Introduction: A body of resources – CA studies of social conduct

Spencer Hazel [a], Kristian Mortensen [b], Gitte Rasmussen [c],*

[a] LINGCORP, Department of Culture and Identity, Roskilde University, Postbox 260, 4000 Roskilde, Denmark
[b] Department of Design and Communication, University of Southern Denmark, Engstien 1, 6000 Kolding, Denmark
[c] Center for Social Practices and Cognition, Institute of Language and Communication, University of Southern Denmark, Campusvej 55, DK-5230 Odense M, Denmark

One [of two conceptions of the calling of CA] is centered on the organization of action in interaction, the organizations of practices for accomplishing those actions and courses of action, and the basic infrastructure for the whole domain—turns and their form and distribution; actions and their trajectories; troubles and their resolution; language as an interface with the physical, social, cultural, emotional, and other worlds that humans live in, grasp and navigate, etc. The other conception is centered on embodied actors, bringing the elements of the organization of human sociality just mentioned into being moment by moment in a particular place, with particular others, vying with or yielding to one another, etc. Both are important, but for me the former is the crux of our undertaking
(Schegloff, 2010, p. 38)

1. Introduction

Conversation Analysis (CA) is both an established research area and research methodology in the social sciences (Atkinson and Heritage, 1984; Heritage, 1984; Levinson, 1983; Maynard and Clayman, 1991; Zimmerman, 1988). It focuses on how members of society organize their lives locally in *social interaction*. Thus, CA investigates how co-participants in interaction construct and orient to social actions, practices and patterns of social interaction. In doing so, CA aims at explicating how co-participants occasion their social encounters through what they orient to as relevant sense-making practices for shaping social actions for interaction. CA is especially known for its research interests in how co-participants organize their social encounters in and through *vocal conduct*. That is how co-participants produce recognizable and systematic social order through the construction of sequentially ordered and locally accomplished actions produced through turns-at-speaking. Hence, the now well-known primary CA terminology emerged out of analyses of *vocal* conduct in interaction. The terminology includes concepts such as ''turns-at-talk'' and ''first and second pair-parts'', ''turn constructional units (TCUs)'' and ''possible completions'' (Sacks et al., 1974). Some of these concepts are now widely used in research areas such as Anthropology (Goodwin and Heritage, 1990), Discourse Studies (Brown and Yule, 1983), Second Language Acquisition (Block, 2003), Linguistics (Ochs et al., 1996), Cognitive Linguistics (Williams, 2008), Multimodal Communication (Norris, 2004), Health Communication (Heritage and Maynard, 2006), Psychology (Edwards and Potter, 1992) and Speech- and Language Pathology (Clarke and Wilkinson, 2008).

However, early research into practices through which members produce social order in interaction also encompasses studies of how not only vocal conduct but also gaze (Goodwin, 1979, 1981), gestures (Goodwin, 1986; Schegloff, 1984)

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +45 65503116.
  E-mail addresses: spencer@ruc.dk (S. Hazel), krimo@sdu.dk (K. Mortensen), gitter@sdu.dk (G. Rasmussen).

and bodily posture and movements (Heath, 1984, 1986) are part and parcel of the details of ordered social interaction. These applied CA methodology to explicate how such resources for interaction are organized with or in relation to vocal production. These studies, which have laid the foundations of what can be characterized as research into ''multimodal interaction,'' ''embodied interaction'' or ''multimodality'', have undoubtedly contributed to the early development of CA, even though the main attention of CA was from early on and for many years later directed at vocal-conduct-in-interaction (Psathas, 1995).

A somewhat different approach to the studies in social interaction, Context Analysis (Kendon, 1970 [1990]; Scheflen, 1972; Birdwhistell, 1970) developed as a research field at the same time as CA. Context Analysis, too, aims ''to provide an account of the recurrent behavioural forms that are employed in interaction and the rules that govern how they are employed'' (Kendon, 1990, p. 35). Furthermore, in line with CA, Context Analysis aligns itself with the natural sciences, requiring for human conduct to be investigated in the settings in which it naturally occurs. In contrast to CA, however, Context Analysis focuses on body-visual resources such as gesture and body posture. As Schegloff suggests:

> ''Most directly pertinent is the work of Kendon, who as long ago as 1972 reported in passing a finding like those with which I am concerned. Our interpretation of these findings is different – Kendon finding in them grounds for a claim of some sort of priority, precedence, anteriority, or more fundamental status for body behaviour as compared to speech. I treat the production of talk as organizationally more fundamental, the body behaviour being generally temporally and sequentially organized with respect to *it*, and not the other way around. Still, the convergence of findings is notable; the results were arrived at independently, and from different sets of (naturalistic) materials.''
> (Schegloff, 1984)

The upshot of the overlapping orientations in the questions raised and/or the methodologies used in CA research, research in 'Multimodality' using CA methodology and Context Analysis, has been that the research areas have both inspired and influenced one another. This has, of course, and will, we hope, occasion further ongoing interdisciplinary discussion of *when* what is relevant and *how* what is relevant in the analysis of social conduct in interaction (see for instance, Deppermann, 2013; Streeck et al., 2011). From the perspective of the CA research paradigm, the questions relate to if, when and how resources and actions other than those produced in speech should be included in concepts such as those mentioned above, namely ''turns-at-talk'', ''TCUs'', ''possible completions'' or ''first and second pair parts'' (Sacks, 1972a,b). For instance, a number of studies, such as Mondada (2006, 2007), draw on previous findings in the *speech*-oriented CA literature, but here document the systematicity of body-visual behaviours as recognizable social practices, for example in demonstrating how certain gestures may project an upcoming turn-at-talk in much the same way as has been described for vocal conduct (Jefferson, 1984). Such findings are supported by other studies, which explore the organization of social conduct through ''semiotic resources'' (Goodwin, 2000a, 2003) other than those produced in speech (Goodwin, 2007; Carroll, 2004; Klippi, 2003; Mori and Hayashi, 2006). One way some of these studies challenge the traditional boundaries of CA is by extending our understanding of 'turns-at-talk', 'TCUs' and 'first and second pair-parts' to include non-vocal components while still employing CA *speech*-oriented terminology. However, most of them do not describe the body-visual resources and methods employed for doing specific actions as being occasioned systematically as type-matched practices (Schegloff, 2007, cf. however Keisanen and Rauniomaa, 2012). Consequently, it is claimed that these studies do not document the systematicity of body-visual behaviours as *recognizable* social practices, since it is through *comparisons* of cases that CA studies aim at capturing the social logic, rules or maxims that these behaviours index, seeking to accomplish this in ways that are similar to how members of society presumably make sense of the world, namely by fitting cases to types (Garfinkel, 1967). This is usually done explicitly in so-called 'collection studies' and 'single case studies', the former which constitutes the main method in the CA paradigm (Schegloff, 1996a). Schegloff argues that studies which are not based on collections of phenomena have no framework for describing actual actions as being ordinary normative actions or idiosyncratic: ''[But if] the goal of inquiry is the establishment and elucidation of recurrent phenomena and the practices by which they are produced, then work will be grounded in collections of single instances, and collections provide a different sort of resource for addressing the problem of relevance. A *collection* of extracts can display the way persons (or persons in a certain sequential or interactional context, or persons doing some activity) do some action'' (Schegloff, in Wong & Olsher, 2000, p. 117)''.

This CA stance does, however, not stand unchallenged. The method of comparing by collecting instances has been and still is subject to criticism. The critique holds that researchers carrying out collection studies reconstruct an idealized and decontextualized reconstruction of social life instead of studying that life in its own situated particulars (ten Have, 1990).

With our starting point that much more than speech belongs to such situated particulars in human social interaction, the question for this Special Issue is if and how studies in CA would be able to deal with these particulars through the research methods that constitute the paradigm.

2. 'Multimodal' interaction and its 'semiotic fields'

The findings of empirical studies of social interaction as carried out in aforementioned research areas or with partly different methodologies demonstrate an extraordinary breadth of interactional resources that people bring to bear on how they go about their social lives. People are forever foraging for materials from which to fashion their contributions within interactions. In doing so they demonstrate an immensely rich range of abilities to improvise *in situ* materials for constructing social action in the moment-by-moment unfolding course of interaction (Goodwin, 2013).

We take as a point of orientation that as participants-in-interaction may draw on any number of situated materials from the phenomenal field in the conducting human sociality, then researchers too are obliged to consider these behavioural components as potentially relevant to the participants for the social actions being occasioned. Where there is evidence of raw materials, for example the visually accessible body, or vocally produced sound, or physical structures in the surround, being occasioned, indexed and assembled as objects (Sacks, 1966) of perception, for analysts to pursue an *emic* perspective of locally produced social order it is incumbent upon them not to treat any of these orientations *a priori* as redundant. Indeed, the very privileging of one set of interactional components, for example speech or hand movements, above others introduces an *etically* derived interpretation of interactional order which may not chime with each participant's distribution of attention *at that moment* and *that sequential position*. It would then appear prescient to explore how these resources are occasioned by participants and are packaged as aggregates of social action.

As mentioned previously, one line of social interaction analysis, which has gone some way to address this, has come to be known as 'multimodal interaction analysis' (e.g., Hutchins and Nomura, 2011; for overview, see Mortensen, 2012). Here, modes are understood to pertain to different local 'media' through which actions are produced, e.g., gaze, speech, gesture, etc. That the term 'multimodality' is used for a particular subset of interaction studies appears to evidence a bias identified in more mainstream traditions, for example within the CA research paradigm where as mentioned vocal production enjoys a privileged position, and indeed where one type of resources may be implicitly treated as the sole medium through which social order in interaction is occasioned. However, interaction as the primordial site for human sociality is *always* multimodal, and as such the term as applied within interaction analytic studies relates to the research *focus*, rather than to the *object* of research. Consequently, studies that adopt the 'multimodal' descriptor appear to offer an implicit critique that the wider fields such as talk-oriented CA in fact *disregard* in their data modalities through which social action is jointly occasioned, indeed treating interaction as typically *mono-modal*.

A similar specification as described above appears to have entered interaction analysis parlance when describing 'embodied' interaction (Streeck et al., 2011). The term, for example in ''*embodied* components'' or ''features of *embodiment*'' in interaction has come to be used as shorthand for referring to visual features such as postural orientation, facial configuration, gesture, or the situated nature of interaction within environmental and interpersonal spatial arrangements. However, similar to the use of *multimodal* in a restricted focus of research, the implication is that this is a subordinate sub-classification within interaction studies, where some, indeed a mainstream of interaction research focuses on *disembodied* interaction between co-participants. If embodied interaction is that studied by researchers interested in the 'multimodal' constitution of interaction, then the implication is that those investigating interaction from a mono-modal perspective treat their data as incorporeal. Yet, this position is neither articulated anywhere in talk-oriented CA research, nor would it arguably be a position researchers in the CA research area would claim. Human interaction *is* fundamentally embodied, and as such any research into human social interaction is research into embodied interaction, whether it treats visual features as potentially relevant to the constitution of social actions or not. In sum, the categories of *multimodal* and *embodied* interaction are not necessary, as for us 'interaction' indexes all of that.

Where researchers have explored the myriad resources people occasion in pursuing courses of meaningful action in interaction, they have at times located meaning as being situated in some or other *symbolic* realm. Goodwin, for example, speaks of ''concurrently relevant semiotic fields'' (Goodwin, 2000a, p. 1499). These refer to, for example, linguistic structures produced through speech, gestures produced with some or other part of the body, or structures found in the environment (Streeck et al., 2011). LeBaron and Streeck (1997) talk of spaces and objects therein being ''symbolically pre-ordained'' (p. 2). From a less interaction-oriented perspective, Latour (2005) argues for research to take into account how a locality has been assembled and the ways in which this structures situated action, providing social actors with both resources to draw on in their interactions, as well as sets of constraints. From such perspectives, the materials from which participants construct 'objects' already embody predetermined symbolic properties, which are subsequently drawn on and shape actors' socially situated practices. However, rather than attributing such inherent qualities to the components through which participants distribute meaning in practice, we hold that it may be more prudent to start out with focusing on the practices through which materials are produced by social actors as *objects of perception* ''within the setting'', indeed *as* constituting the setting. In this way, rather than presupposed 'semiotic fields' being drawn on by participants in the design of their social actions, properties in the phenomenal field of action are actively assembled and constituted by them

as recognizable components of the unfolding occasioned interactional context. Materials are of course not all of the same type, nor do they each possess an unrestricted range of generic affordances (on affordances, see Gibson, 1977; see also Hutchby, 2001).[1] A length of lead encapsulated within a wooden tube can easily be used to write a love letter, or to draw someone's attention to a distant object, or to physically threaten an assailant, but its structural properties are less likely to warrant its use in signing one's will, feeding one's infant, or carrying out an internal examination. An extended finger may be used to trace the outline of a horizon, but maybe not the outline of an academic abstract. Securing mutual gaze as a precursor to initiating a social encounter may act as a summons *par excellence* in some settings, in a darkened nightclub one may need to opt for different strategies. It is then for members to identify features of materials – vocal, visual, physical – which can be indexed in combination with other materials to produce a task- appropriate social action. In interaction, this means that materials must be brought forth into the field of perception in such a way as to make them recognizable as objects (Sacks, 1966) occasioned within sense-making actions (see Streeck, 2013). This quality of recognizability can subsequently be utilized by co-participants to determine the type action in progress, and what it will take for the action to come to completion. As such, it relates to the projectability of courses of action in interaction as has been described within CA pertaining to speech components.

In sum, our point of departure is that social interaction, including speech oriented conversational interaction, *is* 'multimodal' and 'embodied', and that participants-in-interaction fashion resources from the materials at hand, materials which are oriented to as possessing affordances that are operationalized in interaction as recognizable objects (Sacks, 1966) in the construction of social action. As such, *interactional conduct* which is analyzed and dealt with within the CA research or in studies using CA methodology in terms of 'turn taking' and 'turn design' can only be treated as *mono-modal* and *non-embodied* if there is warrant for this in the data.[2]

3. CA studies of social conduct

Most CA-based interaction analytic studies which have incorporated interactional resources beyond the spoken ones have investigated interactional settings relating to various types of institutional interaction, or at least to the analysis of social interaction in institutional settings (Drew and Heritage, 1993). Furthermore, an increasing number of interaction studies have been carried out in settings in which one or more resources, most noticeably 'speech', are for various reasons somehow 'restricted'. These studies have revealed how participants are able to distribute available resources in alternative ways to construct coherent and meaningful courses of action.

Although studies in the speech-focused CA research initially looked at interaction in various institutional activities, e.g., Harvey Sacks' early work on suicide prevention centres (Sacks, 1967) and Schegloff' on police emergency calls (Schegloff, 1968), CA researchers quickly turned the focus towards everyday mundane conversation. This reflects a somewhat different development than the multimodal interaction analytic studies: although Goodwin's early work was primarily based on everyday ordinary conversation (e.g., Goodwin, 1979, 1981), more recent studies have been largely concerned with various kinds of institutional interaction. The often complex material and spatial layout of such institutional settings has undoubtedly motivated an increased focus on body-visual features of interaction as well as the inclusion of physical artefacts and graphic structures in the analysis of interactions in such settings (e.g., LeBaron and Streeck, 1997; Streeck and Kallmeyer, 2001). This is particularly evident in what has come to be called workplace studies (e.g., Luff et al., 2000). For instance, Heath and Luff (1992) and Goodwin (1996) show how participants in control rooms include information provided through computer screens to perform coherent action within the control room itself. In medical settings, research has documented how consultations (Heath, 1986), surgeries (Koschmann et al., 2011; Mondada, 2011) and midwife examinations (Nishizaka, 2007, 2011) are constructed by reference to participants' bodies as publicly displayed and physically available entities, and mediated through technological artefacts such as monitors.

Interaction analytic studies such as the above have investigated a wide range of types of social conduct, adding to our understandings of the socially situated constitution of social interaction. A number of studies, for example, have described interactions in which participants are moving in and through space (Ryave and Schenkein, 1974; Haddington et al., 2013; Mondada, 2009a; Mortensen and Hazel, 2014). Others, such as Haddington and Keisanen (2009), Laurier (2005) and Mondada (2012) look at car driving as a situated accomplishment where participants orient to the changing phenomenal field outside of the car as relevant to interaction within it. Similarly, Nevile (2004) looks at cockpit interaction (see also Arminen, Koskela and Palukka, this volume) and the pilots' shifting orientations to a range of highly technically advanced

---

[1] According to Streeck et al. (2011) semiotic value is not assigned to the material as a pre-existing property, but drawn out through the actions of the person who fashions the material as one semiotic component occasioned in combinations with others. From this perspective, social action is then 'packaged' through the emergent production and occasioning of raw materials that appear and disappear in time and space.

[2] We will, of course, leave it to the authors in this Special Issue to categorize the resources-for-interaction in accordance with their understanding of them or analytical focus.

equipment that constitute the cockpit. These studies are linked to a rapidly growing bulk of research on technology-in-interaction. Following the pioneering work of Suchman (1987), they take an ethnomethodological approach to technology by looking at participants' embodied and situated interaction with new technologies (e.g., Button and Dourish, 1996; Heath and Luff, 2000) including computers (Luff et al., 1990; Greatbatch, 1992). These studies contribute to our understanding of the reflexive relationship between technology and social practices and provide some interesting links to more applied interaction research.

As mentioned, interaction analytic studies have investigated settings in which one or more of the participants experience difficulties accessing conventional formal linguistic structures. These demonstrate the necessity of including non-linguistic resources in the analysis of participants' construction of actions and organization of their interactions in such settings. In a range of studies, Goodwin (e.g., 1995, 2000b, 2003), for example, demonstrated how a man with severe aphasia draws on a range of resources such as gesture, intonation and the use of physical artefacts in his surround to engage skillfully in social interaction. This line of research is part of an increasing body of EM/CA studies of communication disorders[3] (e.g., Goode, 1994; Klippi, 2006; Pilesjö and Rasmussen, 2011; Rasmussen, 2013; Robillard, 1999; Wilkinson, 1999). Pilesjö and Rasmussen (2011) investigate how a boy and his communication partner construct recognizable actions for interaction as they draw upon talk, gaze and pointing at Blissymbols.[4] The actions are overtly co-constructed units as the boy points at a symbol that is subsequently given voice by the co-participant. Rasmussen (2013) on the other hand investigates how a 6-year-old boy with Specific Language Impairments is trained in using signs and gestures that constitute a supplement to conventional language structures. The boy speaks but a few words, hence the language structures are produced by his co-participant, a Speech-Language Pathologist. The training is mixed with routine conversational actions through which the boy is invited to tell about his social experiences. Rasmussen demonstrates how the training activity enables the boy only in making (gestural/sign) supplements to the co-participant's talk. In this way, rather than being trained in using communicative resources available to him personally, he is taught to be dependant on the speech conduct of others.

Somewhat linked to this are studies in first and second language acquisition and second language interaction. Although 'children' and 'second language speakers' may not have physiological and/or cognitive impediments obstructing full engagement in interaction they may still lack the formal linguistic structures to produce coherent courses of action through speech. For instance, in first language acquisition, Kidwell (e.g., Kidwell, 2005, 2009; Kidwell and Zimmerman, 2007; Lerner et al., 2011) and others have demonstrated how 'very young children' use gaze shifts of their peers to project caregivers' intervening actions (Kidwell, 2009). In second language research, studies have shown how speakers may assist their turn construction through body-visual turn-completions (e.g., Mori and Hayashi, 2006). Other studies, building on the CA notion of the adjacency pair, have shown how both first and second pair-parts may be performed through visual actions. Olsher (2004) shows how gestures may perform second actions. Seo and Koshik (2010) show how gestures may initiate repair of the prior talk (see also Mortensen, in preparation). These studies precede current work on interactional practices between 'first language speakers' (Berger and Rae, 2012; Keevallik, this issue; Arminen et al., this issue; de Stefani and Gazin, this issue; Ford et al., 2012), by suggesting findings sourced from studies into restricted linguistic interactional settings as potential features of social interaction more generally, rather than related specifically to social categories such as 'child' and 'second language user' (cf. Gardner and Wagner, 2004).

Although we suggest that most interaction research that incorporates not only vocal production, but also body-visual conduct, material artefacts, the spatial surround and graphical structures has been done in institutional settings, such as classrooms or workplaces, similarly oriented research into everyday mundane conversation is rapidly expanding (Ford et al., 2012; Mondada, 2009b; Hayashi et al., 2002; Hayashi, 2005). Indeed, interaction analytic studies employing CA methods as in those described above have pushed for an increased focus on more than vocal production in traditionally 'speech'-oriented studies in CA.

This Special Issue, ''A body of resources – CA studies of social conduct'', aims at contributing to the discussion of if, when and how resources such as speech, gesture, gaze, body movements and artefacts should be included in CA studies of social interaction. The Issue is a result of two thematically parallel panels that were presented at the 10th Conference of the International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis (IIEMCA), held in Fribourg (CH) July 2011. Hazel and Mortensen (this issue) take up the fundamental understanding and finding in CA that intersubjectivity and sense in interaction is achieved through an emergent progression of courses of action. The production of actions and subsequent or next actions is not pre-determined but contingent on the choices made by the co-participants (Schegloff, 1996b). The paper shows how co-participants in an institutional environment make such choices amongst a wide array of possibilities as they deploy for instance posture, gaze, gesture, the visual-spatial environment *and* physical objects in constructing recognizable and understandable social orderliness.

---

[3] CA studies in this research area are also referred to as CA studies in Atypical Interaction.

[4] A system of meaning-based symbols invented by Charles K. Bliss.

Rasmussen (this issue) addresses the question of if and how a participant's deployment of different resources and materials can be captured and described in CA analysis. Following core CA research interests in describing co-participants' systematically employed recognizable methods for achieving social orderliness and intersubjective understanding, Rasmussen advocates for a CA approach which describes the systematic use of diverse materials as being components in the construction of actions and turns that is *sequentially consequential* (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973, p. 296) and demonstrably oriented to. With the purpose of exemplifying its recommended CA approach to the use of diverse resources, the paper focuses on an interactional phenomenon, namely the systematic use of talk and the bodily movement 'leaning forward' in the construction of repair actions in specific positions.

Arminen, Koskela and Palukka (this issue) argue that multimodality, embodiment and materiality are key aspects of co-participants' sense making action and discuss the status of multimodal actions compared to actions constructed solely through talk. In their study of the organization of training interaction in Air Traffic Control they demonstrate how other resources than talk are not simply a supplementary layer of co-participants' understanding and analysis of some action. Rather, multimodally constructed actions are projected as sequentially relevant next actions in instructional sequences. The study investigates trainees' responses to trainer prompts in the organization of the ATC task accomplishment. The paper shows how the multimodal construction of the responses not only serves as a resource for accomplishing the task, but as a demonstrable proof of the learning of skills and competences.

In line with the above, De Stefani and Gazin (this issue) deal with the organization of multimodal actions in adjacency pairs. Here also, it is this sequential structure in an institutional setting that is investigated. De Stefani and Gazin analyze more specifically the sequential organization of instructions in driving lessons. The sequences are initiated by the instructor through a first pair part and is subsequently completed by the student driver through a range of resources. Furthermore, as with Arminen, Koskela and Palukka, de Stefani and Gazin find that multimodal actions are projected as sequentially relevant next actions in instructional sequences. The findings differ, however, in that here the actions produced by the student driver to accomplish the task, for instance "turn left", do not serve as a demonstrable proof of the driver's skills. The paper demonstrates how these actions are organized sequentially but that the concept of adjacency pair here only unsatisfactorily captures the features of the structure of the instructional sequences under investigation.

Also, Stukenbrock (this issue) investigates and discusses the notion of adjacency pair as a sequential structure accomplished by the use of multimodal resources. Furthermore, in line with de Stefani and Gazin, Stukenbrock analyzes how bodily actions are relevant as nexts to instructive actions constructed as first pair parts. However, Stukenbrock also demonstrates how such bodily actions systematically and recognizably are made relevant as turn and/or TCU internal components of the first instructive pair part in sequences in which German speaking co-participants routinely employ the linguistic deitic form "so" ('like this'). Moreover, the paper shows, the speaker by employing 'so' not only projects turn internal bodily elements, which are understandable as 'demonstrations', but also invites the co-participant to gaze at the bodily demonstration. Finally, the paper analyzes how the bodily demonstration, if performed by the instructed person makes an assessment by the instructing person relevant. Hence, the paper investigates how talk, bodily demonstrations and gaze are organized in specific ways in instructional sequences comprised of instructions, demonstrations and eventually assessments, and in which 'so' serves as a grammatical link between language and bodily resources used as elements in these actions. The findings serve as a basis for discussing the CA classical notions of adjacency and projection.

Keevallik (this issue) focuses on the phenomenon of *bodily-vocal demonstrations*. She investigates the construction of multi-unit turns in which bodily-visual configurations produced in conjunction with non-lexical vocalizations, (*a*) may accompany talk in the construction of a TCU (as also dealt with in Rasmussen, this volume); (*b*) may complete a TCU initiated by syntax in speech; or (*c*) ultimately constitute a TCU on their own. Keevallik considers and analyses these as emergent patterns that give no priority to language and speech, categorizing them as *syntactic-bodily units*. Through analyses of examples taken from dance classes in which the teachers speak English, Swedish or Estonian, and from a meeting between an artist, a head of a theater workshop and craftsmen, Keevallik participants' practical concerns in projecting the termination of such syntactic-bodily units and hence an upcoming Turn Transition Relevant Place. This adds to the discussion of CA researchers' challenges in using TCU as an analytic concept which has originally been understood in terms of grammar.

Groeber and Pochon-Berger (this issue) also address the question of how bodily movements can be segmented in units. Groeber and Pochon-Berger, however, address the concept of 'turn' as constructed in and through talk in a study of the use of hand signs for turn construction. In this study in sign language interaction, Groeber and Pochon-Berger focus on 'holds' in turn-final position. A 'hold' here denotes a sustained hand-position, suspended at a point during a sign- or gesture-production, before the related movement has been brought to completion and the hand retracted. As for talk-in-interaction, the study finds that turn-final holds occur frequently in first pair parts, that they embody the expectations regarding next actions and that they are finely tuned to that next action. This then calls for a revision of turn boundaries and speaker transition as joint achievement and locally managed processes. The paper discusses the difficulties in categorizing these holds as either verbal or non-verbal resources and thus advocates for expanding the concept of turn to encompass both verbal and non-verbal resources.

Finally, Lorenza Mondada's commentary brings together the various strands developed in the articles for this Special Issue, situating them within the existing literature, and discussing the phenomena described here with reference to her own data. This synthesis of the of the various findings demonstrates the importance for considering social actions in a lived world as formatted as *complex multimodal Gestalts*, without any *a priori* privileging of one type of resource over another.

References

Atkinson, John Maxwell, Heritage, John C. (Eds.), 1984. Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Berger, Israel, Rae, John, 2012. Some uses of gestural responsive actions. Journal of Pragmatics 44 (13), 1821–1835.

Birdwhistell, Ray L., 1970. Kinesics and Context: Essays on Body Motion Communication. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Block, David, 2003. The Social Turn in Second Language Acquisition. Edinburgh University Press Ltd., Edinburgh.

Brown, Gillian, Yule, George, 1983. Discourse Analysis. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Button, Graham, Dourish, Paul, 1996. Technomethodology: paradoxes and possibilities. In: Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems: Common Ground. pp. 19–26.

Carroll, Donald, 2004. Restarts in novice turn beginnings: disfluencies or interactional achievements? In: Gardner, R., Wagner, J. (Eds.), Second Language Conversations. Continuum, London, pp. 201–220.

Clarke, Michael, Wilkinson, Ray, 2008. Interaction between children with cerebral palsy and their peers 2: understanding initiated VOCA-mediated turns. Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) 24 (1), 3–15.

Deppermann, Arnulf (Ed.), 2013. Conversation analytic studies of multimodal interaction. Journal of Pragmatics 46 (1) , (special issue).

Drew, Paul, Heritage, John (Eds.), 1993. Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Edwards, Derek, Potter, Jonathan, 1992. Discursive Psychology. Sage, London.

Ford, Cecilia E., Thompson, Sandra A., Drake, Veronika, 2012. Bodily-visual action and turn continuation. Discourse Processes 49 (3–4), 192–212.

Gardner, Rod, Wagner, Johannes (Eds.), 2004. Second Language Conversations. Continuum, London.

Garfinkel, Harold, 1967. Studies in Ethnomethodology. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.

Gibson, James J., 1977. The Theory of Affordances. In: Shaw, R., Bransford, J. (Eds.), Perceiving, Acting, and Knowing. John Wiley and Sons, New York, pp. 67–82.

Goode, David, 1994. A World Without Words. The Social Construction of Children Born Deaf and Blind. Temple University Press, Philadelphia.

Goodwin, Charles, 1979. The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In: Psathas, G. (Ed.), Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology. Irvington, New York, pp. 97–121.

Goodwin, Charles, 1981. Conversational Organization: Interaction Between Speakers and Hearers. Academic Press, New York.

Goodwin, Charles, 1986. Gestures as a resource for the organization of mutual orientation. Semiotica 62 (1–2), 29–49.

Goodwin, Charles, 1995. Co-constructing meaning in conversations with an aphasic man. Research on Language and Social Interaction 28 (3), 233–260.

Goodwin, Charles, 1996. Transparent vision. In: Ochs, Schegloff E.A., Thompson, S. (Eds.), Interaction and Grammar. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 370–404.

Goodwin, Charles, 2000a. Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. Journal of Pragmatics 32 (10), 1489–1522.

Goodwin, Charles, 2000b. Pointing and the collaborative construction of meaning in aphasia. Proceedings of the 7th annual Symposium About Language and Society. Texas Linguistic Forum 43, 67–76.

Goodwin, Charles, 2003. Conversational frameworks for the accomplishment of meaning in aphasia. In: Goodwin, C. (Ed.), Conversation and Brain Damage. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 3–20.

Goodwin, Charles, 2007. Participation, stance and effect in the organization of activities. Discourse & Society 18 (1), 53–73.

Goodwin, Charles, 2013. The co-operative, transformative organization of human action and knowledge. Journal of Pragmatics 46 (1), 8–23.

Goodwin, Charles, Heritage, John C., 1990. Conversation analysis. Annual Review of Anthropology 19, 283–307.

Greatbatch, David, 1992. System Use and Interpersonal Communication in the General Practice Consultation: Preliminary Observations (No. EPC-1992-107). Rank Xerox Research Centre, Cambridge.

Haddington, Pentti, Keisanen, Tiina, 2009. Location, mobility and the body as resource in selecting a route. Journal of Pragmatics 41 (10), 1938–1961.

Haddington, Pentti, Mondada, Lorenza, Nevile, Maurice (Eds.), 2013. Interaction and Mobility. Language and the Body in Motion. De Gruyter, Berlin.

Hayashi, Makoto, 2005. Joint turn construction through language and the body: notes on embodiment in coordinated participation in situated activities. Semiotica 156 (1/4), 21–53.

Hayashi, Makato, Mori, Junko, Takagi, Tomoyo, 2002. Contingent achievement of co-tellership in a Japanese conversation: an analysis of talk, gaze, and gesture. In: Ford, C.E., Fox, B.A., Thompson, S.A. (Eds.), The Language of Turn, Sequence. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 81–122.

Heath, Christian, 1984. Talk and recipiency: sequential organization in speech and body movement. In: Atkinson, J.M., Heritage, J. (Eds.), Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 247–265.

Heath, Christian, 1986. Body Movement and Speech in Medical Interaction. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Heath, Christian, Luff, Paul, 1992. Collaboration and control: crisis management and multimedia technology in London underground line control rooms. Computer Supported Cooperative Work 1 (1), 24–48.

Heath, Christian, Luff, Paul, 2000. Technology in Action. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Heritage, John, 1984. Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology. Polity Press, Oxford.

Heritage, John, Maynard, Douglas W. (Eds.), 2006. Communication in Medical Care. Interaction Between Primary Care Physicians and Patients. Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Hutchby, Ian, 2001. Technologies, texts and affordances. Sociology 35 (2), 441–456.

Hutchins, Edwin, Nomura, Saeko, 2011. Collaborative construction of multimodal utterances. In: Streeck, J., Goodwin, C., LeBaron, C. (Eds.), Embodied Interaction: Language and Body in the Material World. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 29–43.

Jefferson, Gail, 1984. Notes on some orderlinesses of overlap onset. In: D'Urso, V., Leonardi, P. (Eds.), Discourse Analysis and Natural Rhetoric. Cleup Editore, Padua, pp. 11–38.

Keisanen, Tiina, Rauniomaa, Mirka, 2012. Organization of participation and contingency in pre-beginnings of request sequences. Research on Language and Social Interaction 45 (4), 323–351.

Kendon, Adam, 1970. Movement coordination in social interaction. Acta Psychologica 32, 1–25.

Kendon, Adam, 1990. Conducting Interaction: Patterns of Behavior in Focused Encounters. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Kidwell, Mardi, 2005. Gaze as social control: how very young children differentiate ''The Look'' from a ''Mere Look'' by their adult caregivers. Research on Language and Social Interaction 38 (4), 417–449.

Kidwell, Mardi, 2009. Gaze shift as an interactional resource for very young children. Discourse Processes 46 (2), 145–160.

Kidwell, Mardi, Zimmerman, Don H., 2007. Joint attention as action. Journal of Pragmatics 39 (3), 592–611.

Klippi, Anu, 2003. Collaborating in aphasic group conversations: striving for mutual understanding. In: Goodwin, C. (Ed.), Conversation and Brain Damage. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 117–143.

Klippi, Anu, 2006. Nonverbal behavior as turn constructional units in aphasic conversation. Texas Linguistic Forum 49, 158–169.

Koschmann, Timothy, LeBaron, Curtis, Goodwin, Charles, Feltovich, Paul, 2011. ''Can you see the cystic artery yet?'' A simple matter of trust. Journal of Pragmatics 43 (2), 521–541.

Latour, Bruno, 2005. Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Laurier, Eric, 2005. Searching for a parking space. Intellectica 41–42 (2–3), 101–116.

LeBaron, Curtis, Streeck, Jürgen, 1997. Built space and the interactional framing of experience during a murder interrogation. Human Studies 20 (1), 1–25.

Lerner, Gene, Zimmerman, Don H., Kidwell, Mardi, 2011. Formal structures of practical tasks: a resource for action in the social life of very young children. In: Streeck, J., Goodwin, C., LeBaron, C. (Eds.), Embodied Interaction: Language and Body in the Material World. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 44–58.

Levinson, Stephen, 1983. Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Luff, Paul, Gilbert, Nigel, Frohlich, David (Eds.), 1990. Computers and Conversation. Academic Press, London.

Luff, Paul, Hindmarsh, Jon, Heath, Christian (Eds.), 2000. Workplace Studies: Recovering Work Practice and Informing System Design. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Maynard, Douglas W., Clayman, Steven, 1991. The diversity of ethnomethodology. Annual Review of Sociology 17, 385–418.

Mondada, Lorenza, 2006. Participants' online analysis and multimodal practices: projecting the end of the turn and the closing of the sequence. Discourse Studies 8 (1), 117–129.

Mondada, Lorenza, 2007. Multimodal resources for turn-taking: pointing and the emergence of possible next speakers. Discourse Studies 9 (2), 194–225.

Mondada, Lorenza, 2009a. Emergent focused interactions in public space: a systematic analysis of the multimodal achievement of a common interactional space. Journal of Pragmatics 41 (10), 1977–1997.

Mondada, Lorenza, 2009b. The methodical organization of talking and eating: assessments in dinner conversations. Food Quality and Preference 20 (8), 558–571.

Mondada, Lorenza, 2011. The organization of concurrent courses of action in surgical demonstrations. In: Streeck, J., Goodwin, C., LeBaron, C. (Eds.), Embodied Interaction: Language and Body in the Material World. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 207–226.

Mondada, Lorenza, 2012. Talking and driving: multiactivity in the car. Semiotica 1 (4), 223–256.

Mori, Junko, Hayashi, Makoto, 2006. The achievement of intersubjectivity through embodied completions: a study of interactions between first and second language speakers. Applied Linguistics 27 (2), 195–219.

Mortensen, Kristian, 2012. Conversation analysis and multimodality. In: Wagner, J., Mortensen, K. (Eds.), Conversation Analysis and Applied Linguistics. The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics (general editor C.A. Chapelle). Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford.

Mortensen, Kristian. The body in the service of repair: 'cupping the hand behind the ear', in preparation.

Mortensen, Kristian, Hazel, Spencer, 2014. Moving into interaction: social practices for initiating encounters at a help desk. Journal of Pragmatics 62, 46–67.

Nevile, Maurice, 2004. Beyond the Black Box: Talk-in-Interaction in the Airline Cockpit. Ashgate, Aldershot.

Nishizaka, Aug, 2007. Hand touching hand: referential practice at a Japanese midwife house. Human Studies 30 (3), 199–217.

Nishizaka, Aug, 2011. Touch without vision: referential practice in a non-technological environment. Journal of Pragmatics 43 (2), 504–520.

Norris, Sigrid, 2004. Analyzing Multimodal Interaction. Routledge, New York.

Ochs, Elinor, Schegloff, Emanuel A., Thompson, Sandra T. (Eds.), 1996. Interaction and Grammar. Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Olsher, David, 2004. Talk and gesture: the embodied completion of sequential actions in spoken interaction. In: Gardner, R., Wagner, J. (Eds.), Second Language Conversations. Continuum, London, pp. 221–245.

Pilesjö, Maja S., Rasmussen, Gitte, 2011. Exploring interaction between a non-speaking boy using aided augmentative and alternative communication and his everyday communication partners: features of turn organization and turn design. Journal of Interactional Research in Communication Disorders 2 (2), 183–213.

Psathas, George, 1995. Conversation Analysis. The Study of Talk-in-Interaction. Sage Publications, London.

Rasmussen, Gitte, 2013. That's My Story! Resisting disabling processes in a therapeutic activity Journal of Interactional Research in Communication Disorders 4 (2), 273–298.

Robillard, Albert B., 1999. Meaning of a Disability: The Lived Experience of Paralysis. Temple University Press, Philadelphia.

Ryave, Alan Lincoln, Schenkein, James N., 1974. Notes on the art of walking. In: Turner, R. (Ed.), Ethnomethodology: Selected Readings. Penguin, Harmondsworth, pp. 265–274.

Sacks, Harvey, 1966/1995. Proffering identifications; The navy pilot; Slots; Paired objects; Adequate complete utterances. In: Jefferson, G. (Ed.), Harvey Sacks. Lectures on Conversation, vol. I. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 306–311.

Sacks, Harvey, 1967. The search for help: no one to turn to. In: Shneidman, E.S. (Ed.), Essays in Self-Destruction. Science House, New York, pp. 203–223.

Sacks, Harvey, 1972a. Adjacency pairs: scope of operation. In: Jefferson, G. (Ed.), Harvey Sacks: Lectures on Conversation, vol. II. Blackwell Publishers Ltd., Oxford, pp. 521–533.

Sacks, Harvey, 1972b. Adjacency pairs: distribution in conversation: a single instance of Q–A pair. In: Jefferson, G. (Ed.), Harvey Sacks: Lectures on Conversation, vol. II. Blackwell Publishers Ltd., Oxford, pp. 533–542.

Sacks, Harvey, Schegloff, Emanuel A., Jefferson, Gail, 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Language 50 (4), 696–735.

Scheflen, Albert E., 1972. Body Language and Social Order: Communication as Behavioral Control. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., 1968. Sequencing in conversational openings. American Anthropologist 70 (6), 1075–1095.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., 1984. On some gestures' relation to talk. In: Atkinson, J.M., Heritage, J. (Eds.), Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 266–296.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., 1996a. Confirming allusions: toward an empirical account of action. American Journal of Sociology 104 (1), 161–216.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., 1996b. Issues of relevance for discourse analysis – contingency in action, interaction and co-participant context. In: Hovy, E. H., Scott, D. (Eds.), Computational and Conversational Discourse: Burning Issues – An Interdisciplinary Account. Springer, Berlin, pp. 3–38.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., 2007. Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis, vol. 1. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., 2010. Commentary on Stivers and Rossano: ''Mobilizing Response''. Research on Language and Social Interaction 43 (1), 38–48.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., Sacks, Harvey, 1973. Opening up closings. Semiotica VIII (4), 289–327.

Seo, Mi-Suk, Koshik, Irene, 2010. A conversation analytic study of gestures that engender in ESL conversational tutoring. Journal of Pragmatics 42 (8), 2219–2239.

Streeck, Jürgen, 2013. Interaction and the living body. Journal of Pragmatics 46 (1), 69–90.

Streeck, Jürgen, Kallmeyer, Werner, 2001. Interaction by inscription. Journal of Pragmatics 33 (4), 465–490.

Streeck, Jürgen, Goodwin, Charles, LeBaron, Curtis D. (Eds.), 2011. Embodied Interaction. Language and Body in the Material World. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Suchman, Lucy, 1987. Plans and Situated Actions: The Problem of Human–Machine Communication. Cambridge University Press, New York.

ten Have, Paul, 1990. Methodological issues in conversation analysis. Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique 27 (June), 23–51.

Wilkinson, Ray, 1999. Sequentiality as a problem and a resource for intersubjectivity in aphasic conversation: analysis and implications for therapy. Aphasiology 13 (4), 327–343.

Williams, Robert F., 2008. Guided conceptualization. In: Oakley, T., Hougaard, A. (Eds.), Mental Spaces in Instructional Discourse. Mental Spaces in Discourse and Interaction. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, pp. 209–234.

Wong, Jean, Olsher, David, 2000. Reflections on conversation analysis and nonnative speaker talk: an interview with E.A. Schegloff. Issues in Applied Linguistics 11 (1), 111–128.

Zimmerman, Don H., 1988. On conversation: the conversation analytic perspective. In: Anderson, J.A. (Ed.), Communication Yearbook (11). Sage, Beverly Hills.

Spencer Hazel currently holds a postdoctoral position as Assistant Professor at Roskilde University in Denmark. His research interests deal primarily with co-present interaction as situated and embodied practice, seeking to investigate the multifarious resources social actors draw upon in their interactions. His research focuses mainly on linguistically dynamic settings such as multilingual workplaces and language classrooms. He works from an interaction analytic approach, which draws on ethnomethodological conversation analysis and micro-ethnography. He is currently engaged in the LINGCORP project, which is investigating transnational mobility in workplaces in Denmark.

Kristian Mortensen is associate professor at the Department of Design and Communication at the University of Southern Denmark. He has previously held positions at the University of Luxembourg and the Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies (FRIAS). His research interest is broadly on social interaction in various settings with a focus on how social interaction is organized through multimodal resources such as ''talk'', gaze, gesture, body posture and material objects. A central aspect of his research has been second and foreign language classroom interaction and how teachers afford students' participation. His research has appeared in journals such as Discourse Processes, Journal of Applied Linguistics and Journal of Pragmatics. He is co-editor of ''Conversation Analysis and Applied Linguistics'' in Wiley-Blackwell's ''Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics'' (general editor C.A. Chapelle).

Gitte Rasmussen is employed as Professor at the Institute of Language and Communication, University of Southern Denmark. She is Director of the Center for Social Practices and Cognition (SoPraCon). Her research interests are ethnomethodological and conversation analytic studies of how people conduct their ordinary everyday as social affairs, be it in their homes, in public places, in institutions or at their workplaces. Her research focuses on how people accomplish social recognizable actions in interaction as they draw upon different kinds of resources. Currently, her main focus is on how interactions with or amongst people with communication disorders are organized mostly in public institutions in Denmark.