaps add that it is less physicality *per se*, than 'immediate indexicality' which produces this.

Schegloff (1990:51-53) discusses CA's general acceptance that sequence structure is not founded on 'topic', and writing later (2007:1) he stresses that 'talk-in-interaction...is better examined with respect to *action* than with respect to

*topicality'*. However topic working through the relative referentiality of the talk does seem to have an important influence on sequence structure in DC talk.

Generalising these findings to other incipient talk, we might discover that in such 'comment' or 'assessment' based 'genres', topicality has a significance in developing sequences which it lacks in question/answer instances of talk. Also, that the structural devices used to manage topical development between in-scene indexical and non-indexical talk might be similarly applied to such shifts in other states of incipient talk. This supports Goodwin's (2000) assertion that, in many fields of conversation we cannot consider the talk separate from the physical environment where semiotic fields provide frameworks which are integral to the management of turn and sequence structure. I would argue that the results of this study show continuing states of incipient talk to be just such a field of conversation, and that the *need* to consider the 'physical environment' may be what has limited the amount of detailed study into such talk to date.

# Appendix 1 - Transcription conventions

(NB letter x below represents transcribed words, or numbers)

| | |
|---|---|
| xxx=<br><br>=xxx | Equals signs show latched utterances, one speaker connecting talk to another's without a pause. The sign also shows uninterrupted continuation by a speaker in the face of overlapping talk. |
| xxx: | Colons signify the preceding sound is stretched. |
| (x.x) | Brackets with decimalised numbers show a pause between words or utterances equal to or greater than 0.2 seconds, measured in tenths of a second. |
| (.) | A dot in brackets shows a micropause measuring less than 0.2 seconds |
| .hh | A dot preceding 'h's shows an audible in breath, the number of 'h's indicating approximate length. |
| [xxx] | Square brackets mark the beginning and end of simultaneous overlapping talk by more than one speaker, but only where the talk did not *begin* simultaneously. |
| [[xxx]] | Double square brackets show overlapping talk in utterances which *began* simultaneously |
| (   ) | Empty brackets show an unclear utterance that could not be identified, the length of gap reflecting the approximate length of the utterance, relative to the surrounding utterances. |
| (xxx) | The utterance was unclear but the words are estimated by the transcriber. |
| (): | In the speaker column, indicates an unidentifiable speaker of an utterance. |
| xx- | A hyphen shows the preceding word was not completed and was cut off at this point. |
| XXX | Words transcribed in capital letters show an utterance spoken at above normal volume. |
| >xxx< | In pointing arrow heads show an utterance spoken at above normal speed. |
| ((xxx)) | Double brackets contain description of a non speech event, e.g. 'laughter'. |
| °xxx° | Degree signs surround a part of an utterance spoken more softly than the general volume. |

| : | Underlined colons indicate a high pitch with the preceding and following syllables being lower; a rise and fall pitch. |
| xxx | Underlining shows a general emphasis on a word as opposed to the surrounding utterance. |
| . | 'Full stop' at the end of an utterance shows a general falling tone over the course of the preceding utterance. |
| , | A comma illustrates falling intonation on the previous word or utterance, followed by a rise. |
| ? | A question mark shows a rising tone on the previous word (not necessarily a question). |
| ↓ | A downward arrow shows a particularly *noticeable* falling tone in the following utterance. |

These conventions are taken from Wray, A., & Bloomer, A. (2006), *Projects in Linguistics* (2nd ed.), London: Hodder.

# Appendix 2 – Unmarked closings

An extensive transcription of commentary taking place over the opening credits of a film.

The right hand column shows 'on screen credits' (cards). The first appearance of the card coincides approximately with the beginning of the adjacent turn. The numbers in brackets indicate how many seconds the card remained on screen. Although the pace of on screen change is far more rapid here than scene changes during the film proper, the character of topic change shown in the transcription is typical. It can be viewed as an intensified form of the kind of change seen throughout the movie, and illustrates the absence of closing sequences, new topic introduction as in-scene referent oriented, as well as the prioritisation given to such talk.

```
RA.2.01
1          ((Theme Music begins))
2    Co:   Dum dum dum dum da da da da
3          (1.5)                                        Brian Yuzna
                                                        Presents (5)
4    S:    He:::y Brian
5    Co:   Du du du du du du tchu tchu tchu ((musical noises))
6          (3.0)                                        HP
                                                        Lovecraft's
7    S:    Oh: I love this (.) I'm [so prou]d of this [film]=  Reanimator
                                                        (10)
8    A:                           [This's ]        [this]
9    Y:    =It is good
10         (0.7)
11   Cr:   Yeah
12   A:    This's become the most popular colour (.) of all
           time now ((referencing background graphics))
13   Y:    Green?
14   A:    We (.) we began (0.5) we did=
15   Cr:   =the [green (thing)?]
16   Co:        [the  lime  gre][en thing          ]
17   A:                        [(The green phase)]=
18   Co:   =Everyone has (gotten) into green after us
19   A:    My son wears nothing but that green
20         ((General laughter))
21   Co:   That's sick
22         ((General laughter))
23   S:    Now has he seen this film
24   A:    You're a fine person to be talking about sick (.)
           [Jeff ]
25   S:    [Bruce]
26         (0.5)
27   S:    Bruce has your son seen this film
28   A:    No not yet (.) er: (.) maybe when he's seven      An Empire
                                                             Pictures
                                                             Release (3.5)
29         ((General laughter))
30   Cr:   He'll be old enough by then
31   ():   (°Yeah°)
```

```
32              (1.0)                                       Starring
                                                            Bruce Abbott
                                                            (3.5)

33     S:     Oh
34     Co:    Hey Br[uce ]
35     S/Y:        [He:y]=
36     Co:    =First [ca:rd      ]
37     S:            [>Hey there<]
38     Y:     That's it                                     Barbara
                                                            Crampton
                                                            (3.5)

39     S:     Barbara [Crampton]
40     Y:             [(       )]
41            (1.5)
42     Co:    A:h I'm way back at the end.
43            ((General laughter))
44            (1.5)
45     A:     Jeff where are you going (.) come back
46     Co:    Nah I'm leaving
47            (3.0)                                         David Gale
                                                            (3.5)

48     S:     O:[:::h]
49     ( ):     [A::::h]
50     S:     David
51            (1.0)
52     S:     David's here (.) I [really feel] it today     Robert
                                                            Sampson (3.5)
53     Cr:                       [Ye::::::::h]
54     ():    [[David G-]]
55     ():    [[David is]][ here]
56     Cr:              [HI DA]::D]
57     Co:    Hey Bob There you go
58            (2.5)                                         And Jeffrey
                                                            Combs as
                                                            Herbert West
                                                            (3.5)

59     Co:    A:nd
60     S:     A:nd
61     Co:    I got an and before my na-name [((laughing))]=
62     S:                                    [A:::h]
63     Co:    =that means I'm the last one >(   ) have to
               endure< [that °(  )°]
64     Y:             [but you got] an as=
65     A:     =His agen[t w]as a fierce negotiator=
66     Co:             [yeah]
67     Co:    =>With yeah and< (.) >I must have that and<   Co starring
                                                            Carolyn
                                                            Purdy-Gordon,
                                                            Peter Kent
                                                            and Gerry
                                                            Black (3.5)
68     Y:     I think his agent was Anthony Barnao ((casting Featuring Ian
               director))                                    Patrick
                                                             Williams,
                                                             Barbara
                                                             Peters, Bunny
                                                             Summers, Al
                                                             Berry (3.5)
69            ((General laughter))
70     Co:    [Not true]
```

63

```
71   S:    [A:::::h ]                                          Director of
                                                               Photography
                                                               Mac Ahlberg
                                                               (3.5)

72         (0.5)
73   S:    Bunny Summers
74   Y:    Bunny (0.2) yep (0.2) she was in she was in starred  Art Director
           in From Beyond also=                                 Robert A
                                                                Burns (3.5)
75   Co:   =That's true=
76   Y:    =[[Remember?]]
77   Cr:   =[[He:y     ]] and isn't this em Stuart's wife's=    Editor Lee
                                                                Percy (3.5)
78   S:    =great [editor]=
79   Cr:        =[first    part]
80   Y:         [>That's right<]                                Music
                                                                composed and
                                                                Conducted by
                                                                Richard Band
                                                                (3.5)

81         (0.5)
81   Cr:   In a movie
83         (0.5)
84   Y:    Could be
85   Cr:   I think it is=
86   S:    =Really she was ex[cell]ent=                         Casting
                                                                Anthony
                                                                Barnao (3.5)

87   Cr:                     [Yeah]
88   Y:    =Mmhh
89   S:    A::h (.) an' Anthony Barnao (.) fine fine fine
           director
90         (3.0)
91   Co:   Why have you worked with him Bob                     Executive
                                                                Producers
                                                                Michael
                                                                Avery, Bruce
                                                                Curtis (3.5)

92   S:    Yes (0.5) [several times]
93   Cr:             [in what      ]
94   (Y):            [((laughter))]
95   Co:   Oh so he's hired you
96         [((General gentle laughter))]                        Associate
                                                                Producers Bob
                                                                Greenberg,
                                                                Charles
                                                                Donald Storey
                                                                (3.5)

97   Cr:   [[Yeah right              ]]
98         (1.5)
99   Y:    Bob Greenberg (1.0)                                  Executive in
                                                                charge of
                                                                Production
                                                                Dennis Murphy
                                                                (3.5)

100  Cr:   A:h [yeah ]
101  S:        [Bobby] [Gree]nberg=
102  ():            [Bo:b]
103  S:    =Bob is here too                                     Screenplay by
                                                                Dennis Paoli,
```

64

```
104   Y:    Bob Greenberg introduced me to Stuart
105         (2.0)
```

```
106   CR:   Oh yeah=
107   S:    =O:h
108   Y:    Mmmhhh
109   Cr:   Where
110   S:    He wz a wallkling (.) walking encyclopaedia Bob
            [Green]berg=
111   Y:    [Yeah]
```

```
112   Y:    =He was gre[at  ]
113   Cr:              [When] did he introduce you to him
114         (0.5)
115   Y:    To S- ((lau[ghs))] >He er (.) he [er he in-]<
116   A:               [er  ]              [About   ] two
            months after the film was made
117         ((General laughter))
118   Co:   Ok ok=
119   ():   =(come on come on shhh)=
120   Co:   =Everybody shut up it's starting= ((in whispering
            voice))
121   (Y):  =It's the [VA hos]pital=
122   Cr:             [okay  ]
123   ():   =Shhhh=
124   (Co)  =Who's scratching their pop[corn]= ((in whispering
            voice))
125   (A):  =Shut up ((in whispering voice))
126   (Co)  [[(That's UCLA     )]] ((in whispering voice))
127   Cr:   [[Oh this hospital's]]in LA (.) isn't it (.) really
128   (A):  That's -at's Cedar [Sinai          ]
129   (Co)                     [That's Westwo-] that's Westwood
130         ((On screen: Woman receives heart massage))
131   Co:   O[h]
132   S:     [O::]:h
133   Co:   Oh
134   Y:    Oh give it up Bru[ce]=
135   Co:                    [Oh]
136   A:    =I know=
137   Co:   =Oh
138         ((Gentle laughter))
139   A:    I hurt her (.) a lo:t=
140   Co:   =give it up=
141   A:    =>I think [she ]< I broke three ribs when [I was- ]
142   Co:             [This]                          [This w-]
            this scene was a lot bigger=
143   Y:    =O:::h there [was a lo    ]::ng version=
144   Co:                [This is (big)]
145   Y:    =there was a lo:ng version=
146   Co    =a long grotesque vers[ion  ]=
147   Y:                          [Uh hh]
148         (1.0)
149   S:    I thought you handled that very well by the way
            (0.5) after her telling you ((continues))
```

# Appendix 3 – Notes on the data and extract-transcriptions

The data presented in the study are taken from a transcribed corpus of approximately 9000 words from one TV comedy and nine different feature film commentaries. The extracts presented for analysis here are claimed to be illustrative of the corpus and the commentaries in general.

Some DVD commentaries available and not used here, feature talk edited together from contributions recorded individually. The commentaries in this study were chosen as examples of natural, spontaneous conversation between co-present participants. In correspondence with Jeffrey Combs, a participant in two of the commentaries below, it was absolutely confirmed that the talk in *H.P. Lovecraft's From Beyond* and *H.P. Lovecraft's Re-Animator* was spontaneous and natural. The latter was said to have formed a reunion of people who had worked together on several occasions but prior to this commentary had not seen each other for some years. The other commentaries used were judged to meet these criteria based on the presence of overlapping talk, interruption and features intuitively representative of interactivity and spontaneity.

All the extracts quoted in my paper are presented below, ordered alphabetically by film (codes given below) and chronologically (start time of the extract in hours, minutes and seconds from beginning of film) within each DVD.

Note that no attempt has been made to transcribe 'accent'.

**Key**

BG - *The Brothers Grimm*: Terry Gilliam (Gi) [director].

BIS - *Best in Show*: Christopher Guest (G) [director, writer, actor], Eugene Levy (L) [writer, actor].

DG - *Dharma and Greg*: Jenna Elfman (E) [actor], Mimi Kennedy (K) [actor], Alan Rachins (R) [actor].

FB – *H.P. Lovecraft's From Beyond*: Jeffrey Combs (Co) [actor], Barbara Crampton (Cr) [actor], Stuart Gordon (G) [director], Brian Yuzna (Y) [producer].

FF – *Fantastic 4*: Jessica Alba (A) [actor], Michael Chiklis (C) [actor], Ioan Gruffudd (G) [actor].

OJ - *Osmosis Jones*: Marc Hyman (H) [writer], Piet Kroon (K) [animation director], Zak Penn (P) [producer], Tom Sito (S) [animation director].

RA – *H.P. Lovecraft's Re-Animator*: Bruce Abbott (A) [actor], Jeffrey Combs (Co) [actor], Barbara Crampton (Cr) [actor], Robert Sampson (S) [actor], Brian Yuzna (Y) [producer].

RAD – *H.P. Lovecraft's Re-Animator*: Stuart Gordon (Go) [director].

RC – *Robocop*: Ed Neumeier (N) [writer], Paul Verhoeven (V) [director].

WFG – *Waiting for Guffman*: Christopher Guest (G) [director, writer, actor], Eugene Levy (L) [writer, actor].

**Extracts**

```
BG.00.02.55
                ((discussing how the film is set in French occupied
                Germany))
      1         (8.0)
→     2  Gi:    This is my son (.) alright (.) this is the moment (.)
                Harry Gilliam (.) gets his moment on film .hhhh stable
                boy (0.5) he got to act with Matt and Heath (.) and I've
                probably ruined his life subsequently (now well) he
                wants to be an actor
      3         (2.0)
→     4  Gi:    Again (.) these scenes were shot inside the same castle
                we used for the exterior .hh u:::m (1.0) there's a sense
                here in these ro:oms that you would never build a set
                quite like this .hhh
      5         (0.7)
→     6  Gi:    Originally the rain was supposed to be pouring down
                outside the windows which would have made it the
                lighting effect more interesting but e::r unfortunately
                .hhh nobody checked out the windows and er water was
                pouring in through them (.) down this e:::r .hh (0.5)
                wall (0.5) where the books are so (.) the rain had to
                stop
      7  Gi:    .hhhhhh °mmmm°
      8         (1.5)
→     9  Gi:    Matt and Heath (0.5) are a great (0.5) double act
                ((continues))




BIS.00.14.13
      1  L:     Now you actually fell in love with this dog on the set
                and e:r probably e:r would have taken (.) him=
      2  G:     =Oh yeah=
      3  L:     =Home
      4         (4.0)
      5  L:     had his owners wanted to sell him
      6         (3.0)
      7  L:     (boy) you had a real love affair with this dog
      8         (8.0)
      9  L:     He's a cute dog=
     10  G:     =Mmhh=
     11  L:     =One of those dogs e:r that er require a slop rag
     12  G:     Slob er rag
     13  L:     Slobber rag
     14  G:     Yeah (.) slop rag that's what pigs (.) use (0.5)°yes
                slobber°=
```

```
15  L:    =What[ever (.) what] what the hell's=
16  G:         [>No I'm just<]
17  L:    =the difference it's a a slop it's a rag you put in the
            mouth when when you wipe up blood (or) drool
18  G:    >Mmhh mmhh<=
19  L:    =S::o e::r=
20  G:    =The kind that Tovey ((fellow actor)) uses
21  L:    Ye-know huh huh
22        ((Quiet laughter))
23        (8.0)
24  G:    Where are you going (0.5) where're ye going
25  L:    Is it lunch
26  G:    Huph
27  L:    Huh huh huh (3.0) Oooh (1.0) yeah
28        (3.0)


BIS.00.15.14
1         (3.0)
2   G:    This dog e:r in between (2.0) well actually whenever he
            wanted to he had this obsession with th- the er the boom
            (1.0) the pole that the microphone is on and he would
            look up at that and try to jump at it
3         (0.5)
4   G:    This? was also California (.) this was e::r (0.2) meant
            to be (.) your (0.5) yard
5         (12.0)
6   G:    And this com- coming up is the song that you wrote er
            (2.0) which is e:r sung (0.5) live (.) which you don't
            see in movies (.) I don't think people (.) sing (0.5) in
            movies (0.5) for real (.) they they they
7   L:    [[E::r     ]] they Burt Reynolds attempted it once=
8   G:    [[(Do they)]]


BIS.00.20.10
1   G:    Th- the great thing about improvising is tha- that's
            something that Will just (.) ye-know (.) he just pulls
            out this tape out of out of out of nowhere and (3.0) it
            just it just (1.0) makes the scene somewhat (0.5) so
            much more dimensional
2         (9.0)
3   L:    Yeah he's a funny guy Will Sasso


DG.00.00.43
1   E:    And that bag (.) those bags are er special=
2   K:    =Yeah=
3   E:    =TV show bags=
4   R:    =Oh really=
5   K:    =°Yeah°=
6   E:    =They're not (.)normal [brown] [bags cos  ] those are=
7   R:                          [they ]
8   K:                                 [They spray]
9   E:    =too Loud=
```

```
10  R:     =They [don't crinkle ]
11  E:          [These are like] (.)wax bags (.) they're not even=
12  K:     =They wet 'em (.) wet 'em down (.) and then spray 'em
                 don't they?
13  E:     Well no they they wet normal bags down but these are
                 particular=
14  K:     =Oh=
15  E:     =Like sort of rubberised waxy bags made to look like
                 brown paper [bags]
16  K:                      [How ] funny (1.0) I didn't get=
17  K:     =[to carry (one much)]
18  E:      [And then they put the] sound in later
19  K:     Oh they put the sound in foley?




FB.00.04.11
    1  Y:     And Crawford Tillinghast actually in the short story was
                 who Doctor Pretorius is in this=
    2  Cr:    =Oh is that right
    3  Y:     [[Yeah]]
    4  G:     [[Yes]] (0.5) That's [right]
    5  Cr:                         [So   ] you made two characters
               (0.5) [out of] one=
    6  Y:           [We::ll]
    7  Y:     =Yeah (0.5) yeah (.) yeah kin- yeah (.) well no there wz
               a character that's nameless in the short story=
    8  G:     =But (s-)=
    9  Y:     =But he became the main character in the movie
   10  G:     Yeah th-=
   11  Co:    =It's running itself ((echoes dialogue in-scene))
   12  G:     [[((laughter))]]
   13  Y:     [[((laughter))]] That's (a) key


FB.00.11.32
    1  Y:     Barbara are you gonna leave those things on the whole
                 movie
    2  ():    ((quiet laughter))
    3  Cr:    [[Leave what]] things on
    4  Co:    [[(She  digs]]
    5  Y:     These glasses=
    6  Cr:    =th- [the earrings or glass] [no I take it all off] (.)
    7  ():         [    ((laughter))      ]
    8  Y:                                   [The earrings are nice] (hhh)


FB.00.14.25
    1  Y:     God look at those blue eyes
    2         (2.5)
    3  Cr:    How could you see anything through those (.) big ugly
                 [glasses]


FB.00.15.16
    1         ((On screen dialogue: No machines))
    2  Co:    Yeah
```

```
3           (1.2)
4    G:     And this was er: when CAT scans were just coming in when
            we shot this ye know and er:: w- this machine I think b-
            was built out of plywood
5    Co:    [[Yeah]]
6    Y:     [[Yeah]] I think it was plywood and Reanimator serum
7           ((General chuckling))
```

```
FB.00.15.48
1    Y:     Oh (.) a [doctor     ]
2    Co:             [doctor smo]king (°I love that°)
3    ():    er:::
4    G:     Yeah well you wouldn't see that now
5           (1.7)
6    Cr:    In Europe? you might (0.3) right? (.) that guy
            Lived in Europe=
7    G:     =Not any more (0.2) they don't even smoke in Italy
            any more er [er (even in France)]=
8    Cr:                [Oh they don't      ]
9    G:     =Yeah it's amazing I I couldn't believe it (1.0) but er::
```

```
FB.00.16.08
1           (6.5) ((On screen dialogue: The pineal gland is oversized
            and extending through the optic thalami))
2    Co:    You bet baby
3           ((General chuckling))
4    Y:     Yeah baby
```

```
FB.00.16.24
1    Y:     What is it with this this sync here
2    G:     Well you know what it is=
3    Y:     =It's not in sync=
4    G:     =No ye know what what what happened was because of the
            television thing I think they shot this a:t (1.5) 25
            frames instead of 24 frames (.) because it's on PAL (0.5)
            and that's why everybody's voice is a little bit lower
            in this
```

```
FF.00.43.27
1    A      =Yes he was very sweet
2    G      He was hysterical cos  (0.5) when when we see him come
            up now he's he just (.) hands me the:: er the post=
3    C      =I love this mo[ment]
4    A                     [Yeah]
5           ((In-scene character 'The Thing' is asked if he has a
            message for the kids. Replies 'Don't do drugs'))
6    C      Huh huh
7    G      Does- huh
8    A      They're terrified [huh huh]
9    C                        [Doesn't] know what to do
```

```
10           (1.5)
11   C       >Wz funny<=
12   G       =And Stan was like ((continues))




OJ.00.09.10
  1   P:     Who are the voice (.) are these guys (.) anyone the
             voice guys (.) [(the)]
  2   S:                    [No  ] they're no-o[ne]
  3   H:                                       [Th]ey're someone to
             somebody's mother
  4   P:     Hah hah hah (.) uh hah ((topic change follows))




OJ.18.27
  1   S:     By the way that was also a cool shot=
  2   K:     =That was a pretty cool shot=
  3   P:     =Yeah
  4   H:     Yeah
  5   P:     [[That's the kind of commentary they're expecting]]
  6   K:     [[We actually built built the the::            ]] the
             freeways  in in the computer also as a 3D freeway so we
             could move around freely =
  7   S:     =That's great=
  8   K:     =on the freeway
  9   ():    Uh huh
  10  S:     coming up ((New sequence begins))




OJ.20.58
  1   P:     David was (.) I would say (.) I think I know this is
             controversial but I think he was the best (0.2) voice
             over person we worked with in terms of his pure (.)
             ability (.) to ad lib a:nd make the lines better (.) and
             (.) we would just sit there constant- wouldn't you agree
             that he was=
  2   K:     =Yeah he was amazing
  3   ():    Yeah
  4   H:     He has a lot of lines that he: originated
  5   P      I mean I'm not picking favourites (.) any of you other
             actors who might be watching this but David (0.3) ye-
             know [(0.5)] David David improvised a lot of stuff=
  6   ():         [Yeah ]
  7   P:     =that ended up in the movies whereas a lot of you were
             just lazy hacks who just read your lines
  8          ((Laughter))




OJ.00.33.00
  1   P:     I love this whole idea (0.5) these? are great comments
             by me right(0.2) I lo:ve this I l:ove this oh er yeah=
```

71

```
 2  ():   Yeah
 3  P:    But I love this whole idea of this giant dam (.) erm
 4  H:    With the mucus membrane being er:
 5  P:    The dam=
 6  H:    =dam yeah



OJ.00.34.40
 1  P:    It's my anniversary ye-know
 2        (0.5)
 3  K:    Happy [anniversary Zak]
 4  ():         [Congratulations]
 5  P:    Thank you (.) three years I've been married (0.2) in
             fact we got married (0.2) er after we started working
             [on this] movie=



OJ.00.37.28
 1  S:    This is m- (.) this is everyone's favourite=
 2  K:    =This is -really cool yeah=
 3  S:    =Stuff that the newscasters=
 4  K:    =°Yeah°



OJ.00.40.15
 1  S:    Th- em (.) this over here this is the homage to (.) erm
             I originally started as an animator in New York City in
             the seventies and our east coast labour rep e:r (.) he
             loved to grab you by the face and give you a good tug
             an' everything and he was like he:y ye- smart kid there
             he:y
 2        (4.0)
 3  H:    It works cos it's also the first time you really see
             where Osmosis's nose is
 4        ((laughter))
 5  H:    Ye-know I love that when you push him in certain
             directions all of a sudden features pop out of that
             blob=
 6  K:    =Uh huh



OJ.00.40.40
 1  K:    The thing that we probably should've er mentioned way
             earlier is the fact that (.) Drix is actually a computer
             animated character
 2  P:    He is
 3  K:    He actually is (.) yeah
 4  P:    Wow



OJ.00.44.01
 1  S:    This entire erm this entire fair an'all i-this's all
             shot in a real er elementary school in Plymouth
             Massachusetts and er in the basement of the school we
             also like built some several other sets like the
             emergency room later in the picture and er er e:rm I
             think the split pea soup factory and a few of those
             things=
```

72

```
2  P:    =You're absolutely right Tom (.) By the way er that in
         that gym (.) when we weren't shooting in there we used
         to have er three point shooting contests=
3  ()    =mm=
4  P:    =Bill Murray still owes me I think like forty bucks
         [from]=
5        [((Laughter))]
6  P:    =I hit like seven out of ten three pointers the greatest
         day of my life
7  S:    There ye-go
8  P:    And er he still owes me the money so=
9  S:    =I hope [he's listening]
10 P:           [If he's watch]ing this
11 H:    I had a spelling bee with him and e:r I smoked him=
12 P:    You did
13 H:    Yeah (.) he still owes me a lot for that too


OJ.00.50.00
   1  K:    This character Chill was animated by Stephan Frank er
            the French er lead animator (0.2) we had
   2        (1.5)
   3  P:    If you notice he bears some similarity to: Thrax in
            the ge:neral=
   4  ():   =Right=
   5  P:    =(Way) I mean like in a very general way he's got
            kind of an a:ngular
   6  H:    Yeah
   7  P:    [[Face  ]]
   8  H:    [[Except]] for his horizontal erm ocular orientation
   9  P:    Phuh hu-right (0.7) ah but notice he has almost like
            dreadlocks like Thrax (0.3) am I wrong here (Piet)=


OJ.00.50.40
   1  K:    This is the scene where they actually (.) phuh like
            start working together for the first time (1.0) they
            kind of figure out that (0.3) ye-know (.) working
            together is the way to go
   2  P:    I love that shot too (.) Piet (.) the one where he
            you're sh- looking down his arm
   3  K:    (Right)
   4  P:    It's a good one
   5        (2.5)


OJ.00.51.33
→  1  S    (Jus- Just to) explain digitally (too) what's happening
            here o- originally when you see these sort of large
            shapes moving (.)(an all) they're actually painted
            stationary backgrounds .hh and then the computer does a
            thing called elastic reality (0.2) where we can make
            buildings sway and things kind of move .hh without like
            animating them like in a traditional sense
→  2  K    This this whole sequence that is about to come up is a
            tribute to our di- digital erm effects er team they did
            amazing jobs >i- (in)< make the (0.3) the nightclub e:rm
            ye-know throb and bounce and come alive
```

73

```
→   3   S     This is a (Roger Shaison) did this scene (0.5) the
                  transformation
    4         (3.5)
    5   K     And this er (0.3) the nightclub the The Zit used to be
                  called The Cyst and used to be located on the lower east
                  backside (0.5) so could have been a way different
                  [movie]
    6   S     [That's] his tuchy  ((sequence continues))




OJ.01.02.34
    1   P:    [[This scene ]]
    2   K:    [[This is so-]] this is some really grea- great
                  animation on Thrax coming up
    3   S:    Yeah yeah
    4   P:    [[Why ]] (.) why is it so good (1.5) what's so=
    5   K:    [[(   )]]
    6   P:    =good about it I mean
    7   S:    It's just good performance (     ) it's it's a good
                  combination of of good dialogue and strong acting at the
                  same time (.) it's it's really shows the animator's
                  craft at this point
    8   K:    All these guys get is is a bl- ye-know blank sheets of
                  paper and some (.) and a line and they have to run (.)
                  with it
    9   ():    Mmmhhh
    10  K:    And invent it it's amazing it looks like he's actually
                  saying the lines
    11  P:    Ye like the way I fed that to you by the way that I gave
                  you the [chance to    ] explain what's good
    12  K:            [('twas great)]
    13  K:    That was great Zak
    14  P:    I just want you to know I wasn't questioning you




OJ.01.03.52
    1   H:    Now one thing you should notice is these are (0.5) for
                  those golfers out there these are some very expensive
                  golf clubs in the background
    2   P:    Are they re:ally
    3   H:    Yeah yeah I recently became a golfer and so now I know
                  why they're in the shot because that way (.) they're
                  they're definitely golf clubs that this character
                  couldn't afford (1.0) er=
    4   P:    =Interesting=
    5   H:    =But I think somehow they were given free to the
                  production (0.5) [I don't know] who has them right now




RA.00.02.30
    1   A:    My son wears nothing but that green
    2         ((General laughter))
    3   Co:   That's sick
```

74

```
    4              ((General laughter))
    5   S:     Now has he seen this film
    6   A:     You're a fine person to be talking about sick (.)
               [Jeff ]
    7   S:     [Bruce]
    8          (0.5)
    9   S:     Bruce has your son seen this film
    10  A:     No not yet (.) er: (.) maybe when he's seven


RA.00.02.40
    1   S:     Bruce has your son seen this film
    2   A:     No not yet (.) er: (.) maybe when he's seven
    3          ((General laughter))
    4   Cr:    He'll be old enough by then
    5   ():    (°Yeah°)


RA.00.02.55
    1   Co:    A:h I'm way back at the end.
    2          ((General laughter))
    3          (1.5)
    4   A:     Jeff where are you going (.) come back
    5   Co:    Nah I'm leaving


RA.00.04.39
    1   Co     This this w- this scene was a lot bigger= ((questioning
               voice))
    2   Y      =O:::h there [was a lo:    ]::ng version=
    3   Co                  [This is (big)]
    4   Y      =there was a lo:ng version=
    5   Co     =a long grotesque vers[ion  ]=
    6   Y                            [Uh hh]


RA.16.54
    1   S:     Ye-know Mac did a terrific job on this
    2   Y:     He really [did]
    3   Cr:              [He did]
    4   Co:              [Really] did
    5   S:     He's a wonderful cinematographer
    6          (4.0)
    7   Y      Did you ever see the the script that had the scene
               (0.3) where er Doctor Hill (0.2) holds his class after
               his head gets cut off
    8   Cr:    No=
    9   A:     =No=
    10  Y:     =He does it on TV (.) huh huh it's just his head
    11  A:     No
    12  Cr:    I didn't see that. (0.5) that was cut out?
    13  Y:     °Mm°
    14         (1.0)
    15  Co:    Ye-know what's remarkable about what Mac did about all
               the medical (1.0) hospital stuff was (1.5) he shot it
               all with fluorescent light ((topic continues))
```

```
RA.00.17.03
   1  Y      Did you ever see the the script that had the scene (0.3)
              where er Doctor Hill (0.2) holds his class after his
              head gets cut off
   2  Cr:    No=
   3  A:     =No=
   4  Y:     =He does it on TV (.) huh huh it's just his head
   5  A:     No
   6  Cr:    I didn't see that. (0.5) that was cut out?
   7  Y:     °Mm°


RA.00.19.17
   1  A:     What (.) what is on Dan's mi[nd]
   2  Cr:                               [You] were (0.3) quite
              [interested]
   3  A:     [Dan is a  very] busy (.) uh I didn't quite
              [realise (.) what his] motivating force was (0.2)=
→  4  Co:    [What is she studying]
   5  A:     =until now=
   6  Y:     =[[until you saw the movie]]=
→  7  Co:    =[[What is she studying   ]]=
   8  A:     Until I see it again
   9  ()     (            )
→  10 Co:    Wait=
   11 Y:     =°It's all coming°=.
→  12 Co:    =This is what I never thought of (0.5) he's in medical
              school (.) what's she studying
   13 Cr:    Yeah [hah hah hah]
                  [((Laughter))]


RAD.00.59.08
   1  Go:    When we did this movie (.) erm ye-know we had Doctor
              Hill had had come up with the idea of (0.5) er
   2         ((new scene begins))
   3         (0.5)
   4  Go:    a laser (0.5) lobotomy (1.0) and er (0.5) this idea was
              something that didn't exist when we made the movie but
              today it's done every day
   5         (2.5)
   6  Go:    Now laser surgery is jus- er is a part of er (.) ye-know
              is is a very ordinary thing now (1.0) and lobotomies are
              performed with lasers now
   7         (11.0)


RC.00.17.09
   1  N:     This was a really amazing place for me because it it was
```

```
          like the cliché of the closed steel plant (.) and when
          ye got there th'wz was no one there (.) but there were
          like lunch boxes left over (.) someone had written on
          the boilers .hh these boilers were lit in nine- 1897 and
          we shut them down today for the first time in eight- in
          1985 and this was .hh sort of the end of the rust belt
          economy=
    2  V:  =Yeah it had just shut down ye-know th-big so all these
          personal messages were on the wall of all these people
          that .hh felt terrible that >er< that they couldn't work
          anymore and lost their job there
    3     (2.5)
    4  N:  Bu:t? It was a great set for us
```

```
WFG.00.03.48
    1     ((unrelated topic))
    2     (8.0)
    3  G:  These are these are (0.5) some of the shows Corky did on
          the wall they were they were we spent a lot of time
          thinking of the names (.) of these off off Broadway
          shows that he would've .hhhhhh (.) e:r done
    4     (6.0)
    5  G:  A number of people asked me er: (1.5) after the film
          they said er: (1.5) so ye you had to get a really kind
          of a weird haircut for [that]=
    6  L:                         [mmm ]
    7  G:  =movie (1.5) couldn't 've been more disappointing this
          is actually a er: (1.2) bad toupee that just sits on top
          of my er (0.5) hair
    8     (2.5)((character of 'Corky' shown in-scene wearing
          striking pyjamas))
    9  G:  You have those pyjamas now don't you didn't you take
          those (at the)=
    10 L:  =er I did take the pyjamas=
```

```
WFG.00.04.24
    1  G:  You have those pyjamas now don't you didn't you take those
          (at the)=
    2  L:  =er I did take the pyjamas=
    3  G:  =yeah
          (0.5)
    4  L:  Mmhh (2.0) erm (2.0) had them cleaned (0.4)
    5  G:  Mmhh
```

```
WFG.00.06.16
    1  L:  Ye know in the initial edit when you cut this thing for
          the first time you had (0.3) literally cut yourself out of
```

```
            the movie
2    G:   That's true
3    L:   ((laughs))
4    G:   I was er:: editing [this film  ]
5    L:                      [I looked at]= ((continues))
```

# References

Ainsworth-Vaughn, N. (1992), 'Transitions in Physician-Patient Interviews: Power, Gender, and Discourse Change', *Language in Society*, 21 (3): 409-426.

Antaki, C., Diaz, F. & Collins, A. F. (1996), 'Keeping your footing: Conversational completion in three-part sequences', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25: 151-171.

Aston, G. (1995), 'Say "Thank You": Some Pragmatic Constraints in Conversational Closings', *Applied Linguistics*, 16 (1): 57-86.

Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984), *Structures of Social Action,* Cambridge: CUP.

Austin, J. L. (1962), *How to do Things with Words*, Oxford: Clarendon Press

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981), 'Discourse in the Novel', in M. M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1986), 'The Problem of Speech Genres', in M. M. Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*,  Austin: University of Texas Press.

*Best in Show*, (2000), [DVD Commentary by C. Guest, E. Levy], Film directed by Christopher Guest, USA: Castle Rock.

Boyle, R. (2000), 'Whatever happened to preference organisation?', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32: 583-604.

*The Brothers Grimm*, (2005), [DVD Commentary by T. Gilliam], Film directed by Terry Gilliam, USA: MGM.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983), *Discourse Analysis,* Cambridge: CUP.

Button, G. (1992), 'Answers as interactional products: two sequential practices used in job interviews', in P. Drew & J. Heritage (eds.) *Talk at Work: Interaction in institutional settings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 212-231.

Button, G. & Casey, N. (1984), 'Generating topic: the use of topic initial elicitors', in J. M. Atkinson, & J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 167-190.

Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (1997), *Exploring Spoken English,* Cambridge, CUP.

Clark, H. H. & Carlson, T. B. (1982), 'Hearers and Speech Acts', *Language*, 58 (2): 332-273.

Clayman, S. E. (1992), 'Footing in the achievement of neutrality: the case of news-interview discourse', in P. Drew & J. Heritage (eds.) *Talk at Work: Interaction in institutional settings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 163-198.

Coates, J. (2007), 'Talk in a play frame: More on laughter and intimacy', *Journal of Pragmatics, 39*: 29-49.

Coulthard, M. & Brazil, D. (1992), 'Exchange Structure', in M. Coulthard (ed.) *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*, London: Routledge, pp. 50-78.

Coupland, J. (ed.). (2000), *Small Talk,* Harlow: Pearson.

*Dharma and Greg: The Official Dharma and Greg Episode of the 1998 Winter Olympics*, (1998), [DVD Commentary by J. Elfman, M. Kennedy, A. Rachins], Television programme directed by James Burrows, USA: Twentieth Century Fox.

Drew, P. (1992), 'Contested evidence in courtroom cross-examination: the case of a trial for rape', in P. Drew & J. Heritage (eds.) *Talk at Work: Interaction in institutional settings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 470-520.

Drew, P. & Chilton, K. (2000), 'Calling just to keep in touch: regular and habitualised telephone calls as an environment for small talk', in J. Coupland (ed.), *Small Talk*, Harlow: Pearson, pp. 137-162.

Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (1992), 'Analyzing talk at work: an introduction', in P. Drew & J. Heritage (eds.) *Talk at Work: Interaction in institutional settings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3-65.

Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (eds.) (1992) *Talk at Work: Interaction in institutional settings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P. & Holt, E. (1998), 'Figures of speech: Figurative expressions and the management of topic transition in conversation', *Language in Society*, 27 (4): 495-522.

Eggins, S. & Slade, D, (1997), *Analysing Casual Conversation*, London: Cassell.

*Fantastic 4*, (2005), [DVD Commentary by J. Alba, M. Chiklis, I. Gruffudd], Film directed by Tim Story, USA: Twentieth Century Fox.

Fisher, S. & Groce, S. B. (1990), 'Accounting practices in medical interviews', *Language in Society*, 19: 225-250.

Fries, P.H. (1994), 'On Theme, Rheme and discourse goals', in M. Coulthard (ed.), *Advances in Written Text Analysis*, London: Routledge, pp. 229-249.

Gardner, R. (1987), 'The identification and role of topic in spoken interaction', *Semiotica*, 65 (1/2): 129-141.

Goffman, E. (1974), *Frame Analysis*, Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Goffman, E. (1981), *Forms of Talk*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Goodwin, C. (1986), 'Audience diversity, participation and interpretation', *Text*, 6 (3): 283-316.

Goodwin, C. (2000), 'Action and embodiment within situated human interaction', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32: 1489-1522.

Goodwin, C. (2002), 'Time in Action', *Current Anthropology*, 43: [1-53, retrieved in pre-publication format].

Goodwin, C., & Heritage, J. (1990), 'Conversation Analysis', *Annual Review of Anthropology , 19*: 283-307.

Greatbatch, D. (1992), 'On the management of disagreement between news interviewees', in P. Drew & J. Heritage (eds.) *Talk at Work: Interaction in institutional settings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 268-301.

Grice, H. P. (1975), 'Logic and Conversation', in P. Cole & J. Morgan (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, New York: Academic Press, pp. 41-58.

Grundy, P. (2000), *Doing Pragmatics* (2nd ed.), London: Arnold.

Gundel, J. K. (1985), 'Shared knowledge and topicality', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9: 83-107.

Gunter, R. (1974), *Sentences in dialog*, Columbia S.C.: Hornbeam Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (2004), *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (3rd ed.), London: Hodder Arnold.

Haslett, B. (1987), *Communication: Strategic Action in Context*, Hillsdale New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Heritage, J. (1984), 'A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement', in J. M. Atkinson, & J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 299-345.

Heritage, J. (1985), 'Analyzing News Interviews: Aspects of the Production of Talk for an Overhearing Audience', in T. Van Dijk (ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis: Vol.3, Discourse and Dialogue*, London: Academic Press, pp. 95-117.

Heritage, J. (1998), 'Conversation Analysis and Institutional Talk: Analyzing Distinctive Turn-Taking Systems', in C. Cmejrkova, J. Hoffmannova, O. Mullerova & J. Svetla (eds.), *Proceedings of the 6th International Congress of IADA (International Association for Dialog Analysis)*, Tubingen: Niemeyer, pp. 3-17.

Heritage, J. (2004), 'Conversation Analysis and Institutional Talk', in R. Sanders & K. Fitch (eds.), *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction*, Mahwah NJ: Erlbaum, pp.103-146.

Heritage, J. (2007), 'Intersubjectivity and progressivity in person (and place) reference', in T. Stivers & N. J. Enfield (eds.), *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Perspectives*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 255-280.

Horowitz, R. & Samuels, S. J. (eds.) (1987), *Comprehending Oral and Written Language*, San Diego: Academic Press.

Houtkoop, H. & Mazeland, H. (1985), 'Turns and Discourse Units in Everyday Conversation', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9: 595-619.

*H.P. Lovecraft's From Beyond,* (1986), [DVD Commentary by J. Combs, B. Crampton, S. Gordon, B. Yuzna], Film directed by Stuart Gordon, USA: MGM.

*H.P. Lovecraft's Re-Animator*, (1985), [DVD Commentary by B. Abbott, J. Combs, B. Crampton, R. Sampson, B. Yuzna], Film directed by Stuart Gordon, USA: Anchor Bay.

*H.P. Lovecraft's Re-Animator*, (1985), [DVD Commentary by S. Gordon], Film directed by Stuart Gordon, USA: Anchor Bay.

Hurtig, R. (1977), 'Toward a functional theory of discourse', in R. O. Freedle (ed.) *Discourse Processes: Advances in Research and Theory, Vol 1: Discourse Production and Comprehension*, New Jersey: Ablex, pp. 89-106.

Hutchby, I. & Wooffitt, R. (2008), *Conversation Analysis* (2nd ed.), Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jefferson, G. (1984a), 'On stepwise transition from talk about a trouble to inappropriately next-positioned matters', in J. M. Atkinson, & J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 191-222.

Jefferson, G. (1984b), 'On the organization of laughter in talk about troubles', in J. M. Atkinson, & J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 346-369.

Labov, W. (1972), *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Levinson, S. C. (1983), *Pragmatics,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, S. C. (1988), 'Putting linguistics on a proper footing: explorations in Goffman's concepts of participation', in P. Drew & A. J. Wootton (eds.) *Erving Goffman: Exploring the Interaction Order*, Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 161-227

Maynard, D. W. (1980), 'Placement of topic changes in conversation', *Semiotica*, 30 (3/4): 263-290.

Maynard, D. W. & Zimmerman, D. H. (1984), 'Topical Talk, Ritual and the Social Organization of Relationships', *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 47 (4): 301-316.

Myers, G. (1998), 'Displaying Opinions: Topics and Disagreements in Focus Groups', *Language in Society*, 27 (1): 85-111.

Nystrand, M. (1987), 'The Role of Context in Written Communication', in R. Horowitz & S. J. Samuels (eds.), *Comprehending Oral and Written Language*, San Diego: Academic Press, pp. 197-214.

*Osmosis Jones*, (2001), [DVD Commentary by M. Hyman, P. Kroon, Z. Penn, T. Sito], Film animation directed by Piet Kroon and Tom Sito, live action directed by Peter Farrelly & Bobby Farrelly, USA: Warner Brothers.

Pomerantz, A. (1984a), 'Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes', in J. M. Atkinson, & J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 57-101.

Pomerantz, A. (1984b), 'Pursuing a response', in J. M. Atkinson, & J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 152-164.

*Robocop*, (1987), [DVD Commentary by J. Davison, E. Neumeier, P. Verhoeven], Film directed by Paul Verhoeven, USA: MGM.

Rossano, F. (2006), 'When eyes meet: using gaze to mobilize response', abstract of paper delivered at the International Conference on Conversation Analysis. Helsinki, Finland, 10-14 May 2006. Available from http://www.helsinki.fi/hum/skl/icca/abstracts/single/rossano.pdf [retrieved 21st January 2010].

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974), 'A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation', *Language, 50* (4): 696-735.

Schank, R. C. (1977), 'Rules and Topics in Conversation', *Cognitive Science*, 1 (4): 421-441.

Schegloff, E. A. (1968), 'Sequencing in Conversational Openings', *American Anthropologist*, 70 (6): 1075-1095.

Schegloff, E. A. (1984), 'On some questions and ambiguities in conversation', in J. M. Atkinson, & J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 28-52.

Schegloff, E. A. (1986), 'The Routine as Achievement', *Human Studies*, 9: 111-151.

Schegloff, E. A. (1990), 'On the Organization of Sequences as a Source of "Coherence" in Talk-in-Interaction', in B. Dorval (ed.), *Conversational Organization and its Development*, Norwood NJ: Ablex Publishing, pp. 51-77.

Schegloff, E.A. (1992a), 'In Another Context', in A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking Context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 191-227.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992b), 'On talk and its institutional occasions', in P. Drew & J. Heritage (eds.) *Talk at Work: Interaction in institutional settings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 101-134.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997), 'Third Turn Repair', in G. R. Guy, F. Feagin, D. Schiffrin & J. Baugh (eds.), *Towards a Social Science of Language. Volume 2: Social Interaction and Discourse Structures*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 31-40.

Schegloff, E. A. (2002), 'On "Opening Sequencing": a framing statement', in J. E. Katz & M. A. Aakhus (eds.), *Perpetual Contact: Mobile Communication, Private Talk, Public Performance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 321-385.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007), *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis 1,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. & Sacks, H. (1973) Opening Up Closings, *Semiotica* 8: 289-327.

Selting, M. (2000), 'The construction of units in conversational talk', *Language in Society*, 29: 477-517.

Tannen, D. (1989), *Talking Voices: Repetition, dialogue and imagery in conversational discourse*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ten Have, P. (2007), *Doing Conversation Analysis* (2nd ed.), London: Sage.

*Waiting for Guffma*n, (1996), [DVD Commentary by C. Guest, E. Levy], Film directed by Christopher Guest, USA: Castle Rock.

West, C. & Garcia, A. (1988), 'Conversational Shift Work: A Study of Topical Transitions between Women and Men', *Social Problems*, 35 (5): 551-575.

Wortham, S. E. F. (1996), 'Mapping participant deictics: A technique for discovering speakers' footing', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25: 331-348.

Wray, A., & Bloomer, A. (2006), *Projects in Linguistics* (2nd ed.), London: Hodder.