

## URNS AND DISCOURSE UNITS IN EVERYDAY CONVERSATION

Hanneke HOUTKOOP and Harrie MAZELAND\*

Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) have described how conversationalists construct turns at speaking and how they allocate them in a systematic way. In this paper, we shall describe how certain larger projects are produced. These larger projects include stories, jokes, extended descriptions, pieces of advice, and so on, and are here called Discourse Units (DUs). We shall distinguish between Closed DUs and Open DUs. Closed DUs are activities larger than one turn-constructive unit and are accomplished by a Primary Speaker holding the floor through the course of their production. We formulate some restrictions which operate on Sacks et al.'s turn-taking model when a Closed DU is being produced. Whereas closed DUs are projected as DUs from the beginning of their production, open DUs are not. They develop as a DU by virtue of negotiation on the type of conversational unit underway. That is to say, whether or not the turn will be built into a larger project is more dependent upon recipient as is the case for Closed DUs. We try to show that the recipient design of turn construction not only operates through syntactical projection of a possible completion point, but also action-sensitive devices have to be taken into account.

### 1. Data

The data upon which the analysis is based are drawn from a larger, informal conversation by Dutch speaking participants. As only some parts of the conversation are represented in the text, we have provided large parts of the transcription in Appendix 2 (see also Appendix 1 for the transcription conventions).

### 2. Turns and discourse units

Sacks et al. (1974) have outlined a model for turn-taking in spontaneous conversation. We shall assume that our readers have some knowledge of this

\* The contribution of Hanneke Houtkoop was made possible by the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (ZWO) which financed the research project entitled 'Turns as practical and analytic units. Linguistic Analysis of turn-taking and turn-construction'. The paper is a revised version of a paper written for the Subsection 'Basic phenomena of verbal and non-verbal interaction' of the Xth World Congress of Sociology, Mexico City, 1982. We wish to thank especially Peter French for his help with the translation from the Dutch, as well as Jacob Mey and Hartmut Haberland for their helpful comments and advice.

Correspondence address: Hanneke Houtkoop, Subfaculteit Letteren, Katholieke Hogeschool Tilburg, P.O. Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands.

model, and merely outline those aspects of it which bear relevance to the points developed here. The system that Sacks et al. describe has two components: a turn-constructural component and a turn-allocational component. Additionally, it specifies a set of rules governing the allocation of turns. A speaker can use various, syntactically defined unit-types to construct a turn: sentential, clausal, phrasal, or lexical constructions. Instances of the unit-type allow a projection of the unit-type under way, and what it will roughly take for the unit-type to be completed. Sacks et al. state that:

“As for the unit-types which a speaker employs in starting the construction of a turn’s talk, the speaker is initially entitled, in having a turn, to one such unit. The first possible completion of a first such unit constitutes an initial transition-relevance place. Transfer of speakership is co-ordinated by reference to such transition-relevance places, which any unit-type instance will reach.” (1974: 703)

Sacks et al. provide three rules for the allocation of turns at transition-relevance places. These rules are:

- (a) Current speaker can select the next speaker (e.g., by directly addressing a question to him/her).

If current speaker exercises this option, the person so selected has a right and an obligation to take a turn at talking. However, if current speaker passes-up the option, rule (b) may operate. This rule states that:

- (b) In default of (a), any speaker other than the current one may self-select.

Should neither rule (a) nor rule (b) operate, then rule (c) may come into operation. (c) specifies that:

- (c) Current speaker may continue.

This set of rules for the turn-allocation is cyclical in its application; it re-applies at each transition-relevance for each speaking turn.

The turn-taking model suggests that at each possible completion of a turn-constructural unit, the participants negotiate turn-taking, and that turns larger than those consisting of more than one turn-constructural unit are the result of successive negotiations at each next possible completion point. According to the model, those larger turns can only be produced by applying rule (c), the third option in the series.

From the data to be examined here, it appears that not all turn-taking behavior can be explained in terms of Sacks et al.’s model. There are stretches of talk where the completion points of turn-constructural units do not present themselves as transition-relevance places, i.e., as opportunities for turn-trans-

fer. These larger units of talk are not constructed out of one syntactic unit-type. A speaker who is producing such a larger project not only has the right to take a turn which is constructed out of more syntactical units, but also has the right to take as many turns as is necessary to finish the project. (See also Sacks (1969) on this subject.)

We believe that, in addition to turn-units, there are larger units of talk on a different level of discourse and that conversationalists display sensitivity to such units in their turn-taking behavior. In a first step, we take rather clear instances of these units to be stories, jokes, descriptions and the like, and we shall refer to them as 'Discourse Units' (this notion derives from Wald (1976;1978)). When we speak about larger turns or larger projects, we refer to this specific unit, the discourse unit (DU).<sup>1</sup>

In lines 25–32 of the transcript below *D* produces a larger turn. After *R* has asked whether there are mice in the apartment, the conversation continues (see Appendices 1 and 2 for the transcription conventions and the complete transcription):

(1) HH:FF:2

19. *R*: hier in de keuken alleen?  
just here in the kitchen?
20. *D*: en in de voorkamer ook. he:le schattige muisjes.  
and in the living room too. ve:ry sweet little mice.
21. (.)
22. *M*: oh je ziet ze echt geregeld lope | n.  
23. *D*: oh you really see them walking around regular | y.  
*D*: yes.
24. (.)
25. *D*:→ ik zag nog 'n keer, een keer liep tie zo hier langs,  
I once saw, once it walked along here
26. *D*: heel schattig. en toen haalde ik iets weg, en toen zat ie daar,  
so sweet. and then I took something away, and then it was over there,
27. *D*: en in 'n gegeven moment eh dacht ik ach nu pak ik 'm  
and one moment uh I thought well now I'll catch it.
28. (.)
29. *M*: j(h)a::  
ye::(h)s
30. *D*: maar eh toen maakte die 'n noodsp<sup>o</sup>ng hier omlaag,  
but uh it then made a big jump down here,
31. *M*: heel hoog.  
very high.

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with Wald, we take the position that a DU can be considered as a unit, because conversationalists themselves orient to it as a unit. For instance, they sometimes explicitly indicate that they feel interrupted when they are prevented from completing such a unit.

Polanyi and Scha (1983) distinguish between three types of discourse units. Their 'type 2 structure' corresponds with ours, as they themselves indicate.

32. *D*: e(h)n toe(h)n wa(h)s tie we(h)g.  
a(h)nd the(h)n it wa(h)s go(h)ne.  
33. (1.9)  
34. *M*: eigenlijk moeten ze gewoon  
actually they should  
35. (1.0)  
36. *M*: zou je die poezen 'n nacht hier op moeten sluiten,  
you should lock those cats in here for a night,

*D* illustrates *M*'s remark that she frequently sees mice (line 23), with an example (lines 25–32). The ends of the turn-constructural units of *D*'s story cannot be seen as the same kind of transition-relevance places as the end of the story itself. It also seems rather inadequate to consider the two short contributions of *M* (line 29 and 31) as the same kind of turns as those of the story components. Consequently, it has to be asked if they follow the turn-taking model of Sacks et al., realized by applying rule (b). By saying:

“ik zag nog 'n keer, een keer liep tie zo hier langs, heel schattig.”  
('I once saw, once it walked along here, so sweet.') (line 25)

*D* signals that she is beginning to perform a certain type of action, that is to tell a story.

Stories often begin with a story-entry device (Jefferson (1978), see also Terasaki (1976)), and in using such a device the speaker claims the floor as long as the projected story is not yet completed. Conversationalists orient to the activity type story-telling as consisting out of several parts or segments, and to the local social identity of teller, who goes through these segments until the story is completed.

In his analysis of the inner functional structure of stories, Labov (1972) distinguishes between the following story sections: (1) the abstract, in which the reason-for-telling is often made clear; (2) the orientation section, in which time, place, etc. are introduced; (3) complicating action, in which the events are told; (4) the evaluation, in which the teller comments on the story; (5) the result or resolution, and finally (6) the coda. The latter section connects the action with the here and now and functions as a 'story telling ending device' (Jefferson (1978)). Labov notes that not all of these sections always occur, nor do they have to occur in this order.<sup>2</sup>

We think that the knowledge of such story features is used in the devices for the interactional construction and projection of turn completion. With the story-entry ('I once saw...'), *D* signals that she is starting a larger turn – and by

<sup>2</sup> Labov (and Waletzky) do not look at how stories are embedded conversationally (as Jefferson (1978) and Ryave (1978) do).

Both Quasthoff (1980) and Rehbein (1980) are concerned with situational and functional aspects of story-telling in institutional settings.

projecting a larger turn, the completion points of further turn-constructional units are blocked from being treated by the recipients as normal transition-relevance places. The successive story-components are recognizable as being 'not-yet-the-end' of the story, whereby the successive turn-constructional units mark the incompleteness of the turn-so-far. In that sense, these sections function as 'incompletion-signals' of the story as a larger unit. The story-entry, as well as the following sections, indicate where that ending appears. In other words, the incompleteness of the story is indicated by the absence of its completion. To recognize the completion of *D*'s story 'and then it was gone' (line 32) has to be identified by recipients as in default of a property of story-incompleteness.

Once a speaker has projected a larger turn, expectations for the occurrence of turn-transition are constrained. The speaker has the floor in order to produce what s/he has projected, e.g., to tell a story. During the telling, the story-recipients can react to the story (cf. Jefferson (1978)). However, compared to 'normal' turns these reactions have a special character; they are contributions by which the recipient signals that s/he still retains the role of recipient (e.g., *M*'s 'very high' (line 31)).

This type of recipient reactions can be considered to be realized as a sideline, parallel to the mainline of the story, and does not have to be treated by story-teller as loss of his/her 'story-floor'. During or after a recipient reaction the speaker can continue the story. It would be rather strange to talk of 'self-selection' by the story-teller in such cases: s/he simply continues his/her story unfinished. It is in view of this that we would suggest that turn-allocation in these cases is only in part realized according to the systematics specified by Sacks et al.

The placing of recipient reactions, however, is the same as in the case for 'normal' turn-taking: i.e., they are positioned around the ends of turn-constructional units (see, e.g., lines 180, 183 and 185 in fragment (2) in Appendix (2)).<sup>3</sup> Although the borderlines of turn-constructional units are marked as 'story-incompletion points', and therefore as activity type transition-irrelevant, there is room for this kind of turn-accompanying contributions. The end of a story segment which is marked as a turn-incompletion point, then, is a place for turn-transition, but only in a restricted sense.

Related to this last observation is the fact, that, in addition to the syntactically formulated turn-constructional units, some higher level devices must operate by which the projection of a completion point is realized: e.g., telling a story displays a property of story-incompleteness of the speaker's project at the end of most of the syntactical units by which the story is produced. In

<sup>3</sup> Recipient reactions do not always occur around the ends of turn-constructional units. For instance, Goodwin and Goodwin (1982: 7) show that assessments can elicit recipient reactions before turn completion: "(...) it appears that constraints which exert quite powerful influence on the sequential organization of talk, for example an orientation to one speaker at a time, can be relaxed for assessments".

summary, then, it appears that speakers may employ more extensive turn-constructive units which are not syntactically based. The authors of the turn-taking article also make this point in their discussions of larger turns in larger projects like jokes (Sacks (1974, 1978)) and stories (Sacks (1970), Jefferson (1978)).

We would argue that a speaker who obtains the right to produce a larger turn is obliged to continue until s/he reaches the end of the first unit which can be heard as completing the projected larger turn. A consequence of this is that during the production of this turn the turn-taking system is restricted. The restrictions apply to the system itself, as well as to the type of contributions speaker and recipient(s) produce. A descriptive model within which such restrictions can be accounted for may be derived from Wald's category of Discourse Unit (Wald (1976, 1978)). Partly drawing on his concept, we see a DU as a unit of action and of conversation, produced by one speaker, the 'Primary Speaker' ('PS'; Wald uses 'principal speaker').

At the beginning of a DU, a projection is given of the kind of action which has been started. The recipients can conclude that this action will consist of several subactions, and that it will have a recognizable end. The completion of the subactions will be marked as DU-incomplete as long as a turn-constructive unit which can be heard as a possible end of this DU has not been produced.

The projections of this kind of unit are not always and not only given by the speaker, but can also derive from the context in which the DU is produced. Sacks (1974), for example, showed that jokes have a tendency to come in rounds, which means that once a joke has been told, other jokes can follow, without the necessity for their tellers to pre-announce that \*this is a joke too\*. The next turn will be inspected for the possibility of its being a joke too, because there is a heightened expectation for such an activity to occur in that sequential position.

In this way, the first joke projects the probability of a next one. The same holds for stories (cf. Ryave (1978)) and other activities that can occur in series. For instance, in the conversation examined here, one can see that first *D* tells a story about a mouse in her kitchen; later, *M* tells about a whole family of mice she once had in her apartment, while later still (though not shown here), *D* tells how her father once tried to save a mouse that had been caught.

Although a DU is produced by one speaker, this does not imply that during this period only the primary speaker will talk. We have already demonstrated that *M* accompanies *D*'s first story by saying 'ye::(h)s' (line 29) and 'very high' (line 31). Recipients are not only allowed, but also expected to react to the DU by making short remarks, if necessary by asking for clarification of further information. Should they fail to do so, the Primary Speaker may attempt to elicit recipient reactions (cf. Jefferson (1978)), and ask whether they are still listening or still interested. The fact that the recipients are expected to make

contributions during the production of the DU does not mean that they thereby fulfill the role of Primary Speaker. As long as the DU is under construction, the recipients are 'DU-recipients' (DRs), even when they are producing transient reactive turns. When a DR's turn during a DU is completed, the turn by preference goes back to the PS as soon as possible (cf. for instance the transitions in lines 29/30 and 31/32).

In this way, the 'last-speaker-as-next-speaker-bias', which Sacks et al. describe as a tendency in turn-taking, is specified in the form of restrictions on the turn-taking model in the case of a DU being produced. This treatment of rights and obligations with respect to turn-taking restrictions is partly similar to that provided by Sacks et al. in their attempt to answer the question 'who speaks next, and when?' In their model, a speaker is allowed at least to complete the turn-constructural unit s/he started: in our specification of the model, a speaker is allowed to complete the DU until its recognizable end. This right can temporarily be suspended by transient reactive contributions of the DRs. In addition to the fact that the DR can become only a temporary speaker, rather than a PS, s/he has no right to select another speaker her/himself (cf. rule (a), above), unless the selected next speaker is the preceding speaker, the PS.

More systematically stated, the restrictions on the Sacks et al. model are:

- R(a) The PS is expected to continue a DU until a turn-constructural unit which marks DU completion has been produced.
- R(b1) The DU is sequentially implicative (cf. Sacks et al. (1974)) for the kind of contributions DU-recipients can make ('DU- accompanying actions'). These actions are preferably of limited length.
- R(b2) DR-constructs should be placed according to the turn-taking model, that is, around the end of turn-constructural units.
- R(c) If there is speaker transition at a point which is marked as DU-incomplete, there is a preference for the PS to become next speaker. Thus, during a DU-in-progress, nobody else starts another DU.

After a recognizable end of the DU, the turn-taking model becomes operative again, until a next DU is started.

Note that R(a) is a constraint upon the PS, whereas R(b) constraints operate upon DRs. R(b1) specifies the type of turns DU-recipients can produce, while R(b2) treats the location of recipient contributions. R(c) formulates constraints upon turn-allocation by the recipients.

Conversationalists' orientation to DU production occupies a central place in the formulation of the restrictions. Their orientation to a larger unit of interaction makes it possible to recognize turn-constructural units as DU-incomplete.

At the same time there are different types of indications which turn-constructural component can be treated as DU-completing. Story-telling ending devices, e.g., allow an inference of DU-completion, whereas sometimes a

speaker can give an explicit indication of the minimal set of DU-components to be produced, that is, of the subactions by which the DU will be realized, e.g., prefaces like \*two answers to that\* or \*on the one hand\*.<sup>4</sup>

In projecting the global structure of the turn to follow, the turn-constructio-  
nal units which can not to be heard as the projected completion-component are  
signaled as 'incompletion-marked'. The difference between projection of comple-  
tion and of incompletion is crucial. Sometimes speakers indicate that the  
end of the DU is coming (\*the last point is\*, \*and last but not least\*), but  
more often they signal that the DU-end is not yet coming. Because DUs such  
as these have the capacity to project their completion and incompletion, we  
shall call them Closed DUs. The Closed DUs can be distinguished from the  
Open DU in which the continuation of current speaker is not projected by  
incompletion-marking by the speaker, but is the result of interactional nega-  
tions.

### 3. Open discourse units

After the DU in which *D* tells about the time she saw a mouse in the kitchen,  
*M* takes over the floor to suggest how to get rid of the current mice (line 32-  
44):

(2) HH:FF:2 (continued)

32. *D*: e(h)n toe(h)n wa(h)s tie we(h)g.  
a(h)nd the(h)n it wa(h)s go(h)ne.  
33. (1.9)  
34. *M*:→ eigenlijk moeten ze gewoon  
actually they should  
35. (1.0)  
36. *M*: zou je die poezen `n nacht hier op moeten sluiten,  
you should lock those cats in here for a night,  
37. *M*: dan horen ze ze ook.  
then they will hear them too.  
38. → (0.5)  
39. *M*: want nu komen ze wel hier zo nu en dan kijken,  
because they now do look in every now and then,  
40. (.)  
41. *M*: [maar ze zitten gewoon niet eh/  
42. *D*: [maar nu zie ik geen muizen meer.  
*M*: [but they just aren't uh/  
*D*: [but I don't see mice anymore.  
43. *M*: oh je ziet ze ook niet meer?  
oh you don't see them anymore?  
44. *D*: nee. want ik laat nu 's nachts altijd open.  
no. because nowadays I always leave open at night.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Keller (1979), Rehbein (1979).



In lines 34–41 *M* produces a multisentence utterance which is divided into two parts by a 0.5 second silence (line 38) after the word *ook* ‘too’ (line 37). At the point of uttering *ook*, *M*’s turn could be treated as complete on syntactic grounds, and although it is not definitely marked as a turn completion by intonational means, the intonation contour at least admits that possibility. The question which we could raise here is whether *M*’s continuation should be described as a continuation according to rule (c) of the turn-taking model – i.e., as a continuation in the failure to operate of rules (a) (*M* selecting another speaker), and (b) (another speaker self-selecting).

The first part of *M*’s utterance up till *ook* can be heard as the activity type ‘giving advice’. After the ensuing silence, *M* carries on to give the reason for giving the advice, projecting and displaying the account<sup>5</sup> with *want* ‘because’ at the beginning of the utterance. Explanations of utterances by mentioning their reasons and effects are collected here under the heading ‘accounts’. These accounting-utterances explain and justify aspects of the state of affairs described by the utterance they account for, and thereby they account for the doing of the utterance they bear upon.<sup>6</sup> The action structure of *M*’s utterance:

“eigenlijk moeten ze gewoon (1.0) zou je die poezen ’n nacht hier op moeten sluiten, dan horen ze ze ook. (0.5) want nu komen ze wel hier zo nu en dan kijken, (.) maar ze zitten gewoon niet eh/” (lines 34–41)

(‘actually they should (1.0) you should lock those cats in here for a night, then they will hear them too. (0.5) because now they do look in every now and then, (.) but they just aren’t uh/’)

can be described as a piece of advice followed by an account (schematically ‘advice/account’; single slash indicates action transition).

In an earlier part of the analysis, we put forward the hypothesis that the giving of advice, together with the specific sequential placement of the advice, would create an orientation of the participants to the continuation of current speaker by producing an account of the advice given.

However, there are reasons to assume that accounts are interactionally produced. They frequently occur in structurally specifiable conversational environments, for instance, when a preferred next turn is not produced. This

<sup>5</sup> The account with *want* ‘because’ is projected as consisting of two parts. First there is a concessive ‘do’-part (in Dutch an unstressed *wel*): *want nu komen ze wel zo nu en dan kijken* ‘because now they do take a look every now and then’ (line 39). The second part usually begins with *maar* ‘but’, as it does here. In such two part utterances something is admitted in the first part, while this ‘do’ part projects a second adversative part that participants know will counter or constrain the preceding agreement (cf. Houtkoop-Steenstra (1980), Koerfer (1979)).

<sup>6</sup> The account thus accounts for the doing of a foregoing or postponed utterance, as well as for the doing of itself as an account in a reflexive way. The latter use of this heading corresponds with the use of it from an ethnomethodological perspective where ‘account’ refers to the reflexive display of the methodologicalness of an action by the doing of that action on a specific occasion.

holds for requests, invitations, proposals, suggestions,<sup>7</sup> as well as for the rejections and disagreements that go with these first pair parts of adjacency pairs<sup>8</sup> (cf. Pomerantz (1977)).

In the next fragment, a piece of advice is followed by an account, after a recipient reaction. (The situation is as following: *S* has three vacation houses in France for rent, and advises *H* not to take the largest house.)

<sup>7</sup> In the following fragments the first utterance has as its preferred relevant next turn an acceptance or agreement. Instead of the preferred next turn showing up, the first-pair parts are followed by an account of initial speaker after a post-utterance pause (a) and after a post-utterance recipient reaction (b):

(a) HH:TC:11:334

((after *M* has suggested *K* to come over some day by bicycle, which means a long trip))

*K*: nee, dat halen we niet.  
no, we won't make it.

*M*: nee, dat wordt overnachten. nòh tèn'tje mee hè. Hu(h)u.  
no, that means staying overnight. well bringing along a tent. Hu(h)u.  
(1.3)

→ *M*: om in Leiden te overnachten.  
To spend the night in Leiden.

(b) HH:TC:11:256

((*M* and *K* just before made an appointment to play squash some day))

*K*: ik zou wel es een keer in zo'n zweetkuil willen staan te rammen,  
I wouldn't mind being in one of these sweating-cages, banging away,

*K*: [dat e:h

*M*: [als je 't nou vanavond zou doen zou je dood gaan.

*K*: [so that u:h

*M*: [if you did it tonight you would die.

(1.7)

→ *K*: oh ja:h.  
oh ye:s.

→ *M*: 't is ontzettend hee:t en dan (.) kan die lucht niet weg.  
it's damned ho:t and then (.) and there's no ventilation.

<sup>8</sup> Compare for example the rejection of an advice (c) or the rejection of a request (d):

(c) Jefferson and Lee (1981:406):

*L*: How: 's your foo:t.=

*E*: ='t ·hh Oh: it's healing beautifully:.

*L*: Goo: [d.

*E*: [The other one ma have to come o:ff on the other toe  
I've got it in that but it's not infected.  
(0.8)

*L*: Why don't you use some stuff [ on it.

→ *E*: [ 't I've got peroxide I put o:n  
it but uh ·hhhh the other one is healing very well: I  
looked at it the other day I put a new ta:pe on it every  
da:y so ·hhhh

## (3) HH:TC:5

1. *S*: maar  
but
2. (.)
3. *S*: echt als je samen bent zou ik zou'k dat niet doen hoor.  
really if you are with the two of you I would I wouldn't do it really.
4. *H*: nee.  
no.
5. *S*: want dat is echt een knoets van een boerderij.  
because it really is an incredible large farm.

After *S* has given her advice not to rent the larger house, *H* does not accept or reject the advice, she only agrees with it (line 4; in Dutch, a negative acknowledgement of a 'negative' advice signals agreement by correspondence within a positive/negative dimension; cf. Pope (1973)).

In saying just 'no' *M* thereby also displays continuation of her recipientship, and consequently evokes continuation of the speakership of her conversational partner. The locally negotiated conversational identities are continued speakership and recipientship. On the level of the corresponding local social identities, the advice-recipient – having got the floor after the advice turn – uses the floor not to produce a preferred next utterance (acceptance of the advice), but uses it for reselecting last speaker as next speaker. Or, phrased differently, the recipient uses the floor to display she doesn't want it, and consequently, to elicit continued speakership of previous speaker. However, *H*'s 'continuer' (cf. Schegloff (1982)) constrains the types of 'proper nexts' of previous speaker as an advice-giver. Next speaker's account of her previous advice satisfies such restrictions on a proper next in the sequential constellation of a continuer after an advice.

The result of the recipient's rejecting the floor and thereby not producing a preferred second can be analyzed as 'advice//non-second//account by advice giver' (double slashes indicate action and speaker transition).

This way, it is recipient's rejecting the floor what makes previous speaker into primary speaker. The larger project is not projected by the participant who realizes it, but its production is due to the type of post-advice recipient reaction.

The display of continued recipientship not only constitutes a local distribution of conversational identities, but also negotiates and constitutes continuation of the local social identities of advice-giver and advice-recipient.<sup>9</sup>

## (d) HH:TC:20

- R*: heb jij tijd (.) en zjn om vanavond op te passen bij mij.?  
do you have time (.) and would you feel like to baby-sit here tonight?
- H*: nee.; want ik sta op het punt om naar Utrecht te gaan.  
no.; because I'm about to leave for Utrecht.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Jefferson and Lee (1981: 416ff.)

This type of recipient-reaction, by which the production of a preferred next to an advice is postponed, persuades the advice-giver to work up and to continue his identity of advice-giver by a delivery of an advice-account.

The results of this diversion thus lead to a re-analysis of the methods used by the participants in fragment (2) to organize turn-taking and turn-construction. They also shed light on the restrictions of turn-taking research on the basis of audiotaped data of face-to-face interactions.<sup>10</sup> It is quite possible that around the 0.5 silence succeeding *M*'s advice, the recipient produced some non-linguistic action, which could be seen by *M* as questioning her advice or displaying continuation of recipientship. But whatever the recipient may have done before or during the 0.5 silence, she did not produce a relevant second to a first utterance, that is, she did not accept or reject the advice, but produced a 'non-second' after a 'first'. The absence of a preferred 'second' could be seen in this constellation as a continuation-device, a 'continuer' realized through omission of a relevant next to a foregoing utterance. The sequential structure therefore can be re-analyzed as 'advice//non-second//account by advice-giver'.

Probably it was not *M* who projected incompleteness of her advice-turn. Recipient's 'negative' continuer defines her turn as being 'insufficient' on both a conversational and a social action level: the conversational insufficiency signaled by the continuer guides an inference of the insufficiency of the utterance as a piece of advice. The retrospective treatment of her last utterance as being actionally insufficient persuades *M* to redefine her turn as being incomplete through the back-tying of her next utterance to her last utterance. And although the turn might not have started as such, it now is treated as first part of a larger project.<sup>11</sup>

Or, as Kendon said in his review of an earlier draft of this paper: "Recipients may, thus, by what they do at turn-transition places, project another turn slot for previous speaker which is a consequence of their treating previous turns as if it were a discourse unit, even when first speaker may not have formulated it as such in the first place" (Kendon (1982: 15–16)).<sup>12</sup>

The methods by which the recipient-definitions of continued reciprocity and speakership are realized operate on a sequential actional level and are occasion-sensitive: the specific type of recipient reaction around the completion of

<sup>10</sup> Adam Kendon has criticized an earlier draft of this paper on exactly this point: "We need here, however, full details of what happened in that pause. It was not a moment of nothing. The recipient of this utterance undoubtedly did something (as George Bateson insisted, in interaction nothing never happens)" (Kendon 1982: 14–16).

<sup>11</sup> The re-analysis corresponds with, and is inspired by Ehlich and Rehbein's analysis (1976) of accounts as insertion sequences, initiated by recipient-tokens which display lack of understanding or non-acceptance of the preceding talk.

<sup>12</sup> In the same vein, Quasthoff (1981) has shown that transitions to turn-by-turn talk not only depend on the kind of preceding talk, but that they are also constrained by recipient's willingness to change his/her actual local conversational identity.

an advice-turn projects and elicits a specific kind of continuation by previous speaker, here an account of the advice.

Furthermore, the completion of the DU itself can be negotiated interactionally. *D*'s rejection of *M*'s account in line 42 leads to a break in *M*'s production of the account and a shift is made to a turn-by-turn dispute on the relevance of the reasons for the advice *M* mentions in her account. The developments in the segment can, on a conversational level, be seen as renewed negotiations on the locally establishable identities of primary speaker and recipient of a larger project. That is, *M* can be seen as producing a new DU in lines 54–62 (see Appendix 2), whereas the intervening turn-by-turn talk can be seen as both interactionally completing her former DU, and as negotiating on the production of a next larger unit and thereby of a next Primary Speaker.

We call these types of larger projects Open Discourse Units. Continuation of previous speaker is not in the first place projected by the speaker him-/herself, as is the case in the production of Closed DU's, but it is an interactionally managed construction, due to a specific type of recipient reaction in a typical sequential position. Recipient reactions as, e.g., continuers, have another quality when they are produced –or omitted– on the kind of sequential positions described for proper nexts of advices. In the course of the production of closed DUs they signal that Primary Speaker can go on with his project, whereas in the post-advice constellation they negotiate primary speakership of advice-giver. The turn-taking machinery can operate this way on the basis of the interactional sequencing of specific types of social actions (cf. also Mazeland (1983), Redder (1984)).

We illustrated the Open DUs by a case of giving advice. Further research is necessary to see to what extent it also accounts for other types, such as requests for action, proposals, disagreements, and the like.

Summing up, in (at least) spontaneous conversation there is a tendency that certain social actions are produced as conversationally larger units, as Discourse Units. This can be done by the speaker himself projecting the larger unit (Closed DUs), as in the case of stories. It also can be done interactionally (Open DUs), as in the case of advice followed by negotiated accounts.

We think it is fruitful for the analysis of turn-construction and turn-taking to take into account factors like social action-sensitivity, routines of action-sequencing,<sup>13</sup> and recipient-devices for turn-allocation and (in)completion-marking projections.

For closed DUs, we formulated restrictions on the turn-taking model. For the Open DUs, we will not do so (systematically), since the kind of negotiations taking place in the course of Open DU-production depend on sequen-

<sup>13</sup> Cf. for instance Terasaki (1976), Pomerantz (1977), Ehlich and Rehbein (1979), Rehbein (1977), Jefferson and Lee (1981), and Griffin and Mehan (1981).

tially structured and specifiable occasions, of which we analyzed only one example in detail (the ‘advice//non-second//account’-structure).

#### 4. Weakening of the projection of DU-completion

So far, we have differentiated between Closed and Open DUs. In case of the latter, the issue of which turn-constructural unit should be heard as the last one is a matter of negotiation. In case of the Closed DU, we said the last unit was marked as such. However, this is not always the case. The completion of a Closed DU is not always recognizable for the recipients, and can also be subject to negotiation.

An example can be found in the story *M* tells about the little bird which fell down from the tree (see lines 159–250 in fragment (2), Appendix 2).

This story is told as having several endings. *M* starts with a story-entry device (line 159), succeeded by a time-indication, typical for orientation-sections of stories (line 160; cf. Labov (1972)):

(4) HH:FF:2

159. *M*: maar we hadden zo`n/ was `n vogeltje uit de boom gevallen,  
but we had such a/ a little bird had fallen down the tree,

160. *M*: was van `t voorjaar.  
happened this spring.

In starting this way, *M* signals the initiation of a DU, and thereby appoints herself as the Primary Speaker and her partners as DRs. She starts her DU with the adversative *maar* ‘but’ and refers to the animal als *een vogeltje* ‘a little bird’, and so signals that she will produce a topic-shift. Although she too will tell about killing animals, it will not be about the killing of scary animals, which was the topic of the preceding talk,<sup>14</sup> but about how to kill *lieve beestjes* ‘sweet little animals’, which makes the killing much more problematic, of course. The diminutive, which is used very frequently in Dutch, is not only used to specify size, but also has the connotation of ‘sweet’ and ‘innocent’. This connotation gives rise to the expectation that *M* will introduce a shift from ‘scary animals’ to ‘sweet (little) animals’.

After telling that the bird fell just in front of the cat’s nose, *M* mentions *maar dat beestje was ook niet dood* ‘but that little animal wasn’t dead either’ (line 174). The ‘contextual implicature’ of this utterance may be heard as the story being an illustration of ‘how to kill animals’.

This way she makes her turn ‘externally coherent’ with the preceding talk.

<sup>14</sup> Formulating what a topic is about, always depends on how globally one wants to formulate it, and which and how many specifications of the ‘the topic’ one wants to include in the formulation. Because of that, our formulation of what is the topic varies to some extent.

By 'external coherence', we refer to the coherence of the global and local conversational relations of the current topic with the preceding topic(s). The 'internal coherence' which the speaker creates within DU-production, is complementary to the external coherence.

From what *M* has told so far, her recipients may expect her to continue telling how she has solved the problem of killing sweet little animals. As long as *M* has not done so, her DU will not be heard as completed. However, instead of just telling what happened and what she did, *M* later on gives rise to doubts about what the DU is about. Or, about what kind of DU she is producing.

This starts when she expands an evaluation-section of her story into a discussion of how this kind of problem can be solved in general (cf. lines 176–227). She illustrates not being able to deal with this horrible kind of situation, whereas 'Marion' is able to deal with it quite well (lines 179–201).

In a way, she breaks off her story to highlight a special problem. In so doing, she makes the external coherence much stronger, since the problem of how to kill animals was the main focus of the preceding talk. But at the same time, she brings her story to another level. By indicating the illustrative function of the story very amply, the balance between establishing the external coherence with the general problem and the telling of what actually happened gets disturbed. This not only weakens the internal coherence of her DU as it was projected earlier, but also provides slots for recipient reactions that modify the DR-constraints that hold during the production of a DU.

(5) HH:FF:2

201. *M*: dat je 't/ dat het maar een beetje pijn zit te hebben of zo. =  
that you/ that it's paining or something. =
202. *R*: = even in de oven?  
= in the oven for a bit?
203. (1.5)
204. *M*: °gas.°  
°gas.°
205. *R*: ja.  
yes.
206. *M*: jaja.
207. (.)
208. *M*: ja da's ook iets. maar ether of zo is ook goed eigen
209. *R*: ja. } o.  
*M*: yes that's possible too. but ether or something is good to } yes.
210. *R*: dat heb je natuurlijk niet bij de hand.  
you won't have that on hand.
211. *D*: nee { dat ( )
212. *R*: heb je ether staan beneden? –  
*D*: no { that ( )  
*R*: do you have ether downstairs? =

213. *M*: = ja heb ik zo'n 'n klein flesje staan.  
 = yes I have this a a small bottle.
214. *R*: [ oh.
215. *M*: [ ((lau [ghs))
216. *D*: [ lau [ghs))  
*R*: [ wat eng.
217. (1.5) how scary.

In line 202 *R* suggests another possibility for killing birds *even in de oven* 'in the oven for a bit'. *M* responds to this suggestion and contrasts it with her own suggestion already given in line 176, to kill the bird with ether. *R*'s suggestion and *M*'s response to it create turn-by-turn talk which constitutes yet another form of moving away from the initially projected talk. This turn-by-turn talk by *M* and *R* can be even heard as a multi-party produced evaluation-section of *M*'s story, which then indicates that they treat the story as near-to-completion or completed. The last 'move' to completion of the story is done by *R* when he comments on *M*'s remark that she indeed has ether in her apartment with *oh. wat eng* 'oh. how scary' (lines 214–216).

After the completion point of *R*'s turn, *D* may be heard to start another DU, but she is stopped by *M* who finally picks up her story about the bird again:

(6) HH:FF:2

218. *D*: → oh zulk soort dingen daar krijg ik ook nachtmerries van. [ zo als ik/  
 219. *M*: → [ ja. en toen  
*D*: oh that kind of things cause me nightmares, too. [ like when I/  
*M*: [ yes. and then
220. *M*: hebben we 'm 'n hele nacht laten zitten,  
 we left it there a whole night,  
 221. *M*: → en toen was ie de volgende dag weg.  
 and then it had gone next day.  
 222. *M*: maar ja, dan denk ik na ja misschien had ie gewoon 'n klap.  
 but well, then I think well maybe it just had a blow.
223. *D*: ja:.  
 ye:s.  
 224. (0.9)
225. *M*: 'n shock.  
 a shock.  
 226. (0.8)
227. *D*: → nec ik vind heel erg da [ t/  
 228. *M*: → [ oh nec toen hebben we nog de plantsoendienst  
*D*: no I find it terrible whe [ n/  
*M*: [ oh no then we phoned the park-council  
*D*:
229. *M*: o(h)pgebe(h)ld of ze 'm k(h)wame(h)n ha:(h)len.  
 to co(h)me and ge(h)t i:(h)t.

The internal coherence of *M*'s projected DU was gradually broken down; starting her DU as a story of the little bird, she ends the DU as an illustration



of how to kill animals in general. And when *R* and *M* get into producing turn-by-turn talk, *M*'s conversational role as the PS of a DU is shifting into the role of speaker and recipient of turn-by-turn talk. It is not before *D* starts a new DU that *M* picks up her PS role again to continue her story (lines 219–220), immediately succeeded by the 'result' of the story 'and then it had gone next day.' (line 221). The story telling is completed conversationally by a story telling ending device in line 222.

Now, *M* really having completed her story, turn-taking can take place again, and *D* self-selects in line 227 with the start of what might be again the beginning of a new DU ('no I find it terrible when').

However, *M* interrupts this to correct her story-ending with a much more exciting resolution. The park-council had been phoned to rescue the bird. *M*'s self-correction also shows a typical tendency in story telling devices. Since the order of tellable events is modified retrospectively, factual order of the events must have been sacrificed for the sake of being able to present a plausible whole. The plausibility of the told order of events appears to be more important than their factual succession.

The analysis shows how even Closed DUs can develop into another kind of DU than that which was initially projected. Depending on the weakness of the internal coherence of the DU, the participants can do a re-negotiation on what kind of DU actually is in production. *M* impairs her rights as PS by engaging in turn-by-turn talk during the production of her DU; or – from the perspective of recipients – DR-constraints on what they can do during the production of a DU are weakened.

Depending on how strictly the PS sticks to the initially created expectations the kind of DU actually in production is open to negotiation. This also holds, therefore, for the related expectations with respect to the further development and completion of the DU-in-progress. The projection can be weakened and, concomitantly, the restrictions on the turn-taking model as we formulated them.

## 5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have discussed some of the methods conversationalists use to produce complex social actions, like story-telling and advice-giving, and how it is made clear to conversational partners that a Discourse Unit is still in progress.

A Primary Speaker projects the type of project to follow, and thereby projects completion and incompletion of the DU, once it is under way. These projections can be achieved by a number of means: (para)linguistic means, projections of the types of social action, projections based on the preceding conversational actions, and finally projections of sequential position within conversational routines and their actional and preferential structure.

Whereas in the case of Closed DUs it is mainly the Primary Speaker who does the 'construction-work', in the Open DU the recipient plays an important role in whether or not a turn will be elaborated into a DU. Closed DUs are interactionally generated as such, and we have tried to account for turn-taking during the production of Closed DUs by formulating DU-sensitive restrictions on the turn-taking model by Sacks et al. Since our analysis leans on merely a few fragments, it can only be seen as a starting point for a description of larger projects with respect to both their conversational and actional features.

## References

- Ehlich, K. and J. Rehbein, 1976. 'On effective reasoning'. In: G. Nickel, ed., *Proceedings of the IVth International Congress of Applied Linguistics*. Stuttgart: Hochschulverlag. pp. 313–338.
- Ehlich, K. and J. Rehbein, 1979. 'Sprachliche Handlungsmuster'. In: H.G. Soeffner, ed., *Interpretative Verfahren in den Sozial- und Textwissenschaften*. Stuttgart: Metzler. pp. 243–274.
- Goodwin, Ch. and M.J. Goodwin, 1982. Concurrent operations on talk: notes on the interactive organization of assessments. Paper given at the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting. San Francisco, September 9.
- Griffin, P. and H. Mehan, 1981. 'Sense and ritual in classroom discourse'. In: F. Coulmas, ed., *Conversational routine*. The Hague: Mouton. pp. 187–214.
- Houtkoop-Steenstra, J.P., 1980. 'Je hebt wel gelijk, maar ...': enige pragmatische aspecten van concessief-adversatieve 'wel' – 'maar' – constructies. Publication of the Institute of General Linguistics, nr. 28. University of Amsterdam.
- Jefferson, G., 1978. 'Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation'. In: J. Schenkein, ed., 1978. pp. 219–248.
- Jefferson, G. and E.L. Lee, 1981. The rejection of advice: managing the problematic convergence of a 'trouble telling' and a 'service encounter'. *Journal of Pragmatics* 5: 399–422.
- Keller, E., 1979. Gambits: conversational strategy signals. *Journal of Pragmatics* 3: 219–238.
- Kendon, A., 1982. Discussion of papers on basic phenomena of interaction: Plenary Session, Subsection 4, Research Committee on Sociolinguistics. Xth International Congress of Sociology. Mexico City. August 16th, 1982. (Unpublished paper.)
- Koerfer, A., 1979. 'Zur konversationellen Funktion von "ja aber" – am Beispiel universitärer Diskurse'. In: H. Weydt, ed., *Die Partikeln der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter. pp. 14–29.
- Labov, W., 1972. 'The transformation of experience in narrative syntax'. In: W. Labov, *Language in the inner city: studies in the black English vernacular*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press. pp. 354–396.
- Mazeland, H., 1983. 'Sprecherwechsel in der Schule'. In: K. Ehlich and J. Rehbein, eds., *Kommunikation in Schule und Hochschule. Linguistische und ethnomethodologische Analysen*. Tübingen: Narr. pp. 77–101.
- Polanyi, L. and R.J.H. Scha, 1983. 'On the recursive structure of discourse'. In: K. Ehlich and H. van Riemsdijk, eds., *Connectedness in sentence, discourse and text*. Proceedings of the Tilburg Conference held on 25 and 26 January, 1982. *Tilburg Studies in Language and Literature* 4. pp. 141–178.
- Pomerantz, A., 1977. 'Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes'. To appear in: J.M. Atkinson and J.C. Heritage, eds., *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Pope, E., 1973. 'Question–answering systems'. In: C. Corum, T.C. Smith-Stark and A. Weiser, eds., *Papers from the IXth Regional Meeting Chicago Linguistic Society*. pp. 482–492.
- Quasthoff, U., 1980. *Erzählen in Gesprächen*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Quasthoff, U., 1981. 'Zuhöreraktivitäten beim konversationellen Erzählen'. In: P. Schröder and H. Steger, eds., *Dialogforschung*. Düsseldorf: Schwann. pp. 287–313.
- Redder, A., 1984. *Modalverben im Unterrichtsdiskurs. Pragmatik der Modalverben am Beispiel eines institutionellen Diskurses*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Rehbein, J., 1977. *Komplexes Handeln*. Stuttgart; Metzler.
- Rehbein, J., 1979. 'Sprechhandlungsaugmente. Zur Organisation der Hörersteuerung'. In: H. Weydt, ed., *Die Partikeln der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter. pp. 58–74.
- Rehbein, J., 1980. 'Sequentielles Erzählen – Erzählstrukturen von Emigranten bei Sozialberatungen in England'. In: K. Ehlich, ed., *Erzählen im Alltag*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp. pp. 64–108.
- Ryave, A.L., 1978. 'On the achievement of a series of stories'. In: J. Schenkein, ed., 1978. pp. 113–132.
- Sacks, H., 1969. Unpublished lecture notes. Winter 1969, lecture 9.
- Sacks, H., 1970. Unpublished lecture notes. Winter 1970, lecture 2.
- Sacks, H., 1974. 'An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation'. In: R. Bauman and J. Sherzer, eds., *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 337–353.
- Sacks, H., 1978. 'Some technical considerations of a dirty joke'. In: J. Schenkein, ed., 1978. pp. 249–269.
- Sacks, H., E.A. Schegloff and G. Jefferson, 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language* 50: 696–735. (Also in: J. Schenkein, ed., 1978. pp. 7–55.)
- Schegloff, E.A., 1982. 'Discourse as an interactional achievement: some uses of "uh huh" and other things that come between sentences'. In: D. Tannen, ed., *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1981*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press. pp. 71–93.
- Schenkein, J., ed., 1978. *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction*. New York: Academic Press.
- Terasaki, A.K., 1976. Pre-announcement sequences in conversation. *Social Sciences Working Paper Nr. 99*. School of Social Sciences, University of California, Irvine.
- Wald, B., 1976. *The discourse unit. A study in the segmentation and form of spoken discourse*. Los Angeles, CA: Dept. of Linguistics, UCLA. (First MS.)
- Wald, B., 1978. 'Zur Einheitlichkeit und Einleitung von Diskurseinheiten'. In: U. Quasthoff, ed., *Sprachstruktur – Sozialstruktur. Zur linguistischen Theoriebildung*. Kronberg: Scriptor. pp. 128–150.

## Appendix 1

### Transcription key

We made use of Jefferson's transcription system (cf. Schenkein (1978: xi–xvi)).

- . – indication that an utterance is finished; often falling intonation
- ˊ – rising intonation
- ? – questioning intonation
- (.) – pause of less than 0.5 of a second
- / – cut-off word or phrase or sentence
- ( ) – uninterpretable part of speech
- (very) – probably 'very' (transcribers' guess)
- ve:ry – prolonged vowel

- very – accentuated vowel  
 ve(h)ry – an ‘h’ between brackets indicates that the word in which it occurs is spoken laughing  
 ·hhh – inbreath  
 °very° – the ‘°’ indicates that the words between it are spoken relatively softly. When a phrase is spoken more and more softly, this is indicated by ‘°very°’  
 very =  
 = quick – very quick speaker change (latching)  
 ((laughs)) – nonverbal activity or remark of the transcriber  
 ‘very’ – translation of a fragment in the Dutch text  
 \*very\* – fictional conversation  
 [ – point of overlap onset

## Appendix 2

### Transcripts of the conversation

#### Fragment (1)

((The participants *D*, *R*, and *M* are colleagues as well as friends. *D* and *M* live together in the same building, something which is referred to in the conversation; *D* lives upstairs, *M* downstairs. The conversation takes place in *D*’s kitchen. Bommel and Polletje are *M*’s cats.

The fragment begins in a phase where participants shift from a working discussion (which was the reason for meeting) to the informal part upon which the analysis is based)).

1. *R*: waar hebben jullie eigenlijk la[st van muizen?
2. *D*: [ ja.  
*R*: where do you actually have mice-[problems?  
*D*: [ yes.
3. *R*: oh.
4. (.)
5. *R*: ik dacht dat 't afgelopen was.  
 I thought it was finished.
6. *D*: mh?
7. *R*: [ ik dacht dat we klaar waren.
8. *M*: [ 't is afgelopen.  
*R*: [ I thought we were ready.  
*M*: [ it's finished.
9. *D*: ja 't was afgelopen. ik zat alleen nog maar  
 yes it was finished. I was only just
10. (.)
11. *D*: de mogelijkheid van konomiegebruik (te) kijken.  
 considering the possibilities of comma-use.

12. D: maar daar praten we de volgende keer (wel) (.) over.  
but we'll talk about that next (.) time.
13. (3.0)
14. D: poes! [( )]
15. R: maar waar hebben jullie nu eigenlijk last van muizen?  
D: cat! [( )]  
R: but where do you actually have mice-problems?
16. (1.5)
17. R: °die is van jou.°  
°this is yours.°
18. R: hier. °poes ophouden!°  
here. °cat stop it!°
19. R: hier in de keuken alleen?  
just here in the kitchen?
20. D: en in de voorkamer ook. he:le schattige muisjes.  
and in the living room too. ve:ry sweet little mice.
21. (.)
22. M:→ oh je ziet ze echt geregeld lope[n].
23. D: [ ja.
- M: oh really see them walking around regularl[y].
- D: [ yes.
24. (.)
25. D: ik zag nog 'n keer, een keer liep tie zo hier langs,  
I once saw, once it walked along here
26. D: heel schattig, en toen haalde ik iets weg, en toen zat ie daar,  
so sweet. and then I took something away, and then it was over there,
27. D: en in 'n gegeven moment eh dacht ik ach nu pak ik 'm.  
and one moment uh I thought well now I'll catch it.
28. (.)
29. M: j(h)a::.  
ye::(h)s.
30. D: maar eh toen maakte die 'n noodsprong hier omlaag,  
but uh it then made a big jump down here,
31. M: heel hoog.  
very high.
32. D: e(h)n toe(h)n wa(h)s tie we(h)g.  
a(h)nd the(h)n it wa(h)s go(h)ne.
33. (1.9)
34. M: eigenlijk moeten ze gewoon  
actually they should
35. (1.0)
36. M: zou je die poezen 'n nacht hier op moeten sluiten,  
you should lock those cats in here for a night,
37. M: dan horen ze ze ook.  
then they will hear them too.
38. → (0.5)

39. *M*: want nu komen ze wel hier zo nu en dan kijken,  
because they now do look in every now and then,  
40. (.)
41. *M*: [maar ze zitten gewoon niet eh/  
42. *D*: [maar nu zie ik geen muizen meer.  
*M*: [but they just aren't uh/  
*D*: [but I don't see mice anymore.
43. *M*: oh je ziet ze ook niet meer?  
oh you don't see them anymore?
44. *D*: nee. want ik laat nu 's nachts altijd open.  
no. because nowadays I always leave open at night.
45. *D*: 't enige wat/  
th'only thing/  
46. *M*: ik geloof dat Bommel ook wel boven zit.  
I believe Bommel is upstairs too sometimes.
47. *D*: ja.  
yes.
48. (0.8)
49. *D*: ja.  
yes.
50. *R*: moeten ze ook heel regelmatig bij zitten  
they should be around very regularly
51. *R*: want dan weten ze de plekjes  
because then they'll know the spots
52. *R*: waar ze moeten gaan zitten kijk [en,  
53. *D*: [ja.  
*R*: where to wa [tch,  
*D*: [yes.
54. *M*: ja.: 't is m [eer/  
55. *R*: [en dan moeten ze soms een dag wachten.  
*M*: ye:s. it's m [ore/  
*R*: [and sometimes they've to wait a whole day.
56. *D*: en [ik geloof/  
56. *M*: [nee: maar 't is meer als ze gewoon ergens zitten  
*D*: and [I believe/  
*M*: [no.: but it's more if they're just around somewhere
57. *M*: en op een gegeven moment horen ze die beesten daar lopen.  
and one moment they hear these animals walking.  
58. (.)
59. *D*: ja.  
yes.
60. *M*: en nu komen ze gewoon toevallig boven en dan eh  
and now they just come upstairs accidentally and then uh  
61. (.)
62. *M*: nou ja dan zijn die muizen d'r °misschien toevallig niet.°  
well then these mice may °happen to be not there.°  
.....

## Fragment (2)

((After fragment (1), *M* tells a story and then talks about how cats treat mice till they die. Then there is a discussion about all kinds of scaring and disgusting animals or insects which come into one's house, and how to kill them. In line 159 *M* starts telling a new story.))

159. *M*: maar we hadden zo'n/ was 'n vogeltje uit de boom gevallen,  
but we had such a/ a little bird had fallen down the tree,
160. *M*: was van 't voorjaar.  
happened this spring.
161. (1.0)
162. *M*: gewoon voor Polletjes neus, bam, kwam vogeltje naar beneden.  
right in front of Polletje's nose, wham, came birdy down.
163. *M*: ((laughs))
164. *M*: ui(h)t de boo(h)m  
do(h)wn the t(h)ree
165. (1.2)
166. *M*: en die pakte ze natuurlijk.  
and she took it of course.
167. *M*: ik bedoel ik kon [kon ook nie t mooier.
168. *R*: [ ja.
169. *D*: [ ja.
- M*: I mean I could [couldn't be better.
- R*: [ yes.
- D*: [ yes.
170. *M*: 'n vogeltje uit de [boom.
171. *D*: [ ((laughs))
- M*: a birdy down the tree.
173. (.)
174. *M*: en eh ((lacht)) maar dat beestje was ook niet dood,  
and uh ((laughs)) but that little animal wasn't dead either,
175. *M*: dus die hebben we op bij jullie op het balkon neergezet,  
so we put it with yours at the balcony,
176. *M*: en dan hadden we de hele tijd van moeten we nou (.) ether gebr/  
and then we were all the time like should we keep (.) ether/
177. *M*: watje met ether vo [o(h)r z'n neu(h)sje houden,
178. *D*: [ ((laughs))
- M*: pad of ether fro(h)nt of its li(h)ttle nose,
179. *M*: (of) moet je 'n klap geven of z [o? Marion zegt dan altijd van
180. *D*: [ mhhm.
- M*: (or) should you hit it or something? Marion tends to say like
181. *M*: nou moet je de vuilnisbak op z'n ((geeft klap))  
well you should drop the dustbin on its ((knocks))
182. *M*: op z'n kop laten valle [n, die z/ Marion kan dat heel goed.
183. *D*: [ mhhm.
- M*: on its nose, it s/ Marion is very good at that.

184. *M*: nee vind ik ook heel knap van d'r hoo[r].
185. *D*: [mh.
- M*: no I find it very good of hers, really.
186. *M*: die is echt heel eh, en ik zit daar 'n uur met dat beest te m:emmen,  
she really is very uh, and I'm hus:tling for an hour with that animal,
187. *M*: wat ontzettend bang is,  
which is terribly scared,
188. *M*: en ik denk van god wat moet ik nou met dat beest.  
and I think oh god what am I to do with this animal.
199. *D*: mhmh.
200. (0.8)
201. *M*: dat je 't/ dat het maar een beetje pijn zit te hebben of zo. =  
that you/ that it's paining or something. =
202. *R*: = even in de oven?  
= in the oven for a bit?
203. (1.5)
204. *M*: °gas.°  
°gas.°
205. *R*: ja.  
yes.
206. *M*: jaja.
207. (.)
208. *M*: ja da's ook iets. maar ether of zo is ook goed eigen [lijk.
209. *R*: [ja.  
*M*: yes that's possible too. but ether or something is good to [o.  
*R*: [yes.
210. *R*: dat heb je natuurlijk niet bij de hand.  
you won't have that on hand.
211. *D*: nee [dat ( )
212. *R*: [heb je ether staan beneden? =
- D*: no [that ( )
- R*: [do you have ether downstairs? =
213. *M*: = ja heb ik zo'n 'n klein flesje staan.  
= yes I have this a a small bottle.
214. *R*: [oh.
215. *M*: [((lau[ghs))
216. *D*: [((lau[ghs))
- R*: [wat eng.  
how scary.
217. (1.5)
218. *D*: oh zulk soort dingen daar krijg ik ook nachtmerries van. [zo als ik/
219. *M*: [ja. en toen
- D*: oh that kind of things cause me nightmares. [like when I/
- M*: [yes. and then
220. *M*: hebben we 'm 'n hele nacht laten zitten,  
we left it there a whole night,



221. *M*: en toen was ie de volgende dag weg.  
and then it had gone next day.
222. *M*: maar ja, dan denk ik na ja misschien had ie gewoon 'n klap.  
but well, then I think well maybe it just had a blow.
223. *D*: ja:.  
ye:s.
224. (0.9)
225. *M*: 'n schok.  
a shock.
226. (0.8)
227. *D*: nee ik vind heel erg da [t/
228. *M*: [ oh nee toen hebben we nog de plantsoendienst.  
*D*: no I find it terrible whe [n/  
*M*: [ oh no then we phoned the park-council
229. *M*: o(h)pgebe(h)ld of ze 'm k(h)wame(h)n ha:(h)len.  
to co(h)me and ge(h)t i:(h)t.
230. *M*: [ ((laughs)) dat vogeltje.  
this little bird
231. *D*: [ ((laughs))
232. *R*: [ ((laughs))
233. (.)
234. *M*: ja(h) [aha. hij was uit de boom van de buurvrouw gevallen,  
235. *R*: [ ik zou eerst naar de dierenambulance.  
*M*: ye(h) [aha. it had fallen down the tree of the lady nextdoors,  
*R*: [ I would have gone to the animal ambulance first.
236. *M*: dus die voelde zich verantwoordelijk, ((lacht))  
so she felt responsible, ((laughs))
237. *M*: ze zei van nou ik bel de [plantsoendienst wel,  
238. *D*: [ ((laughs))  
*M*: she said well I'll phone the park-council,
239. *M*: nee die heeft eerst opgebeld, ja was de de dierenambulance,  
no she phoned first, yes was the the animal ambulance,
240. *M*: (( [ lacht )) [die zou/  
241. *R*: [ welke instantie moet ik nu eigenlijk e[h voor een halfdood vogel-  
tje.  
*M*: (( laughs )) [they would/  
*R*: which institution should I actually uh [for a half-dead little bird.
242. *M*: het vogeltje komen halen, nee want het was nog niet dood  
come and collect the little bird, no because it wasn't dead yet
242. *M*: en dan zouden ze het opknappen  
and they would fix it
243. *M*: en werd 't weer in het park losgelaten of zo.  
and it would be released again in the park or something.
244. *M*: nou(h) e(h)cht waa(h)r. 'n toestand over zo'n klein mereltje.  
we(h)ll rea(h)lly. such a fuss about this tiny little blackbird.

245. (0.9)
246. *M*: maar 't be [staat wel,
247. *D*: ( )
- M*: but it does exist,
248. *R*: h [mm
249. *M*: [ dus de dierenambulance komt 't halen als 't goed is. =  
so the animal ambulance does come to get it if it's alright. =
250. *D*: = 't is ook heel raar (.....)  
= it's very strange (.....)