Time Bound Talk and Competitive Overlap: Some features of conversation in DVD Commentaries

Brian P. Elliston

This study examines the initiation of competitive overlapping talk and some locally managed devices used in its resolution leading to the reinstatement of one-at-a-time talk. The framework of phases in which these devices operate, and some of the devices themselves are taken from Emanuel Schegloff (2000), and Gail Jefferson (2004). Both these papers examine mundane, ordinary conversation. This work takes as its point of departure the requirement for the talk to follow the timescale of a film's scene structure which may be expected to manifest particular effects on occurrences of overlapping talk. The study begins with a rationale for the use of conversation analysis (CA) as the basis for this analysis, and considers how a commercial product like DVD commentaries (DCs) *can* be analysed as casual conversation. An examination of two segments of talk from different DCs follows.

Conversation analysis (CA) places casual (ordinary or mundane) conversation not 'generically' as one variety of conversation among many but rather as a locus for other types of conversation. That is, occupying a unique place as the most fundamental manifestation of human verbal communication, with other varieties of talk seen as deviations and derivations (see Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974). CA proposes that 'each "current" conversational action embodies a "here and now" definition of the situation to which subsequent talk will be oriented' (Goodwin & Heritage 1990: 287). This is manifest as 'adjacency pairs', operating as a framework 'through which participants constrain one another, and hold one another accountable, to produce coherent and intelligible courses of action' and which embody 'analysis of past interactional events in a course of current action [to provide] the basis for others to judge both one's understanding of what has transpired and the appropriateness of one's response' (ibid: 288). Goodwin and Heritage (ibid:288/289) go on to explain that this view leads to the reasoning that one turn of talk projects another, meaning it may reasonably expect but not require one of a range of next actions. Utterances therefore simultaneously show both understanding of prior turns and project next/future turns. A logical consequence of *this* is recognition that context is not a 'static field surrounding the sentence, speech event or other action [and that] time and transformation are essential constituents of context' (ibid: 289).

This is significant in DCs, with talk notionally addressing both those present at the recording *and* an absent audience, for whom a DC as language act is principally created. It can be challenged quite robustly how far the audience can be regarded as absent and we can reconcile this (the 'absent' as 'target') by appealing to the idea that the audience has a 'ratified social space' in the dialogue (Goffman 1981:131). We are part of the discourse whether addressed or not, and having achieved 'participant status' we are part of the 'participation framework' (ibid: 137). Goffman goes on to say (ibid:138), '...a broadcast talk may have a "live" audience and a broadcast audience, the speaker now styling his projection for the one, now for the other, and only the music of language can

lull us into thinking that the same kind of recipient entity is involved.' The notion of being within a participation framework enables us to orient ourselves to within the participant group on the commentary, while a production framework enables us to view 'speakers' as actively shifting stance and role within the framework. It is from this that Goffman derives the concept of 'footing' which we can use to rationalise different and constantly changing roles, modes of address and 'types of talk', as in a DC, and which enables us to categorically place ourselves within this conversation and escape the analysis of conversation in a DC as an ambiguously 'created' event or act of entertainment.

Many writers on spoken genre have taken situations of talk and attempted to highlight linguistic and discourse features specific to, consistent within, or defining of that context (see for example McCarthy 1998:26 for references to research on service encounters and narrative as genres), though as McCarthy states (ibid), 'many of the everyday forms of talk we engage in remain unclassified in generic terms'. Ease of labelling a piece of talk does not however make it a genre, and thinking in terms of the functions of language and the dynamics involved for the participants may be more insightful a starting point for analysis than applying the label 'genre' to socio-situational instances of talk.

The two commentaries in this study have four and six speakers respectively and fall very much into what Carter and McCarthy (1997:10) term 'comment-elaboration' conversation, 'people giving casual opinions and commenting on things, other people, events, etc. around them and in their daily lives without any set conversational agenda'. I take the presence of a film to 'comment on' as acting as supplying a stimulus for the participants' 'casual conversation' as any conversation requires stimulus, not as an agendum.

From Beyond Commentary 1-4

The first analysis comes from a DC to *H.P. Lovecraft's From Beyond* (hereafter FBC), made in 1986 with the commentary created approximately 10 years later. The film was made in Italy on a low budget. Transcription follows broadly those of Gail Jefferson (in Atkinson & Heritage 1984). This segment begins with Y making an ambiguous query based on an on screen observation. G orients to this with 'Well' as the start of an answer, a preferred response. From Y's latched elaboration of his initial comment we can surmise he feels he has not made his point clearly or even completed his initial turn, and such an 'interruption' from the introducer of the query does *not* lead to an overlap with G, who allows the interjection. G latches to this with an agreement token ('No') and continues with what Jefferson (2004:50) terms a 'marked self retrieval', a restart of a previously aborted utterance (→ shown below): an example of latching as an avoidance of potential overlap in the pre-onset of overlap phase.

```
     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
```

FBC 4-12

Y tries to continue this topic, as 'But' attests (line 5). However for other participants this exchange has run its course. Cr begins simultaneous with Y but her prior audible in-breath gives her a competitive advantage in both volume and speed. Y drops out temporarily but tries again to gain control. He does so at a point when there is no signal that the turn could rationally be completed and handed over (a Transition Relevance Place- TRP) and does not employ any extra techniques for gaining turn control. Cr here employs what Jefferson (2004:50) calls 'Unmarked Competition', a defensive tactic used, she claims, by speakers perceiving themselves Turn Occupant, and 'ignores' Y's overlap. Stretches in Cr's talk ('the: er:') allow Y to latch the start of another comment (→10). Cr does not wish to relinquish the turn and latches to *his* comment. It may be his noticeably falling intonation that allows Cr to predict that he will permit her latch. Y however again seizes the turn to finish his comment (→12). We witness here examples of competitive overlap followed by latching, neither of which tactic alone is sufficient to force the relinquishing of the turn to Y. Both Cr and Y are competing for their 'focus' to be the one projected to next utterance.

```
   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
   5    Cr:   .hh [[I]] also remember [doing a lot] of ADR for this=
   6    Y:        [[But]]             [do you think]
   7    Cr:   =because of=
   8    G:    =uh huh=
   9    Cr:   the: er:=
→  10   Y:    =Oh do you think it was ( ).=
   11   Cr:   =May- maybe we did=
→  12   Y     =not a technical [thing].
```

FBC 12-15

Co enters the dialogue with a competitively raised voice overlapping Ys conclusion and developing the topic of Cr's turns, not Y's. By entering at this predicted TRP on Y's turn, Co maximises his chances of winning the turn, though of course we cannot know

whether Y had truly finished, or whether this overlap stole the turn. Cr latches onto this with an agreement to his assessment (see Pomerantz 1984 for a discussion of preferred responses to assessments). Co overlaps with Cr after she continues beyond a predicted TRP ('very noisy') but she then releases the turn to him at the next TRP ('all the time') (→14). Co has here competitively taken the turn using a 'segmental adjustment', a repeat of 'action' (→15), which enables more of his turn to appear clear of overlap (see Jefferson 2004:49). Y's focus has been left behind - to return to it now would be belated and unwelcome. Getting said what you wish to say can be seen to be highly time bound in a DC context.

```
        12   Y     =not a technical [thing].
        13   Co:                    [THE ITALIANS] didn't really care about sound=
  →     14   Cr:   =No (.) they were very noisy [all the time weren't they]
  →     15   Co:                                [acti- action] would be: the time
                   for them to talk about what they did (.) last night=
```

FBC 15-21

The segment continues with G latching to Co with an acknowledgement token and making an observation which builds on the established focus, a preferred response and one which as such naturally discourages overlap. In line 19 Y makes an *apparently* appropriate latch with 'well I I I remember' (echoing G's earlier turn (→)) and by stuttering 'I', draws out his interjection more competitively, a deterrent to overlap discussed by Schegloff (2000:15). However his turn is overwhelmed by an aggressive overlap (extremely rapid talk) by Cr. Co subsequently prevents Y's topic being reintroduced by latching to Cr's focus on 'ADR' (that is, voices being dubbed onto films later rather than recorded simultaneous with the filming). From this we can see that stuttering as a tactic in pre onset is a weak defence against speeded talk, and may conceivably even *encourage* overlap if adjudged to be 'hesitation'.

```
        15   Co:                                [acti- action] would be: the time
                   for them to talk about what they did (.) last night=
  →     16   G:    =Yeah I remember one time I was er: we were shooting something
                   and some guy was hammering=
        17   Co:   =Yeah=
        18   G:    =Ye know like er a carpenter (.) while we were trying to shoot
                   a scene=
  →     19   Y:    =Well I I [I remember]
        20   Cr              [(>Yeah because<)]  they ADR'd all their movies=
        21   Co:   =They They ADR'd even their own movies I went to an=
```

FBC 21-24

Unknown to the other participants, G has begun an 'extensive' anecdote in line 16. He does not pursue it immediately but produces an overlapping continuer on Co's turn (→22). Co continues and G then latches an agreement token (→24) possibly intended to 'encourage Co to finish', though this cannot be determined for *certain* here.

```
      21   Co:  =They [They ADR'd] even their own movies I went to an=
→     22   G:         [That's right]
      23   Co:  =Italian movie (.) when I was there (.) and (.) it was an
                 Italian movie and they were all dubbed (1.2)
→     24   G:   [Yeah yeah]
      25   Co:  [Italian] So their was their mouths didn't even link up they=
```

FBC 21-32

G's final agreeing overlap 'No' is then repeated in a latching attempt to take control of the turn (→). However, Y latches to this 'no', perhaps interpreting it as a final closing agreement by G, and begins his own extended turn (discouraging overlapping interruption this time by making his turn a 'question' ('Well [do you all] remember' rather than 'I remember'). He is allowed to finish and is encouraged by laughter to add a further clarifying comment.

```
      21   Co:  =They [They ADR'd] even their own movies I went to an=
      22   G:         [That's right]
      23   Co:  =Italian movie (.) when I was there (.) and (.) it was an
                 Italian movie and they were all dubbed (1.2)
      24   G:   [Yeah yeah]
      25   Co:  [Italian] So their [was] their mouths didn't even link up they=
      26   Cr:                     [Right]
      27   Co:  =[don't] ca:re=
→     28   G:    [No]
→     29   G:   =No=
      30   Y:   =Well remember one of the electricians wouldn't work in the
                 morning cos he was cooking pasta for the rest of them
                 [((chuckles))]
      31   G:   [Oh yeah]
      32   Y:   On the set
```

FBC 30-33

G now begins an interesting turn (→), opening with an agreement token to Y's prior utterance, essentially an 'unmarked other retrieval' (Jefferson 2004:55), embedding a continuation of Y's talk into his own turn ('it was pretty crazy'), then continuing with an 'unmarked self retrieval' (ibid:51) of his own talk - direct continuation of the anecdote he

started in line 18 ('and and I wen-') - before checking himself and repairing this to a marked self retrieval; a complete restart.

```
    30   Y:   =Well remember one of the electricians wouldn't work in the
              morning cos he was cooking pasta for the rest of them
              [((chuckles))]
    31   G:   [Oh yeah]
    32   Y:   On the set
→   33   G:   No: it was pretty crazy and and and I wen- I remember when this
              guy was hammering I went over to him and I said er:: (.) Senior
              please ye know we're shooting a
              scene [and] >and and and< silencio: and he says er=
```

FBC 33-35

 In the turns that follow, G pushes his anecdote to a conclusion using a variety of competitive strategies, despite several 'uncooperative' overlaps, beginning when Co uses an ambiguous witticism, 'Silencio'. G speeds up his talk to defend against the overlap then uses the technique of embedding the overlapper's words into *his own* turn (regardless of how meaningful/meaningless they become there) (→). This *specific* tactic is not discussed by Schegloff, or Jefferson, who (ibid:56) discusses embedding as a post overlap resolution device used by the *Turn Claimant* to help establish themselves as new Turn Occupant, but not as a 'defensive' tactic used by current Turn Occupant to avoid handing over, as is the case here.

```
    33   G:   No: it was pretty crazy and and and I wen- I remember when this
              guy was hammering I went over to him and I said er:: (.) Senior
              please ye know we're shooting a
→             scene [and] >and and and< silencio: and he says er=
    34   Co:        [Silencio]
    35   G:   =he says er: Fellini always let's me hammer
```

FBC 33-43

G then apparently finishes his story (→35), his hesitation before 'Fellini always' giving the listeners an even greater impression of finality. They laugh (unknown to them at the wrong moment), and G tries to continue, but Y's overlaps force him again to use the defensive techniques of speeding up and stutter (→37) before he returns to normal speed. He produces *another* false ending ('I'm not Fellini'). The humorous nature of talk at this stage has established a 'play frame' (see Coates 2007, particularly regarding repetition and turns of laughter as seen in this segment). Y's overlaps do not attempt to claim the turn *from* G, rather in using unmarked language with no device other than regular continuous talk, Y behaves as Turn Occupant himself (lines 38/40). G's token response 'right' is ambiguous. It may respond to Y's overlap, reasserting G's turn

occupancy, or could be a checking token prior to punch line delivery. He signals the end of his turn by joining in the laughter himself (see Coates 2007:45).

```
      33   G:    No: it was pretty crazy and and and I wen- I remember when this
                 guy was hammering I went over to him and I said er:: (.) senior
                 please ye know we're shooting a
                 scene [and] >and and and< silencio: and he says er=
      34   Co:        [Silencio]
→     35   G:    =he says er: Fellini always let's me hammer
      36         ((General laughter))
→     37   G:    [And I >and I and I] and I(said)< well I'm not=
      38   Y:    [Well excuse me:]
      39   G:    =I'm not [Fellini] °right°=
      40   Y              [(then hammered)]
      41   G:    =and he goes (.) THAT'S for sure
      42         ((Loud General laughter))
      43         (1.0) ((New topic follows))
```

Coates (2007:38) highlights the amount of participant's collaboration in humorous conversation and the greater sense of joint construction therein, establishing a 'play frame' in which humour can be understood (and consequently developed) by all the participants. She adds (ibid:39), 'the conversational floor is potentially open to all participants simultaneously' in contrast to regular one at a time talk. This can be viewed alongside Schegloff (2000:2),

> To take "one-at-a-time" to be a basic design feature in participants' construction of talk-in-interaction is not to assert that it is invariably achieved. If some design feature of ANY project, pursued through an organisation of practices, fails to be achieved on some occasion (or even on many occasions), this is not prima facie evidence that it is not a design feature to which participants orient in the course of its production.

This goes some way to explaining how Y in lines 38/40 is permitted to create such an undesirable and competitive environment of two simultaneous Turn Occupants and raises the question of how far, or precisely when, one-at-a time talk can be the natural preferred order, if simultaneous talk can be argued to form a specific function in (humorous) talk.

Devil Wears Prada Commentary 1-5

The second segment for analysis comes from the DC to *The Devil Wears Prada* (DWPC), and does not feature the 'play frames' generated in the FBC. It starts with D making a deictic reference to a new scene in the film. His speech is marked with hesitations, lengthening and repetitions in a generally quite slow stream of speech. This may in part result from his commenting on in-scene features as they appear. However W, perhaps

misinterpreting D as 'offering' the turn, usurps it with an extremely rapid latch. D is forced to cut short his continuation mid word (w-). He continues in precisely the same tone, speed and volume as previously, an 'ignoring technique' and an example of unmarked self retrieval (→). W lengthens her words ('clo:set') as D begins the overlap. As this is not a predictable TRP we can judge this a 'defensive' rather than 'passing' mechanism, but on D continuing she drops out, even offering an apology token, itself ironically constituting additional overlap.

```
     1   D:    So this was (.) this was about o::ne eighth of an actual set
                (.) that we (1.2) e::r (0.5) that w- that just built (.) those
                columns an' a an' a few (.) shelves an' then (0.3) erm (0.7)
                through the magic of (0.7) photography =
     2   W:    =>One thing that [we] all found out was that that the<=
     3   D:                      [w-]
     4   W:    =real [clo:set w- (.) sorry]
→    5   D:          [we created the rest] of the set (0.2) ye know it's Randy
                (.) Randy (0.4)extended the set (.) made it twice as big as it
                really was and (2.6) go ahead (and)
                Wendy, [>what were ye saying<].
```

DWPC 4-6

D's continuation is marked by similar hesitations to those exhibited before, but having received an acknowledgment of the inappropriateness of W's latch and the appropriateness of his own overlap in line 5 he may feel confident that no further overlap will occur. So much so in fact that he must explicitly pass the turn upon completion (→), a 'marked other retrieval' device (i.e. a direct question reorienting the talk to the Turn Claimant (Jefferson 2004:52)) used post overlap resolution. W's post resolution phase begins with a rapid Marked Self Retrieval of her curtailed turn (→), after which she slows and continues. The transition between this post resolution phase and the return to slower, normal uncompetitive talk is achieved by repeating the lengthened 'clo:set', originally used defensively.

```
     4   W:    =real [clo:set w- (.) sorry]
     5   D:          [we created the rest] of the set (0.2) ye know it's Randy
                (.) Randy (0.4)extended the set (.) made it twice as big as it
                really was and (2.6) go ahead (and)
→               Wendy, [>what were ye saying<].
→    6   W:            [>I was gonna say what] the what we all< (0.2) >seemed
                to find out the more and more research that we
                did <(.) the real clo:set at th- at (.)at fashion magazines
                (1.0) is not at all closet that is (0.3) er:
                [a twentieth]  as nice.
```

DWPC 6-11

However she begins to stutter, repeat and hesitate, D overlaps after W makes one significant pause (0.3 er:) but drops out when he recognises the turn is not finished. W finishes and D begins to repeat his prior comment (→ 8) (a semantic agreement with W's assessment). Schegloff (2000:19) has suggested that supporting, agreeing overlaps

often match a syllable or beat pattern within the two utterances. Lines 7-9 initially look to be illustrating this, D retrieving his truncated utterance from 7 at 8. W's audible intake of breath in line 9 creates an initial hesitation for D at line 8, but he continues and W matches his talk, with them speaking over one another until W realises her conclusion differs from D's, and she drops out. After a micro pause she takes control of the turn using unmarked other retrieval and in so doing expresses agreement with D's assessment in the prior turn (→8) (see Pomerantz 1984). So powerful is this adjacency pairing that we even see D overlapping W's comment to agree with *her* agreeing assessment of *his* prior assessment (→10). W is now Turn Occupant.

```
      6   W:            [>I was gonna say what] the what we all< (0.2) >seemed
                        to find out the more and more research that we
                        did <(.) the real clo:set at th- at (.)at fashion magazines
                        (1.0) is not at all closet that is (0.3) er:
                        [a twentieth]  as nice.
      7   D:            [Well it's not fab-]
   →  8   D:            It  [It's not fabulous]
      9   W:            .hh [It's not or-]     (.) It's [not] fabulous it's not=
   → 10   D:                                             [No]
     11   W:            =organised it's basically kind of a big room full of (.) ye
                        know (.) used an' borrowed clothing thrown in 'n thrown out 'n
                        it's all over the place .hhh an' wi (.) w:e I think we took
                        er:=
```

<u>DWPC 11-16</u>

At 12, D latches to the turn, but without W having reached a TRP, only a hesitation and she retrieves her utterance unmarked in overlap with D (→). She does not take the turn, or even attempt to do so, but the 'closet scene' they are discussing is ending and her overlap is an example of the desire simply to say what she wanted to say during the time in which the utterance maintains some degree of appropriateness.

```
     11   W:    =organised it's basically kind of a big room full of (.) ye
                know (.) used an' borrowed clothing thrown in 'n thrown out 'n
                it's all over the place .hhh an' wi (.) w:e I think we took
                er:=
     12   D:    =>But it was< this was a [it was a key el-] it was a=
   → 13   W:                             [liberties here]
     14   D:    =it was [a   key element in the book 'n it was one of=
     15   W:            [yes]
     16   D:    =the things that (.) people remembered in the book 'n (0.4)
                were curious about and it was important to translate it to the
                film.
```

<u>DWPC 17-24</u>

Lines 17-23 see a major dysfunctional overlap. A and another speaker begin simultaneously. A is given the turn (lines 17 and 18). Speaker D overlaps loudly to comment about something new in the scene ('Giselle'). His overlap may be seen as

having a legitimacy given its reference to the new scene, now in front of the participants rather than A's 'throw back' comment to the 'closet' scene, and it also relates to earlier discussion (not printed here) of 'Giselle'. A however will not relinquish but defends her turn with a marked, competitive segmental adjustment (→). D reduces volume and drops out with a face saving 'ye know'.

```
       17  A:     [[Well (                  ),]]=
       18  ():    [[(                        )]]
  →    19  A:     =[they have access, (.) they have access] to: erm (0.2)
       20  D:      [THERE'S GISELLE LOOKING (.)ye know.]
       21  A:     =items before they come on the market [(.) when] they=
       22  ():                                           [right]
       23  A      =see everything
       24         (0.8)
```

DWPC 25-31

P overlaps D after a (both syntactically and intonationally) predicted TRP ('hard to do') (→) but D continues. It is possible that P feels a right to the turn and perhaps an extra, 'cohesive validity', in using a phrase echoing D's earlier utterances 'and there's Giselle looking'/'Here's Giselle looking'. Both speakers use speed as a competitive device during this overlap (lines 25/26), but only when D also uses a stress in his utterance does P drop out. D continues and retrieves P's words in an unmarked form. Cooperation returns in the conclusion of the phrase repeated chorally by the two. Coates (ibid: 40) comments on the pleasure speakers gain in conversation by such choral talk.

```
       25  D:     Here's Giselle looking (.)un (.)modelish (.)
  →            which (0.3) she worked very hard to ↓do 'n
                 [>was almost impossible<] =
       26  P:     [>'n there's Andy looking<]
       27  D:     =for her to accomplish >'n there's< Andy looking (0.2)
                 [modelish] Yeah (0.5) and this is Chanel obviously.
       28  P:     [modelish]
       29         (1.0)
       30  W:     From this moment on (.) Pat she'll be wearing all Chanel (.) for
                 the most part (.) correct? Not [(     )]
       31  P:                                   [A lot ] Let me put it to ye this
                 way a lot of Chanel (1.5) It was perfect for her (2.5) and Chanel
                 was so good.
```

DWPC 25-28

The reasons for choice of this 'embedding of other's talk' technique (→) and those seen earlier are unclear, and this study is too small to determine reasons within a turn taking procedure. However, perhaps uniquely among the overlap deterrent strategies examined here, this 'incorporation' has a strongly phatic bias, perhaps acknowledging the legitimacy of the overlap. We may need to look into this rather than into the turn taking or adjacency pair system to gain more understanding of this.

```
       25  D:     Here's Giselle looking (.)un (.)modelish (.)
                 which (0.3) she worked very hard to ↓do 'n
```

```
                      [>was almost impossible<] =
      26   P:         [>'n there's Andy looking<]
→     27   D:         =for her to accomplish >'n there's< Andy looking (0.2)
                      [modelish] Yeah (0.5) and this is Chanel obviously.
      28   P:         [modelish]
```

In conclusion, competitive overlap is seen here to have two functions: to project a speakers 'topic' to next (or future) utterance, and to 'get out' a speaker's comment 'in time', without necessarily the *need* for projection; scenes 'moving on' actually making some of the topic change decisions on behalf of the participants. The limited 'relevant time frame' of the talk simultaneously *encourages* overlap, through this necessity to produce 'in time talk', and *discourages* it in light of the potential penalties incurred by disruption to the flow of talk resulting from the requirement for negotiation of a return to normal talk.

Within the phase prior to overlap, mechanisms for preventing this potentially harmful state of affairs from arising are seen to include a preference for latching, encouragement devices to speed the end of a rival's turn (often combining with tactically relinquishing a turn to strategically win control of the sequence in subsequent talk), the use of the 'moral advantage' in producing a preferred response to prior utterance and the use of semantic devices deterrent to overlap.

During overlap we see marked and unmarked competitive behaviour by both Turn Occupant *and* Turn Claimant and we see self retrieval both challenging and sustaining Turn Occupant status; a quite intense state of overlap negotiation. Notably in these time bound contexts, speeding up of talk operates as a powerful tactic, and the unusual use of embedding rival's talk functions as a strong protective measure which also runs into the *post* overlap management of *return* to *normal* talk. In this post overlap phase we also see instances of Turn Occupants following strongly contested overlap being relatively free from overlapping challenges – a kind of 'grace period'.

CA has provided most of the general descriptive work on overlap thus far and will probably continue to be the most useful framework in terms of its adjacency/projection model. Future study may however take different approaches, perhaps in consideration of gender, age, situational, or relational issues. Larger or more detailed studies in the future will shed more light on the precise operation of overlap, but this study has tried to serve as a next step, with its focus on overlap within *time constrained* conversation, and also in its use of DVD commentary, a resource which if handled sensitively, is of great potential value in future linguistic and discourse analysis.

Appendix 1 - Full Transcript of Excerpt

H. P. Lovecraft's From Beyond DVD Commentary (time c.16:45-18.05). Y=Brian Yuzna (Producer), G=Stuart Gordon (Director), Co=Jeffrey Combs (Actor), Cr=Barbara Crampton (Actress)

```
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
5     Cr:   .hh [[I]] also remember [doing a lot] of ADR for this=
6     Y:        [[But]]             [do you think]
7     Cr:   =because of=
8     G:    =uh huh=
9     Cr:   the: er:=
10    Y:    =Oh do you think it was ( )=
11    Cr:   =May- maybe we did=
12    Y     =not a technical [thing]
13    Co:                    [THE ITALIANS] didn't really care about sound=
14    Cr:   =No (.) they were very noisy [all the time weren't they]
15    Co:                                [acti- action] would be: the time for
            them to talk about what they did (.) last night=
16    G:    =Yeah I remember one time I was er: we were shooting something and
            some guy was hammering=
17    Co:   =Yeah=
18    G:    =Ye know like er a carpenter (.) while we were trying to shoot a
            scene=
19    Y:    =Well I I [I remember]
20    Cr             [(>Yeah because<)]  They ADR'd all their movies=
21    Co:   =They [They ADR'd] even their own movies I went to an=
22    G:          [That's right]
23    Co:   =Italian movie (.) when I was there (.) and (.) it was an Italian
            movie and they were all dubbed (1.2)
24    G:    [Yeah yeah]
25    Co:   [Italian] So their [was]  their mouths didn't even link up they=
26    Cr:                      [Right]
27    Co:   =[don't] ca:re=
28    G:     [No]
29    G:    =No=
30    Y:    =Well remember one of the electricians wouldn't work in
            the morning cos he was cooking pasta for the rest of them
            [((chuckles))]
31    G:    [Oh yeah]
32    Y:    On the set
33    G:    No: it was pretty crazy and and and I wen- I remember when this guy
            was hammering I went over to him and I said er:: (.) Senior please ye
            know we're shooting a
            scene [and] >and and and< silencio: and he says er=
34    Co:         [Silencio]
35    G:    =he says er: Fellini always let's me hammer
36          ((General laughter))
37    G:    [And I >and I and I] and I(said)< well I'm not=
38    Y:    [Well excuse me:]
39    G:    =I'm not [Fellini] °right°=
40    Y             [(then hammered)]
41    G:    =and he goes (.) THAT'S for sure
42          ((Loud General laughter))
43          (2.0)  ((New topic follows))
```

Appendix 2 - Full Transcript of Excerpt

The Devil Wears Prada DVD Commentary (time c.34:45-36:18). D=David Frankel (Director), W=Wendy Finerman (Producer), P=Patricia Field (Costume Designer), A=Aline Brosh McKenna (Screenwriter), M=Mark Livolsi (Editor), F=Florian Ballhaus (Director of Photography)

```
1    D:    So this was (.) this was about o::ne eighth of an actual set (.) that
           we (1.2) e::r (0.5) that w- that just built (.) those columns an' a
           an' a few (.) shelves an' then (0.3) erm (0.7) through the magic of
           (0.7) photography =
2    W:    =>One thing that [we] all found out was that that the<=
3    D:                     [w-]
4    W:    =real [clo:set w- (.) sorry]
5    D:          [we created the rest] of the set (0.2) ye know it's Randy (.)
           Randy (0.4)extended the set (.) made it twice as big as it really was
           and (2.6) go ahead (and)
           Wendy, [>what were ye saying<].
6    W:           [>I was gonna say what] the what we all< (0.2) >seemed to find
           out the more and more research that we
           did <(.) the real clo:set at th- at (.)at fashion magazines (1.0) is
           not at all closet that is (0.3) er:
           [a twentieth]  as nice.
7    D:    [Well it's not fab-]
8    D:    It  [It's not fabulous]
9    W:    .hh [It's not or-]     (.) It's [not] fabulous it's not=
10   D:                                    [No]
11   W:    =organised it's basically kind of a big room full of (.) ye know (.)
           used an' borrowed clothing thrown in 'n thrown out 'n it's all over
           the place .hhh an' wi (.) w:e I think we took er:=
12   D:    =>But it was< this was a [it was a key el-] it was a=
13   W:                            [liberties here]
14   D:    =it was [a]   key element in the book 'n it was one of=
15   W:            [yes]
16   D:    =the things that (.) people remembered in the book 'n (0.4) were
           curious about and it was important to translate it to the film.
17   A:    [[Well (            ),]]=
18   ():   [[(              )]]
19   A:    =[they have access, (.) they have access] to: erm (0.2)
20   D:     [THERE'S GISELLE LOOKING (.)ye know.]
21   A:    =items before they come on the market [(.) when] they=
22   ():                                         [right]
23   A     =see everything
24         (0.8)
25   D:    Here's Giselle looking (.)un (.)modelish (.)
           which (0.3) she worked very hard to ↓do 'n
           [>was almost impossible<] =
26   P:    [>'n there's Andy looking<]
27   D:    =for her to accomplish >'n there's< Andy looking (0.2)
           [modelish] Yeah (0.5) and this is Chanel obviously.
28   P:    [modelish]
29         (1.0)
30   W:    From this moment on (.) Pat she'll be wearing all Chanel (.) for the
           most part (.) correct? Not [(    )]
31   P:                               [A lot ] Let me put it to ye this way a lot
           of Chanel (1.5) It was perfect for her (2.5) and Chanel was so good.
```

Elliston, B. P. (2008), *Time Bound Talk and Competitive Overlap: Some features of conversation in DVD Commentaries*. Unpublished manuscript. Available from http://www.brianelliston.com/my-research.html

Appendix 3 – Transcription Conventions

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

xxx= =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.
<u>:</u>	Underlined colons indicate a high pitch with the preceding and following syllables being lower; a rise and fall pitch.
<u>xxx</u>	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.

Elliston, B. P. (2008), *Time Bound Talk and Competitive Overlap: Some features of conversation in DVD Commentaries*. Unpublished manuscript. Available from http://www.brianelliston.com/my-research.html

References

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

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

Coates, J. (2007), 'Talk in a Play Frame', *Journal of Pragmatics , 39*: 29-49.

The Devil Wears Prada, (2006), [DVD Commentary], Film directed by David Frankel, USA: Fox 2000

Goffman, E. (1981), 'Footing', in E. Goffman, *Forms of Talk* (pp. 124-159), Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

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

H.P. Lovecraft's From Beyond, (1986), [DVD Commentary], Film directed by Stuart Gordon, USA: MGM.

Jefferson, G. (2004), 'A Sketch of some orderly Aspects of Overlap in Natural Conversation', in G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation* (pp. 43-59), Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

McCarthy, M. (1998), *Spoken Language and Applied Linguistics,* Cambridge: CUP.

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

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

Schegloff, E. A. (2000), 'Overlapping Talk and the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation', *Language in Society, 29* (1), 1-63.

Schegloff, E. A. (2002), 'Accounts of Conduct in Interaction', in J. H. Turner (Ed.), *Handbook of Sociological Theory* (pp. 287-321), New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.