Analyzing Greek Talk-in-Interaction

Analyzing Greek Talk-in-Interaction

Edited by

Maria Christodoulidou

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

To Stavros

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part III. Code Mixing and Switching

Part IV: Mobile and Facebook Talk

INTRODUCTION

MARIA CHRISTODOULIDOU

Research on talk-in-interaction has been widely employed in many languages, but its application to the Greek language is quite new. In recent years, the growing interest of researchers towards the study of Greek talk-in-interaction has been expressed with the publication of some remarkable studies on the analysis of Greek conversations. Despite this growing interest there is still a bibliographical gap concerning books focused on analysis of Greek talk-in-interaction, and this has led to the genesis of the current volume. This edited volume includes ten chapters on Greek talk-in-interaction and is intended to be accessible to analysts of various interests as well as researchers new to the field. The book aims to bring together researchers of talk-in-interaction that apply the conversation analytic perspective in their studies with others who combine conversation analysis with other approaches, such as corpus linguistics. It is hoped that it will become a valuable "tool" as it could be used as a handbook in courses of analyzing interactions. After careful consideration, leading researchers of the field with a special interest in Greek data were invited to contribute their studies to the book, which would not have been a reality without their enlightening and enriching contributions.

Conversation Analysis has its origins in the pioneering work of the sociologist Harvey Sacks (1992) in the 1960s. In the period from 1964 until 1975, when Sacks was killed in a car accident, he initiated a radical programme based on the hypothesis that ordinary conversation is a deeply ordered, structurally organized phenomenon and was designed to investigate the social order in the everyday practice of talking. His work quickly began to attract a growing number of adherents; most significantly, Sacks' main collaborators during his lifetime were Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. To put it as its most basic, conversation analysis is the systematic analysis of talk that occurs in everyday situations. Practitioners of Conversation Analysis (henceforth CA) use the term "talk-in-interaction" rather than "conversation" to refer to the object of conversation analysis because they do not engage exclusively in the analysis of everyday conversations; the variety of forms of talk-in-

interaction that have been the subject of study within CA is much larger than the term "conversation" would imply (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008).

What makes this approach distinctive is both its analytical focus and the kind of data it analyzes. CA research is based on "recorded naturally occurring talk-in-interaction," which means that the activities recorded are situated as much as possible in the ordinary unfolding of people's lives rather than being pre-arranged or set up in laboratories. The aim of studying these interactions is to discover how participants understand and reply to one another in their turns at talk, with a central focus on how "sequences" of actions are generated. To that end, recordings of naturally-occurring interaction are transcribed, according to the system devised by Gail Jefferson, in such a way as to capture the temporal production of utterances at turns-at-talk and thus show in the analysis how participants understand and respond to one another (Atkinson & Heritage 1984; Clift, Drew & Hutcbhy 2006; Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008).

The upshot of this is that CA's aim is to analyse the production and interpretation of talk-in-interaction as an orderly accomplishment by the participants themselves. In other words, during a conversation speakers display in their "next" turns an understanding of what the "prior" turn was about. The understanding may or may not turn out to be what the prior speaker intended. This is described as a "next-turn proof procedure," and is the most basic tool used in CA to ensure that analyses are not based on the assumptions of the analyst but rather oriented to the accomplishments of the participants (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008).

The summary of the methodological basis of CA is based on the following propositions:

- talk-in-interaction is systematically organized and deeply ordered
- the production of talk is methodical
- the analysis of talk-in-interaction should be based on naturally occurring data
- analysis should not be constrained by prior theoretical assumptions (Ibid., 23; Psathas 1995).

Although Conversation Analysis has not yet been employed in Greek data as much as in other languages, there are several studies that have employed CA methods in analyzing Greek data, such as Makri-Tsiplakou's study (1994) which investigated the affiliative and disaffiliative interventions with reference to gender, along with her 2003 study of the use of diminutives, Tzanne's (2000) investigation of miscommunication from a conversation analytic approach, and Pavlidou's (2002) and Sifianou's (2002) studies on telephone calls.

More recently, a growing interest in the field has emerged and several studies have been produced. With regard to Greek conversation analysis, Vasilopoulou, Hadjidemetriou & Terkourafi (2010) include studies by practitioners of conversation analysis using Greek data. Some of the aspects that practitioners of Greek talk-in-interaction have been investigating include conversational humour (e.g. Archakis, Giakoumelou, Papazachariou & Tsakona 2010), conversational irony (e.g. Christodoulidou 2006; 2007; 2008; 2012a), extreme-case formulations and hyperbole in talk-in-interaction (Christodoulidou 2009; 2011c), advice giving sequences (Poulios 2010), conversational stories (Georgakopoulou 2006; 2007; 2010; Christodoulidou 2013a) complaining (Christodoulidou 2010), and lexical markers (Christodoulidou 2011a; 2012b).

The studies included in the current volume have been selected mainly on the basis of their content since the intention is to cover a wide spectrum of topics in Greek talk-in-interaction. The ten chapters are grouped into thematic categories and are presented in the following four sections: (a) grammar and interaction, (b) reporting small stories, (c) analysis of code mixing and switching, (d) mobile and Facebook talk from a conversation analytic perspective.

The first part of the book is dedicated to grammar and interaction. The organization of a turn in interaction is basic to any conversation and is in a reflexive relationship with grammar (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974; Schegloff 1996). In other words, the organizational contingencies of talking in a turn shape grammar. The grammatical realization of talk can shape the exigencies of the turn as a unit of interactional participation and the grammatical properties of a language may contribute to the organization of turns-at-talk (Ibid.). Thus, the focus of the first four chapters is on the turn and its component turn constructional units (TCUs) to analyze the meaning of lexical markers, address forms and certain verbs in interaction "by reference to their placement and participation within sequences of actions" (Heritage & Atkinson 1984, 5). The turn is now seen as the habitat in which TCUs are housed (Schegloff 1996, 56) and this reframing deepens our understanding of turns-at-talk. TCUs are sentential, clausal, phrasal and lexical units, which can constitute complete turns (Sacks et al. 1974, 702). Their potential completion in the transition to another speaker turns out to be relevant (Ibid.). In this context, it should be noted that the shift of focus from sentences to TCUs which was proposed by Schegloff (1996) has proved to be essential for these studies. Chapters one to four analyse the interactional function of specific lexical items in talk-in-interaction. More specifically, in chapter one Karachaliou & Archakis analyse the construction of surprise in teenage storytelling via the Greek

pragmatic marker *re*. They investigate the occurrence of *re* in the turn taking of "immediate surprise responses" that follows the presentation of the unexpected events of the story, and in the turn taking of "postponed surprise responses" where hearers present themselves as unprepared for accepting the unexpected information. In chapter two, Tsakona investigates the interactional use of first names as address terms in Greek interaction among three young female roommates combining pragmatic considerations (stance, interactional function) with organisational ones (turn structure, preference organisation). The analysis of the conversational extracts reveals that the form and function of the address term correlates with the negative or positive stance expressed. The preference organisation of such turns also varies—negative stance turns including first name address terms are used as first pair parts, whereas positive stance ones are used as first or second pair parts, depending on the action performed. In chapter three, Christodoulidou examines the lexical item *siga* (which translates variously as "like hell," "yeah right," "big deal") by taking into consideration its sequential placement and its position in the turn. This study shows that a single lexical item, in this case *siga*, may occur in different positions within turns and that the positions in which it occurs are crucial for the actions it implements. Goutsos, in chapter four, shows how corpus linguistics and conversation analysis can be combined in the analysis of Greek conversation by examining how the Greek verbs for "remember" (*θimáme*) and "forget" (*kseχnáo*) are used in face-to-face spontaneous conversations between intimates drawn from the Corpus of Greek texts. The study of grammatical categories and colligation patterns in all forms of the two verbs is used to identify the patterns and the discourse functions with which the verbs are employed in conversation.

The studies included in the second part of the book employ conversation analysis to analyze the reporting of small stories and jokes in ordinary Cypriot-Greek conversations. Given that Conversation Analysis (CA) is concerned with the sequential organization of talk, the analysis of stories integrates into the analysis of storytelling, which successively becomes fundamental in the production of storytelling sequences (Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998). Specifically in chapter five, Charalambidou & Georgakopoulou analyse a sexually-explicit joke narrated in the context of a casual peer group of older Greek Cypriot women to uncover the interconnections amongst three layers of analysis: ways of telling, sites, tellers. In chapter six, Christodoulidou analyzes reported speech in talk-in-interaction by examining some of the interactional environments of the occurrence of reported speech and its sequential placement in these environments. Specifically, she analyses some patterns of reported speech

and thought in small stories which involve complaints, oppositional conversations and amusing events. Reported speech is used as an interest arouser, as evidential and for providing access to the interaction reported.

The third part of the book, "Code Mixing and Switching," refers to mixing and switching codes in bilingual and bidialectal settings. In chapter seven Georgalidou, Kaili & Celtek examine bilingual talk-in-interaction among members of close-knit networks who belong to different age groups of the bilingual in Greek and Turkish Muslim communities of Rhodes, Greece, and make use of code-switching and mixing practices. The authors tackle theoretical questions which have to do with the organizational patterns of bilingual discourse, as well as the notion of preference for same medium talk as an interpretation scheme for bilingual speakers. In chapter eight, Elena Ioannidou examines teachers' language use in the bidialectal educational setting of Cyprus, focusing on the linguistic choices made by teachers in the classroom context. The chapter investigates how teachers form various types of discourse in their classroom interactions, establishing an instructive, a regulative and an evaluative discourse.

Part four investigates text-messages and Facebook talk from a conversation analytic perspective. Particularly, in chapter nine Tereza Spilioti explores how text-messages are organized in terms of sequential patterns, with a focus on opening sequences. Text messages are explored not only as asynchronous, individual texts but as contributions in quasi-synchronous, interactional sequences. In chapter ten, Eirini Theodoropoulou analyzes Facebook talk with a focus on people's assessments of politicians and activists' initiatives reported and represented in openly accessible Facebook pages. The chapter provides a detailed analysis of the interactional, linguistic and semiotic patterns which characterize assessments on Facebook. In addition, it argues for four functions performed through assessments: setting the stage for activism, invitations for participation in initiatives collectively organized by them, updates from the field, and feedback on *aganaktismenoi* (indignants) initiatives.

To conclude, this volume incorporates ten studies which focus on Greek CA. Although still new, research on Greek talk-in-interaction is promising and pointing in many directions. This volume's contribution is to fill in a bibliographical gap in Greek linguistics and in the field of talk-in-interaction by offering a book dedicated to studies on several aspects of talk-in-interaction, seen from a conversation analytic perspective. The contributors of this book hope that it will serve as a point of reference for scholars and students interested in Greek talk-in-interaction. The aim is to

familiarize readers with CA research on the Greek language and its varieties and to encourage further research into Greek CA.

References

Archakis Argiris, Maria Giakoumelou, Dimitris Papazachariou & Villy Tsakona. 2010. "The Prosodic Framing of Humor in Conversational Narratives: Evidence from Greek data." *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 10 (2): 187–212.

Atkinson, J. Max & John Heritage (eds.). 1984. *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Christodoulidou, Maria. 2013a. "Opposition-Type Stories." In *Linguistic Studies of Human Language*, Georgeta Rata (ed.), 253–274. Athens Institute for Education and Research.

—. 2012a. "Conversational Irony: Evaluating Complaints." In *Spaces of Polyphony*, Clara-Ubaldina Lorda & Patrick Zabalbeascoa (eds.), 25–42. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

—. 2011c. "Hyperbole in Everyday Conversations." In *Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium on Theoretical and Applied Linguistics* 19: 143–152.

—. 2010. "Complaints about Misbehaviour." *Journal of Greek Linguistics. Special Issue on Analysing Greek Talk-in-Interaction: Current Directions and Future Prospects* 10 (2): 295–316.

—. 2009. "Extreme Case Formulations in Cypriot Greek." In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics, EACL2009 (SRSL 2009, the 2nd Workshop on Semantic Representation of Spoken Language)*, 1–9.

—. 2008. "*Siga* in Interaction." *Pragmatics* 18 (2): 189–213.

—. 2007. "Prefaced *siga* in Cypriot Greek Conversations." In *Studies in Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, School of Philology, Faculty of Philosophy*, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 113–124.

—. 2006. *Ironic Responses in Cypriot-Greek Talk-in-Interaction*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. University of Essex, UK. 250pp.

Clift, Rebecca, Paul Drew & Ian Hutchby. 2006. "Conversation Analysis." In *Handbook of Pragmatics,* Jan-Ola Östman & Jeff Verschueren (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Georgakopoulou, Alexandra. 2007. *Small Stories, Interaction and Identities*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

—. 2006. "The Other Side of the Story: Towards a Narrative Analysis of Narratives-in-Interaction." *Discourse Studies* 8: 235–257.

Heritage, John & Max J. Atkinson. 1984. "Introduction." In *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. J. Max Atkinson & J. Heritage (eds.), 1–15. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hutchby, Ian & Robin Wooffitt. 2008. (2nd edition). *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices and Applications.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Makri-Tsilipakou, Marianthi. 1994. "Interruption Revisited: Affiliative vs Disaffiliative Intervention." *Journal of Pragmatics* 21: 401–426.

—. 2003. "Greek Diminutive use Problematised: Gender, Culture and Common Sense." *Discourse and Society* 14: 699–726.

Pavlidou, Theodossia-Soula. 2002. "Moving Towards Closing: Greek Telephone Calls Between Familiars." In *Telephone Calls: Unity and Diversity in Conversational Structure across Languages and Cultures*, Kang Kwong Luke &Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou (eds.), 201–228. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Poulios, Apostolos. 2010. "Aspects of Advice Giving and Advice Receiving in Television Talk Shows." *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 10 (2): 251–294

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

Sacks, Harvey. 1992. *Lectures in Conversation*, 2 vols, edited by Gail Jefferson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Gail Jefferson. 1974. "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation." *Language* 50: 696–735.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1996. "Turn Organization: One Intersection of Grammar and Interaction." In *Interaction and Grammar*, Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Sandra A. Thomson (eds.), 52–133. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sifianou, Maria. 2002. "On the Telephone Again! Telephone Call Openings in Greek." In *Telephone Calls: Unity and Diversity in Conversational Structure across Languages and Cultures*. Kang Kwong Luke & Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou (ed.), 49–85. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Vasilopoulou, Alexandra, Chryso Hadjidemetriou & Marina Terkourafi. 2010. "Introducing Greek Conversation Analysis." *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 10 (2): 155–183.

Tzanne, Angeliki. 2000. *Talking at Cross-Purposes: The Dynamics of Miscommunication*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

PART I

GRAMMAR AND INTERACTION

Chapter One

Doing Surprise in Teenage Storytelling: The Case of the Greek Marker *re*

Rania Karachaliou
and Argiris Archakis

1. Introduction

The present study is concerned with the exploration of emotion in Greek teenage storytelling. Particularly, we focus on the construction and negotiation of surprise via the Greek pragmatic marker *re* appearing in the turn taking of narrative interaction. Our analysis follows the interactional paradigm, according to which surprise is an interactional achievement that the interlocutors collaborate on to attain. Drawing on literature from Conversation Analysis (henceforth CA), we argue that in the narrative contexts under scrutiny *re* functions as an interjection of surprise signalling either alignment among the interlocutors, when found in "immediate surprise response sequences," or disalignment when occurring in "postponed surprise response insert sequences."

In the following section we present the theoretical building blocks of our analysis. Initially, we present the recent linguistic research on emotion (section 2.1) and emotional expressivity through interjections (section 2.2). Specifically, we draw our attention to the emotion of "surprise" (section 2.3), which is the main focus of our analysis. As our study involves oral narratives we briefly refer to the theory of conversational storytelling and, particularly, to the concept of "tellability" (section 2.4). Then, we focus on some basic CA concepts which constitute useful methodological tools for our analysis, such as "adjacency pairs," "preference" and "insert sequences," and combine them with Andersen's (2001) terms of *A-signals* and *D-signals* (section 2.5). In section 3 we present the narrative data examined here and in section 4 we analyse the occurrence of *re* in narrative interaction. We distinguish two main categories: *re* in adjacency pairs of *immediate surprise response* and *re* in

insert sequences of postponed surprise response. Our analysis shows that in the first case, interlocutors use *re* to indicate surprise alignment through immediate surprise response (section 4.2.1). In the latter, participants use *re* in insert sequences that signal temporary disalignment between the interlocutors through "ritualised disbelief" (section 4.3.1), (partial) disagreement (section 4.3.2), or "multiple insert sequences" (section 4.3.3). Finally, we intend to suggest that in teenage storytelling the Greek marker *re* functions as an interjection, marking the communicative strategies which storytellers and story-recipients frequently use to "do" surprise (section 5).

2. The Theoretical Framework of the Analysis

2.1 Language and emotion

Although emotion plays a central role in human communication, linguistic research on it has been scarce (Maynard 2002). While the significance of emotive expression through language has been underlined since the 1960s (e.g. Gunther 2011, 574; Jacobson 1960), only during the last three decades has there been a growing interest in the study of language and emotions from diverse perspectives (Pavlenko 2005, 3).

In general, there are two dominant frameworks in the conceptualisation of emotion: the "organismic" and the "interactional" (Hochschild 1979, 553; Selting 2010, 229). In the organismic model, emotion is conceived as instinctive and emotional expressions are regarded "as inadvertent manifestations of individual bodily processes" (Wilkinson & Kitzinger 2006, 150). Drawing on frameworks like CA, interactional sociolinguistics and social constructionism, our analysis relies on the interactional model where emotion is considered an interactive achievement that is socially constructed and intentionally negotiated. Thus, emotion is conceived as "a form of communication" (Parkinson 1996, 680) and a "social phenomenon" (Gunther 2011, 586). The interactional model has been significantly influenced by Goffman's (1978) insightful research on response cries, which he did not consider as "an expression" but as "a self-other alignment, an interactional arrangement" (Ibid., 811).

Maynard (2002, 3), in her approach to emotive communication, distinguishes three categories of emotive mechanisms:

(1)   linguistic devices that describe emotions, such as "love" and "hate"
(2)   linguistic strategies, such as interjections, that directly enact emotional attitudes
(3)   grammatical and rhetorical means which foreground the emotive meaning, for example an exclamative sentence structure.

In this chapter we are particularly interested in the use of interjections in teenage storytelling as a medium of emotional expressivity and negotiation.

2.2 Interjections

Interjections are linguistic forms which are frequently described in vague terms, as the boundaries between them and other parts of speech are easily blurred. Recently, however, there have been some prominent steps towards a deeper understanding of this linguistic category.[1]

Interjections are usually defined as unit words or formulaic phrases which signal emotional involvement or a change in the speaker's cognitive or emotional state. They are characterised by orality, syntactical independence, initiality, peripherality, indexicality and context sensitivity (Ameka 1992b; Kryk 1992; Wilkins 1992; Cuenca 2000; Norrick 2008; 2009; 2011). From a pragmatic perspective, Ameka (1992b) points out that interjections "encode speaker attitudes and communicative intentions" (Ibid., 107), and divides them into three categories: the "expressive" ones, which focus on the speaker's emotional state (such as "ouch"—I feel pain) or cognitive state (such as "aha"—I now know this); the "conative" ones, which place emphasis on the speaker's wishes and are directed to the hearer (such as "shh"—I want silence) and the "phatic" ones, which are associated with the establishment of contact and backchanneling (such as "mhm," and "yeah") (Ibid., 113). In a similar vein, Fraser (1996, 176) claims that interjections are a subclass of pragmatic markers (henceforth PMs) and classifies them into different categories based on what they express (e.g. receipt of new information, desire for attention, pleasure, displeasure, desire for clarification, etc.).[2] Overall, interjections are characterised by "an extremely rich and well-structured indexical relationship to social, situational and discursive context" (Kockelman 2003, 479) and "routinely function as PMs" in everyday conversations (Norrick 2009, 866).

In his analysis of interjections in conversational narrative performances, Norrick (2008, 438) suggests that interjections contribute to "the organization of conversational storytelling" via "justifying tellability," signalling "narrative climaxes" and "evaluating the narrative point." The present analysis aligns with Norrick's considerations as it investigates the use of the Greek PM *re* as an interjection of "doing surprise" in teenage storytelling.

2.3 Doing surprise

Surprise is considered a basic form of emotional expression (Ekman 1992, 170). Adopting a psychological perspective, Meyer et al. (1997, 253) claim that surprise is elicited when a discrepancy between schemata and encountered events is traced and, consequently, a more complex analysis of the unexpected events is deemed necessary from the interlocutors' part.[3] This analysis involves a sequence of processes: the acknowledgement of the surprising event as a signal of schema-discrepancy, the appearance of a surprise effect and, at the same time, the interruption of the current information processing, focusing on the schema-discrepant event, and finally the evaluation of the event, which may or may not result in the revision of the schema. On the contrary, in the case of non-surprise eliciting events, where there is alignment between activated schemata and input, the interpretation of the encountered events is achieved automatically.

As already pointed out, our analysis relies on interactional approaches. Thus, we assume that surprise is socially constructed and intentionally communicated. We mainly follow Wilkinson & Kitzinger (2006) who have shown how surprise is an interactional achievement that the participants of a conversation collaborate on to perform. More particularly, we adopt to a large extent their conversational analytic approach, according to which the analysis focuses on surprise tokens, i.e. linguistic items used to perform surprise and signalling that prior talk and/or an event of the world is counter to expectation (e.g. "o:::h!," "wow," "gosh," "oh my god," etc.).

2.4 Storytelling, tellability and surprise

Following Labov (1972), we identify and analyse oral narratives that recount past events of personal experience. In particular, Labov's (1972, 363) model of narrative structure consists of five parts: (1) the "abstract," which is a brief summary of the story, (2) the "orientation," which serves to inform the hearer for the time, place, persons and context of the narrated event, (3) the "complicating action," which comprises a series of events that lead to a climax, (4) the "coda," which marks the end of the story and the transition from the narrative world to the real word, and (5) the "evaluation," which displays the attitudes and emotions of the narrator towards the narrated events. Additionally, here we examine narratives which depart from Labov's above-mentioned model, such as small stories

of shared/known past events, or even stories about events that are projected in the future (Georgakopoulou 2007).

Our research adopts a conversational analytic approach, according to which stories are considered to be "situated within interactional and sequential contexts" (Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998, 131). Furthermore, following interactional sociolinguistics we assume that narratives are considered a joint achievement between the interlocutors and hearers as active participants (Becker & Quasthoff 2005). Participants contribute to the construction of the story in various ways, for example via repairing, clarifying, adding information, asking for further information, commenting, and evaluating.

To tell a story, a narrator-to-be is expected to be able to present/construct his/her story as noteworthy and tellable/reportable (Labov 1972; Sacks 1992). Baroni (2011) claims that "tellability":

1   depends on the assessment of certain events as "significant, surprising and worthy of being reported" by the storyteller
2   is related to the "breaching of a canonical development"
3   may be marked by discourse features like evaluative devices.

Hence, tellability relies on the negotiation of the unexpected between the narrator and the story recipients. As Ochs & Capps (2001, 154) point out, breaches of expectation induce "a variety of responses not only at the time of the narrated event but also at the time of the telling." Given the above, we assume that storytelling is a suitable and fertile locus of tracing the unexpected, and thus surprise.[4]

Combining psychological and interactional approaches to the emotion of surprise in storytelling, we assume that the story recipients frequently interfere in the narrative performance when they realise that there is a schema discrepancy in the narrator's recounting of events upon which they want to focus. They then interrupt their current activity (i.e. listening to a story), assess it and then respond to it with a +/– surprise response (see section 2.5).

2.5 Adjacency pairs, preference, insert sequences & A- and D- signals

As already mentioned, the aim of our study is to investigate the Greek marker *re* in the turn-taking of teenage storytelling. In a preliminary research (Karachaliou & Archakis 2012), we claim that *re* in narrative interaction functions as a PM signalling a presumably unexpected piece of information. In the present study, we adopt a conversational analytic

approach to *re* by examining how it contributes to the construction and negotiation of surprise in adolescent narrative performances.

Drawing on CA literature, we consider that conversation is a "continuous achievement" based on the organized and joint activity of turn taking (Ten Have 1999, 128). Turns consist of units which are called *turn constructional units* (henceforth TCUs) ranging from a single word to a whole sentence. Transfer of speakership takes place in the first possible completion of a TCU or at any transition-relevance place (Sacks et al. 1974). Turns appear in clusters and are organized to "be coherent, orderly and meaningful" for the interlocutors to "perform actions through talk" (Liddicoat 2007, 105).[5] In our study we consider the notion of sequence organization and, specifically, the concepts of "adjacency pair" and "preference" to be highly relevant.

The adjacency pair, i.e. the basic unit of sequence construction, is characterised by the following features (Schegloff & Sacks 1973; Schegloff 2007, 13):

(1)   it consists of two turns
(2)   it is produced by different interlocutors
(3)   its turns are adjacently placed
(4)   the two turns are "relatively ordered"—the first pair part (FPP) which "initiates" an action, and the second pair part (SPP) which is "responsive to the action"
(5)   it is related to particular "pair-types," e.g. greeting-greeting, question-answer, etc.

As Hutchby & Wooffitt (1998, 41) remark, speakers can use the adjacency pair mechanism to make "their on-going understanding and sense-making of one's another talk" manifest.

During talk-in-interaction, and in order to design their contribution, speakers may choose among alternatives which "may have different interactional import" (Liddicoat 2007, 110), such as invitation—acceptance / decline, assessment—agreement / disagreement, etc. These non-equivalent alternatives are structured according to "preference organization" (Pomerantz 1984; Liddicoat 2007). As Schegloff points out (2007, 58), the alternative types of response "embody different alignments" toward the action undertaken in the FPP. Nevertheless, such choices are not associated with personal desires or psychological factors but with "observable regularities at talk" (Sidnell 2010, 77). "Preferred" actions, such as agreements or acceptances, are usually performed directly and without hesitation, while "dispreferred" actions, such as disagreements or rejections, are delayed, qualified and accounted for (Pomerantz 1984;

Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998, 45). Schegloff (2007, 59) calls the preferred responses "+responses," which "embody an alignment" with the FPP by favouring "the accomplishment of the activity" in SPP and securing the "aligned recipiency of their addressed target," and the dispreferred ones "–*responses*," which indicate "a problem" in sequence by blocking the activity of the FPP and conveying "distancing" and disalignment. In the case of +responses, sequences are completed with the immediate occurrence of the SPP, while in the case of –responses sequences are usually extended through "insert expansion," i.e. talk that occurs between the FPP and the SPP. As Liddicoat (2007, 143) claims, the insert sequence, which constitutes another adjacency pair, gives the hearer the opportunity to delay the production of the SPP in order to "do interactional work relevant to the projected SPP." The examination of our data reveals that interlocutors may extend the adjacency pair of surprise / response through insert expansion.

More particularly, in our research we investigate the occurrence of *re* in the turn taking of "immediate surprise responses" that follow the presentation of the unexpected events of the story, i.e. in the places where story recipients align with the narrator in their negotiation of surprise, and in the turn taking of "postponed surprise responses" where hearers present themselves as unprepared to accept the unexpected information. Using Andersen's terms (2001, 71–76), we intend to show that the SPP, i.e. the immediate surprise responses, functions as "A-signal," while the FPP of the insert sequences in postponed surprise responses as "D-signal."

Andersen (2001), combining sociolinguistic research and relevance theory (Sperber & Wilson 1986; 1995), examines PMs that are frequently used in youth language (e.g. "like," question tags such as "innit") from the perspective of their pragmatic functions, sociolinguistic variation and synchronic development. He argues that PMs are small recurrent linguistic units with multidimensional functions, which act as helpers in the interpretation process and can be described as a synthesis of three basic aspects of pragmatic meaning, referred to as subjective, interactional and textual. We are specifically interested in the interactional domain, which is concerned with whether "communicated assumptions are mutually manifest" (Ibid., 69). Drawing on the distinction proposed by relevance theory between information which strengthens contextual assumptions and information which contradicts them, Andersen claims that PMs may function either as A-signals, i.e. markers which express contextual alignment among the interlocutors, or as D-signals, i.e. markers which express contextual divergence.

Relying on Andersen's distinction, we attempt to show that, in the case of narrative performances, turns that function as A-signals are compatible and support the existing contextual assumptions of the speaker/narrator, while turns that function as D-signals, by challenging/contradicting the existing assumptions of the speaker/narrator, may lead to the re-organization of the story recipients' backgrounds.

In this context, we intend to argue that in narrative interaction *re* appears in contexts of surprise negotiation, functioning as a general indicator of surprise. Particularly, *re* seems to occur at every point of surprise negotiation—in surprise source turns, in immediate surprise responses, in insert sequences of surprise negotiation, and in postponed surprise responses. Thus, *re* has the capacity to accompany both A-signals and D-signals.

3. The Data of the Study

Our data consist of two conversations (total duration 150 min) of naturally occurring speech between 17-year-old male informants and young researchers. These conversations are part of the data collected during a large-scale research project investigating the narrative performances of youths in Patras, the third biggest city in Greece. The researchers familiarised themselves with the informants for two months before the recordings to establish an intimate relationship with them. It should be noted that in the unfolding of speech the young researchers tend to participate in the conversations very actively by commenting, asking questions, requesting information, clarification or even by narrating their own stories. Hence, the researchers' contributions to the narrative performances will also be examined here.

In this set of data we identified 134 narratives referring to experiences from interlocutors' lives outside and inside school, including 55 instances of *re*.

4. Data analysis

4.1 Surprise source turn in narratives

Given that tellability is the *sine qua non* of narrative events (see section 2.4), narrators often design their story to create a surprise effect so as to keep the audience involved in the telling. As Wilkinson & Kitzinger (2006, 156) point out, in what they call "surprise source turns" a teller highlights "the contrast between what might be expected and what actually

turned out to be the case." Then, the hearer either expresses his/her alignment or disalignment to what the teller suggests is surprising.

In storytelling in particular, narrators use a variety of linguistic devices to orient hearers either to an unexpected event in the complicating action of the story or to an unexpected piece of orientation information. Hearers can express their surprise through a variety of ways such as facial expressions, repeats, laughter, gestures, etc. In this chapter, we pay particular attention to the occurrences of the marker *re*. In example (1), Y[6] narrates a funny incident which took place between the headmaster of his school and a teacher in the room where Y was writing an exam:

(1)[7]

[1] Γ: *Μετά πάει ένας καθηγητής να φάει το γλυκό, τον κοιτάει ο διευθυντής* <u>*φάε ρε*</u> *του λέει, φάτο, φάτο του λέει όλο με τη μία και πιάνει ένα γλυκό το δαγκώνει, μια πάστα τό::ση τώρα.*

[2] Ε: *Παναγία βόηθα!*

[3] Γ: *Με το χέρι ο διευθυντής >και τη ρίχνει μέσα* ***ρε****< μπαπ ανοίγει το στόμα και >τη ρίχνει μέσα<.*

[4] Ε: *((γέλια))*

[1] Y: Then, a teacher wants to eat the pastry, the headmaster looks at him <u>eat re</u> he tells him, eat it, eat it all he tells him with one bite and he grabs the pastry he bites it, a pastry so:: big now.

[2] R: Holy mother!

[3] Y: With his hand the headmaster >and he pushes it down his throat **re**< slam he opens the mouth and >he throws it in<.

[4] R: ((laughs)).

In the above example, the headmaster initially seems to force the teacher to eat a pastry with one bite and then he rushes to eat it himself. Y designs his telling so as to elicit surprise at two points particularly:

(1) when he describes the unusually large piece of pastry by using "so" with extended sound ("so:: big" [turn 1]), i.e. an extreme case formulation in Pomerantz's terms (1986)[8]

(2) when he recounts the unexpected action of his headmaster by using repetition ("he throws it in" [turn 3]), increasing speed, onomatopoeic words ("slam") and the marker *re* in complicating action (> "and he pushes it down his throat *re*" [turn 3]).

Interestingly, in the first case the hearer produces a +surprise response ("Holy mother!" [turn 2]) to make her surprise alignment manifest, while in the second the hearers express their interest for the unexpected action and their involvement in the narrative performance via laughter (turn [4]).

In sum, narrators intentionally design their stories to be unexpected, and afterwards the story-recipients display their surprise. In what follows, we examine two mechanisms interactants use to perform surprise by using *re* in storytelling: (1) adjacency pairs of "immediate surprise response," and (2) sequences of "postponed surprise response."

4.2 Adjacency Pairs of Immediate Surprise Response

In example (2), the narrator designs his/her utterance as a surprise source turn by recounting an unexpected event, while the story recipient interferes in the narrative performance with an immediate surprise response.

(2)

[1] Σ: *Έκατσε και::: ήμουνα νοσοκομείο:: τρεις μέρες. Ε:: είχα κάνει εγχείρηση, στα ούλα για δόντι. Δυο μέρες πάλι:: είχα πάει στην οδοντίατρο να μου βγάλει δόντι. Άλλες δυο μέρες ήμουνα άρρωστος, και τις επόμενες απουσίες τις είχα κάνει, καθόμουν σπίτι και διάβαζα.*

[2] E: *Και διάβαζες; ((γέλια))*

[3] Σ: *Και με πήρε μένα μια καθηγήτρια, η Παπαδοπούλου ρε, η Παπαδοπούλου.*

[4] X: *Μη μου τη θυμίζεις αυτή.*

[5] Σ: *Αυτή [με πήρε].*

[6] E: *[Και η Παπαδοπούλου] καλά. ((γέλια))*

[7] X: *Αυτή σ' αρέσει εσένα;*

[8] Σ: *Όχι, αυτή με πήρε τηλέφωνο, δεν κατάλαβες;*

[9] X: *Και τι σου 'πε;*

[10] Σ: *Μου λέει άμα δεν θέλεις να μείνεις έλα σχολείο.*

[11] E: *Έλα **ρε::**↓*

[12] Σ: *Και η μάνα μου έλεγε:: μήπως έχεις κάποιο πρόβλημα με τις απουσίες και πάω και της λέω, μη φοβάσαι τις έχω εγώ.*

[1] S: It just happened tha::t I was in the hospita::l for three days. U::h, I had an operation, on my gum, for my teeth. Two days mo::re I was at the dentist's to have my tooth taken out. Two more days I was ill and I was also marked absent ((when)) I was home studying.

[2] R: And were you actually studying? ((laughs))

[3] S: And a teacher called me, Papadopoulou *re*, Papadopoulou ((the surname of the teacher)).

[4] C: Don't remind me of her.

[5] S: She was the one who [called me].

[6] R: [And Papadopoulou] well. ((laughs))

[7] C: Is this the one you like?

[8] S: No, you don't understand, she is the one who called me.

[9] C: And what did she tell you?

[10]   S: She tells me if you don't want to repeat the class next year,
        you'd better come to school.
[11]   R: No kidding **re::↓**
[12]   S: And my mother was telling me::: do you have any problems with
        your absence ((from school)) and I tell her, don't worry everything is
        under control.

In example (2), S explains to his interlocutors, i.e. R and C, why he has been absent for several days and starts narrating an event about a teacher who called him at home and warned him to return to school, otherwise he would have to repeat the class the following year. Due to the increased tellability of the story, participants contribute to the telling very actively by teasing (turn [2]), expressing frustration (turn [4]), contempt (turn [6]), asking for further information (turn [7]), and prompting the story (turn [9]). Focusing on surprise negotiation we observe that in turn [10] the complicating action of the narrative reaches a climax, thus constituting a surprise source turn. The fact that a teacher called S at home and told him to return to school is unexpected for the narrator-protagonist for two reasons: first, he had not realised he would have to repeat the class, and second, the teacher showed concern by warning him about it. In turn [11], the story recipient responds immediately to the surprise source turn by using an exclamatory formulaic phrase ("No kidding *re::↓*") with a falling contour of completion, including the marker *re*, which indicates that she considers the narrated event as surprising. In doing so, R displays her alignment with the narrator's assumptions about what counts as surprising. In turn [12], S continues his story by adding background information which further justifies the unexpectedness of the event ("And my mother was telling me::: do you have any problems with your absence ((from school)) and I tell her, don't worry everything is under control").

Through a CA perspective, it could be suggested that the turn sequence [10] & [11] constitutes an adjacency pair consisting of the surprise source turn and the immediate surprise response. In the FPP, the speaker/narrator presents the unexpected event of the story, and in the SPP the hearer/story recipient makes a responsive move by expressing her surprise. The SPP, in particular, is structured as a preferred next action (Pomerantz 1984, 63), since it is produced immediately after the FFP and expresses mutual understanding. As Andersen would put it (2001, 72), turn [11] functions as an A-signal, and *re* indicates the surprise alignment among the interlocutors.

So far, we analysed how narrators and story recipients seem to "do" surprise through the following adjacency pair:

> Narrator → Surprise source turn $_{FPP}$
> Recipient of the narrative → Immediate surprise response & *re* $_{SPP}$

Apart from expressing his/her surprise for the sequence of events the narrator designs as unexpected, it is possible for the hearer to focus on a specific "side" aspect of the unexpected events and interfere in the narrative performance so as to display that he/she also considers it unexpected:

(3)

[1]   Γ: *Πήγαινε με το μετρό ο άνθρωπος, ρε φίλε του λέω, πολύ <u>γαμάτα</u> εδώ πέρα <u>τη γουστάρω πολύ</u> τη φάση του μετρό δεν παίρνεις χαμπάρια του λέω δεν μ' ενδιαφέρει μου λέει, κάτσε του λέω δηλαδή εσύ ποτέ δεν βάζεις τον εγκέφαλό σου του λέω να σκεφτεί του λέω για τα προβλήματα που υπάρχουν γύρω σου; Δηλαδή μου λέει; Έλα δω ρε Πέτρο του λέω, πιάνω τον Πέτρο του λέω >ρε φιλαράκι μια τουαλέτα του λέω κατουριόμαστε του λέω απ' το πρωί ρε φίλε του λέω<.*

[2]   Ε: *Ναι **ρε** >πλάκα πλάκα δεν έχει τουαλέτα το μετρό<.*

[3]   Γ: *Του λέω/ μου λέει δεν μ' ενδιαφέρει, φύγε του λέω δεν αξίζεις να ζεις του λέω ….*

[1]   Y: He was going to take the metro, re mate I tell him, it's <u>fucking awesome</u> over here <u>I fancy very much</u> this metro thing you just don't get it I tell him I don't care he tells me, wait I tell him so you never sit and make your brain think about the problems around you? What do you mean he tells me? Come here re Petro I tell him, I grab Petro and tell him >re mate a toilet I tell him we want to pee I tell him since this morning re mate I tell him<.

[2]   R: Yeah **re** >no kidding there is no toilet in the metro<.

[3]   Y: I tell him/ he tells me I don't care, go away I tell him you don't deserve to live ….

In example (3), Y narrates a story about a school excursion to Athens. Y designs turn [1] as surprising, particularly at the end of the turn, via the use of repetition, direct speech and increasing speed (">*re* mate a toilet I tell him we want to pee I tell him since this morning re mate I tell him<" [turn 1]). The aforementioned sequence of events contributes to the tellability of the story as talking to a stranger in a familiar way, and asking him persistently about the nearest toilet constitutes unexpected behaviour. Interestingly, in turn [2] the hearer focuses on a specific piece of the surprising information in the story, i.e. the fact that in the metro stations there are no toilets available to the public. In the first TCU of turn [2], R uses a secondary interjection ("yeah") followed by *re* to confirm the unexpected information. In the second TCU, she expresses her surprise

("no kidding") and points out the unexpected aspect of the story ("there is no toilet in the metro"). While in example (2) R expresses her surprise at once, here she first acknowledges one of the unexpected aspects of the story and then elaborates on it. Following Norrick (2008, 456), we would like to suggest that in the first TCU of turn [2], R indicates that she recalled a surprising piece of information which is compatible with her information state, i.e. that the metro station does not have public toilets. In the second TCU she shares this unexpected piece of information which partially aligns with the narrator's surprise source turn. Turn [2] functions as an A-signal and *re* is used to indicate surprise alignment. In this case, participants seem to "do" surprise through the following adjacency pair:

> Narrator: Surprise source turn $_{FPP}$
> Story Recipient: Surprise confirmation & *re* $_{TCU1}$ +
> surprise elaboration $_{TCU2\ SPP}$

4.3 Sequences of Postponed Surprise Response

4.3.1 Ritualised disbelief

Narrative surprise source turns are not always followed by immediate surprise responses. In our data, we identified cases where the hearer does not align at once with the narrator's surprise design but expresses his/her doubts of the surprising event through requesting confirmation or further elaboration. This is achieved via insert expansion.

(4)
[1]   Γ: *Έμαθες τι παίχτηκε;*
[2]   Κ: *Όχι.*
[3]   Γ: *Βγαίνω τώρα απ' τον Άγι' Αντρέα, αρχίζουνε να προχωράνε τώρα καμιά εικοσαριά δεσποτάδες όλοι μαζί, ο Χριστόδουλος δίπλα απ' το Νικόδημο, το δικό μας __και πέφτει πίσω__ **ρε**.*
[4]   Κ: *Σοβαρά **ρε**;*
[5]   Γ: *__Ναι__ **ρε** [πάει].*
[6]   Κ: *[Ψόφησε]. ((γέλια))*

[1]   Y: Did you hear what happened?
[2]   K: No.
[3]   Y: I get out of St. Andrew's church, everybody starts walking now a bunch of bishops altogether, Christodoulos ((the former archbishop of the Greek Orthodox church)) next to Nicodimos, our bishop ((the former bishop of Patras)) and he falls on his back **re**.
[4]   K: Really **re**?