

University of Groningen

## The interactional accomplishment of action

Seuren, Lucas

**IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.**

*Document Version*

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Publication date:*

2018

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Seuren, L. (2018). The interactional accomplishment of action. Utrecht: LOT/Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics.

**Copyright**

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

**Take-down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

# **The Interactional Accomplishment of Action**



**university of  
groningen**

faculty of arts

CLCG

The research reported in this thesis has been carried out under the auspices of the Center for Language and Cognition Groningen (CLCG) of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Groningen and The Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics (Landelijke Onderzoeksschool Taalwetenschap).



Groningen Dissertation in Linguistics 166

Published by

LOT

Trans 10

3512 JK Utrecht

The Netherlands

phone: +31 30 253 6111

e-mail: [lot@uu.nl](mailto:lot@uu.nl)

<http://www.lotschool.nl>

Cover illustration: Ross Fountain, Edinburgh. Photo by Lucas M. Seuren.

ISBN: 978-94-6093-276-2

NUR: 616

Copyright © 2018 Lucas Martinus Seuren. All rights reserved.



rijksuniversiteit  
 groningen

# **The Interactional Accomplishment of Action**

## **Proefschrift**

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor aan de  
Rijksuniversiteit Groningen  
op gezag van de  
rector magnificus prof. dr. E. Sterken  
en volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties.

De openbare verdediging zal plaatsvinden op

donderdag 5 april 2018 om 16.15 uur

door

**Lucas Martinus Seuren**

geboren op 1 juli 1986  
te 's-Gravenhage

**Promotor**

Prof. dr. A.J. Koole

**Co-promotor**

Dr. M. Huiskes

**Beoordelingscommissie**

Prof. dr. G. Redeker

Prof. dr. E. Couper-Kuhlen

Prof. dr. S. Pekarek Doehler

To my grandparents,  
for always asking but never questioning.



---

## Contents

---

Acknowledgments . . . . .	xi
Transcription Conventions . . . . .	xv
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 A problem of action formation . . . . .	1
1.2 Interaction as social action . . . . .	3
1.3 Conversation Analytic Method . . . . .	8
1.3.1 Adjacency pairs and turn taking . . . . .	9
1.3.2 Intersubjectivity in interaction . . . . .	13
1.3.3 Interactional Linguistics . . . . .	21
1.4 Previous work . . . . .	25
1.4.1 Preferred interpretations . . . . .	26
1.4.2 Semantics of sentence types . . . . .	30
1.4.3 Conversation Analysis . . . . .	45
1.5 Contents of this dissertation . . . . .	58
<b>2 Confirmation or Elaboration</b>	<b>63</b>
2.1 Introduction . . . . .	63
2.1.1 Questions in Dutch . . . . .	65
2.2 Data & Method . . . . .	66
2.3 YNDs that get a simple yes/no response . . . . .	68
2.4 YNDs that elicit more than confirmation . . . . .	75
2.5 Discussion . . . . .	86
2.6 Conclusion . . . . .	87



<b>3</b>	<b>Getting into topic talk: a classification of topic proffers</b>	<b>91</b>
3.1	Moving into topical talk . . . . .	91
3.1.1	Coherence in interaction . . . . .	92
3.1.2	Topic boundaries . . . . .	94
3.2	Data . . . . .	95
3.3	Topic-initiating actions . . . . .	97
3.3.1	Other's-News Announcements . . . . .	98
3.3.2	News Requests . . . . .	107
3.3.3	Agnostic News Inquiries . . . . .	114
3.4	Conclusion . . . . .	118
3.5	Discussion . . . . .	119
<b>4</b>	<b>Remembering and understanding</b>	<b>123</b>
4.1	Knowing and understanding in interaction . . . . .	124
4.2	Data . . . . .	126
4.3	Restoring intersubjectivity . . . . .	126
4.3.1	Doing now-remembering with <i>oh ja</i> -prefaced <i>YNDs</i> . . . . .	127
4.3.2	Doing now-understanding . . . . .	131
4.3.3	Interrogative formulations of understanding . . . . .	139
4.4	Discussion & Conclusion . . . . .	141
<b>5</b>	<b>Resolving knowledge-discrepancies in informing sequences</b>	<b>145</b>
5.1	Receipting information . . . . .	145
5.2	Data & Method . . . . .	148
5.3	Counterexpectation remarks . . . . .	149
5.3.1	Combining practices . . . . .	149
5.3.2	Responding with negative interrogatives . . . . .	151
5.3.3	Responding with positive interrogatives . . . . .	157
5.4	Challenges and repair . . . . .	163
5.5	Discussion & Conclusion . . . . .	168
<b>6</b>	<b>Assessing Answers: Action ascription in third position</b>	<b>171</b>
6.1	Conversational Structure . . . . .	171
6.2	Data & Method . . . . .	175
6.3	Evaluative Assessments . . . . .	175
6.4	Deontic assessments . . . . .	182
6.4.1	Deontic assessments in second position . . . . .	182
6.4.2	Deontic assessments in third position . . . . .	184
6.5	Mixed assessments . . . . .	189

6.6	Implications for sequence organization . . . . .	191
6.7	Discussion & Conclusion . . . . .	193
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>197</b>
7.1	Main findings . . . . .	197
7.1.1	Sequential understanding of action . . . . .	198
7.1.2	Sequential understanding of grammar . . . . .	201
7.1.3	Procedural nature of action . . . . .	203
7.2	Implications for future research . . . . .	205
7.2.1	Accountability, Epistemics, and Action . . . . .	205
7.2.2	Rethinking Linguistics . . . . .	208
	References . . . . .	211
	Samenvatting in het Nederlands . . . . .	237
	Biography . . . . .	243
	Groningen dissertations in linguistics (GRODIL) . . . . .	245



---

## Acknowledgments

---

When I say that this dissertation is not an individual, but, dare I say, an interactional accomplishment, that would still be somewhat of an understatement. In the past four years I've had so many interesting discussions, with so many great people, from so many different institutions that it is virtually impossible to thank everyone who helped bring this dissertation to life. But that does not mean I'm not going to try, starting of course with the people who were most influential: my supervisors.

First of all, Mike, I feel like I owe most of my academic accomplishments to you. You've been supervising my academic career since my bachelor's thesis, and you enthusiastically supported me in all my endeavors since. You let me discover my own voice, gently nudging me along the way in the direction you saw I was going for, while also letting me stray from the path when I needed to. Our discussions and particularly your feedback on my various manuscripts and blogs—and there were a lot of those—have been invaluable. I will never know where you found the time, but I am immensely grateful for it.

Tom, you showed me that being a good academic is about much more than doing good research: it's about collaborating, it's about networking, it's about being open to other viewpoints, and it's about accepting a win when one comes your way. These are things they don't necessarily teach you before becoming a PhD student and they are skills that didn't always come easy to me, but you led by example, occasionally correcting my course more explicitly, and I am a better scholar for it.

Some of the most inspirational, educational, and fun times of my PhD were spent at a number of institutions in- and outside The Netherlands. There were my regular visits to the Max Planck Institute in Nijmegen, for which I particularly want to thank Kobin Kendrick for welcoming me and providing

me with the opportunity to present and discuss my work. In addition I want to thank Elliott, Mark, Stephen, Tayo, and everybody else who participated in the interesting data sessions and discussions.

For my extended visit to York I am particularly grateful to Traci Walker and Richard Ogden. Traci, our regular meetings taught me a lot about the analytic importance of transcription and how to use data, build collections, and carefully distinguish between linguistic form and social action. I was also very happy when you agreed to co-organize a panel for IPrA 2017; I'm sure it would not have been half as successful without you. Richard, thank you for your inspirational classes; I've gotten a new appreciation for the complexities of phonetics in talk-in-interaction, and the fact that even the tiniest aspect of behavior in interaction—clicks—should be understood as a meaningful part of interaction. Of course, I also want to thank the other students and scholars at York for the fun and interesting meetings: Becky, Carla, Katherina, Rasmus, and Verónica.

I was fortunate enough to spend some time at UCLA for which I am grateful to a number of people, foremost John Heritage, Tanya Stivers, and Steven Clayman. John, you put the idea of visiting in my head and made it possible. You also took the time to read my work, give feedback, and discuss my questions and ideas. Your input and supportive feedback were invaluable for a number of chapters in this dissertation. Tanya, I have never met anyone who could read and comment as critically as you; you systematically dissected my work, and while that sometimes left me overwhelmed, it always felt like an opportunity to learn and improve myself. Steve, your support was instrumental when I decided to do some work outside my project, and you were a great guide to the hikes, bookstores, and coffee places in LA. I am also very grateful to Clara Bergen for all the paperwork she did to make my visit possible, all the emails she responded to, and all my questions she answered. Finally, a big thanks to all the other PhDs and friends that made my stay in Los Angeles, and the US in general, such an awesome time: Amanda, Amelia, Anne, Bernie, Caroline, Chase, Emmi, Keith, Lisa, Liisa, Luis Manuel, Mika, Nan, Sam, Saskia, Signe, Tianjian, and Will.

A special thanks to Geoff and Elena Raymond; I was thrilled that you let me invite myself to Santa Barbara to present my work and that you welcomed me into your home. I was and still am humbled by your incredible hospitality.

More locally there are a lot of people to whom I'm grateful for their comments, the discussions, data sessions, and *gezelligheid* in general: Annerose, Audrey, Carel, Henrike, Jacqueline, Joëlle, Joelle, John, Lennie, Lisanne, Liz, Lotte, Myrte, Ninke, Petra, and Yfke. A big thanks especially to my office mates

Agnes, Bernat, Charlotte, and Ruth for making my PhD far more enjoyable and plainly for putting up with me for so long. Bernat, thank you as well for inviting me to stay with you and Mirjam in Berkeley for a weekend and for sharing many a beer both in California and Groningen.

To my two paranymphs, Alisa and Samuel, thank you for all the work you have done and will have done arranging the events around my defense and for literally standing by me. Alisa, we've sort of gone through the PhD together: you started a bit earlier but we attended the same seminars, dealt with the same challenges, and we were our own little therapy group. I loved all the lunches, coffees, teas, homemade cookies and cakes, and of course the moral support that kept me going in tough times. Sammie, the last couple of years we've shared two great passions, burgers and Star Wars, preferably in combination. With Disney in charge, I don't doubt we can keep enjoying those things for decades to come.

Of course, I cannot ignore the most important people: my parents. The road was long and it has not always been easy, but you supported me every time I decided to change lanes or even directions. If not for you, I probably would have literally ended up working at McDonald's. I cannot express how happy I am to have you, to be able to talk to you when things get tough, and to occasionally occupy your chalet in France.



---

## Transcription Conventions

---

The data in this dissertation consist of 21.5 hours of phone and Skype conversations that were recorded by students at Utrecht University as part of a course assignment in 2011 and 2012. These data were transcribed and the excerpts that were selected for the studies in this dissertation are presented as follows. Every excerpt displays the original Dutch with a word-by-word gloss in italics on the subsequent line. A free translation is provided in boldface on a turn-by-turn basis, unless this would hinder legibility in which case free translations are provided on a line-by-line basis. The following abbreviations were used for the glosses:

ADV	Adverb
INT	Interjection
PL	Plural
PRT	Particle
SG	Singular
TAG	Tag particle

Both the original Dutch and the free English translation make use of transcription conventions that represent not just what the participants say, but also give an approximation of how the talk was produced. The conventions used were developed by Jefferson (2004; see also Hepburn & Bolden, 2013) and should be understood as follow:

- (1.0) Numbers between parentheses represent seconds of silence, that is, time in which none of the participants make an audible contribution. Silences between turns are written on a separate line; silences within turns are written in the turn.



(.)	A silence of less than 200ms, also known as a <i>beat</i> of silence.
turn1= =turn2	Turn 2 is latched onto turn 1; there is no silence between the two turns
tur[n1 [turn2	Turns 1 and 2 are produced in overlap. The left square bracket marks the point of overlap onset.
turn1] tur]n2	Turns 1 and 2 are produced in overlap. The right square bracket marks the point where overlap ends.
tcu1<tcu2	The smaller than sign in between two turn-constructural units signifies a <i>left-push</i> or <i>abrupt-join</i> ; the speaker pre-empts the point of transition relevance.
tcu.	A period marks a point of prosodic completion with a boundary pitch that falls to low in the speaker's range.
tcu,	A comma marks a point of prosodic completion with a boundary pitch that rises to the middle of the speaker's range.
tcu?	A question mark marks a point of prosodic completion with a boundary pitch that rises to high in the speaker's range.
tcu;	A semicolon marks a point of prosodic completion with a boundary pitch that falls to the middle of the speaker's range.
tcu_	An underscore marks a point of prosodic completion with a flat boundary pitch.
↑	An upwards pointing arrow marks an upstep in the speaker's pitch that lasts no longer than one syllable.
↓	A downwards pointing arrow marks a downstep in the speaker's pitch that lasts no longer than one syllable.
stre::tch	Colons signify that the preceding vowel or syllable is held longer than what would be considered normal.
<u>stress</u>	Underlined data is pronounced with audible stress or emphasis.
<u>pi</u> :tch	An underlined vowel followed by a colon that is not underlined signifies a pitch that rises and falls during the production of the vowel.
pi:tch	A vowel followed by an underlined colon signifies a pitch that rises throughout the production of the vowel.
LOUD	Data written in capitals is produced relatively loud.
°soft°	Data written between degree signs is produced relatively soft; multiple degree signs °° mean that the data is barely audible.

^high^	Data in between two carets is produced high in the speaker's pitch range.
>talk<	Talk between two inward pointing smaller than and larger than signs is contracted; it is produced relatively fast.
<talk>	Talk between two outward pointing smaller than and larger than signs is elongated; it is produced relatively slowly.
tal-	A hyphen signifies a cut-off in mid-production, typically audible as a glottal stop.
.hh	An <i>h</i> or series of <i>hs</i> preceded by a period represents an audible inbreath. Each <i>h</i> denotes about 200ms.
hh	A free-standing <i>h</i> or series of free-standing <i>hs</i> represents an audible outbreath.
ha hi hu	Various laughter tokens.
t(h)alk	An <i>h</i> between parentheses in a word means that the word is produced laughing.
#talk#	Talk in between number signs is produced with creaky voice.
£talk£	Talk in between two pound symbols is produced with smiley voice; the speaker is audibly smiling while speaking.
((sniffs))	Anything in double parentheses is a comment, typically a characterization of a sound that cannot be represented otherwise.
( )	Empty space between two parentheses signifies that the speaker said something but it is not hearable what. More space means more talk.
(talk)	Talk in between two parentheses signifies that it is not clear what the speaker said and only an attempt could be made at transcription.
(talk/talk)	Talk in between two parentheses and separated by a slash signifies that it is not clear what the speaker said; the slash separates two ways the data could be heard.

