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1. Introduction: The visual turn

Video data in CA:
Heath (1986)
⇒ See Luca Greco’s talk (Monday)
⇒ Interaction as *embodied*
2. Multimodality in transcripts

(7) 01 Carl: ((addressing Paul)) *Cavallo bastoni* [knight (of) clubs] ah?
02 Paul: ((Nods)) *Cavallo bastoni*.
03 Paul: ((addressing researcher)) *Come si dice?* [How do you say?]
04 Res.: *Questo è il (.) fante di coppa* [This is the jack of cups]
05 Paul: *Fante di coppa*.

De Fina (2007:387), *Code-switching and the construction of ethnic identity in a community of practice*
2. Multimodality in transcripts

(2) G.50:8:30

Clacia: B’t, a-another one theh wentuh school

\textbf{Gaze Withdrawn From Recipient}

\downarrow

\textit{with me wa:s a girl na:med uh, (0.7)}

\textbf{Thinking Face}

\rightarrow^{°}W’t th’hell wz’er name\text{.} = Karen. Right.
Karen.er name wz Karen something or other.

Goodwin (1987:118), \textit{Forgetfulness as an interactional resource}
2. Multimodality in transcripts

Goodwin & Goodwin (2004:229), *Participation*
Nancy: Tch! We couldn't stand her, so badly
we uetuh take her doorknob'n

grease it wi(h)th va(h)selin(h)ne(h)ry n(h)i(h)ght,
*HHSSS! O(h)r,

*hhh y'know (if) sh'd be in th'room' n we'd-

*hh kinda put toilet paper across
so thet when she open' up the door

she'd aftuh come, yih know.

(0.4)

Nancy: la:m bastin g through it.

Tasha: [Oh::

Ghho:: d ]=

Nancy: =Oh:: God it wz r'ly funny.

(0.7)
2. Multimodality in transcripts

SS: Yes er(m)::: (0.4) the supervisor’s coming now. (1.2)

SA: Thanks Michael could you just keep an eye on the Westbound for us? We might need (to/some) erm: (0.4) station control if it goes on much longer:. (1.2)

SS: Alright then. (1.0)

SA: (Thank you)
2. Multimodality in transcripts

1. Beth: 's the tea been stewing long enough?
   ((leaning over her laptop to look at the teapot))
2. Beth: .hh (. ) (hhh) (1.5)
   ((picking up her mug as Andy reaches for the teapot))
3. Beth: "give it a sukk- ('ll do okay)o
   ((watching as Andy pours himself tea))
4. (1.6)
5. Beth: leave the two tea bags in (you see/yourself)
6. (long enough)
   ((places mug on table near Andy as he moves to set teapot down))
7. Beth: (almost be like three)
8. .hh ("I don’t know if that’s .")
   ((Andy lifts teapot and begins pouring tea into Beth’s mug))
9. (0.8)
10. Andy: (ks) it’s fairly strong
11. Beth: yeah

Figure 1. Line 6 of Example (2)

Drew & Couper-Kuhlen (2014:18), Requesting: From speech act to recruitment
2. Multimodality in transcripts

Excerpt (2): Shoe shop 123230

#a
01 S: I’ll help you over here
02 C: that’s fine
03 (1.8)#b
04 C: #c < I don’t know> if there’s any () I wanted to
05 see if there’s any way those can be repaired? =
06 S: = it can be glue::d,
07 (0.5)
08 C: o:h oka[y

FIGURES 2a, 2b, 2c C takes a waiting position at the back of the shop, boot in hand. She then approaches counter, framing parts of the boot with her hands. S leans in to inspect the boot.

Fox & Heinemann (2015:348), The alignment of manual and verbal displays in requests for the repair of an object
## 2. Multimodality in transcripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>David</th>
<th>Toby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonverbal</strong></td>
<td>1. sucks thumb,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toby's blanket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbal</strong></td>
<td>(1.2)\textsuperscript{1} mnn//nnn</td>
<td>2. moves blanket &amp; monkey towards rt., &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. blanket, blanket reaches rest loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. pushes blanket into ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. picks up part of blanket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. holds part, ↓ part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. pushes part down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. picks up another part, holds it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. releases part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonverbal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. [\textit{\textasciitilde yea\textit{\textasciitilde}] Im gonna make, (?} car\textsuperscript{4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>heres/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. here thats? (?}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. handle ≠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. handle ≠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and thats, (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>people ≠\textsuperscript{9}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ochs (1979:60), *Transcription as theory*
2. Multimodality in transcripts

Kendon (2004:142), *Gesture*
3. Working transcripts vs. published transcripts

**Published transcripts**
- represent an analytically relevant transcriptional *version*
- are static representations of social events
- respond to editorial needs
- respond to the reader’s needs (e.g. translations)

**Working transcripts**
- result from a reflexive practice
  (the primary data *informs* the transcription and vice versa)
- respond to analytical needs
- constitute a preliminary analysis of the primary data
- are continuously transformable artefacts
4. Interaction on the move

1) 10163sg2BM4 / 09:35-09:57

First transcript version

INS  pronto freno, voilà.

Second version

1     (2.0)
2  INS  'h pronto freno,
3     (1.3)
4  INS  voilà.
5     (18.4)

⇒ First action (l. 2)
⇒ Second action (l. 3)
⇒ Sequence-closing third (l. 4) (Schegloff 2007)
4. Interaction on the move


*Proposals* (Houtkoop-Steenstra 1987, Stevanovic 2015)
*Offers* (Clayman/Heritage 2014)
*Recruitments* (Floyd et al. 2014, Drew/Couper-Kuhlen 2014)
*Directives* (Goodwin 1990, Craven/Potter 2010, Goodwin/Cekaite 2013)
*Prompting* (Nevile 2007)

For Goodwin (1990: 67) *directives* are utterances “designed to get someone else to do something.” (see also Drew/Couper-Kuhlen 2014: 8)

Craven/Potter (2010: 426) state “*requests* have to be accepted before they can be performed; *directives* just need to be complied with.”
4. Interaction on the move

1) 10163sg2BM4 / 09:35-09:57 🚗
4. Interaction on the move

Possible questions:

- How are instructions designed (turn-constructional features)?
- When do instructions occur?
- How are (non-verbal) instructed actions assessed?

“In any case, an account of second utterances in terms of their contingency on a first leaves unexplained how there could be any firsts; after all, from where could they draw their design? Conversation could never begin. Or, once begun, would be one utterance away from the end. Tails would know how to wag, but there would be no dogs.” (Goffman 1983: 30).

“[…] the question of first actions and their constitution became effectively a dormant topic.” (Heritage 2012: 3)
4. Interaction on the move

Fig. 7.1  M's rest position before and after his 'stroke' is shown in A. B shows the 'stroke' of M's gesture phrase.

Example 1  Crick III 17.42.02

RH right hand; ~~~~ preparation; *** stroke action; -...recovery; (...) indicates a pause in speech. Length of pause in tenths of a second. Tonic syllables in SMALL CAPITALS.

0.3 sec

M: He used to go down there and throw (........) ground rice over it
RH

| ~~~~~~~~~~******/**** - - - - - - |
| preparation  stroke  recovery |

__GESTURE PHRASE__

__GESTURE UNIT__

Kendon (2004: 114)
4. Interaction on the move

1. (2.0)
2. INS 'h pronto freno,
3. (1.3)
4. INS voi:1là.
5. (18.4)

**Third version**

1. (1.8)+(0.2)+
   ins +......+-->
2. INS 'h +pr+onto f+reno,
   ins -->'+gz+,,.,,,+
3. +(0.1)+(0.3)* (0.3)+(0.6)+
   ins +......+gazes at STU's leg+,,,,,+,-->
   stu *moves leg--*
4. INS voi:+là.
   ins --'+
5. (18.4)
4. Interaction on the move

Principle of economy

- not everything visible in the video needs to be transcribed (what is analytically relevant?)
- transcripts convey spatial constraints

1. (1.8)+(0.2)+
   ins +........+-->
   ins *........*-->

2. INS 'h +pr+onto f+reno,*
   ins -->+gz+,,,,,,,,,+*
   ins -->*ri hand up*,,,,,,,,,,*

3. +(0.1)+(0.3)* (0.3)+(0.6)+
   ins +.......+gazes at STU's leg+,,,,,,,,,+-->
   stu *moves leg--*

4. INS voi:+là.
   ins -->+

5. (18.4)
4. Interaction on the move

1. \( (1.8) + (0.2) + \)
   ins +......+-->
   ins *......*-->

2. \( \text{INS } 'h \text{ pr+onto f+reno,} * \)
   ins -->+gz+,,,,,,+,
   ins -->*ri hand up*,,,,,,,,

3. \( +(0.1)+(0.3) * (0.3)+(0.6) + \)
   ins +......+gazes at STU's leg+,,,,,,,+-->
   stu *moves leg--*

4. \( \text{INS voi:+là.} \)
   ins -->+ 

5. \( (18.4) \)

L. 2: - “ri hand up”
   - “points upwards with right hand”
   - “points upwards with the right hand and down in front with right hand”

L. 3: - “turns the head 18° to the left and inclines it at 35°”
   - “gazes at STU’s leg”
   - “checks whether STU performs instructed action correctly”
4. Interaction on the move

**Principle of economy**
- not everything visible in the video needs to be transcribed (what is analytically relevant?)
- transcripts convey spatial constraints

**Principle of reduction and focus**
- By selecting specific features for transcriptions, others are excluded from the analysis
- Transcriptions as a reduction of complex phenomena
- Transcriptions as focusing on specific phenomena
- Separate different modalities

**Logocentricity**
- Talk as modality of reference
- Non vocal actions are transformed into comments, descriptions
4. Mobility

Fourth version

1. \((1.8) + (0.2) + \) 
   \(\text{ins} \) +......+- -->

2. \(\text{INS} \) 'h #+pr+onto f+reno,#
   \(\text{ins} \) -->+gz+,,,,,,+ 
   \(\text{fig} \) #2 #3

3. \((0.1) + (0.3) \times (0.3) + (0.6) +\) 
   \(\text{ins} \) +.....+gazes at STU's leg+,,,,,,+-
   \(\text{stu} \) *moves leg--*
   \(\text{fig} \) #4

4. \(\text{INS} \) voi:+là.# 
   \(\text{ins} \) -->+ 
   \(\text{fig} \) #5

5. \((18.4)\)
4. Mobility

*Fifth version (De Stefani & Gazin 2014)*

1. \((1.8) + (0.2) + \)  
   \(\text{ins} \quad +.....+---\)

2. \(\text{INS} \quad 'h \# + \text{pr} + \text{onto f} + \text{reno}, \# \)  
   \(\text{ins} \quad -- + \text{gz} + , , , , , , + \)  
   \(\text{fig} \quad #2 \quad #3 \)

3. \(+(0.1) + (0.3) * \)  
   \(+(0.3) + (0.6) + \)  
   \(\text{ins} \quad +.....+ \text{gazes at STU's leg}+, , , , , +---> \)  
   \(\text{stu} \quad * \text{moves leg}--* \)  
   \(\text{fig} \quad #4 \)

4. \(\text{INS} \quad \text{voi:} + \text{lè}. \# \)  
   \(\text{ins} \quad -- + \)  
   \(\text{fig} \quad #5 \)

5. \((18.4)\)
5. Asking the way

1 TER  >signorina< mi sa dire dove sono le scatole, (0.6)  
      >miss< can you *tell* me where the *boxes* are, (0.6)
2    per f- (0.2) per metter via la roba d'estate
      to d- (0.2) to store away the things for *sum*mer
3    o d’inverno ma non in: *e* materiale-
      or for winter but not in: uh materiale-

4 SHO [le scatole?
      [the boxes?

5    (0.4)
6 TER le scatole in cartone.
      the boxes in *card*boar:

7    (0.8)
8 SHO quelle per metter dentro i vestiti [cosi?  
      those ones   to put in the clothes [and stuff?
9    [si.
      [yes.

10    (0.3)
11 SHO sono s– alla fine dei libri sotto la scala mobile [(son) proprio] li.
      they’re s– at the end of the books under the escalator [(they’re) right] there.

12 TER [grazie.    ]
      [thank you.  ]

13 SHO (di niente)
      (you’re welco:me)
14 TER [grazie.
      [thank you.
5. Asking the way
5. Asking the way

Possible phenomena:

- a) How are social encounters initiated?
  ⇒ Literature on openings of telephone conversations (Schegloff 1967, 1968, 1986)
  ⇒ Transition from *unfocused* to *focused interaction* (Goffman 1963)

- b) How are (route) directions formulated?
  ⇒ Literature on place formulations (Schegloff 1972)
1 TER >signorina< +mi sa dire dove *sono le #scatole, (0.6)*

TER >iconic gesture “boxes”*-->

sho >>walking--------------------------#,,,,,,#,--->

sho ~~~+gazes at TER----------------+-->

>miss< can you tell me where the boxes are, (0.6)

2 #per f-# (0.2) per metter* via* la roba d’esta:te
to d- (0.2) to store away the things for su:mmmer

TER -->#,##,##

sho -->#,##,##

3 o d’inverno ma non i#n:^e ma[teriale-
or for winter but not in: uh ma[terial-

4 SHO [le scatole?#

[the boxes?

SHO #leans forward------#-->

5 (0.4)

6 TER le scatole in carto:ne.#

TER the boxes in cardboa:rd.

TER -->#
5. Asking the way

Observables based on video recordings and multimodal transcription:

- TER addresses SHO as the latter is passing by
- “Misses” immediately followed by “mi sa dire” (request)
- TER and SHO establish reciprocal gaze
- SHO slows down and adopts a stationary position
- TER and SHO end up standing face-to-face in an *F-Formation* (Kendon 1990)
- TER and SHO become *participants*
le scatole in cartone.

the boxes in cardboard.

repositions body

quelle per metter dentro i vestiti [così?
those ones to put in the clothes [and stuff?

[si.+
[yes.

sono s- alla fine dei libri sotto la scala mobile [(son) proprio] li.+
they're s- at the end of the books under the escalator [(they're) right] there.

[grazie.] [thank you.]

(di niente)
(you're welcome)

[grazie.] [thank you.]

the boxes?
5. Asking the way

Observables based on video recordings and multimodal transcription:

- SHO requests confirmation of a candidate referent (l. 08)
- At the same time, SHO repositions herself and ends up standing at the aisle that she is subsequently going to use as a semiotic field (Goodwin 2000) for describing the itinerary to the “boxes”
- SHO accommodates her body to the local environment, thereby reorganizing the *origo* (Bühler 1934) that allows her to use deictic reference (verbal and gestural) in an intelligible way

“Analysis – at least conversation analysis – treats each case in its particulars, indeed, is responsible for the determination of what will constitute a “case” or an “instance” of a putative phenomenon in the first place. Each candidate instance of a putative phenomenon has to survive such an examination and can in the course of the examination transform the researcher’s understanding of what the phenomenon is, rather than simply being included in, or excluded from, class-membership status (Schegloff 2009:391).

See also Stivers (2015): Coding social interaction: A heretical approach in conversation analysis?

Transcription conventions for multimodal phenomena:
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