Discourse Studies

Multimodal resources for turn-taking : pointing and the emergence of possible next speakers

Lorenza Mondada

The online version of this article can be found at:

Published by:

$SAGE

Additional services and information for *Discourse Studies* can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://dis.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://dis.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations: http://dis.sagepub.com/content/9/2/194.refs.html

Multimodal resources for turn-taking: pointing and the emergence of possible next speakers

LORENZA MONDADA
UNIVERSITÉ DE LYON

ABSTRACT   The article investigates a multimodal practice for self-selecting observed in a video-taped corpus of work meetings: the use of pointing gestures predicting possible turn completions and projecting the emergence of possible next speakers. This practice is analyzed in various sequential positions, namely at turn beginnings and at pre-beginnings. It displays recipients' practical online turn parsing, and their orientation to transition spaces, and to TCU, completions in a visible, recognizable, public way. It shows the emergent and progressive establishment of speakership, exploiting both systematic features of turn-taking and specific features of the interactional space. The article explores the emic, locally situated and contingent definition of speakership by considering not only where pointing gestures begin but also where they end: pointing does not only end in pre-completion positions, projecting turn end, but can also persist through sequences, showing speaker's orientations to her turn's sequential implicativeness. Thus, by observing a particular multimodal practice within a specific interactional setting, the article explores participants' orientations to the rights and obligations associated with talk-related categories such as 'non current speaker', 'possible next speaker', 'incipient speaker' and 'current speaker'.

KEY WORDS: *multimodality, pointing, pre-beginnings, projection, self-selecting techniques, sequence organization, turn-taking*

Introduction

In this article,[1] I study a specific gestural practice through which a recipient gradually establishes her or himself as next speaker in talk-in-interaction: by using a pointing gesture, while current speaker's turn is still going on and has not yet reached its completion. Thus, pointing gestures will be studied here not as a resource primarily devoted to the accomplishment of referential or deictic actions but as a resource locally mobilized for self-selecting and for organizing the emergent character of a 'transition space' (Schegloff, 1996: 96). This practice

and resource will be explored in its orderly and systematic character in a specific setting, an informal work session where participants – a multidisciplinary team of agronomists and computer scientists – are involved in a discussion around a table, whilst writing notes and looking at maps.

A TURN'S EMERGENT CONSTRUCTION

In recent years, the 'turn-taking machinery' introduced by Sacks et al. (1974) has been extensively studied, both in its turn-constructional component, allowing the identification of relevant spaces for turn transition, and in its turn-allocational component, constituted by selection techniques by which either current speaker selects next or next speaker self-selects.

Explorations of the *turn-allocational component* have highlighted various practices for selection (such as turn-sharing and other choral performances: Lerner 2002; various methods for addressing the next speaker: Lerner, 2003) and their eventual specialization and diversification in conversation, institutional and professional contexts (namely in talk at work, Drew and Heritage, 1992). The consideration of various settings has implied a diversification of the resources studied (verbal and vocal resources for telephone conversations, multimodal resources for face-to-face interactions, artefacts and technologies for mediated interactions, etc.).

Explorations of the *turn-constructional components* have been carried out with the collaboration of linguists in recent years (within interactional linguistics: see Ochs et al., 1996; Selting and Couper-Kuhlen, 2001; Ford et al., 2002; Hakulinen and Selting, 2005): they made possible the identification of Turn-Constructional Units (TCUs) as interactive organizational units formatted by exploiting linguistic resources in ways that are both shaped by the contingencies of the step-by-step incremental organization of interaction and by the constraints and possibilities of grammar, one being reflexively structured by the other. TCUs are a specific kind of unit, praxeologically defined by the local achievements of the participants, interactively negotiated, emerging within the temporal moment-by-moment unfolding of talk as it is jointly, situatedly, contingently produced by the participants. Opportunities to co-participate and interactively produce emerging TCUs are centrally provided by their projective potential, responsible for the predictible features of a turn's emergent construction. Projectability (Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff, 1984; Sacks, 1992) is a central feature that provides for next speakers the possibility of not only identifying turn completion but also predicting it before it occurs, to anticipate transition-relevance points and to locate the upcoming place where to begin to speak (see Ford et al., 1996; Selting, 2000; Tanaka, 2001, Auer, 2005, for a description of linguistic resources for projectability):

> The sentence is a great packaging technique for a series of reasons [...]. It has a structure which can at all points be seen as to whether it is possibly complete or not possibly complete, and people are able to deal with it in such a way as to see, on its occurence that it's possibly complete. And also, from its beginning it can be looked at to see what it will take to complete it. (Sacks, 1992: 40)

> Sentential constructions are capable of being analyzed in the course of their production by a party/hearer able to use such analyses to project their possible directions or completion loci. (Sacks et al., 1974: 709)

These features are responsible for the flexible, moment-by-moment, dynamic, revisable and expandable definition of turns by the participants; in this sense, turns and TCUs are 'interactively determined' units (cf. Ford, 2005 emphasizing this praxeological and interactive aspect):

> The turn-unit is of a sort which a) employs a specification of minimal sizes, but b) provides for expansion within a unit, c) is stoppable (though not at any point), and d) has transition places discretely recurring with it, e) which can themselves be expanded or contracted; all of these features except the first are locii of interactional determination. By virtue of this character, it is misconceived to treat turns as units characterized by a division of labor in which the speaker determines the unit and its boundaries, with other parties having as their task the recognition of them. Rather, the turn is a unit whose constitution and boundaries involve such a distribution of tasks as we have noted: that a speaker can talk in such a way as to permit projection of possible completion to be made from his talk, from its start, allowing others to use its transition places to start talk, to pass up talk, to affect directions of talk, etc.; and that their starting to talk, if properly placed, can determine where he ought to stop talk. That is, the turn as a unit is interactively determined. (Sacks et al., 1974: 726–7)

Therefore, a central task for conversation analysis has been to describe methods and resources by which recognizable units in action are interactively and reflexively produced and monitored. For example, previous research has shown how turns are interactively constructed (Goodwin, 1979, 1981), how TCUs can be extended beyond the initially projected completion allowing for the timely production of assessments by the other party within the unit's boundaries (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1987); how they can have a 'semi-permeable' character and their second part can be predicted for the production of collaborative sentences (Lerner, 1991, 1996). The dates of these studies show that the importance of multimodal resources for these collaborative and reflexive practices has long been recognized (see also Hayashi, 2005; Schmitt, 2005).

Analyses of the methods involved in projection and in the online incremental construction of TCUs were first focused on linguistic resources, but were soon expanded in order to take into consideration gestures, gazes and bodily postures.

Linguistic resources considered have been primarily syntactic (Sacks et al., 1974; Sacks, 1992: 642 referred to 'sentences', 'clauses', etc. although pointing to the practical and emic character of these units, not corresponding to their definition in classical linguistics) and syntax is still considered as one important resource for the 'packaging' of turns (see Schegloff, 1996 on syntactic materials characterizing initial, middle and terminal TCU positions; Auer, 2005 on the projective potentials of syntax). But its interplay with prosodic resources has since been largely explored (see Sacks, 1992; Auer, 1996; Couper-Kuhlen, 1996, 2001, 2004). Moreover, by the 1980s, French and Local (1983), Local et al. (1986) and Local and Kelly (1986) were showing the import of phonetic resources for turn projection. Instead of claiming the relevance of one unique dimension, studies

focus more on the contributions of syntactic, prosodic, and pragmatic resources for achieving completion (Ford and Thompson, 1996; Ford et al., 1996 take into consideration gaze and body movements too). More recently, multimodal resources have been strongly taken into account, including gestures (Schegloff, 1984, Streeck and Hartge, 1992; Ford et al., 1996; Hayashi et al., 2002), gazes (Goodwin, 1981; Lerner, 2003; Rossano, 2005) and more generally the entire body (Goodwin, 2000).

ESTABLISHING SPEAKERSHIP AS A PRACTICAL ACCOMPLISHMENT

Through the analysis of multimodal practices for establishing speakership in a corpus of video-recordings of professional meetings, this article aims to contribute to the growing literature on turn-taking on the following aspects:

- the orderly and systematic way in which *multimodal resources* are exploited for the organization of turn-taking and more particularly within practices for self-selecting contingently defining-and-exploiting transition spaces;
- the *reflexive* organization of turns-at-talk, relying both on the production of recognizable emergent structures by current speaker and on the local interpretation, monitoring and online analysis done by and implemented in recipients/next possible speakers actions. Multimodal practices contribute crucially to the visibility for participants – and for analysts alike – of public displays and recognitions of 'in-course parsing of a turn in progress' (Jefferson, 1984: 14).
- the interactive organization, identification and exploitation of 'pre-beginnings', that is, of actions taking place *before* the turn properly starts, in pre-initial turn positions, and projecting the beginning of a possible next turn: this position can be occupied by head movements, gaze redirections, onset of gestures, incipient facial expressions, in-breaths, 'uh(m)' tokens (Schegloff, 1996), that is, actions that are not yet realized as a turn but which strongly project it. We will show that multimodal actions play a crucial role in this position, allowing for their simultaneous production with ongoing current speaker's talk. Analysis of these actions expands our focus of study beyond the limited 'transition-relevance point' to the more conceptually extensive 'transition space', characterized by its shape, duration, import and limits (Schegloff, 1996).
- the very notion of speakership, and other *talk-related categories* ('next speaker', 'incipient speaker', 'current speaker', etc.), as well as their rights and obligations, as products of emergent joint accomplishments: the dynamic, locally organized, contingent emergence of a 'speaker' provides for the occasion to respecify this category as it is recognized and accomplished by participants themselves in the course of their interaction.
- the articulation between the *context-free* and the *context-sensitive* dimensions of turn-taking: although they recognized the situated order of turn-taking, Sacks et al. were more concerned with the abstraction of the machinery rather than the particularities of content, context or identity (1974) and abstained from precisely defining 'the scope of reference of "context" that is

relevant' (1974: 699, note 8). This article will show how situated features of the material and spatial environment are methodically mobilized for achieving self-selection and in turn shed some light on more general practices for turn-taking.

Discovery of the phenomenon

In what follows, we will analyze turn-taking practices observable in a particular corpus, dealt with as a 'perspicuous setting' (Garfinkel and Wieder, 1992: 184), that is, a setting that in its specificity and uniqueness allows us to highlight methodic and systematic features. This setting provides for specific multimodal resources, related to the spatial arrangement of the participants, to the artefacts they manipulate and to their peculiar activity. These resources are contingent, associated with the specificity of the activity; nevertheless, they are mobilized within systematic practices which can shed some light on other turn-taking and turn-transition practices.

The professional activity concerned is a series of work meetings (the corpus is composed of six sessions, for about 15 hours of video data) in which agronomists and computer scientists collaborate to develop a common cartographic language for modelling agricultural land. The agronomists collected a series of geographical and land survey maps of several farms and created a new, more abstract, topological representation of these territories; the computer scientists were engaged in producing a further formalization, in the form of graphs. These activities involve several reformulations and re-descriptions of the initial map representation, as well as a number of controversial discussions about the descriptive categories each discipline is using (for detailed analysis of this 'multimodal semantics in action', see Mondada, 2005a, 2005b). The maps and other visualizations lay on the work table, around which three or four participants are seated; their attention is focused on the documents that are discussed, described, pointed at, and even modified in the course of the talk. Thus, the activity considered is characterized by a specific ecology, where a limited work space full of artifacts mobilized by talk and gesture is at the center of the collective attention. In contrast to other work settings where multi-activity occasions a constant dispersion of attention in fragmented spaces and where mutual attention has to be constantly re-achieved through intense interactional work (see Goodwin and Goodwin, 1992; Heath and Luff, 1992; Goodwin, 2003; Heath et al., 2002 for examples), the activity studied here is characterized by a sustained focus of collective attention on the documents at the center of the table. This peculiar ecology of action provides for specific resources for the organization of interaction, both in an indexical and systematic way (Figures 1 and 2).

The way in which this activity has been videotaped is reflexively sensitive to the features of action: a perspective view, allowing to see the upper part of the participants' bodies as well as their mutual orientations, is completed by a vertical view, allowing the detailed description of the material and spatial environment involved, as well as participants' gestures (for a detailed analysis of recording choices as reflexively shaping analytical possibilities, see Mondada, 2006a).

FIGURE 1.   *Perspective view*

FIGURE 2.   *Vertical view*

Looking at the video-recording of this activity, a recurrent action is notice-able: pointing gestures done by participants toward the maps and other documents on the table are highly frequent – either in the form of one person pointing or even in the form of various participants pointing at the same time to the same item.

Pointing gestures within talk have been mainly investigated in the literature in relationship with deictical reference (Hanks, 1992; Kita, 2003; Kendon, 2004) they are a pervasive resource for identifying and making recognizable an object (even if it is not visible for the participants, Haviland, 1996), within a referential practice which may or may not co-occur with other spoken resources, for example, deixis. Studies of pointing-in-interaction (Hindmarsh and Heath, 2000; Goodwin, 2003; Mondada, 2005c) have shown that the articulation between deicticals and pointing gesture is not so simple as it might appear in previous accounts: pointing gestures are precisely timed, being synchronized with the moment-by-moment organization of talk-in-interaction, with recipient-oriented talk and bodily conducts, with appropriate arrangements of bodies and objects in space, with the progressive (re)disposition of the domain of scrutiny, with contingent demands of the activity, and with timely organized coordination.

Moreover, pointing gestures are not always and exclusively devoted to deictical reference. In our corpus, at the first sight, these gestures seem to be related to the descriptive practices characterizing this work activity, as well as to the common attention towards shared referents. However, detailed examination show that these gestures are not systematically associated with deictical forms and are much more frequent than referential expressions. Pointing gestures do not seem to have just a referential use. That prompts a closer analysis of the circumstances of their finely timed unfolding in interaction.

This noticing has opened another perspective on the corpus, raising another kind of issue: speakers do point to the maps not only in order to refer to them but also to make visible their engagement and participation in interaction. The occurrence and temporality of pointing gestures is a key resource for the organization of turn-taking. Pointing practices and turn-taking practices are here deeply embedded, in a way that exploits the specificities of the situated

action – such as the fact that it takes place around a table covered with artifacts, the fact that participants' attention is focused more on these objects rather than on co-participants, and the fact that topical activities are centered on visible materials. The specificity of the situation is thus locally exploited by the interactional practices, although their exploitation remains related to more general principles governing action and interaction.

Our analysis will be organized around two basic questions: the first concerns the sequential environment at which pointing *begins*, characterizing the context in which the recipient/possible next speaker is emerging and establishing as a speaker. The second concerns the sequential environment where pointing *ends*, showing that interestingly this does not always occur at the established speaker's turn completion. Thus, analysis will show a range of ordered sequential positions at which pointing as a technique for self-selecting is used by participants, and will reflect upon the way in which this technique reflexively shapes sequentiality as it is practically managed by co-participants.

When does pointing begin? Practices for self-selecting

In what follows, we will focus on the way in which pointing is exploited by participants as a practice for self-selecting and for projecting current speaker upcoming turn completion.

This descriptive aim makes some strict demands of the data used (Mondada, 2006b): on the one hand, it requires video-recordings that make relevant details accessible for the analyst: this is the reason why we will use multiple video sources. On the other hand, it requires transcripts that represent the finely tuned aspects of multimodal details as they sequentially unfold in interaction – making them available for analysis. A rough notation of gesture would erase the orderly organization of the very phenomena we try to study. In order to preserve them, we will adopt a specific notation system for gestures, complementing Jefferson's conventions used for talk. The system, inspired by Goodwin's gaze notation (1981) and by Schegloff's gesture notation (1984), aims at capturing the main phases of a gesture's trajectory and to synchronize them with talk: we will describe the preparation phase (represented by dots ...), the culmination or stroke, which can be held for a while (represented by dashes −−), and the retraction (represented by commas ,,,) (see the end of this article for a full account of conventions used).

TURN-INITIAL POINTINGS: DISPLAYING INCIPIENT SPEAKERSHIP

In the following excerpt, Pierre-Alain (PAL) is engaged in a long multi-unit turn about the way in which farmers use their land over the year. When it is brought to completion, Viviane (VIV) self-selects and relates Pierre-Alain's explanation to its cartographical representation. She is overlapped by a third speaker, Laura (LAU), asking for a confirmation about the object represented on the map.

(1) (e9/agro1–47.00)

1	**PAL**	**ben suivant le cas euh: ben on tra- (.) on est là que pour le**
		well in certain cases ehm well one wor- (.) one is there only for the
2		**champ, et puis à d'autres moments:, ben on va échouer, (0.3)**
		field, and at other times, well one ends up, (0.3)
3		**en pâturage. .h sur l'assemblage sans parcours. .h je pense**
		in pasture. .h on rough ground without any path. .h i think
4		**que dans le cas du gaec du pradou, .h c'est tout l'un,**
		that in the case of the ((region's name)), .h it's either one,
5		**tout l'autre.**
		or the other.
6	**VIV**	**+.hh# oui.# parce# que: i#m'sem#+ble: eh i- ici# c'était s::- ce**
		.hh yes. because it seems to me eh he- here it was w::- what
	#fig	#fig3 #fig4 #fig5 #fig6 #fig7 #fig8
		+. . . . .+ppp w pen-->>
7		**qui: ce que ça voulait représenter, [c'était**
		this wanted to represent, [was
8	**LAU**	**[*c'est les am*andes ça?**
		[are these almonds? ((=kind of field))
		*. . . . .*ppp w finger->>

FIGURE 3.   *.hh#*   FIGURE 4.   *oui.#*   FIGURE 5.   *parce#*

FIGURE 6.   *que: i#*   FIGURE 7.   *'m sem-#ble:*   FIGURE 8.   *eh i- ici#*

When Pierre-Alain has reached a recognizable turn completion (syntactically, prosodically, pragmatically), Viviane, line 6, self-selects: she begins her turn with two turn-entry-devices: with an in-breath ('.hh') and with her arm beginning to stretch over the table ('....'). A pointing gesture emerges from this stretching of her arm and her bending over the table, showing a direction with her pen extending the hand movement.

Excerpt 1 shows the occurrence of a second instance of turn-initial pointing: Laura self-selects overlapping Viviane (line 9) and begins to point at the

beginning of the turn too. This occurrence of turn-initial pointing is done with the finger and not with a pen (the pen is being used by Laura writing notes).

Some remarks can be made at this stage:

- for the description of the gesture, the sequential placement of the beginning of its preparatory phase is crucial, and allows the identification of a relevant sequential environment for the phenomenon.
- the pointing gesture is not limited to the hand: it engages the whole body (the upper body bending over the table, the arm crossing the table). Moreover, the embeddedness of pointing in other activities and in the ecology of the ongoing action shapes the form and the resources of pointing: pointing with a pencil or pointing with a finger allow different kinds of movements, of ways of being precise, of parallel simultaneous activities.
- Viviane's pointing trajectory is not a mere individual isolated gesture but a finely coordinated one, synchronized with the format of the turn in progress and adjusted to other's actions:

(2) = (1) line 6

```
6    VIV    +.hh oui. parce que: im' sem+ble: eh i- ici
                +. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . +ppp w pen— - >>
            lau                                *opens folder*
```

Viviane's turn is formatted in a way that delays (with the insertion of 'i m'semble' and the self-repair of 'i- ici' – which are thus not just hitches in her talk but resources for the production of a timed action) the position of the deictical 'ici' until the point where the pointing gesture has reached its maximal extension (when she says 'i m'semble'). This in turn is reflexively adjusted to Laura's action: Laura is holding a closed folder where the referent of Viviane's utterance is hidden and which therefore constitutes an obstacle for her referential action. Laura opens it as the pointing gesture reaches it. So, Viviane's gesture and turn on the one hand, and Laura's manipulation of the referred artifact on the other hand are finely adjusted and reflexively organized.

PRE-INITIAL TURN POINTINGS: PROJECTING SELF-SELECTION, CLAIMING SPEAKERSHIP

The first case examined here, although it exhibits two occurrences of the same phenomenon – turn-initial pointing – is relatively less frequent than another phenomenon, pre-initial turn pointing. In most of the cases observed in the corpus, pointing projects self-selection well before the completion of current speaker's turn and well before the beginning of next speaker's turn.

Here is an occurrence:

(3) (e3/agro1–16.48)

```
1    PAL    et donc on voit la logique,  avec cet cet aménagement  du: de
            and so one sees the logic,      with this this settlement      of: of
2            l'espace,  .hh qui revient à obtenir, (.) euh: des des de- des
            space,        .hh which would make      (.) ehm
```

3   **pâturages,   (.) RElativement plus productives, qu'elles ne**
       pasturelands, (.) RElatively more productive,   than what they
4   **l'étaient avant, grâce notamment à la: (.) <la**
       were before, thanks among other things to the (.) <the
5   **re*distribution des biens communs. ((decrescendo))>***
       redistribution of common goods.   ((decrescendo))>
   la   *. . . . .*
6 LAU ***et donc le: ce qui est en   (.) orange ici là, terre assolée**
       and so the: what is coloured in (.) orange there, farmland
       *ppp —— ->>
7 PAL **hum**
8 LAU **c'est, (.) des prairies,**
       that's, (.) grassland,

In this case, Laura begins to point well before her turn beginning: the
preparation of her gesture takes place before, but reaches its maximal extension
exactly in turn-initial position. If we consider the sequential position in which
the preparation begins, we notice that it is reflexively adjusted to Pierre-Alain's
ongoing turn production: his last utterance is syntactically quite complex, but
could be syntactically complete with the end of the comparison ('qu'elles ne
l'étaient avant', ll. 3–4). Pierre-Alain adds another constituent (beginning with
'grâce à', l. 4). This last add-on is characterized by some hitches ('à la: (.) la
redistribution', ll. 4–5) and by a decrescendo low voice until the end of the turn.
Laura initiates the preparation of her pointing gesture just after the beginning
of the decrescendo, projecting an imminent turn completion. Therefore, her
movement anticipates the upcoming transition-relevance place and projects
her as possible next speaker. Pointing begins properly at the same time as her
establishment as self-selected current speaker.

This occurrence shows some more general points:

- Pointing orients to transition-relevance points, even if it can occur much
  earlier (see later).
- Pointing appears as a *method* for projecting self-selection, being part of an
  emergent movement for establishing upcoming speakership.[2]
- Pointing makes visible for all participants a pre-beginning, taking the visual
  floor but not yet the vocal-spoken turn.
- This pre-beginning phase anticipates the possible completion of the current
  speaker's unit in progress: a) it exhibits the monitoring of the structure in
  progress by the possible next speaker, and more precisely his finely tuned
  online analysis for all practical purposes, b) it projects the next action, that
  is, the turn to be taken by the recipient/incipient speaker who is pointing.
- Thus, pointing has more to do with the temporality of the interactive
  construction of TCUs in progress than with referential practices per se – since
  pointing begins well before deictics occur and even in absence of deictics,
  that is, well before the relevance to deictically indicate something. Never-
  theless, if we observe where deictics are positioned in these utterances we
  can say that deictical reference in turn-initial position can be a resource

for enhancing the legitimacy and accountability of pointing as a method for establishing speakership.

Deployment of gesture at transition-place has been described by Streeck and Hartge (1992), who analyze two gestural techniques being used in this position as gestural turn-entry devices in Ilokano conversations: the [a]-face, preparing the articulation of [a], even when no sound is produced, making visible for all participants the speaker's gearing up to utter the vowel; and the 'palm up' gesture employed not only for claiming the floor but also for providing co-participants with a preview of the type of projected talk, prefiguring a list. These cases confirm that gestures have a potential of anticipation: not only iconic gestures precede their speech-affiliates; more generally, gestures are oriented to the organization of interaction and project relevant sequential positions, such as transition-points. In our corpus, pointing gestures do not just precede their deictical affiliates, but are more generally exploited for projecting self-selection (in another article, Streeck, 1995, speaks of 'action projectors'); they occur at transition places too, but more generally they tend to start even before. The aim of this article is precisely to explore the kind of 'projection space' (Schegloff, 1984) they open up.[3]

If we turn back to the first example, and reconsider it, as well as its transcript, we notice that although the preparation of the pointing gesture takes place at the beginning of the turn – that is, relatively late if compared to excerpt 2 – VIV accomplishes other actions before she self-selects. They are represented in a second version of the transcript:

(4) = (1) lines 2–7

```
2   PAL   et puis à d'autres moments:,
           and at other moments,
3         ben on va échouer, (.) en pâturage,  .h
           well one ends up, (.) in pasture, .h
4         +sur l'assemblage   +sans parcours.  .h +je pense que+
            on a rough ground   without any path.  .h i think that
    viv   +.................+moves pape —— - +
5         +dans le cas du gaec du pr+adou, .h c'est tout l'un,
            in the case of the ((region's name)),   .h it's either one,
    viv   +turns wrist, comes in——-----+
6         tout l'autre.
           or the other.
7   VIV   +.hh oui. parce que: i'm'sem+ble: eh i- ici c'était
            .hh yes. because it seems to me eh he- here it was
           +.......................  +ppp w pen–>>
```

Viviane's movements exhibit a very sharp and timely understanding of Pierre-Alain's ongoing turn. The latter is characterizing one form and use of pasture: his TCU could be syntactically complete line 3 but prosodically, continuing intonation projects more to come, that is a prepositional syntagm ('sur l'assemblage sans parcours.', l. 4). Toward the end of this added-on constituent,

Viviane begins to move, anticipating an upcoming transition-relevance place. But shortly after Viviane moved the paper on which they are working, what comes next is not her self-selection but a new TCU initiated by Pierre-Alain, continuing with an in-breath and a stance marker ('.h je pense que', l. 4). At that point, Viviane withdraws. The 'Gestalt' of the new TCU has an argumentative binary form, stressed by a contrastive prosody, projecting clearly its upcoming completion. At its beginning, Viviane's hand comes closer again to the center of the table, in a position that enables and facilitates the pointing gesture which follows. Thus, the initial-turn position of her pointing gesture has been prepared and projected by other actions before, showing her anticipatory ongoing understanding.

Recipients' predictions can have various scopes, and can exhibit a very early orientation to the next possible transition-relevance place:

(5) (agro 1 / 19.26–19.56 = 20.15 persp)

```
1   PAL   .h et donc elles rentrent en production à::m: c'est-à-dire elles
           .h and so they go into production at m: that is to say they
2         son- elles mettent bas,.h (.) à quatorze mois, c'est-à-
           are- they give      birth,.h (.) at fourteen months, that is to
3         *dire ou trei- oui qua*torze mois, c'est-à-dire deux mois après
            say or   thirt- yes fourteen    months, that is to say two months after
    lau   *. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .*ppp–>
4         les brebis, .h⊥ et donc, (.) pour arriver à cette performance
           the ewes,    .h and so, (.) in order to secure this performance
                            ⊥ppp– ->
5         c'est-à-dire être aptes à mi- *à être mises à la reproduction
           that is to say be able to re- to be put to reproduction
    lau                        — -> *suspends pointing – ->
6         .h à leur premier automne,.hh euh elles sont à un régime assez soigné,*
           .h for their first autumn,    .hh ehm they are given a careful diet
    lau                                                          — ->*
7         *et elles sont notamment    *hébergées là.
           and they are specifically housed there.
    lau   *. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .*ppp—>>
8   LAU   c'est ça qui⊥ est r'présenté ici?
           and that's what is represented here?
    pal           —> ⊥, , , ,
9   PAL   voilà.
           there it is.
```

Pierre-Alain is engaged in a long multi-unit turn about sheep reproduction. Laura begins to point at line 3, that is, in a position where Pierre-Alain is reformulating the age at which sheep can be reproduced. Pierre-Alain's syntactical construction projects the age from line 1 on (with the preposition 'à') but before telling this information he inserts a reformulation of the process (introduced by 'c'est-à-dire', l. 1); another reformulation, concerning the age, is inserted immediately after its mention (l. 2). In this way, although various insertions and expansions are provided by Pierre-Alain, the syntactical construction

of his turn is projected very early. Laura orients to this feature: she ends the preparation phase and begins to point properly during Pierre-Alain's refor-mulation of the sheep age (l. 3). But at the end of this TCU, that is, at a possible transition-relevance place, the current speaker initiates a new TCU ('.h et donc,', l. 4) and begins to point on the map. He projects a longer chunk to come, both by his pointing and his syntactical construction, which initiates a depend-ent clause ('pour arriver à cette production', l. 4) projecting a main clause, then delaying it by the insertion of a reformulation of the former ('c'est-à-dire être aptes', l. 5).

Laura exhibits her responsiveness to these delayed projections by sus-pending her pointing (l. 5); she also exhibits her anticipation of the completion at the end of the main clause by pointing again (l. 7) when Pierre-Alain adds a second paratactic clause. Thus, Laura's pointing gesture exhibits her syntactic online analysis of Pierre-Alain's turn, done for the practical purpose of looking for possible transition-relevance places. The suspension of her gesture shows her recognition not just of projection spaces but also of their spans: when the projected point is delayed, the gesture is relaxed and suspended; when the projected point comes nearer, the gesture is reactivated. This demonstrably shows that Laura is orienting to the relevance and legitimacy, in certain sequen-tial positions, of her claims of speakership, as well as to the fact that, at other moments, these claims cannot be accountably sustained and have to be with-drawn or abandoned. The very fact that she suspends her gesture but leaves her hands ready for service at short distance, shows her readiness to pursue again the same gesture, projecting a future moment where this will be relevant again.

In this context, gesture, incremental syntax and rights and obligations re-lated to speakership are deeply interwoven and made mutually visible, enacted through the unfolding of gestures in time.

PRE-INITIAL TURN POINTINGS, OVERLAPS AND CONCURRENT CLAIMS OF SPEAKERSHIP
Pre-initial pointings can be found in the very same sequential environments where next speakers/turn claimants produce serial starts of an incipient turn in overlap with current speaker/turn occupant (Jefferson, 2004):

(6) (e7/ag1–22'50)

```
1    PAL    devient une unité annexe, (.) qui: sert, (.) uniquement, (.) et en
            becomes an annex unit,       (.) which is used, (.) exclusively, (.) and
            >>ppp– ->
2           continu,     (.) à la génération de renouvellement.
            continuously, (.) for the new generation (of sheep).
3           *(0.5)
     lau    *....–>
4    PAL    [elles y restent [jusqu'à  [*toussaint au moment de la: lutte.
            [they (the sheep) stay [until [All Saints at the moment of the fight.
5    LAU    [#et           [#et       [⊥#*ç-
            [and           [and       [ th-
     pal                              – ->⊥,,,,,
                                      ————————— - >*ppp w pen–>>
     fig    #fig 9          #fig 10    #fig 11
```

6   **LAU**   **ça, # là. (.) y a une différence entre ça et ça?=**
               this, there. (.) is there a difference between this and this?=
               fig   #fig 12

FIGURE 9.   FIGURE 10.

FIGURE 11.   FIGURE 12.

At the end of line 2, Pierre-Alain has reached a completion point and has ended up his turn. The gap that follows (l. 3) is interpreted by Pierre-Alain as an opportunity to talk not taken by his co-participants: he continues to speak (l. 4), but at the same moment Laura begins her serial attempts to begin her turn. Laura sees the gap as an opportunity for self-selecting: this is exhibited by her hand approaching the map before to point (l. 3). This projection of an imminent self-selection is materialized verbally a few moment later, within the serial start ('et' 'et' 'ç-', l. 5) overlapping Pierre-Alain. At the third try, Laura points with her pen, strengthening her position as incipient speaker.

    Gestures – as fragments of incipient turns or as in-breaths – are multimodal resources which make pre-beginnings visible-and-audible. These resources are particularly interesting in a multi-party participation framework, where there is a pressure for current non-speakers who might self-select, to do it as soon as possible and at least at the first possible transition point (Sacks et al., 1974). Pre-beginnings are a technique for securing precise coordination of prior turn ending with next turn beginning, as well as for securing self-selection for would-be next speakers. Whereas verbal and other acoustic resources are vulnerable to overlaps in these early starts, pointing gestures are not and can be

produced simultaneously with the terminal segment of the ongoing turn. This allows at the same time the opportunity to achieve an early self-selection and to display an orientation to the minimization of gap and overlap, that is, to the preservation of the 'one party at a time' normative principle (see Schegloff, 1987 for a similar analysis of turn-beginning recycles).

Nevertheless, it can be noticed that some of these gestural pre-beginnings are dealt with as having an 'interruptive' potential or effect. So, even if gestures can be produced simultaneously with talk without overlapping it, pointing gestures as practices for claiming speakership and for imposing self-selection are oriented to as exhibiting concurrent practices of turn taking (cf. Jefferson who notes about overlapping laughter that 'recipient/prior speaker appear to be attending to the "premature" and turn-incursive character of their talk', 1984: 30). This may be consequential for the ongoing turn production by current speaker, as we will see later.

This situation is particularly clear in environments where concurrent pointings by several persons occur.

(7) (e9/ ag1–47.52)

```
1   VIV    +puisque: ici on on est sur du du paca:ge, ⊥donc
           since here we we are on (sort of) park, so
           +ppp—>
    pal                                              ⊥head forth->
2          c'est c'est des bonnes euh c'e- s:- c'est des surfaces
           there are there are good ehm th- s- there are good areas
3          à *bon à bon potentiel, # donc *euh=
           with a good a good potential, so ehm=
    lau      *........................ *ppp–>
    fig                      #fig 13
```


FIGURE 13.

```
4   PAL    = ⊥*et c'est# ⊥clos#
              and it's closed
              ->⊥ . . . . . . . . ⊥ppp– ->
    viv    —— -pppp———>
    lau    ->*, , , , , suspends her pointing – ->
    fig             #fig 14  #fig 15
```

FIGURE 14.

FIGURE 15.

```
  5           (0.4)
  6   VIV     et *c'est clos, et  [* (est-ce)  #   ⊥pa   [s  be +soin de:
              and it's closed, and (there is) no need to:
  7   LAU                         [*oui mais #(est- [ce que)+
                                  yes but ((interrogative))
      viv     ——————————————ppp——>+
      pal     ——————————ppp–>            ⊥,,,,,,,,
      lau     –>*. . . . . . . . . . . *ppp————————>>
                                  #fig 16
```


FIGURE 16.

```
  8   PAL                                 [(à part)
                                          [(aside from)
  9   LAU     iz y: i vont pas i vont pas dans l'champ après?=
              they they don't go they don't go in the field afterwards?=
              ————————ppp————————————————>>
 10   PAL     =non.
              =no.
```

In this excerpt, we notice that two recipients attempt to self-select while Viviane is still speaking.

   If we were to restrict our analysis to verbal conduct only, we would only see that Pierre-Alain's self-selection does not overlap with Viviane (l. 4), and is presented as a collaborative completion of Viviane's turn, ratified by her. But, if we consider co-participants' gestures, we get another picture: we can notice that Laura comes in with her hand as early as line 3 (Figure 13), pointing before 'euh' which concludes Viviane's turn (l. 3). This projects a possible self-selection

by Laura. However, after Viviane, it is Pierre-Alain who speaks first, beginning to point in turn-initial position (Figure 14). Pierre-Alain has bent his head over the table much earlier (l. 1), at the end of Viviane's first TCU and before she continues with her first 'donc'. Laura withdraws her pointing during Pierre-Alain's completion (Figure 15) – recognizing it as concurrent with, and a challenge to, her own claim of speakership – but prepares to point again as soon as Viviane repeats Pierre-Alain's collaborative item. Laura then fully points when she self-selects in overlap with Viviane (l. 7).

Thus, here, three participants are pointing at the same moment (Figure 16): Viviane points during her turn, as current speaker; Pierre-Alain points when he engages in his turn, whereas Laura begins to point earlier, projecting and making visible her claim of incipient speakership.

We can observe that pointing as a visible and public action projection can be initiated by various co-participants modifying their participation status as turns-at-talk unfold; they can manifest concurrent and mutually exclusive projections and claims of speakership. As such, they are monitored by others as persisting or withdrawing claims, as related to yet-relevant or no-more-relevant contributions to the ongoing conversation. In this sense, publicly displayed pointings as practices for projecting imminent speakership are not only seen but oriented to and exploited by others, who can consequently adjust and modify their conduct. Thus, pointings reflexively shape the ongoing incremental productions by other participants, who mutually respond and adjust to them.

In the following excerpts, we will see that mutual and visible availability and recognition of participants' online interpretation of turns at talk is consequential for the emergent organization of their embodied conduct.

(8) (e8/ag1–23.50)

```
 1   PAL    ⊥au cadastre il est carrément inscrit à leur nom.
             on the land-survey map ((=the field)) clearly belongs to them.
             ⊥ppp—>
 2          *(0.5)
     lau    *....- – ->
 3   LAU    [oui. oui oui, * (.) oui oui]
            [yes. yes yes     (.) yes yes  ]
 4   PAL    [donc euh la sé]*curité de:⊥ du foncier, .h est nou ⊥velle,  ⊥
            [so ehm the se]curity of of the property, .h is new,
                       — ->>looks at LAU⊥looks at maps– – – – –    ⊥at LAU⊥
     lau               – ->*ppp– ->
 5          ⊥.h et* et p- certainement explique  .h que on on défri:che, on
            .h      and and p- surely explains  .h that one one clears the land, one
            ⊥       looks at maps—— ->l.11
     lau    *, , , , suspends her pen at close distance– ->
 6          clôture, on aménage, et donc on .h  [on ⊥REnd fonctionnelle
            encloses, one settles, and so one     .h [one makes functional
                                               ppp– ->⊥gesticulates–>
 7   LAU                                        [hum
```

8 **PAL**   **cette sous-unité qui assure donc, * .h le renouvellement* du**
            this sub-unit which secures   then .h the regeneration of
    lau   —— ->   *. . . . .   *ppp– ->
9   **<du⊥ troupeau. ((low))> <.h alors c' ⊥est ((fast))> important,⊥**
            <of the flock. ((lower voice))> <.h so it's ((faster))> important,
                ->⊥   ⊥ppp at distance w pen — -⊥
10   **parce que *pour pour * donner un chiffre, .hh euh: on d- on**
            because in order in order to give an estimation, .hh ehm one h- one
    lau   –>   *, , , , , , , , , , *chews pen——— - ->l. 15
11   **doit (1.1) on garde une agnelle pour: ⊥cinq brebis euh au-**
            has (1.1) one keeps one lamb for five ewes ehm at
                                                  —>⊥looks at LAU– ->
12   **au minimum quoi.⊥**
            at least ((particle)).
            —>   ⊥
13   **⊥(0.5)**
    pal   ⊥looks at   VIV –>
14 **PAL**   ***.h donc⊥ [eu*h**
             .h so   [ehm
                 –>⊥
    lau   *. . . . .*
    com   ((VIV doesn't look at PAL))
15 **LAU**   **[euh* non mais c'est p- c'est**
                          [ehm no but that's r- that's
                          — ->   *ppp —>
16   **plutôt par rapport à: (0.5) tsk enfin à la légende.**
            rather with regard to (0.5) tsk well to the caption.

At the end of line 1, Pierre-Alain produces a first possible turn completion, followed by a silence (l. 2). During this gap, Laura comes in pointing with her pen and produces an agreement (l. 3) overlapping with Pierre-Alain who expands his turn (l. 4) (cf. excerpt 6, ll. 1–5). This TCU (l. 4) begins with 'donc' and can be interpreted as the conclusion of the previous one: this seems to be Laura's version, who holds her pointing. But Pierre-Alain does not just add some short conclusion: he projects a continuation ('et et', l. 5). Consequently, Laura, at the very beginning of this new TCU, suspends her gesture, although not returning to her home position but leaving her hand in place. Later, Laura points again in a peculiar sequential position within Pierre-Alain's turn: line 8, she anticipates the end of the relative clause as a possible turn completion. Line 9, Pierre-Alain deals with it as completed (namely by lowering his voice) but again adds a new TCU, initiated with an in-breath and louder voice. This initiation projects a longer argument ('alors c'est important, parce que ...', ll. 9–10), and is responded to by Laura suspending again her pointing and beginning to chew her pen – an action which not only visibly withdraws her gesture but also immobilizes her hand and occupies her mouth. Pierre-Alain completes his long argument after a long pause (l. 11), which is not dealt with by Laura as a transition-relevance point. On this completion, he successively looks at Laura and then at Viviane:

this technique for other-selection is vulnerable to the absence of gazes of the selected co-participants (Lerner, 2003). As a matter of fact, Viviane does not look at him and Laura comes back gesturally only on the terminal particle 'quoi', beginning to speak as Pierre-Alain, after a gap where nobody speaks, tries to continue.

Thus, in this excerpt we see various attempts by Laura, implemented in an embodied way, to initiate turns. These attempts make visible for the analyst, on the basis of Laura's online analysis, the identification of turn-relevance points within Pierre-Alain's turn and her projection of possible self-selections. Gesture make visible and recognizable Laura's projections for other participants as well – namely for Pierre-Alain. Their public character has a reflexive effect on turn formatting: for instance, Pierre-Alain organizes his turn in a way that minimizes transition-relevance points in order to continue to speak. This is namely the case of the transition-relevance point of line 9: Pierre-Alain accelerates his speech tempo at the very beginning of the TCU; moreover, at that moment, he does not glance at other participants but looks at the maps in front of him. This minimization is even clearer after several of Laura's serial pointings. By contrast, he looks at Laura at the beginning of the excerpt, and at the end of his long multi-unit turn (ll. 11–12), in pre-completion positions, opening up the opportunity for her to be a possible next speaker.

Thus, pointing gestures as practices for projecting incipient speakership reflexively configure the other's conduct, who progressively integrates within his turn-format the emergent relevancies publicly manifested by gestures. This reflexive adjustment is responsible for the flexible, incremental, collective achievement of turn's units (cf. Goodwin, 1979, 1981).

The public display of projections is particularly effective in cases of concurrent self-selections.

(9) (e2/ag2–16.18)

```
1   PAL   là là pour moi y- pour moi y avait de la surface (.) et donc
            there there for me th- for me there was some surface (.) and so
2         je disais tiens, (.) le quartier, c'est un quartier,
            i said look, (.) the block, it's a block,
3   BRU   ((coughts))
4   PAL   (.) qui%: * c'est un   %   ⊥k- qui* désigne un ensem%ble  %
            (.) which:   that's a        k- which defines a set
                                     ⊥circular hand gesture –>
    bru            %pulls document%                        %takes%
                    towards him                             his pen
    lau            *. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .*ppp– ->
5         %de surfaces ⊥ utilisé dans cer%ta[ins (.) domaines,
            of areas     used   in   some   (.) domains
                       ⟶  ⊥
    bru   %. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . %touches and reads his docs ->
6   LAU                                  [<ça y est (  ) ((lower))>
                                          <that's it (  ) ((lower))>
```

```
7   PAL   ⊥cho:se qu'⊥ j'accepte complètement, (.) la la la * la     *%=
            thing that     I totally accept,    (.) the the the the
            ⊥comes in palm up⊥
    lau                                                    —>*,,,      *
    bru                                                    — ->%
8   BRU   =%mais attends * attends (.) j- je je reprends * ce tr-
            but wait wait I- I I want to take up this th-
            %comes is w left H and opens it on his doc— ->
    lau                       *moves left H———————— -        *moves papers —>
9         ce truc-là. % (.) [donc, (.) là, tu dis bon. (.)
            this thing   there. (.) [so, (.) there you say well (.)
            — ->       %ppp w left H and w pen – ->>
```

Pierre-Alain is explaining the territorial organization of a farm (ll. 1–7). During this explanation, Bruno and Laura project their imminent self-selection. This is visible as far as Laura is concerned: she points from the moment where Pierre-Alain has initiated the definition of the 'quarter' (l. 4), by coming in with her pen, then by fully pointing. Laura withdraws her gesture when Pierre-Alain goes on with his argument (l. 7). Nevertheless, as Pierre-Alain is in the middle of his TCU (with some hitches on the definite determiner) Bruno comes in and takes the turn (l. 8).

Laura and Bruno use different methods and resources for self-selecting, implying different kind of public visibility. Line 4, at the beginning of Pierre-Alain's relative clause, Bruno pulls the central document in his direction; at the same moment, Laura moves in, preparing to point. Thus, at the same sequential position, they both accomplish a gesture on the table, displaying their common orientation to the same relevance within the ongoing action. Immediately after, Bruno does not point to the central map, but points with his pen on his own document. When he begins to speak, he intrudes and suspends Pierre-Alain's turn with a specific discourse marker, 'attends attends' (l. 8), making explicit the interruption of his action. At the same time, he attracts collective attention towards his own document.

Therefore, Bruno does not use the shared work space at the center of shared attention, as do other participants, but uses his own documents, placed in front of him, driving the collective attention onto his personal work space. In a concurrent environment for grasping the turn, Florence's pointing gesture display very visibly her projections, make them recognizable and available for others – here Bruno – who adjust their own conduct and practices, for example, for self-selecting before her. Bruno uses a verbal – rather than a gestural – turn-entry device, 'attends attends', which achieves and topicalizes his stopping Pierre-Alain's turn.

Participants can mobilize various practices and resources for solving the practical problem of self-selecting and for organizing their possibly earlier start in competitive turn-taking environments: different embodied methods favors different resources, which have specific timings and trajectories, and which are differently identifiable, recognizable, and publicly visible. This visibility makes transparent the understanding of action by participants, not only for the analyst, but first of all for their co-participants. This in turn, allows the prediction

and mutual adjustment of their actions, which are reflexively shaped by taking into account responsive actions produced online by others, either for aligning with or for preempting them.

As excerpts 1–9 show, these practices for self-selecting are also a privileged place to look at participant's emic, practical and situated definitions of the emerging status of 'speakership'. They show that speakership is a status that has to be established through adequate interactional work. Gesture at pre-initial turn positions and at transition-relevance places make visible, witnessable and documentable the emergent trajectory of the progressive change of category of a 'non-current speaker' becoming a 'would-be speaker', a '(possible) next speaker', and then an 'incipient speaker'. These categories are established moment-by-moment in the unfolding of action and are oriented to by participants, who affiliate or not with them.[4]

When does pointing end? Boundaries of speakership

Speakership as an emergent phenomenon is observable within gestures in pre-initial turn position; symmetrically, once current speaker is established, it can be interesting to study where it ends, and how a participant ceases to be a speaker. In the remaining analyses, we will focus on the end of pointing gestures in order to question the limits of speakership. Since gestures are characteristic of speakers, we can expect that towards the end of the turn current speakers stop to gesticulate or to point, and that indeed pointing stops before the turn ends, projecting its completion.

POINTING GESTURES PROJECTING OR ENDING AT TURN COMPLETION

In a certain number of cases, we can observe that pointing stops just before the turn is completed:

(10) (e1/ag2–3.43)

```
1    VIV     +%  l:-la bergerie est aussi à côté de de l'exploitation,
                     th- the sheepfold is also near the the farm,
                 +ppp– -> l.7
     bru       %H on his mouth– -> l.7
2            donc c'est facile que les: que les brebis,  .h qui so: :nt mm: :
             so it's easy for the for the ewes,  .h which are mm
3            qu'on doit beaucoup surveiller, parce que: e-  .h euh : : elles
             which have to be watched over a lot, because th-.h ehm they
4            ont leur: leurs agneaux, euh s- peuvent aller, sur (0.5) un
             have their their lambs, ehm on- to be able to go, onto (0.5) a
5            champ qui est proche,
             field which is close,
6    BRU     mh
7    VIV     et qui %en plus % est, + à for- à: : (0.4)  +a beaucoup+
             and which moreover is, of high- of (0.4) has a  lot
                               —>    +comes back w pen– +ppp——+
     bru     —>%pulls H down%puts H on paper–>
```

```
8              +d'her+be pour faire manger les:
               of grass to feed the
               +, , , , ,+
9      BRU     d'accord.% (0.2)    % y a beaucoup plus d'informations
               okay.      (0.2)        there is a lot more information ((on this map))
                — ->      % . . . . . . . %ppp– ->>
```

As the excerpt begins, Viviane is producing an explanation and points to Bruno's paper. Bruno displays he is listening to her, looking at her, his hand on his mouth. After Bruno's continuer, line 6, Viviane continues to speak but progressively withdraws her pen, pointing again only in a limited way, when she has repaired a problem of expression (l. 7). So, she stops to point in a continuous way from line 7 on, in a position where 'qui en plus est' (l. 7) initiates a last expansion closing her turn. Interestingly, this projection of turn's closure is not unilateral but comes just after Bruno has pulled his hand – which was held on his mouth until then – down on the table, thus making free his mouth for speaking and his hand for pointing. Actually Bruno puts his hand on his document and then points at the beginning of his turn.

The end of Viviane's turn is thus an interactive achievement, produced through the alignment of her projecting the coming completion of her turn and her co-participant projecting his upcoming category of 'possible next speaker'.

POINTING GESTURES PERSISTING AFTER TURN COMPLETION

Nevertheless, not all pointing gestures end with the turn they are affiliated with, in a pre-completion position. Some gestures are held after turn completion: this post-completion persistence seems to contradict the idea that gestures are a speaker's characteristic and thus delimit the rights and obligations of speakership.

Detailed analysis shows that this is not the case, but that speakership is probably a phenomenon that is not strictly limited within turn (verbal) boundaries, but that is interactively shaped by complementary participants' relevancies and orientations.

Here is a first occurrence of persisting pointing:

(11) (e9/ag1–47.00) (= at the end of excerpt 1)

```
1      VIV     +.h oui. parce que: i'm'sem +ble: eh i- ici c'était s: :- ce
               .h yes. because it seems to me eh he- here it was wh- what
               +. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . +ppp–> l.6
2              qui: ce que ça voulait représenter, [*c'était
               this wanted to represent,            [ it was
3      LAU                                          [*c'est les am*andes ça?
                                                    [ are these almonds?
       lau                                          *. . . . . . . . . *ppp––>
4      VIV     (.) oh ça c'était (.) des amandes,*  [c'était aussi l'idée que: une
               (.) oh these were (.) almonds,        [it was also the idea that: during
       lau                            ———>*
```

```
5   LAU                                    [°ouais°
                                           [°yeah°
6   VIV    journée, +  (.) les: i-  i restaient dans une en-  une une
            one day,        (.) the: th-  they stood within a wi-  one one
                    ->  +iconic gestures— ->>
7          seu- une seule entité.  ça suffisait pour la nourriture
            onl- one only unit.  this was enough for their food
```

In this excerpt, Viviane is trying to explain what she sees on the map (ll. 1–2). Laura asks a confirmation question in overlap (l. 3), Viviane answers (l. 4) and then continues her previous explanation.

If we look at the pointing gestures in this excerpt, we can first notice that Laura begins to point at the beginning of her question (l. 3) and keeps pointing until the end of the answer (l. 4), stopping just before her acknowledgment ('ouais', l. 5). As far as Viviane is concerned, we can notice that she keeps pointing when the question is asked, when she gives a response and then continues her explanation. The continuity between fragments of her explanation ('ce que ça voulait représenter, c'était', l. 2), suspended by the question/answer adjacency pair, is secured through the recycling of 'c'était' after the second pair part (l. 4). Similarly, the fact that she maintains her gesture during the adjacency pair produces an online practical categorization of this sequence as being a 'punctual insertion' or a 'momentary suspension'.

By holding their pointing gestures, both participants are producing the intelligibility and accountability not only of the current turn organization but more generally of the current sequence organization. They are displaying their orientation to the way in which sequence is structured, to the sequential implicativeness of their turn and to the span of the ongoing sequential actions. Pointings show that Laura is orienting to the adjacency pair as the sequential unit relevant for her action; whereas Viviane is orienting to the continuity of her explanatory action beyond the insertion of the pair.

The sequential scope considered by participants can be variable, as shown by the following excerpt:

(12) (e5/ag1–21.04)

```
1   PAL    ça veut dire qu'on se déplace, (.) pour rentrer et
            this means that one has to travel, (.) in order to go back and
2          sortir les agnelles,  (.)  tou  [s les jours, (.) mais
            to take out the lambs,  (.)  ever[y day, (.) but
3   LAU                                    [mhm
4   PAL    ell [es sont effectiv-
            they are effectiv-                          pointing begins
5   LAU    [et:   *              et *elles restent pas sous* l'abri,*    FPP 1 (Q)
            [and                 and they don't stay under the shelter,
                    *left H comes in-*ppp w finger ——      *, , , , , , *
6   PAL    *(0.5)  non non voilà elles sont abritées la              SPP 1 (A)
                   no no well they are protected during the
    lau    *ppp w finger at distance—>
```

7		**nuit, (.) [et elles sont dans le <u>parc</u> le jour. (.) et ça**	
		night, (.) [and they are in the paddock during the day. (.) and this	
8	**LAU**	**[oui**	
		[yes	
9	**PAL**	**veut di- elles sont pas en plein air intégral**	
		mean- they are not outdoor all the time	
10	**LAU**	**il est où l'parc?**	*FPP 2 (Q)*
		where is the paddock?	
11	**PAL**	**il est le* (.) le parc il est autour**	*SPP 2 (A)*
		it is the (.) the paddock is all around	
	lau	—— ->*	*pointing stops*
12	**LAU**	**°ah oui°**	
		°oh yes°	

Pierre-Alain is describing the temporal organization of the sheep farmer's work; Laura asks a first question (l. 5), with a first start in overlap and then a second start in the clear (l. 5), beginning to point just after the former. She is writing notes with her right hand, and this constrains her movements (she comes back with the hand holding her piece of paper, line 5, and continues to point at distance, holding the paper from lines 6 to 11). Thus, her pointing gesture ends not just after the first adjacency pair is closed, but at the end of the second one, initiated by her with a second question. Both questions pick up a referential element in Pierre-Alain's previous turn and operate a 'tying' with his turn by means of a pronominal anaphora ('elles', l. 5, 'il', l. 10 within a right dislocation, possibly orienting to the fact that another pronominal reference has been used by Pierre-Alain after his mention of 'le parc', l. 7).

By holding her pointing gesture, the speaker designs the span of her action, covering two adjacency pairs initiated by her.

These data suggest that participants, and more particularly speakers, organize the public accountability and visibility of the scope of their turns, covering not only the length of their turns at talk, but the sequence they initiate – typically, an adjacency pair – or more subsequent sequences. In this way, speakers' gestures suggest that rights and obligations characterizing speakership do not stop at turn boundaries but continue within the normative expectancies related to the sequence initiated by that turn. In this sense, the speaker remains 'responsible' for the sequence she has initiated and she continues to control, namely by displaying if it has been completed or answered in an adequate way.

POINTING GESTURES PERSISTING OVER EXTENDED SEQUENCES
This practical delimitation of the scope of the speaker's rights and obligations across the sequence can extend beyond adjacency pairs. This shows that participants do orient to the complex sequential organization of talk-and-embodied-conduct-in-interaction, taking into detailed consideration both the finest and the most complex aspects of this organization.[5]

(13) (e8/ag1–24.17) (end of excerpt 8)

```
 1            ⊥(0.5)
     PAL     ⊥looks at VIV–>
     com     ((VIV is not looking at her co-participants))
 2   PAL     *.h donc  ⊥ [eu*h
             .h so ehm
                      –> ⊥
     lau     *. . . . . . . . . .*
 3   LAU            [euh* non mais c'est p- c'est plutôt par rapport
                    [ehm no but that's r- that's rather in relation
                       *ppp—— –>
 4           à:  (0.5)  tsk enfin à la légende.  (0.2)  mais c'est p't-êt
             with  (0.5)  tsk well with the caption.  (0.2)  but it's maybe
 5           Vivian*ne qui:    (1.  +2)  *+euh[: :
             Viviane    who:              ehm[: :
                 –>*pushes paper tow. VIV*ppp– –>l.20
     VIV                                +shrinks H back+
 6   PAL                     [°n⊥on° mais là des ⊥terres
                             [no but there some farmland
                                  ⊥. . . . . . . . . .⊥ppp ->l.17
 7           assolées,
             with crop rotation,
 8           (0.5)
 9   LAU     ouais
             yeah
10   PAL     donc euh on y fait une récolte ou on le réserve la pâture
             so ehm either one does a harvest or one allots the pasture
11           en particulier au mois d'juille:t,  [les repousses on va
             particularly in the month of july, the new growth will be
12   LAU                                         [ouais
                                                 [yeah
13   PAL     éventuellement les donner aux [agnelles,  [(.) .h et et le reste
             eventually        given       to the lambs      .h and the remaining
14   LAU                                   [et         [et  là,
                                           [and        [and there,
15   PAL     ça c'est du du parcours aménagé.  qui a été eu [:
             this is a an established  path.  which has been ehm[:
16   VIV                                                     [amélioré\
                                                             [improved
     com     ((VIV does any gesture nor movement))
17   PAL     amé⊥lio[ré⊥
             improv[ed
             –>⊥, , , , , , ⊥
18   LAU            [donc labouré et: resemé? [°ou non°
                    [so cropped and: sowed again? °or not°
19   PAL                                      [dans l'temps oui. (.) oui oui
                                              [in the old times yes. (.) yes yes
20   LAU     ah oui* d'a[ccord*
             oh yes   oka[y
              – ->*, , , , , , , , ,*
```

At line 3, Laura asks a question about the caption of the map, overlapping Pierre-Alain who is expanding a previous long multi-unit turn (see excerpt 8).

Laura mentions Viviane as being the relevant speaker for that topic, but she uses the third person, referring to her more than addressing her. Laura does not glance at Viviane, although she pushes a relevant document towards her, while creating a long gap (l. 5), giving her an opportunity to respond. On her side, Viviane is not glancing at her co-participants, and the only movement she does is slightly to pull back her hand during the long gap, displaying her unavailability for talk. In this case, we notice that pointing, pushing a document towards somebody, retracting a hand even minimally are movements that can radically reshape participation frameworks and mutual engagement displays.

In this context, Pierre-Alain answers to the question formulated by Laura (ll. 6–7). During the production of this second pair part, Pierre-Alain points, displaying his speakership. But Laura holds her pointing too. This continues to be the case through the excerpt, even at line 14, when Laura reorients Pierre-Alain's explanation with a complementary question.

Interestingly, when Pierre-Alain produces a word search, line 15 ('qui a été euh:'), Viviane promptly proposes a candidate ('amélioré', l. 16) which is repeated by the him (l. 18). During this short collaborative completion of Pierre-Alain's turn, Viviane makes no movement or gesture: she displays that she is speaking *for* her co-participant – *animating* him – but she is not assuming properly a speakership position – of *author*.

When ratifying the item closing the word search, Pierre-Alain withdraws his pointing (l. 17), projecting his turn completion. He holds this position, even if Laura asks a last confirmatory question (l. 18), which gets a short answer (l. 19).

Laura withdraws only after she closes the whole stretch of interaction ('ah oui d'accord', l. 20). Closure with an agreement and a change-of-state-token ('ah' in French, corresponding to the 'oh' studied by Heritage, 1984) – displaying the completion of the sequence from both an interactional and an informational perspective – together with the withdrawal of a gesture held for a long period, exhibits the boundaries of an extended segment of talk as practically and incrementally defined by the pointing participant who initiated the sequence and projected a space for its completion.

Conclusions

The cases we studied in this article outline a systematic use of pointing as a method for projecting self-selection, designing a transition space, and more generally defining speakership within a range of sequential positions.

Pointing as a practice for turn taking can be initiated either before the actual completion of current speaker's turn (thereby projecting its end), or at the beginning of the incipient speaker's turn. In both cases, pointing displays a participation shift, the pointer initiating, often before even saying a word, her transition from the category of 'non-current speaker' to the category of 'incipient speaker', through the category of 'possible next speaker': in this sense, pointing

gestures manifest the temporal, situated, embodied emergent process of the establishment of speakership. Moreover, this process shows publicly and visibly the way in which a 'recipient' scrutinizes, for all practical purposes, an ongoing turn and produces an online parsing of this turn in TCUs. In this way, not only a local understanding of the ongoing TCUs is exhibited, but also its embodied use oriented to the turn-taking machinery. In turn, this public manifestation of an online analysis is visible for other participants, who reflexively adjust their own turn design and conduct to what is made recognizable by the pointer – for example, in concurrent turn at talk.

Pointing can end either in a pre-completion position or at the end of the turn. But it can also end much later in the sequence: at the end of one or more adjacency pairs initiated by the pointing speaker, as well as at the end of an extended sequence controlled by her. The latter case shows an extension of the local display of speakership: speakers hold their posture across turns, manifesting an extension of their rights and obligations beyond the turn and beyond their talk. In this way, pointing across sequences shows the situated online sequential interpretation and production by participants, displaying the span of their actions and of their sequential implicativeness.

Thus, pointing as it has been analyzed in this particular corpus highlights very general features of turn-taking and sequential organization. At the same time, it is interesting to notice that this methodical and systematic practice exploits the context sensitive specificities of the ecology of action. Pointing as a practice for projecting turns and organizing sequences is not available in every setting: in the case studied, pointing gesture is a resource made available by the peculiar spatial and material environment of the interaction, constituted by a table covered with documents, maps and other visualizations, massively used within an activity focused on reading, writing and correcting cartographic representations. In this particular setting, interaction is not primary organized as a face-to-face exchange of talks and glances but rather as a side-by-side common focalization of attention on objects. In this sense, pointing gestures have a prominence and a salience that is locally achieved through the very activity participants are involved in.

Moreover, pointing gestures as resources for interactional practices are made available by the high focus on referential and deictic activities going on in this praxeological setting. The referential dimension of pointing works here as a resource at the service of the interactional organization: deicticals at turn-beginnings are a resource which can enhance the accountability and legitimacy of pointing gestures for taking the turn. In this sense, both represent not exclusive but rather complementary uses of the same resource.

The efficiency of singular pointing gestures is reflexively shaped by their embededdness in this peculiar activity: pointing with a pen or pointing with a finger not only have different accuracies, but offer different opportunities for their integration within activities. For example, pointing with a pen excludes other uses of the pen, such as taking notes; pointing with the left hand allows one to write with the right hand. Chewing the pen versus placing the hand

holding the pen close to the centre of the table constitute two *home positions* which enable different preparation phases and rely on different kinds of reactivity and temporality for pointing. In this sense, pointing involves an arrangement of the material environment as well as a disposition of bodies, all eventually preparing and projecting an upcoming-speaker position.

Therefore pointing is here the indexical resource at hand, made available by a specific ecology of action. In similar ecologies, the same resource can be mobilized. In other settings, pointing may be used in the same way, but it is also possible that other multimodal resources, best suited to the specificities of the local context and material environment, may be used instead, although never-theless respecting the same sequential and interactional constraints.

In summary, then, this article aims to be a contribution to the description of both systematic and indexical features of multimodal turn and sequence organization.

NOTES

1. This article has been presented and discussed at The Nijmegen Gesture Centre Lecture Series on 8 April 2005, and at the 9e Colloque de Pragmatique de Genève, 26–8 May 2004 and has benefited from comments of the participants. I am most grateful to Charles Antaki for revising my English text.
2. Thus, this gesture done by a current non-speaker seems only apparently contradict-ing the idea that 'hand gesturing is largely, if not entirely, a speaker's phenomenon' (Schegloff, 1984: 271): Schegloff notes that an exception, which is itself in keeping with this general principle, is provided by the fact that 'current non-speakers who initiate a hand gesture may show themselves thereby to be intending, and incipient, speakers, and the gestures may thus be used as a way of making a move for a turn at talk next' (1984: 271). It is precisely this exception that is explored in this article.
3. 'The notion of a "projection space" is concerned with both the span in which some element of talk is "in play" before being produced, and with the evidence of that which a speaker's turn may make available to its recipient. For example, it appears central to the organization of tightly coordinated turn-transfer from one speaker to a next that aspects of some current turn are projected, and are available to analysis by a recipient/potential-next-speaker before their actual occurrence' (Schegloff, 1984: 267).
4. The continuous transformation and negotiation of the participant's categories have been pointed out by Goodwin and Goodwin (2004) revisiting and criticizing the Goffmanian notion of 'participation'. Narratives in interaction have been studied from the perspective of the progressive establishment of 'teller' as well as 'co-tellers' (Goodwin, 1984, 1987; Hayashi et al., 2002). But more generally this movement is observable within every next turn. It is interesting to look at the categories used for dealing with 'not yet speakers' within the current literature: in her analysis of systematic positionings of overlaps, Jefferson (1984) speaks of 'recipient/next speaker', as well as, in concurrent overlaps, of Turn Occupant versus Turn Claimant, showing that these two categories are not always easy to differentiate (2004: 49). When analyzing pre-beginnings, Schegloff (1996: 97) uses the category 'current-recipient-of some talk/potential-next-speaker' showing through this complex label the transitional dynamic character of the category.

5. This is consistent with the analyses provided by Fox (1987) on long distance anaphoras, manifesting the way in which speakers deal for all practical purposes with long stretches of talk as being homogeneous and continuous from a praxeological and a topical point of view.

TRANSCRIPT CONVENTIONS

Data have been transcribed according to conventions developed by Gail Jefferson.
A indicative translation is provided line per line.
   Multimodal details have been transcribed according to the following conventions:

* *	delimitate Laura's gestures and actions descriptions.
+ +	delimitate Viviane's gestures and actions descriptions.
⊥⊥	delimitate Pierre-Alain's gestures and actions descriptions.
*-->	gesture or action described continue across subsequent lines.
*-->>	gesture or action described continue until and after excerpt's end.
—>*	gesture or action described continue until the same symbol is reached.
>>–	gesture or action described begins before the excerpt's beginning.
. . . .	gesture's preparation.
– –	gesture's apex is reached and maintained.
, , , , ,	gesture's retraction.
lau	participant doing gesture is identified when (s)he is not the speaker.
fig	the exact point where screen shot (figures) has been taken is indicated,
#	with a specific sign showing its position within turn at talk.
com	commentary
ppp	pointing gesture
w	with (pen/finger)
H	hand

REFERENCES

Auer, P. (1996) 'On the Prosody and Syntax of Turn-taking', in E. Couper-Kuhlen and M. Selting (eds) *Prosody and Conversation*, pp. 57–100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Auer, P. (2005) 'Projection in Interaction and Projection in Grammar', *Text* 25(1): 7–36.

Couper-Kuhlen, B. (1996) 'Intonation and Clause Combining in Discourse: The Case of Because', *Pragmatics* 6(3): 389–426.

Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2001) 'Interactional Prosody: High Onsets in Reason-for-the-Call Turns', *Language in Society* 30: 29–53.

Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2004) 'Prosody and Sequence Organization: The Case of New Beginnings', in E. Couper-Kuhlen and C.E. Ford (eds) *Sound Patterns in Interaction*, pp. 335–76. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (eds) (1992) *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ford, C.E. (2005) 'Contingency and Units in Interaction', *Discourse Studies* 6(1): 27–52.

Ford, C.E. and Thompson, S.A. (1996) 'Interactional Units in Conversation: Syntactic, Intonational, and Pragmatic Resources for the Projection of Turn Completion', in E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff and S.A. Thompson (eds) *Interaction and Grammar*, pp. 135–84. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ford, C.E., Fox, B.A. and Thompson, S.A. (1996) 'Practices in the Construction of Turns: The "TCU" Revisited', *Pragmatics* 6(3): 427–54.

Ford, C.E., Fox, B.A. and Thompson, S.A. (eds) (2002) *The Language of Turn and Sequence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fox, B.A. (1987) *Anaphora and the Structure of Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

French, P. and Local, J. (1983) 'Turn Competitive Incomings', *Journal of Pragmatics* 7: 701–15.

Garfinkel, H. and Wieder, D.L. (1992) 'Two Incommensurable, Asymmetrically Alternate Technologies of Social Analysis', in G. Watson and R.M. Seiler (eds) *Text in Context: Studies in Ethnomethodology*, pp. 175–206. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Goodwin, C. (1979) 'The Interactive Construction of a Sentence in Natural Conversation', in G. Psathas (ed.) *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*, pp. 97–121. New York: Irvington.

Goodwin, C. (1981) *Conversational Organization: Interaction between Speakers and Hearers*. New York: Academic Press.

Goodwin, C. (1984) 'Notes on Story Structure and the Organization of Participation', in M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of Social Action*, pp. 225–46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, C. (1987) 'Forgetfulness as an Interactive Resource', *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50(2): 115–31.

Goodwin, C. (2000) 'Action and Embodiment within Situated Human Interaction', *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 1489–522.

Goodwin, C. (2003) 'Pointing as Situated Practice', in S. Kita (ed.) *Pointing: Where Language, Culture and Cognition Meet*, pp. 217–41. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Goodwin, C. and Goodwin, M.H. (1987) 'Concurrent Operations on Talk: Notes on the Interactive Organization of Assessments', *Pragmatics* 1(1): 1–55.

Goodwin, C. and Goodwin, M.H. (1992) 'Context, Activity and Participation', in P. Auer and A. di Luzio (eds) *The Contextualization of Language*, pp. 77–99. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goodwin, C. and Goodwin, M.H. (2004) 'Participation', in A. Duranti (ed.) *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hakulinen, A. and Selting, M. (eds) (2005) *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Hanks, W.F. (1992) 'The Indexical Ground of Deictic Reference', in A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds) *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haviland, J. (1996) 'Projections, Transpositions, and Relativity', in J.J. Gumperz and S.C. Levinson (eds) *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hayashi, M. (2005) 'Referential Problems and Turn Construction: An Exploration of an Intersection between Grammar and Interaction', *Text* 25(4): 437–68.

Hayashi, M., Mori, J. and Takagi, T. (2002) 'Contingent Achievement of Co-tellership in a Japanese Conversation: An Analysis of Talk, Gaze and Gesture', in C. Ford, B. Fox and S. Thompson (eds) *The Languge of Turn and Sequence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heath, C. and Luff P. (1992) 'Media Space and Communicative Asymmetries: Preliminary Observations of Video Mediated Interaction', *Human Computer Interaction* 7: 315–46.

Heath, C., Svensson, M., Hindmarsh, J., Luff, P. and Vom Lehn, D. (2002) 'Configuring Awareness', *Computer Supported Cooperative Work* 11: 317–47.

Heritage, J. (1984) 'A Change of State Token and Aspects of Its Sequential Placement', in J.M. Atkinson and J.C. Heritage (eds) *Structures of Social Action*, pp. 299–345. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hindmarsh, J. and Heath, C. (2000) 'Embodied Reference: A Study of Deixis in Workplace Interaction', *Journal of Pragmatics* 32(12): 1855–78.

Jefferson, G. (1984) 'Notes on some Orderlinesses of Overlap Onset', in V. d'Urso and P. Leonardi (eds) *Discourse Analysis and Natural Rhetoric*, pp. 11–38. Padua: Cleup.

Jefferson, G. (2004) 'A Sketch of Some Orderly Aspects of Overlap in Natural Conversation (1975)', in G.H. Lerner (ed.) *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*, pp. 43–59. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Kendon, A. (2004) 'On Pointing', in *Gesture. Visible Action as Utterance*, pp. 199–224. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kita, S. (ed.) (2003) *Pointing: Where Language, Culture, and Cognition Meet*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lerner, G.H. (1991) 'On the Syntax of Sentences in Progress', *Language in Society* 20: 441–58.

Lerner, G.H. (1996) 'On the "Semi-permeable" Character of Grammatical Units in Conversation: Conditional Entry into the Turn Space of Another Speaker', in E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff and S.A. Thompson (eds) *Interaction and Grammar*, pp. 238–71. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lerner, G.H. (2002) 'Turn-sharing: The Choral Co-production of Talk-in-interaction', in C. Ford, B. Fox and S.A. Thompson (eds) *The Language of Turn and Sequence*, pp. 225–56. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lerner, G.H. (2003) 'Selecting Next Speaker: The Context-sensitive Operation of a Context-free Organization', *Language in Society* 32(2): 177–201.

Local, J. and Kelly, J. (1986) 'Projection and "Silences": Notes on Phonetic and Conversational Structure', *Human Studies*, 9:185–204.

Local, J., Kelly, J. and Wells, B. (1986) 'Towards a Phonology of Conversation: Turn-taking in Tyneside English', *Journal of Linguistics* 22: 411–37.

Mondada, L. (2005a) 'Visions controversées de la carte: construire le visible par les gestes et la parole en interaction', in C. D'Alessandro, F. Charvolin, V. November and E. Rémy (eds) *Espaces, savoirs et incertitudes*, pp. 15–31. Paris: Belin.

Mondada, L. (2005b) 'L'analyse de corpus en linguistique interactionnelle: de l'étude de cas singuliers à l'étude de collections', in A. Condamine (ed.) *Sémantique et corpus*, pp. 76–108. Paris: Hermès.

Mondada, L. (2005c) 'La constitution de l'origo déictique comme travail interactionnel des participants: une approche praxéologique de la spatialité', *Intellectica. No spécial sur Espace, Inter-action & Cognition* 2(3): 41–2; 75–100.

Mondada, L. (2006a) 'Video Recording as the Preservation of Fundamental Features for Analysis', in H. Knoblauch, J. Raab, H.-G. Soeffner and B. Schnettler (eds) *Video Analysis*. Bern: Lang.

Mondada, L. (2006b) 'La pertinenza del dettaglio: registrazione e trascrizione di dati video per la linguistica interazionale', in Y. Bürki and E. de Stefani (eds) *Trascrivere la lingua. Dalla filologia all'analisi conversazionale*, pp. 313–44. Bern: Lang.

Ochs, E., Schegloff, E.A. and Thompson, S.A. (eds) (1996) *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rossano, F. (2005) 'When It's Over is it Really Over? On the Effects of Sustained Gaze vs. Gaze Withdrawal at Sequence Possible Completion', Paper presented at the International Pragmatic Association, Riva del Garda, July.

Sacks, H. (1992) *Lectures on Conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2 vols.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. and Jefferson, G. (1974) 'A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation', *Language* 50(4): 696–735.

Schegloff, E.A. (1984) 'On Some Gestures' Relation to Talk', in J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of Social Action*, pp. 266–98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E.A. (1987) 'Recycled Turn Beginnings', in G. Button and J.R.E. Lee (eds) *Talk and Social Organization*, pp. 70–85. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Schegloff, E.A. (1996) 'Turn Organization: One Intersection of Grammar and Interaction', in E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff and S.A. Thompson (eds) *Interaction and Grammar*, pp. 52–133. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmitt, R. (2005) 'Zur multimodalen Struktur von turn-taking', *Gesprächsforschung – Onlinezeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion* 6: 17–61 (www.gespraechsforschung-ozs.de).

Selting M. (2000) 'The Construction of Units in Conversational Talk', *Language in Society* 29: 477–517.

Selting, M. and Couper-Kuhlen, E. (eds) (2001) *Studies in Interactional Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Streeck, J. (1995) 'On Projection', in E.N. Goody (ed.) *Social Intelligence and Interaction*, pp. 87–110. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Streeck, J. and Hartge, U. (1992) 'Gestures at the Transition Place', in P. Auer and A. di Luzio (eds) *The Contextualization of Language*, pp. 135–57. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tanaka, H. (2001) 'Adverbials for Turn Projection in Japanese: Toward a Demystification of the "Telepathic" Mode of Communication', *Language in Society* 30: 559–87.

LORENZA MONDADA is Professor of Linguistics at the Department for Language Studies, University of Lyon 2, and Director of the ICAR Laboratory of Research (CNRS). Her research deals with the grammatical and multimodal practices and resources mobilized by participants for the organization of talk and conduct in interaction. Current research is carried out on video recordings from various institutional and professional settings (in medical contexts as well as in other workplaces) and on ordinary conversations, focusing on the ways in which participants sequentially and multimodally organize their (often multiple) courses of action. ADDRESS: Laboratoire ICAR, ENS LSH, 15 parvis René Descartes, BP 7000, F-69342 Lyon Cedex, France. [email: Lorenza.Mondada@univ-lyon2.fr]