

Welcome to the
ESN: ***Embodied Syntax Network Conference***
esn -->*open hands gesture-----*

September 7-8 2023
Workshops Sept. 6
Linköping University

Programme Booklet

Schedule p.2-4
Abstract Book p.5-22

Schedule overview:

Wednesday Sept. 6	Room: Form 2	Room: Ellen
13-17.00	Workshop: Lorenza Mondada “Actions and their multimodal gestalts: the case of offers of objects here-and-now”	Workshop: Leelo Keevallik, Agnes Löfgren, & Emily Hofstetter “How can bodily performances be included in syntax?”

Thursday Sept. 7	Room: KY35
8.30-9	Arrival
9-9.10	Conference opening
9.10-10.25	Plenary: Jan Lindström, Yael Maschler, & Simona Pekarek Doehler
10.25-10.45	Fika (Coffee break)
10.45-12.15	Presentation Session
12.15-13.30	Lunch
13.30-15.30	Presentation Session
15.30-16	Fika
16-17.30	Presentation Session

Friday Sept. 8	Room: Comenius (morning), KY35 (afternoon)
8.30-10	Presentation Session
10-10.30	Fika
10.30-12	Presentation Session
12-13.15	Lunch
13.15-14.45	Presentation Session
14.45-15.15	Fika
15.15-16.30	Plenary: Jakob Steensig
16.30-16.45	Conference closing
18.00	Conference Dinner in town

Schedule Detail

Thursday	Room: KY35
8.30-9	Arrival
9-9.10	Conference opening
9.10-10.25	Plenary: Jan Lindström, Yael Maschler, & Simona Pekarek Doehler - Multi-unit turns at the grammar-body interface: embodied cues at TCU-boundaries
10.25-10.45	Fika
10.45-11.15	Tiina Eilittä - Children telling on their peers: embodiment, mobility, and the use of summonses when reporting on peers' misbehaviour to adults
11.15-11.45	Iira Rautiainen - Embodiment in radio communication: Multimodal structures in the context of radio-mediated interaction in military observer training
11.45-12.15	Ann Weatherall - "The guy was like that": Using talk and the body in constructions of sexual assault situations
12.15-13.30	Lunch
13.30-14	Lorenza Mondada - When sensoriality disrupts syntax
14-14.30	Paweł Urbanik - Syntactic suspension and the spatio-temporal extension of gesture
14.30-15	Klara Skogmyr Marian - A multimodal action package or not? The case of turn- and TCU-initial EN FAIT plus gesturing in L1 and L2 French
15-15.30	Marri Amon - Exploring reported speech in Estonian: embodied and linguistic resources in storytelling
15.30-16	Fika
16-16.30	Virginia Calabria, Sophia Fiedler & Hilla Polak-Yitzhaki - From 'doing' something to 'doing saying' something: Italian fare, French faire and Hebrew 'asa as quotatives
16.30-17	Samu Pehkonen & Antti Kannisto - Construction ole hyvä ('please') + imperatively formatted directive: A multimodal practice for managing citizen's resistance to step inside a police car
17-17.30	Adrian Kerrison - A grammar of collective chanting at sporting events

Friday	Room: Comenius (morning) & KY35 (afternoon)
8.30-9	Yuval Geva - The Syntactic (Dis)integration of Musical Demonstrations in Hebrew Discourse Among Musicians
9-9.30	Oliver Ehmer - The leg goes first – TACK. : Syntax and the body in a bi-partite instructional format
9.30-10	Maija Tjukanov - Investigating the Combination of Bodily Conduct and Speech during Semantic Error Correction in Finnish Sign Language Interpreter Training
10-10.30	Fika
10.30-11	Anne-Sylvie Horlacher & Simona Pekarek Doehler - Embodied completions of if-clauses in French talk-in-interaction
11-11.30	Anna Inbar & Yael Maschler - Teasing via the Hebrew [lo, ki 'no, because' + ironic utterance] structure
11.30-12	Melissa Juillet - Routinization of grammatical and multimodal 'packages': syntactically incomplete parce que (because)-clauses in L2-French
12-13.15	Lunch
13.15-13.45	Ali Reza Majlesi & Klara Skogmyr Marian - Non-lexical vocalizations as displays of stance in responsive turns in L2 talk
13.45-14.15	Rosario Neyra, Barbara Fox, Chase Raymond, Emilie Nicolaisen, Matthew Butler, Paul Sbertoli-Nielsen, Catherine Tam - The Body as an Aspectual Resource: Embodied Packages with Non-Lexical Vocalisations
14.15-14.45	Leelo Keevallik, Emily Hofstetter, Agnes Löfgren, Sally Wiggins - The syntax of response cries
14.45-15.15	Fika
15.15-16.30	Plenary: Jakob Steensig. Embodied actions in a comprehensive grammar of talk-in-interaction – what to include and what not to include?
16.30-16.45	Conference closing
18.00	Conference Dinner in town

Abstracts Book

Plenary: **Jan Lindström, Yael Maschler, & Simona Pekarek Doehler** - Multi-unit turns at the grammar-body interface: embodied cues at TCU-boundaries

In social interaction, speakers deploy various practices for extending their turns at talk by making syntactically simpler units structurally and semantically more complex in an incremental, step-by-step manner. One such practice consists of, e.g., adding a coordinate or subordinate clause *post hoc* to what was first produced as a main clause ending on a possible turn transition relevance place. Such boundary places can be followed by at least two kinds of trajectories: 1) the speaker's turn continues the same action and grammatical trajectory of the turn-constructional unit, or 2) the speaker continues with a stretch of talk that carries out a new action whereby the syntactic continuation is not dependent on the previous TCU. Whether we are dealing with boundaries of type 1 or type 2 has in earlier studies been related to the strength of the syntactic, prosodic and pragmatic boundaries between the turn units (e.g. Schegloff 1996; Ford & Thompson 1996; Fox, Ford & Thompson 2002; Couper-Kuhlen & Ono 2007; some papers in Barth-Weingarten & Ogden 2021), but much less has been said about the role of speakers' embodied resources in such contexts (however, see Pekarek Doehler 2021; Stoenica 2020).

In our talk we seek to contribute to a better understanding of incrementing and turn continuing practices by attending to speakers' gaze, posture and gesture at the juncture of possible TCUs in multi-unit turns. More specifically, we will discuss cases of type 1, where embodied cues signal TCU and action continuation (including cases where prosodic cues are fuzzy/inconclusive), and type 2, where embodied cues signal TCU ending and possibly action boundary. We will also consider complex multi-unit turns to demonstrate the scalarity of the phenomenon, which can reveal a progression from type 1 turn continuation to type 2 continuation within one long speaker turn. Through such an account, we hope to contribute to current interests in continua of clausal integration (Maschler 2018; Beijering et al. 2019) and in the complexity of how grammar and body interface in social interaction (papers in Maschler et al. 2020; Pekarek Doehler et al. 2022), also with regard to participants' resources for signaling and recognizing turn-transitional relevance places (Kendrick et al. 2023). Our analyses are based on excerpts of video-recorded conversations in three languages, French, Hebrew, and Swedish.

Barth-Weingarten, D. & Ogden, R. (2021). Weak cesuras: what fuzzy boundaries can accomplish in talk-in-interaction. Special Issue of Open Linguistics 7:1.

Beijering, K., Kaltenböck, G. & Sansiñena, M. (2019). "Insubordination: Central issues and open questions". In *Insubordination: Theoretical and Empirical Issues*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 1-28.

Couper-Kuhlen, E., and Ono, T. (eds.) (2007b). "Turn continuation in cross-linguistic perspective." Special issue. *Pragmatics*, 17:4.

Ford, C. E., Fox, B. A. & Thompson, S. A. (2002). "Constituency and the grammar of turn increments". In C. E. Ford, B. A. Fox, & S. A. Thompson (Eds): *The Language of Turn and Sequence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 14-38.

- Ford, C. E., and Thompson, S. A. (1996). "Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational and pragmatics resources for the management of turns," in *Interaction and Grammar*, ed. E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, and S. A. Thompson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 134–184.
- Kendrick K. H., Holler J., Levinson S. C. (2023). Turn-taking in human face-to-face interaction is multimodal: Gaze direction and manual gestures aid the coordination of turn transitions. *Philosophical Transactions B*, 378.
- Maschler, Y. (2018). The on-line emergence of Hebrew in subordinate *she*–‘that/which/who’ clauses. *Studies in Language*, 42 (3): 669-707.
- Maschler, Y., Pekarek Doehler, S., Lindström, J., and Keevallik, L. (eds.) (2020). *Emergent Syntax for Conversation: Clausal patterns and the organization of action*. (Amsterdam: Benjamins).
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2021). How grammar grows out of social interaction: From multi-unit to single-unit question. *Open Linguistics*, 7 (1), 837-864.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., Keevallik, L. & Li, X. (Eds.) (2022). *The grammar-body interface in social interaction*. Special Issue *Frontiers in Psychology*, 1-3.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996). "Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction". In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff & S. A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, pp. 52-133.
- Stoenica, I.M. (2020). *Actions et conduites mimo-gestuelles dans l'usage conversationnel des reatives en français*. Berne: Peter Lang.

Plenary: Jakob Steensig - Embodied actions in a comprehensive grammar of talk-in-interaction – what to include and what not to include?

I am part of a project writing a grammar on Danish talk-in-interaction. The current version of this is a web-version, accessible on <https://samtalegrammatik.dk> (DanTIN, 2023). The grammar aims at becoming a comprehensive, descriptive grammar of the resources people use in talk-in-interaction. All descriptions in the grammar are based on analyses of recordings of naturally occurring interactions in Danish, most of them video-recordings of private, everyday settings, where people talk, eat, drink, prepare food, play games, etc. In building the grammar, we are faced with the very practical question: *Which embodied resources should we include in the grammar?* As an answer to this, our general principle has been logocentric: In the grammar, we describe *only* those embodied resources that are used systematically in the production of social actions in *talk-in-interaction*. One next question, then, is: which embodied resources are excluded? My answer to both questions will depart from results of the project *Grammar in Everyday Life* (GEL) 2019-2023, which investigated how analyses of specific social action formats (Fox, 2007; Steensig et al., in press) can be used in the creation of the comprehensive, descriptive grammar.

Inspired by especially Keevallik (2013, 2018), I will consider embodied resources (a) that have their own position in a sequence of actions (the “inter-unit syntax”), (b) that occupy specific slots in turn constructional units (the “intra-unit syntax”), and (c) that accompany and modify or shape verbal actions.

The embodied features that I will discuss include: hand gestures and movements, pointing, head movements, and facial expressions. The social actions analyzed include: requests and responses to requests, questions and answers to questions, and list construction and recipient reactions to list constructions and storytelling. As noted by Keevallik (2013), some embodied displays fit nicely into traditional syntactic categories or wordclasses, and some do not at all. I will briefly discuss the implications this has for the structure of the entire grammar.

DanTIN. (2023). *Samtalegrammatik.dk*. <https://samtalegrammatik.dk/>

Fox, B. A. (2007). Principles shaping grammatical practices: An exploration.

Discourse Studies, 9(3), 299–318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445607076201>

Keevallik, L. (2013). The Interdependence of Bodily Demonstrations and Clausal Syntax. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 46(1), 1–21.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2013.753710>

Keevallik, L. (2018). What Does Embodied Interaction Tell Us About Grammar?

Research on Language and Social Interaction, 51(1), 1–21.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2018.1413887>

Steensig, J., Jørgensen, M., Mikkelsen, N., Suomalainen, K., & Sørensen, S. S. (in press). Towards a Grammar of Danish Talk-in-Interaction: From Action Formation to Grammatical Description. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*.

Marri Amon - Exploring reported speech in Estonian: embodied and linguistic resources in storytelling

Reported speech is a common feature of storytelling, enabling speakers to convey their own and others' speech and depict past events. While previous studies on reported speech in Estonian have been based on written texts or examples from internet communications (Teptiuk 2019, 2022), the specific resources used in talk-in-interaction have not been examined.

In oral speech, specific devices are used to account for reported material, including enacting of an event or displaying the speaker's stance through prosodic and bodily means in addition to verbal means. Previous studies have established that this apparently "objective" method of quoting someone's talk directly has in fact numerous functions in discourse and is inserted into the discourse primarily as an evidential device and support of the speaker's stance (Holt 1996, 2000).

This paper focuses on examples of reported speech drawn from a story where a mother tells her daughter about the visit of a vacuum cleaner salesman, using a series of reported utterances. The analysis aims to explore the ways in which the recurrent linguistic (quotative markers or their absence, prosody) and embodied resources (gaze, posture, etc.) seem to combine to form a pattern of footing shifts between the ongoing and reported conversation, in line with the speaker's communicative aim. Recipient displays of affiliation (expressions of disbelief, negative assessments aimed at supporting the speaker's stance) further contribute to the collaborative construction of the discourse.

However, different voices and viewpoints can merge in an utterance in a way that blurs the boundaries between direct and indirect reporting, which is consistent with the observations made by several authors regarding the complexity of reporting past talk and difficulties in attributing certain functions in discourse to certain forms (Günthner 1997, Bolden 2004, Clift & Holt 2007).

Virginia Calabria, Sophia Fiedler & Hilla Polak-Yitzhaki - From 'doing' something to 'doing saying' something: Italian *fare*, French *faire* and Hebrew 'asa as quotatives

This study compares the quotative use of Italian *fare*, French *faire* (Fiedler 2022) and Hebrew 'asa (Polak-Yitzhaki 2020) ('to do') using videotaped corpora of naturally-occurring Italian, French and Hebrew interactions of ordinary multiperson (2-5) settings (dinners/aperitifs/coffee breaks). An analysis of these quotatives reveals how grammatical constructions containing the 'do' verb and the speaker's bodily conduct work together in each language.

Deploying interactional linguistic methodology, we build on research on reported speech in talk-in-interaction (Clift & Holt 2007) and reenactment (Sidnell 2006). Investigating speakers' multimodal conduct in turns where 'to do' is used as quotative, we show – similarly to Streeck's observation regarding the *like*-quotative – that 'to do' also "makes nonverbal behavior salient, serving as preface or relevance marker for some unit of body behavior" (Streeck 2002: 581), according to the affordances of each specific language and interactional context.

The quotative 'to do' allows speakers to project that what follows may occur as verbal clauses that are more-or-less morpho-syntactically integrated with a quotative frame, as non-lexical vocalizations (see ex. 1), or as body movements (accompanying the quotative, the quote or both). In our study, we focus mainly on

Participants use specific prosodic resources (e.g., changes in voice quality) and body conduct (e.g., gestures, facial expressions), as the following Italian excerpt illustrates:

A woman with dark hair tied back, wearing a red sweater, is smiling and clapping her hands. She is in a kitchen setting with a green bowl and a framed picture of a person in the background.

9

summoning the adults. The findings are based on video data recorded in an English-speaking kindergarten and were analysed using the principles of Conversation Analysis. I will demonstrate how, depending on the norms breached, children use different linguistic features, such as summonses and invocations of rule breaches (e.g., “she can’t do that”) as well as varying embodied resources and movement closer to the adult as a means for mobilising the adults’ assistance or intervention. For example, in a situation where a child is hitting another child with a pillow, children may summon adults and move closer to them to get the adults to intervene. In contrast, if the misbehaving child is “only” swearing, children may summon the adult but not mobilise a response from them in other ways, or even expect the adult to respond. At these moments children may use their summonses to adults as a way to express their deontic authority to their peers, without necessarily requesting adult intervention. Furthermore, I will look at the adults’ responses to the reports of misbehaviour and how those vary based on the norms that were breached.

Oliver Ehmer - The leg goes first – TACK. : Syntax and the body in a bi-partite instructional format

Instructions of embodied skills have been proven to be revealing for analyzing the interplay of syntax and the body (Deppermann 2018; Hsu et al. 2021), including non-lexical vocalizations (Keevallik 2021). Building on previous work, this paper analyzes a bi-partite instructional format in dance instruction. The first part of the format presents a verbal description of an embodied action (e.g. *the leg goes first*). The second part consists of a non-lexical vocalization (e.g. *TACK*) targeted to be produced in sync with an actual performance of the previously described action. Thus, the action description projects a bodily performance that is intended to be temporally coordinated with the vocalization. While in demonstrations all components of the format are realized by the instructor only, in individual coaching they are co-produced by the participants. In the latter case, the instructor’s action description functions as a directive, and it is the learner who has to embody the action in sync with the instructor’s vocalization.

It will be argued that a central function of this format is to vocally mark the ‘accomplishment’ of the embodied action under scrutiny in an instruction. In demonstrations, the vocalization contributes to the student’s perceptual recognition of the described action. In individual coaching, it serves as a point of reference for the student to evaluate the timing of their own performance.

The study is based on a 60-hour video corpus of instructions for dancing Argentine tango recorded in Argentina.

Deppermann, Arnulf (2018): “Instruction practices in German driving lessons: Differential uses of declaratives and imperatives”, *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 28 (2).

Hsu, Hui-Chieh/Brône, Geert/Feyaerts, Kurt (2021): “*In other gestures*: Multimodal iteration in cello master classes”, *Linguistics Vanguard* 7, 1-11.

Keevallik, Leelo (2021): “Vocalizations in dance classes teach body knowledge”, *Linguistics Vanguard* 7, 1-10.

Yuval Geva - The Syntactic (Dis)integration of Musical Demonstrations in Hebrew Discourse Among Musicians

Musical demonstrations (MDs) are brief, depictive displays of musical behavior. When musicians communicate, they often use MDs alongside talk. Syntax is one resource musicians use to integrate MDs into their turns-in-talk.

In Hebrew discourse among musicians, MDs are realized on a continuum of syntactic (dis)integration. Some MDs are syntactically “embedded” into a participant’s turn, appearing in utterance-final position following projective syntax (cf. Keevallik 2013):

(1)

1 Emma: 'az 'ani mnag^{en}en^{et},
then 1sg play.PTCP.FSG
then I play...
Em-gtr: [♩]plays soft guitar part-----
2 (2.1) [♩]
---->[♩]

Other MDs are “iterative”, repeating a verbal element ending a complete utterance, in the musical modality (cf. Hsu et al. 2021):

(2)

1 Ehud: 'aval lama lo
but why not
2 'eh mashu kaze--,
uhm something like
3 #mashu she-doXEF kadima.#
something that-push.PRS.3MSG forward
something that pushes forward.
Eh-foot: #taps#
4 [♩](3.4) [♩]
Eh-bass: [♩]plays thumping bass line[♩]

MDs may also be “free-standing”, produced by participants without reliance on talk, but on interactional and musical organization

(3)

1 Eran: f†(1.8)†f
Er-bass: †plays bassline to 'Under Pressure' (fig. 1)†
Er-head: fsmiles f
2 Anton: (0.4) #Δ(0.5)*(0.2)Δ #
An-hum: Δhums bassline to 'Under Pressure'
-----Δ
An-head: #nods-----#
3 Idan: *∅(0.4)∅
Id-hum: ∅hums bassline to 'Under Pressure'∅
4 Dari: (0.6) £(0.1) *(1.8)(1.9)£
Da-drms: £plays drum part to 'Under Pressure'£
5 Eran: *f†(1.8)†f
Er-bass: †dissonantly plays bassline to 'Under Pressure' (fig. 2)†
Er-head: fsmiles f



fig 1



fig 2

The syntactic (dis)integration of MDs is molded by the recurring actions they achieve in discourse. Utterances featuring “embedded” MDs tend to allow participants to take stance towards musical realities. “Iterative” MDs are often used to incrementally repair possible problems of misunderstanding. Finally, “Free-standing” MDs can be used to achieve the activity of playing together in musical time.

Anne-Sylvie Horlacher & Simona Pekarek Doehler - Embodied completions of *if*-clauses in French talk-in-interaction

The focus on video-recorded social interaction has demonstrated that language use interfaces in complex ways with bodily conduct (see recently Keevallik 2018, and papers in Maschler *et al.* 2020, Pekarek Doehler *et al.* 2022). In this presentation, we show that embodied aspects of human conduct are consequential for the structuring and interactional functioning of a specific grammatical format: *if*-clauses.

An *if*-clause is traditionally described as a subordinate clause, usually followed by a main clause with which it forms a conditional (*if-then*) construction (e.g., Sweetser 1990, Lerner 1991). Alongside such canonical patterns, the literature mentions occurrences in which the *if*-clause is not followed by any further component (e.g., Stirling 1999, Lindström, Laury & Lindholm 2019, Corminboeuf & Jahn 2020); such occurrences have been interpreted as pertaining to insubordination (Evans 2007). However, little is known about independent *if*-clauses in French talk-in-interaction, and even less about how these interface with participants’ embodied conduct (see, however, De Stefani 2021, Horlacher 2021, Pekarek Doehler & Horlacher, forthcoming).

In this presentation, we analyze participants’ use of independent *if*-clauses conjointly with the deployment of specific embodied resources, based on French data from service encounters, political debates and ordinary conversations. In these data, we find patterns in which the position and function of the main clause is filled not with verbal but with bodily conduct. At the hairdresser’s, for instance, an *if*-clause such as *mais si j’ coupe court là*: ‘but if I cut short there’ might be accompanied by manipulations and demonstrative gestures through which the professional depicts a hypothetical negative result (Horlacher 2021). Therefore, we challenge the independent or insubordinate status of what may appear as free-standing *if*-clauses in cases when the semantic content of the main clause is enacted through embodied resources. We thereby hope to contribute to advancing current understandings of the grammar-body interface.

Anna Inbar & Yael Maschler - Teasing via the Hebrew [lo, ki ‘no, because’ + ironic utterance] structure

Teasing in everyday interaction involves mocking jibes or taunts often being framed as playful or humorous by participants (e.g., Drew, 1987; Haugh, 2014). Teasing underpins numerous interpersonal functions, among which are indicating moral transgressions (e.g., Drew, 1987; Everts, 2003) and mitigating potential offence or embarrassment (e.g., Norrick/Spitz, 2008; Yu, 2013). Employing Interactional Linguistic methodology and multimodal interaction analysis (Couper-Kuhlen/Selting, 2018; Goodwin 2018), we explore deployment of Hebrew *lo* ‘no’ followed by a *ki* ‘because’-prefaced ironic utterance, i.e., one involving an inconsistency between the utterance and the actual state of affairs referred to. We argue that in Hebrew talk-in-interaction the [lo, ki + ironic utterance] structure is deployed for teasing.

For example, in the following excerpt, from a conversation between six close friends, Inbal, Omri's partner, says that sometimes she cleans the sink and toilet, only to find Omri's hair all over the place shortly thereafter. In response, Omri jokingly asks her whether there's anything else she'd like to tell about his hair, to which Inbal laughingly responds, while moving over to Omri and kissing him profusely:

- 1 Inbal: 'ani 'ohevet 'otan,
 I love it,
- 2 me'od.
 very much.
- 3 ...me'od me'od me'od me'od me'od me'od me'od.
 very very very very very very very much.
- 4 Omri: **lo**,
 no,
- 5 **ki yesh**
 because we have
- 6 ...**ki yesh 'orxim**,
 because we have guests,
- 7 **'at yexola**
 you can
- 8 Inbal: me['od me'od me'od me'od me'od me'od me'od.
 very very very very very very much.
- 9 Omri: [**yexola lesaper ma she-'at rotsa**.
 you can tell whatever you want.

Since it is not morally acceptable to embarrass a person in front of guests, Omri's 'we have guests, you can you can tell whatever you want' (lines 6–7, 9) is clearly ironic. The implication is that Inbal *cannot* in fact, according to Omri, tell whatever she wants in front of the guests. This ironic statement is prefaced by two linguistic elements: the negator *lo* (line 4), which often accomplishes disaffiliative moves, such as objection, rejection, or disagreement, and the causal conjunction *ki* (lines 5, 6), often used to project an account. Since accounts have been shown to be regular components of disaffiliative moves (e.g., Pomerantz, 1984; Sacks, 1987; Ford/Mori, 1994; Ford, 2001; Inbar/Maschler, 2023), we suggest that, as a result of repetitive use, the two moves have crystallized to form the *lo, ki* fixed chunk, which, followed by an account provided in an ironic manner, is employed for teasing. This practice may perform a variety of actions. In our example, teasing via the [*lo, ki* + ironic utterance] structure is used to reprimand Inbal for having embarrassed Omri by revealing an intimate fact concerning his hair.

Based on data from the *Haifa Multimodal Corpus of Spoken Hebrew*, comprised of video recordings of 18 hours of naturally-occurring casual conversation, we explore the multimodal realizations of this construction and the actions it accomplishes in Hebrew face-to-face interaction, showing that the [*lo, ki* + ironic utterance] structure constitutes a recurrent and recognizable practice in Hebrew interaction.

Couper-Kuhlen, E. & Selting, M. (2018). *Interactional Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P. (1987). Po-faced receipts of teases. *Linguistics*, 25, 219–253.

Everts, E. (2003). Identifying a particular family humor style: A sociolinguistic discourse analysis. *Humor*, 16, 369–412.

- Ford, C. E. (2001). At the intersection of turn and sequence: Negation and what comes next. In M. Selting, & E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.), *Studies in interactional linguistics* (pp. 51–81). John Benjamins.
- Ford, C. E. & Mori, J. (1994). Causal markers in Japanese and English conversations: A cross-linguistic study of interactional grammar. *Pragmatics*, 4(1), 31–62.
- Goodwin, C. (2018). *Co-operative Action*. Cambridge University Press.
- Haugh, M. (2014). Jocular mockery as interactional practice in everyday Anglo-Australian conversation. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 34(1), 76–99.
- Inbar, A. & Maschler, Y. (2023). Shared knowledge as an account for disaffiliative moves: Hebrew *ki* 'because'-clauses accompanied by the Palm Up Open Hand gesture. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 56(2), 141–164.
- Norrick, N. & Spitz, A. (2008). Humor as a resource for mitigating conflict in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, 1661–1686.
- Pomerantz, A. M. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversational analysis* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1987). On the preference for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 54–69). Multilingual Matters.
- Yu, C. (2013). Two interactional functions of self-mockery in everyday English conversations: a multimodal analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 50, 1–22.

Melissa Juillet - Routinization of grammatical and multimodal 'packages': syntactically incomplete *parce que* (because)-clauses in L2-French

This paper focuses on the way second language (L2) speakers develop their interactional competence through the use and the routinization of grammatical and *multimodal packages* (Goodwin 2003), or *multimodal gestalt* (Mondada 2014). Specifically, I show how L2 speakers of French deploy syntactically incomplete 'parce que' (because)-clauses with multimodal completion in order to manage dispreferred previous actions.

My research is in line with recent conversation analytic research in second language acquisition (CA-SLA), which pays particular attention to the specific linguistic resources mobilized by learners to accomplish interactional actions (see Kim 2009, Ishida 2009, Eskildsen 2009, and contributions in Pekarek Doehler & Eskildsen 2022), i.e., how learners develop a 'grammar for interaction' (Pekarek Doehler 2018) as part of their interactional competence.

The data consist of a longitudinal corpus of video recorded 'coffee-break' interactions between L2 French speakers who meet regularly in a conversation circle. Learners are placed in groups according to their proficiency level and participate for an average of nine months, which allows to track the development of their linguistic resources and interactional practices over time. Preliminary results show that learners do not necessarily use 'parce que' with only multimodal completion when they lack a specific linguistic item, but often to manage a dispreferred previous action, such as a disagreement or disaffiliation from co-participants. The turn with "because" is thus produced in an affective and embodied way, in order to seek affiliation or a greater reaction from co-participants. Few studies have already shown some interactional features of 'parce que' in interaction (Debaisieux 1994, Hancock 1997, Pekarek Doehler 2018), but none of them have

studied 'parce que' in this sequential position nor included multimodal analyses, which makes this present research relevant and original.

Leelo Keevallik, Emily Hofstetter, Agnes Löfgren, Sally Wiggins - The syntax of response cries

The essence of response cries, as described by Goffman (1978), is that their sequential placement in the immediate aftermath of an event performs them as visceral reactions to this event. While some studies already show that they are implemented at specific interactional junctures, such as pain expressions in response to doctor's elicitation (Heath 1989) or surprise tokens after turns seeking surprise (Wilkinson & Kitzinger 2006), we have yet to explore how they are organized in relation to syntax and incorporated into turn design. This study targets the relationship between evaluative adjectival constructions and response cries.

Response cries have been shown to occur turn-initially (Heritage 1984: 325); for instance, gustatory *mmms* typically follow rather than precede evaluative terms (Wiggins 2002: 321). At the same time, response cries are regularly characterized by extreme prosodies and use of sounds not germane to the phonology of a specific language, which can potentially disrupt fluent syntax and turn design, meaning we need a systematic account of how syntax and turns are shaped around them. At this point of tension between the 'natural overflowing' of the body and the social organization of (verbal) interaction, there are opportunities for qualitatively different meaning-making, such as other participants suspending their turns upon an occurrence of a cry, endowing it with urgency and priority, as well as offering adjectival interpretations of its cause.

Based on data from a variety of contexts, such as mealtimes, sports training, and arts rehearsals, we will show how participants use response cries and evaluative constructions in a way that mutually elaborates their meaning in various sequential and simultaneous orders, such as in the form of depictions that take an embodied stance in parallel with verbal assessments. We thereby argue for the expansion of the conceptualization of syntax into areas hitherto left beyond its scope.

Goffman, E. (1978). Response Cries. *Language*, 54(4), 787-815.

Heath, C. (2002). Demonstrative Suffering: The Gestural (Re)embodiment of Symptoms. *Journal of Communication*, 52(3), 597-616.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson (Ed.), *Structures of Social Action* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge University Press.

Wiggins, S. (2002). Talking With Your Mouth Full: Gustatory Mmms and the Embodiment of Pleasure. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 35(3), 311-336.

Wilkinson, S., & Kitzinger, C. (2006). Surprise As an Interactional Achievement: Reaction Tokens in Conversation. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 69(2), 150-182.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/019027250606900203>

Adrian Kerrison - A grammar of collective chanting at sporting events

Chanting as a practice in collective cheering is recognizable by the use of specific sets of rhythmic Chanting Cadences (Kerrison, 2018). The use of a known and conventional cadence provides mutually recognizable instructions for prosody, pacing, and gesture, providing a known performance "shape" that various spoken

content can be adapted to. This makes a wide variety of spoken content available for collective performance through chanting, without needing a separate negotiation of how new words or phrases should be said. This paper explores these chanting cadences as an embodied grammar that members use to provide mutually understandable structure to new and unpredictable in-game events.

This projectable structure is vital in all forms of synchronized cheering, where the use of all participant voices in concert makes for louder and farther reaching talk than any participant could accomplish alone. Variations in pacing of a collective performance will cause the participants to fall out of sync, turning their resonant speech and combined gestures into problematic overlap that obscures rather than reinforces the performance. With the particulars of the co-production of each "round" of a chant established, participants can focus on their repetition as standalone chants or the placement of chanted expressions in meaningful slots within the often-unpredictable sequence of a game.

This analysis comes from video and audio recordings of student supporters at inter-collegiate ice hockey contests in the United States. These fans use a variety of traditional practices to produce instances of collective talk for the purpose of encouraging the home team, disparaging and distracting the visiting team, or simply acknowledging and commenting on in-game events. This study focuses on their use of chanting cadences, examining how the cadences themselves are oriented to as "proper" structures of pacing and prosody, and how their placement/progression depends on the actions of both participants and recipients.

Kerrison, A. (2018). *We're All Behind You: The Co-Construction of Turns and Sequences-at-Cheering*. (Doctoral dissertation). Ulster University.
(317)

Ali Reza Majlesi & Klara Skogmyr Marian - Non-lexical vocalizations as displays of stance in responsive turns in L2 talk

Research on non-lexical vocalizations in interaction has shown that participants may use these resources both on their own and in conjunction with other multi-semiotic resources to assess and to express stance and affect more generally (e.g., Baldauf-Quilliatre, 2016; Couper-Kuhlen, 2012; Goodwin & Goodwin, 2000; Hoey, 2014; Wiggins, 2013; 2019). Moreover, several studies document the use of non-lexical vocalizations as displays of affiliation in response to affect-laden stories, but show that such affiliative displays often are reinforced or specified through subsequent verbal resources (Couper-Kuhlen, 2012; Kupetz, 2014; Reber, 2012). Little attention has been paid to the use of non-lexical vocalizations by second-language (L2) speakers, however. Skogmyr Marian (2021, 2022) analyzes the use of non-lexical vocalizations in the context of complaints in L2 French, but has not specifically investigated these in responsive position.

In this study, we therefore examine the multimodal accomplishment of non-lexical vocalizations produced by L2 speakers of Swedish and French in responsive turns. The data come from both conversational and institutional interactions, such as conversation circles, language cafés, and L2 classrooms, which were recorded in Sweden and in Switzerland with L2 speakers of varying proficiency levels. We analyze the multimodal (prosodic, bodily) composition of actions formed with the help of non-lexical vocalizations and how they are used and responded to interactionally. Preliminary analyses indicate the prevalence of standalone non-lexical vocalizations such as "o::", "ah" and "ts" in responses to assertions,

assessments and affect-laden tellings particularly among less proficient speakers. Speakers use these to display (dis)alignment, affective stance, or appreciation of the tellings. In the paper, we provide a systematic analysis of these sequences and discuss the implications of the findings for our understanding of both non-lexical resources in interaction and L2 learning and use.

Lorenza Mondada - When sensoriality disrupts syntax

Instead of being causally related to cognitive factors and perturbations, disruptions in syntax, hindering its progressivity and even suspending it, have been addressed by various EMCA authors to be related to the timely coordination of concurrent embodied practices. These might be connected to a variety of interactional troubles (reorientation of recipient's gaze, Goodwin 1981, search for a recipient, Goodwin 1979, multiactivity, Mondada 2011, 2014), but also to physiological/somatic events (such as coughing, Broth 1999, sighs and sniffs Hoey 2014, 2020, efforts and strains, Hofstetter, Keevallik, & Löfgren, 2021, Keevallik in press) and sensorial experiences (such as smelling, Mondada 2020a, 2022, tasting, Mondada 2018, touching, Mondada 2020b, but also pain, Weatherall et al. 2021). All of them have been demonstrated to be interactionally shaped, in such a way that embodied practices and sensations are reflexively organized within turns at talk, and in particular within the syntactic progression of the talk. This paper elaborates on these issues, by considering social interactions in which the participants engage with their senses while talking. A peculiar way of multimodally organizing these actions consists in suspending, disrupting, resuming or abandoning ongoing syntactic projected constructions. These "disruptions" are in service of a global multimodal formatting of actions that accountably integrates, in meaningful and relevant ways, the sensorial experience. While sensoriality can be heard as disrupting the projectable order of syntax, these disruptions are themselves contributing to the action relying on sensoriality, its intelligibility, legitimacy, and authority. The paper discusses various multimodal configurations, showing that "disruptions" are methodic practices that are observable in very diverse settings – from tasting sessions to forensic examinations of human remains –, across different languages, and concerning diverse senses – from senses obstructing the mouth/linguistic production, like taste or smell, to senses that can be experienced independently on talk, like touch or sight. In this way, the paper discusses the systematicity of syntactic disruptions as methodic practices within social interaction.

Rosario Neyra, Barbara Fox, Chase Raymond, Emilie Nicolaisen, Matthew Butler, Paul Sbertoli-Nielsen, Catherine Tam - The Body as an Aspectual Resource: Embodied Packages with Non-Lexical Vocalisations

In this paper, we explore the use of non-lexical vocalisations + body movements in joint activities among American English speakers. The study examines instances where participants begin a verbal turn and complete it non-verbally, with a package of non-lexical vocalisation and body movement; we have a collection of 12 instances of this practice. In our collection, we find that participants make use of this practice to depict something problematic that their co-participant has done, or to enact a solution to that problem.

One of the most remarkable features of the cases in our collection is that aspectual dimensions, such as iterative, punctual, or durative, are enacted by both the body movement and the non-lexical vocalisation.

In the following example, Sara has commented on Kayla's whisking in line 1 and follows it up with a package of non-lexicalized vocalization and body movement in line 5.

```

1      SARA:      ɛ°>oh my ↑god<+ (0.2) so +gentle.°ɛ
               kayla  whisking->      +gz to sara+stops whisking-->
2      (0.3)+(0.3)%(0.4)
               kayla      -->+head shake-->
               sara      -->%
3      KAYLA:      +↑WH↑↑(h)(h)%(h)YAT?
               Kayla ->+continues whisking, gaze down->>
               sara      %picks up frying pan
4      (0.4)
5      SARA:      you're just kinda %°like° ↑°uououououo°
               sara      %holds pan, minimal whisking motion-->

```

We argue that these embodied packages with non-lexical vocalisations allow participants to foreground the aspectual nature of their utterances, and we have found that they occur in pursuits, upgrades, downgrades and disagreements. We also discuss the syntactic constructions which permit the hosting the non-lexical vocalisations.

The study contributes to the understanding of embodied syntax by revealing ways in which the body is used to capture aspect, and the kinds of interactional work done by embodied aspectual displays. As far as we are aware, this is the first exploration of embodied aspect.

Samu Pehkonen & Antti Kannisto - Construction *ole hyvä* ('please') + imperatively formatted directive: A multimodal practice for managing citizen's resistance to step inside a police car

A common politeness expression in directive settings in Finnish is *ole hyvä* ('please', OH), a construction consisting of the verb *olla* ('to be') in imperative form, *ole*, followed by an adjective *hyvä* ('good'), thus please literally meaning "be good". We have identified a practice in our data used occasionally by the Finnish police officers: they modify morphological imperatives (bald imperatives, IMP) by including *ole hyvä* either before or after the imperatively formatted directive. Three syntactically available formulations are:

- 1) IMP+OH, e.g., *istu ole hyvä* (sit down please)
- 2) OH+IMP, e.g., *ole hyvä istu* (please sit down)
- 3) OH+ja('and')+IMP, e.g., *ole hyvä ja istu* (please [and] sit down).

In the presentation, we claim that the participants orient to the use of *ole hyvä* also as a way of solving issues of compliance. We employ conversation analysis to locate some of the uses of this construction along a continuum where, on the one end, designing the directive turn with OH indicates a smooth transition from one activity to another, and where, on the other end, it manages recipients' resistance to the directive action. Rather than concentrating solely on the formulation of the directive turn, it is equally relevant to analyze the embodied conduct of the participants. By looking at the position of the bodies in relation to the police car as well as the participants' posture, gaze and type of touch during the production of

the directive turn we suggest that the use of OH forms a recognizable multimodal practice. The video data is from Finnish police encounters.

Iira Rautiainen - Embodiment in radio communication: Multimodal structures in the context of radio-mediated interaction in military observer training

Patrolling is an important part of UN military observers' work and forms a significant part of training new military observers. Radio is used for communication between the patrol and the Net Control Station (NCS). Radio communication is, thus, emblematic of military observers' work and has an important role in training new military observers. Radio-mediated interaction is available to everyone present (Fele 2008; Rautiainen et al. 2022); consequently, team members not directly involved in the interaction over radio can participate, albeit indirectly. Embodied practices have mainly been examined in face-to-face interaction and in situations where the participants can see one another (but see e.g., Fele, 2008; Edmonds & Weatherall 2019). In this presentation, drawing on ethnomethodology and conversation analysis (EMCA), I examine embodiment and the use of multimodal structures as part of radio communication in military observer training. I discuss a preliminary study of interactional moments where a team member uses embodied means to contribute to (e.g., repair, complement) talk that is directed to an interlocutor at a distance. I will also describe how and for what purpose participants invoke embodied means in connection to radio-mediated talk and how they are used collaboratively in this particular context.

Edmonds, D. M., & Weatherall, A. (2019). Managing verbal and embodied conduct in telephone-mediated service encounters. *Technology Mediated Service Encounters*. Amsterdam, 71-95.

Fele, G. (2008). The collaborative production of responses and dispatching on the radio: Video analysis in a medical emergency call center. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 9(3).
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-9.3.1175>.

Rautiainen, I., Haddington, P., & Kamunen, A. (2022). Local participation framework as a resource among military observer trainees: Interactional episodes between repair initiation and repair solution in critical radio communication. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 196, 67–85.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.05.006>.

Klara Skogmyr Marian - A multimodal action package or not? The case of turn- and TCU-initial EN FAIT plus gesturing in L1 and L2 French

This study analyzes speakers' use of the multi-word expression EN FAIT ('in fact/actually') in first-language (L1) and second-language (L2) French from a multimodal perspective. EN FAIT is a common linguistic resource in L1 French. Prior research has identified diverse discourse functions of the expression and observed its use in various positions within utterances (e.g., Blumenthal, 1996; Forsgren, 2009; D'Hondt, 2014). Most of such research is based on written corpora, however. We know little about conversational uses of EN FAIT, and even less so about its multimodal composition in face-to-face interaction.

The study is based on video-recordings of coffee break conversations in L1 and L2 French. The analysis focuses on EN FAIT in turn- and TCU-initial position. Preliminary analyses of two L2 speakers' uses of the expression indicate that turns and turn-extensions initiated with EN FAIT often are coupled with the speaker's pointing gesture directed toward the recipient, although sometimes the expression is preceded by tokens like 'ah' ('oh') or 'oui' ('yes'). These uses seem to have a 'delimitation function' (cf. D'Hondt, 2014) that marks an interactional boundary (story initiation, topic transition, etc.). Drawing on these verbal and embodied resources, speakers also index the upcoming talk as related and relevant to the preceding talk, and sometimes display a 'sudden remembering'. The study extends the analysis to other L2 speakers and to L1 speakers, and analyzes the multimodal composition of the expression to attempt to determine whether the multimodal conduct observed in conjunction with EN FAIT is part of a 'multimodal package' (Hayashi, 2005) by which speakers accomplish a particular action, or rather a general feature of turn-initiation or turn-extension occurring with certain speakers. The results contribute to our understanding of the grammar-body interface in social interaction (Pekarek Doehler et al., 2022).

Maija Tjukanov - Investigating the Combination of Bodily Conduct and Speech during Semantic Error Correction in Finnish Sign Language Interpreter Training

This presentation explores the strategies associated with correcting semantic errors in feedback discussions in Finnish Sign Language interpreter training. These discussions take place after interpreting exercises and are essential for developing professional interpreting skills. However, little is known about the simultaneous and alternating deployment of auditive (speech) and visual (signs, bodily enacting) resources in these feedback situations. The research question is: How is bodily conduct and speech combined when correcting semantic errors? The data consists of 15 hours of videotaped feedback discussions, which were analyzed using multimodal conversation analysis and interactional linguistics.

In semantic errors, one sign is replaced with another (often phonologically similar) sign (as CHEESE vs. NOTHING, CHALLENGING vs. INTERVIEW etc.), which leads to faulted information. Semantic errors are a significant issue in interpreting that can have far-reaching consequences for the participants involved.

Overall, semantic errors are frequently pinpointed and corrected by the teachers. The study suggests that semantic miscues are corrected in feedback typically by using a bodily right-wrong -contrast pair and simultaneously voicing the referents of the signs. Furthermore, the results provide important insight into simultaneous interplay of signed and spoken languages, which remains largely unexplored in the literature.

- Keevallik, L. (2010). Bodily quoting in dance correction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43(4), 401–426.
- Kusters, A., Spotti, M., Swanwick, R. & Tapio, E. 2017. Beyond languages, beyond modalities: Transforming the study of semiotic repertoires. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. 14: 3, 219 - 232.
- Macbeth, D. (2004). The relevance of repair for classroom correction. *Language in Society*, 33(5), 703–736.
- Weeks, P. (1996). A Rehearsal of a Beethoven Passage: An Analysis of Correction Talk. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 29(3), 247–290.

Paweł Urbanik - Syntactic suspension and the spatio-temporal extension of gesture

One important aspect of how embodied actions and language contribute to meaning production and recognition concerns the way they interact with each other in structural and temporal terms. Speakers align gestures with speech in different ways, which is consequential for projection and the management of progressivity. For instance, the gesture stroke can be launched before the verbalization of the component it complements or supplements, thus foreshadowing the latter's upcoming (Schegloff 1984, Urbanik & Svennevig 2021). The temporal span of a hand gesture can be prolonged and cross the boundary of the turn, which functions as a tool to achieve mutual understanding (Sikveland & Ogden 2012). Finally, gestures (or other embodied resources) can be used to complete grammatical units-at-talk, either when the speaker faces contingencies (Olsher 2004) or when the demonstration of action is more specific than its verbalization (cf. Keevallik 2013).

Yet another way of aligning gesture and speech consists in suspending the syntactic unit and initiating the gesture stroke in an intra-turn pause followed by the rest part of the unit. Recently, syntactic suspension has been examined as a resource used to display bodily strain and maintain the right to continue the turn (Hofsteter et al. 2021) or to increase the noticeability of the gesture and secure understanding pre-emptively (Urbanik & Svennevig 2021). The present study looks more closely at the instances of syntactic suspension and the extended production of action-depicting gestures initiated in the intra-turn pause. In other words, it focuses on the cases of the following structure:

initiation of unit A // ((PAUSE)) // completion of A
 // action-depiction (//) (----->)

The data come from corpora of everyday and construction-site interactions in Polish and Norwegian. The study examines the structural and temporal features of syntactic suspension and gestural extension and their function in interaction. It shows that strokes initiated in the intra-turn pause work as cues about the upcoming action verbalization oriented to by the speaker as topically salient. It is further demonstrated that the spatio-temporal extension of gesture serves to increase the depiction's witnessability when understanding is at risk, when the recipient's attention is away, or when the action in question requires a more detailed depiction regarding the manner of performance. In structural terms, this mechanism may be exploited by recipients to predict and mark recognition of the upcoming verbal action before its verbalization.

- Hofsteter, E., Keevallik, L., Löfgren, A. (2021). Suspending Syntax: Bodily Strain and Progressivity in Talk. *Frontiers in Communication* 6, 663307.
- Keevallik, L. (2013). The Interdependence of Bodily Demonstrations and Clausal Syntax. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 46(1), 1-21.
- Olsher, D. (2004). Talk and gesture: the embodied completion of sequential actions in spoken interaction. In A. Gardner and J. Wagner (eds.) *Second Language Conversations*, 221–245. London: Continuum.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1984). On some gestures' relation to talk. In J. Maxwell Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, 266-295. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sikveland, R. O., Ogden, R. (2012). Holding gestures across turns: Moments to generate shared understanding. *Gesture* 12(2), 166-199.

Urbanik, P., Svennevig, J. (2021). Action-Depicting Gestures and Morphosyntax: The Function of Gesture-Speech Alignment in the Conversational Turn. *Frontiers in Psychology* 12, 689292.

Ann Weatherall - “The guy was like that”: Using talk and the body in constructions of sexual assault situations

Feminist self-defense training has a distinctive mix of learning verbal and physical self-defence techniques with the facilitation of a critical consciousness about gender, power and social inequality. Descriptions, demonstrations and re-enactments of sexual assault situations are an important part of the classes. They require parties to jointly create and align with an imagined space inhabited by thinking, moving, sensing and interacting gendered bodies. There is an emerging body of interactional work on instructing in physical activities including dance, sports training and martial arts. However, feminist self-defence has an additional complexity of having multiple relevant participation frameworks. Aside from instructor and student, roles that can be animated include perpetrator, easy target for attack, hard target for attack, novice self-defender, empowered self-defender and by-stander. The present paper asks about the systematic organisation of the rich verbal, vocal and embodied resources for accomplishing demonstrations and re-enactments. Data are from a substantive video study of feminist self-defense classes.

The extract below is an example of the kind of sequence of interest. It comes from an activity where women’s experiences of sexual harassment are being considered for what could be said or done. The incident under consideration occurred in a night club where a guy rubbed the student’s bum.

Extract

```
01  INS:    so you’re thuh (.) groper,
02  ST1:    yeah so I was like that ((walking forward))
03  INS:    so I’m here?
04  ST1:    yeah=
05  INS:    =groping
06  ST1:    the guy [was like that] ((ST1 guides INS’s hand over her bum))
07  INS:    [yip yip okay ]
08  ST1:    and I just had a- so ↑what are you doing and I pulled him
09          away (and) told (.) [the bouncer]
10  INS:    [ Ahh! ]well good on you for doing
11          that <you did actually do something.
```

The instructor at line 1 maps the role of groper to the student, presumably to demonstrate what could be said or done. However, the student initiates a re-enactment by saying *so I was like that* (line 02) . The instructor aligns with action and takes the role of the guy. In line 08 there is a shift from narration to re-enactment which is marked in the talk with a sound cut off and pitch shift. The move back into narration and description *and I pulled him away* does not impact on the smooth progressivity of the talk. The final lines of the extract show the instructor praising the student’s agency. A more detailed analysis will be shown through a transcript with multi-modal annotations.