2018

Cross-Cultural Analysis of Turn-Taking Practices in English and Spanish Conversations

Claudia B. Martínez
University of Alabama

Cross-Cultural Analysis of Turn-Taking Practices in English and Spanish Conversations

Introduction

  This study analyzes methods of turn-taking in verbal communication, a linguistic phenomenon that has been reported by anthropological literature to differ across languages (Stivers et al. 10587). It compares four conversations among native speakers of American English and native speakers of Spanish from Honduras, Mexico, Panama, and Venezuela. The study focuses on their culturally specific turn-taking strategies. In particular, the conversations are screened for distinct instances of overlapping—that is, when two or more people are talking at the same time (Cecil 16) — each of which is categorized as either cooperative and supportive or intrusive and disruptive. Special attention is given to the apparent motivations behind certain acts of overlapping, such as the speaker's effort to facilitate the conversation or to *take the floor*. This study is of particular value to conversation analysts because it proposes reconstruction of the traditional lens through which speaking habits are viewed, thereby potentially reforming the definitions currently in place and calling for similar studies with regard to other languages.

Background

  In the late 1970s, the pioneering work of Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson became the model for studying turn-taking in talk-in interactions (O'Connell et al. 347). With their "Simplest Systematics" organizational system of turn-taking they proposed a speech exchange that is universal to all conversations irrespective of their social or cultural context (Sacks et al. 700). They also claim that any intrusion in the rights of the current speaker is considered a

violation of the orderliness of the turn-exchange principles, which deems *overlaps* as counterproductive and untoward (Li 260). To oppose the Sacks et al. traditional model of turn-taking, ten Bosh et al. contend that it is quite common for turns to overlap to some extent without conveying the impression that speakers are trying to interrupt each other (80). In support of their claim, Murata categorizes overlaps into two groups: cooperative or supportive and intrusive or disruptive (385). On the one hand, Lazarro-Zalazar defines cooperative and supportive overlaps as the speakers' responses "intended to contribute to talk, e.g., minimal responses, agreeing, and supporting claims" (4). Likewise, Zimmerman and West suggest that these "reactive tokens," as described by Clancy et al. (356), function as continuers that indicate the interlocutor's co-participation or engagement in the ongoing conversation.

On the other hand, Goldberg, who has identified instances of intrusive or disruptive overlaps, asserts that these are power related, and may be used by the interlocutors to threaten the current speaker's right to talk (qtd. in Li 261 & Li, Yum, Yates, Aguilera, & Mao 235). Furthermore, Murata upholds that interruptive overlaps are more aggressive in nature and may be used by the speakers to take the floor (288). The fact is, as Ng, Brook, and Dunne (1995) sustain, that despite the disruptive intention that motivates such overlaps, very often the tenor of the conversation continues uninterrupted (378). Similarly, Bennett states that whether these utterances are produced intentionally or unintentionally, their role may vary depending on the context in which the conversation is embedded (as cited in Pomerance, 69).

In light of these findings, Fant proposes that what accounts for differences in the turn-taking practices of speakers from different backgrounds is the result of the culturally and socially determined communicative styles (247). However, research shows that not all overlaps are considered an irregularity in the turn-taking system, as Sacks et al. claim (Murata 386-387). On

the contrary, these so-called violations are a major feature of a conversation with very specific roles that conform to the communicative norms and values dictated in a culture (Li 280).

What is a Turn-Taking?

Taboada defines turns as "continuous talk by one speaker, uninterrupted by the other speaker" (336). At the same time, Cecil states that a turn is a unit of speech that regulates the change over from speaker to speaker in a conversation, a communicative act that is known as turn-taking (10). The turn-taking phenomenon is one of the most-studied features of spoken discourse (Wilson, Wiemann & Zimmerman 159). In the late 1970s, the sociologists Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson initiated studies on naturally occurring conversations to describe the strategies of turn-taking in native speakers of English. Based on their findings, they proposed a prototypic turn exchange system known as "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation," which suggests an ideal way to carry conversations based on a series of facts (qt. in O'Connell et al. 374). Two of the fourteen elements from their system are relevant to this study:

(3) Occurrences of more than one speaker at a time are common, but brief.

(4) Transitions (from one turn to a next) with no gap and no overlap between them are common. (Sacks et al. 700-701)

Despite the fact that the seminal work of Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson has offered perhaps the most complete description for the turn-taking system in conversation, recent studies have countered some of their claims with regard to this phenomenon (Gardner, Fitzgerald & Mushin 69; Power & Dal Martello 29). Consequently, this has raised a question that concerns all ethno-methodologists and conversation analysts: Which turn-taking practices result from

universal or culturally specific communication norms? *(Cecil 6)*. In order to answer this question, this study explores and compares the way native English and native Spanish speakers use overlaps to uncover cultural differences.

Previous studies of turn-taking in other languages

Scholars from various fields including Ethno-methodology, Conversation Analysis, and Sociology, among others, have extensively studied the features of turn-taking techniques in colloquial conversations (Wilson & Wilson 958). However, most of these preliminary studies limited their analysis to conversations of native English speakers (Goodwin & Heritage 291). The study of cross-cultural talk-in interaction was developed within the field of Linguistic Anthropology, and influenced by the ethnographical work of Michael Moerman, who compared the turn-taking systems of Tai-Lue speakers in Thailand and that of American English speakers (Dingemanse & Floyd 448). This gave place to a more innovative approach referred to as "the cultural variability hypothesis," which challenged the conversation model proposed by Sacks et al. in the 1900s (Stivers et al. 10587). From then on, scholars began performing studies that aimed to describe cultural and social differences in turn-taking systems (Goodwin & Heritage 283-284).

Ann Berry developed one of the first documented comparative studies. She compares the turn-taking practices in conversations between North American English speakers to conversations of native Spanish speakers. The results of the study showed that both English and Spanish speakers produced the same amount of overlaps, which surprisingly contradicts the prototypic model of Sacks et al. for English conversations that emphasizes "no gaps and no overlaps" (Sacks et al. 700-701). In terms of the types of overlaps produced in both English and

Spanish conversations, there was a difference in the average length of back-channel utterances, which include utterances such as *uh-huh* or *yeah* in English and *hombre si, si,* or *pues vaya* in Spanish. These turned out to be longer in the Spanish conversations than in their English counterparts. However, the major finding of this study was the way cooperative overlaps were used by both English and Spanish speakers. On one hand, the Spanish speakers appeared to be more inclined to produce intrusive overlaps as though they had the floor in the conversation. On the other hand, the English speakers avoided interruptions in their conversations by producing shorter utterances, thus showing listenership or attentiveness.

In another similar study, Murata observed the occurrences of different types of interruptions or, in other words, overlaps, in conversations between native English speakers, native Japanese speakers, and Japanese speakers of English. The results of the study revealed certain differences in the use of overlaps, categorized as interruptions by Murata, in both English and Japanese. In the English conversations, for example, the author observed both cooperative and intrusive interruptions taking place equally. In contrast with the native Japanese speakers, the number of cooperative interruptions was greater than the interruptive interruptions. Thus, while English seems to show conversational involvement and attentiveness by way of interruption, Japanese conversational style seems to prefer not to interrupt, doing so only if is necessary and as a way of feedback. The results of this study lead us to the interpretation that the conversation styles of both English and Japanese speakers do not obey the model of turn-taking of Sacks et al. (1974). On the contrary, they seem to challenge the conventional pattern for conversations predicted by them, especially in the case of the English conversations.

In the study of Clancy et al., they observed the turn-taking strategies in Mandarin Chinese, Japanese, and English conversations with a specific interest in the use of cooperative

overlaps, or what they refer to as "reactive tokens" (355). This, as well as Berry's study, indicated that the three languages differed in the frequency and type of reactive tokens used. While Japanese speakers show a high frequency of reactive overlaps, this was not found in the English conversations. Another major difference between these two groups of speakers was the location in which the reactive tokens were produced. The English speakers placed their reactive tokens at a grammatical completion point, but the Japanese speakers placed them in the middle of the primary speaker's utterances. These results accord with the pre-established turn-allocation system that Sacks et al. had proposed for English conversations. With regard to the Mandarin-Chinese speakers, their use of reactive tokens was remarkably low in comparison to their English and Japanese counterparts. In all, the results of this study suggest that there are cross-linguistic differences in the turn-taking management in these three languages.

In a more recent study, Li investigates the role that culture plays in the use of overlaps in conversations. Li analyzed two inter-cultural and two intra-cultural conversations that took place between native speakers of Canadian English and native speakers of Chinese. In the intra-cultural conversations, the results of this study conveyed that the use of intrusive overlaps was more frequent in the Canadian conversations than in the Chinese conversations. With respect to the inter-cultural conversations, the author found that again the amount of interruptive overlaps produced by the native Chinese speakers was less than those of Canadian English speakers. According to the author, the findings lead to one conclusion: the use of cooperative overlaps, referred to here as conversational interruptions, is assumed to be a phenomenon that occurs across all cultures, while the interruptive ones may be something that is embedded in the socio-cultural norms of each culture.

In support of these findings, Cecil studies the transcripts of conversations in six languages—Arabic, English, German, Mandarin, Spanish, and Japanese—in order to compare the turn-taking practices in each language. He focused on the analysis of frequency and length of back-channel overlaps, or continuers, as he calls them. The study shows that the amount and length of back-channel utterances varied across all six languages. While the Japanese speakers produced the greatest amount of continuers, followed by the Spanish speakers, the Arabic speakers produced few of them. And as far as the length of the utterances, the Spanish speakers produced the longest and Mandarin the shortest. Although the frequency of overlapping speech was considered high in all six languages, it was significantly lower in the English conversations.

To summarize thus far, the results of these studies have suggested that there are certain differences with regard to turn-taking practices across languages. Also, there seems to be evidence of particular communicative demands or expectations in each language's culture (Cecil 60). Informed by these findings, this study tests the universal turn-taking approach and intends to find possible culturally specific features of the turn-taking practices in two intra-cultural conversations that involve native speakers of English and Spanish.

Data and Methodology

The data for this study consists of four face-to-face conversations, two between native English speakers and two between native Spanish speakers. The conversations were audio-recorded and transcribed using the Jeffersonian transcription system. The first conversation in English took place at a restaurant between two men and one woman having dinner. The second occurred between two female friends at school while waiting to go to class. The Spanish conversations included two female friends in a car going to the mall, and two female friends at a

barbeque party—a "parillada" in Spanish—in one of the women's courtyards.

After transcribing all of the conversations, I scanned for instances of overlapping in each one of them as a main feature of comparison. I specifically aimed to describe the amount and type of overlaps—namely cooperative and supportive or intrusive and disruptive—used in both languages. In order to analyze cooperative overlaps, I compared the frequency of what Berry refers to as "back-channel utterances" produced by the Spanish and the English speakers (183). These included utterances such as *uh-huh*, *yeah,* or *wow* in English and *sí, mmm, ajá, sí, es verdad,* or *pues sí* in Spanish. The intrusive overlaps were compared in terms of how often they were used by the interlocutors in attempts to take the floor and what mechanisms were used for turn-holding in both Spanish and English conversations.

Results from the Spanish Conversations

Examination of the Spanish conversations revealed three major aspects of overlap production in their system of turn-taking. First, the Spanish speakers used more back-channeling overlaps than the English speakers. Second, the Spanish speakers had the tendency to lengthen monosyllabic back-channel expressions, which were for the most part *mmm, aja, si, ah, si es verdad,* and *ay.* Third, although most of these overlaps were cooperative, there were some instances in which the overlaps were employed to interrupt or to take the floor in the conversation.

The following excerpts taken from the Spanish conversations demonstrate the first two aspects of these results (see appendices 1 and 2 for a full transcription of the conversations).

EXCERPT 1: FEMALE-FRIENDS IN A CAR RIDING TO THE MALL

1   A1: <u>Si</u>:: >por eso< te d<u>i</u>::go (0.3) >Que hay personas que talves no <u>ti</u>enen la vo:z. (.) as<u>I</u>::=
                                  (0.3)

2   B1:

3   A1: >Pero si vos estudi[<u>a</u>::s](.) >Si vos te esfuerz[<u>a</u>:s] (.) >Por sacarlo af<u>i</u>nado lo que vas=

4   B1:   [mm::]m   [mm::]m

5   A1: =a cantar?< (0.3) ose::a ya:: lo dem<u>as</u> no es — no e:s (.) >Tu <u>parte</u>. >De todos modos es=

6   B1:

7   A1: =e:[:l espiri] tu s[<u>a</u>:nto] no? (.) >Haciendo su trabajo. (0.7) Pero:: b<u>ue</u>:no. (.03) pero all<u>I</u>=

8   B1:   [m::::m]   [mmm]
                                (.03)

9   A1: =>Como vos °dec[<u>is</u>] (.) es la:: actiTUd de la persona pue::s. (0.3) >Igual la guita:rra.=

10 B1:   [m]mm

EXCERPT 2: FEMALE-FRIENDS AT THE COURTYARD

21 A2: NO<u>::</u> (.03) A::h (.03) >Es <u>Este</u>:: (O.3) el CrIstof[er].

22 B2:   [a:]::h.
                          (2.0)

23 A2: >Si me voy a me<u>ter</u>. (.) pero mas <u>ta:r</u>de p'que estoy <u>bien</u> <asoliadisim[<u>a</u>::],>=

24 B2:   [a<u>::</u>]y si le hace=

25 A2:

26 B2: =[da::no].
                          (.03)

27 A2: =[u<u>::</u>y] >[Ay no °yo se sabe qu<u>e::</u>? (.) e::l — me met<u>I</u> ahora que vin<u>iero</u>[n ay] que=

28 B2   ((laughter))

29 A2: =can<u>sa:</u>da qued<u>E</u> al otro d<u>i:</u>a. (.03) <u>porque</u> <u>disque</u> quise nada:r. y >ma<u>ñ</u>ana voy a=

30 B2:

31 A2: =cocinar yo creo que no me voy °a meter.< <u>Si</u> yo creo que lo que deben hacer es=

32 B2:
                          (0.3)

33 A2: =aquia °fue[<u>::</u>ra].

34 B2:   [<u>si</u>::]::

The use of back-channel overlaps or "acknowledgment tokens" is extensively used in both Spanish conversations (Clancy et al. 356). Excerpt 1 shows how speaker B uses *mmm* to show agreement and attention. Similarly, excerpt 2 shows speaker B2 using various types of "collaborative constructions" including *aja, si, ahh*, and *ay si* to indicate consent and

understanding (Schegloff et al. 15). Aside from playing a reactive role in the conversations, these back-channel expressions are also used by the speakers with a more interactive intention. This can be observed specifically through the use of more elongated monosyllabic utterances, which is very common trend found in "synthetic languages" such Spanish, whose speakers take more time to express the same amount of information (Cecil 56).

Interruptive overlaps were observed in three situations: after what seems to be the end of the primary speaker's utterance or a long pause, as a completion of the current speakers' utterances, and as an attempt to take the floor. In excerpt 3, speaker A2's utterance overlaps with what seems to be the end of speaker B2's utterance, which forces speaker B2 to relinquish the floor to speaker A2.

EXCERPT 3: FEMALE FRIENDS AT THE COURTYARD

```
11  A2:
12  B2: =na(hh)die q(hh)e m(hh)e mu(hh)[eve. ((laughter)) ]
13  A2:                                [No::: e' que aqui:]s'ta (.03) ─quista: bien fuer::te. >A=
14  B2:
```

In excerpt 4, speaker A2 had apparently finished talking, which is implied by the two-minute gap that occurred at the end of her utterance. For that reason, speaker B2 started a conversation in order to break the gap. However, right when speaker B2 starts talking, she is interrupted by the reintegration of speaker A2 into the conversation, which therefore ceases speaker B2's attempt to create a new conversation. This results in a sharing of the floor, which eventually forces one of the speakers to yield the turn. This is an effect that Taboada claims to be characteristic of the "turn-yielding" strategies in conversations of Spanish speakers, in which the

same speaker that produces the pause tries to repair the communication by reclaiming the floor

(33).

EXCERPT 4: FEMALE FRIENDS AT THE COURTYARD

7   A2: e:: liAN (.03) >Pero en lescale::ra Elia::n,
                                  (2.0)
8   B2:   >[La hermana °Katia.]
9   A2: Oo::o[(hh)h que asada no]s dimos

      Excerpt 5 demonstrates two instances of overlapping that occurred when speakers A and

B attempt to take away each other's right to talk. In the first instance (lines 18 and 19), speaker B

makes a short pause before her new utterance, yet speaker A uses this opportunity to take the

floor. A second example of interruptive overlap occurs (lines 23 and 24) following a long pause

after speaker A's utterance. Speaker B assumes that her counterpart has finished talking, and

consequently, speaker B attempts to take the floor in the conversation, which can be observed in

her many attempts to start her utterance (line 24). This is an effect that Berry found to be a

salient feature of the turn-taking strategies in the Spanish conversations she observed, which she

refers to as "continued speaking during overlap" (188). This occurs when a speaker who does not

seem to have reacted to the overlapping continues talking until finished, without hesitating to

stop.

EXCERPT 5: FEMALE FRIENDS IN THE CAR GOING TO THE MALL

18 B1: =es un gru::po? A(hh)y(hh) Dios mI::o a(hh)::y e:sto. (0.1) pero era a(hh)y(h[h) °yo=
19 A1:   [igual te=
20 B1: =quiero pasar] pero.
21 A1: =di::go] (.) >Que co:n como se llama? (.) co::::n (0.3) Toño (0.1) >Ese grupo crecio::::=
22 B1:   (.03)
23 A1: =pues porque::: les exigi:a (0.1) [>Aho:ra es que estan todos tranqui::los] alli:: (.)
24 B1:   [>Y quien ─ y quien iba ─ y quien iba] ((pause))

Results from the English Conversations

The analysis of both English conversations yielded two conclusions (see appendices 3 and 4 for a complete transcription of the conversations). First, there was a minimal use of overlaps in both conversations. Second, most of the overlaps occurred as a result of the speakers' efforts to avoid gaps or pauses between each other's utterances. These results obey the turn-taking rule suggested by Sacks et al.: "Transitions (from one turn to a next) with no gap and no overlap between them are common" (700-701). Also relevant to these conversations is the use of question-answer interactions characteristic of the turn-allocation technique of "current-speaker-selects-next" described by Sacks et al. (701). This conversation also projected "one party talking at a time," who controlled the flow and topic of the conversation (Sacks et al. 700-701).

Conclusions

The comparison of the native English and Spanish conversations of this study has provided evidence of individual differences within a given language in their turn-taking practices. These findings contribute to what Berry and Cecil have observed in their previous studies, in which they also compared turn-taking practices in Spanish and English conversations. On the one hand, the English speakers were the only ones that followed the norms of "minimal gap and minimal overlap" described by Sacks et al. (Stivers et al. 10587). On the other hand, the findings from the Spanish conversations contradicted claims of the ideal conversation theory of Sacks et al. The extensive use of overlaps and continuing talking out of turn by the Spanish speakers would be perceived as "a violation of the orderliness in their turn-exchange system" (Li 260). However, neither the overlapping nor the continued talking seemed to interrupt the flow of the Spanish conversations. On the contrary, overlaps seemed to be perceived as both "functional and acceptable to the ongoing speakers" (O'Connell et al. 353).

In summary, the results of this study refute the idea that all conversations are organized according to a specific set of rules as it compares samples from two different cultures. Additionally, it provides substantiation that the interpretations of Sacks et al. for turn-allocations in English conversations are culturally specific. Furthermore, it attests to "the cultural variability hypothesis" suggesting that native English speakers and native Spanish speakers differ in the way they maneuver their turn-taking system in conversations (Stivers et al. 10587).

Works Cited

Berry, Anne. "Spanish and American Turn-Taking Styles: A Comparative Study." *Pragmatic and Language Learning,* vol. 5, no. 13, 1994, pp. 180-190.

Cecil, Matthew J. *Cross-Linguistic Variation in Turn Taking Practices: A Computational Study of the Callhome Corpus*, University of Colorado at Boulder, Ann Arbor, 2010. AAT 1477002.

Clancy, Patricia M. et al. "The Conversational Use of Reactive Tokens in English, Japanese, and Mandarin." *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 26, no. 3, 1996, pp. 355-387.

Dingemanse, Mark and Simeon Floyd. "Conversation across Cultures." *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Anthropology*, edited by N.J. Enfield, Paul Kockelman, and Jack Sidnell. Cambridge UP, 2014, pp. 447-480.

Fant, Lars. "Cultural Mismatch in Conversation: Spanish and Scandinavian Communicative Behavior in Negotiation Settings." *HERMES-Journal of Language and Communication in Business*, vol. 2, no. 3, 1989, pp. 247-267.

Gardner, Rod et al. "The Underlying Orderliness in Turn-Taking." *Australian Journal of Communication*, vol. 36, no. 3, 2009, pp. 65-89.

Goodwin, Charles and John Heritage. "Conversation Analysis." *Annual Review of Anthropology*, vol. 19, no. 1, 1990, pp. 283-307.

Lazzaro Salazar, Mariana. "The Role of /overlaps\ in Intercultural Workplace Interaction." MA Thesis. Victoria U of Wellington, 2009.

Li, Han Z. "Cooperative and Intrusive Interruptions in Inter- and Intracultural Dyadic Discourse." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, vol. 20, no. 3, 2001, pp. 259-284.

Li, Han Z. et al. "Interruption and Involvement in Discourse: Can Intercultural Interlocutors Be

    Trained?" *Journal of lntercultural Communication Research*, vol. 34, no. 4, 2005, pp.

    233-254.

Murata, Kumiko. "Intrusive or Cooperative? A Cross-Cultural Study of Interruption." *Journal of*

    Pragmatics, vol. 21, no. 4, 1994, pp. 385-400.

Ng, Sik Hung et al. "Interruption and Influence in Discussion Groups." *Journal of Language and*

    Social Psychology, vol. 14, no. 4, 1995, pp. 369-381.

O'Connell, Daniel C. et al. "Turn-taking: A Critical Analysis of the Research Tradition." *Journal*

    of Psycholinguistic Research, vol. 19, no. 6, 1990, pp. 345-373.

Pomerance, Anita. "A Comparison of Speaker Overlaps across Three Genres of Discourse."

    Working Papers in Educational Linguistics (WPEL), vol. 2, no. 2, 1986, pp. 51-72.

Power, R. J. D. and M. F. Dal Martello. "Some Criticisms of Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson on

    Turn-Taking." *Semiotica*, vol. 58, no. 1-2, 1986, pp. 29-40.

Sacks, Harvey et al. "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for

    Conversation." *Language*, vol. 50, no. 4, 1974, pp. 696-735.

Stiver, Tanya et al. "Universals and Cultural Variation in Turn-Taking in Conversation."

    Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, vol. 106, no. 26, 2009, 10587-10592.

Taboada, Maite. "Spontaneous and Non-Spontaneous Turn-Taking." *Pragmatics: Quarterly*

    Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA), vol. 16, no. 2-3, 2010,

    pp. 329-360.

ten Bosch, Louis et al. "On Temporal Aspects of Turn Taking in Conversational

    Dialogues." *Speech Communication*, vol. 47, no. 1, 2005, pp. 80-86.

Wilson, Margaret and Thomas P. Wilson. "An Oscillator Model of the Timing of Turn-

    Taking." *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, vol. 12, no. 6, 2005, pp. 957-968.

Wilson, Thomas P. et al. "Models of Turn Taking in Conversational Interaction." *Journal of*

    Language and Social Psychology, vol. 3, no. 3, 1984, pp. 159-183.

Zimmermann, Don H. and Candace West. "Sex Roles, Interruptions and Silences in

    Conversation." *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science*

    Series, vol. 4, 1996, pp. 211-236.

Appendix 1

1   A1: <u>Si</u>:: >por eso< te d<u>i</u>::go (0.3) >Que hay personas que talves no <u>ti</u>enen la vo:z. (.) as<u>I</u>::=
                                         (0.3)
2   B1:
3   A1: ><u>P</u>ero si vos estudi[<u>a</u>::s](.) ><u>S</u>i vos te esfuerz[<u>a</u>:s] (.) ><u>P</u>or sacarlo af<u>in</u>ado lo que vas=
4   B1:   [mm::]m   [mm::]m
5   A1: =a cantar?< (0.3) ose::a ya:: lo dem<u>as</u> no es ─ no e:s (.) ><u>T</u>u <u>p</u>arte. >De todos modos es=
6   B1:
7   A1: =e:[:l espiri] tu s[<u>a</u>:nto] no? (.) ><u>H</u>aciendo su trabajo. (0.7) Pero:: b<u>ue</u>:no. (.03) pero all<u>I</u>=
8   B1:   [m::::m]   [mmm]
                                     (.03)
9   A1: =><u>C</u>omo vos °dec[<u>is</u>] (.) es la:: acti<u>TU</u>d de la persona pue::s. (0.3) ><u>I</u>gual la guita:rra.=
10   B1:   [m]mm
                         (0.3)
11   A1: =><u>V</u>os crees que Dani<u>el</u> empez<u>O</u> tocando asi como <u>t</u>oca aho[ra]?
12   B1:   [m]mm
                                     (0.7)
13   A1:
14   B1: N<u>o</u>::. (.03) yo me acue:rdo cuando Daniel estaba en sus comie:nzos y yo dec<u>í</u>:a. ─ ><u>Y</u>=
15   A1:
16   B1: =<u>yo</u> estaba comenza:ndo ─y <u>yo</u> estaba n<u>ue</u>::va, ─y <u>yo</u> dec<u>i</u>:a (.) a(hh)<u>y</u> (.) ><u>P</u>ero <u>e</u>se=
17   A1:
18   B1: =es un gru::po? A(hh)y(hh) Dios m<u>I</u>::o a(hh)::y <u>e</u>:sto. (.) pero <u>e</u>ra a(hh)y(hh) [°<u>yo</u>=
19   A1:   [igual te=
20   B1: =quiero pasar] <u>p</u>ero.
21   A1: =di::go] (.) ><u>Q</u>ue co:n como se llama? (.) co<u>:::</u>n (0.3) Toño (0.1) ><u>E</u>se grupo creci<u>o</u>:::=
22   B1:   (.03)
23   A1: =pues porque<u>:::</u> les exig<u>i</u>:a (0.1) [><u>A</u>ho:ra es que estan todos tranqui::los] all<u>i</u>:: (.)
24   B1:   [><u>Y</u> qui<u>en</u> ─ y qu<u>ien</u> iba ─ y qu<u>ien</u> iba] ((pause))
25   A1:
26   B1: =iba a dec<u>ir</u> que Ant<u>o</u>::nio con ese sembla::nte. (.) se ve as<u>I</u> <u>p</u>ue: que<u>::</u> y <u>m</u>ira como
27   A1:
28   B1: =pudie::=ron, (0.3) verdad? (0.3) sacar adela:nte [°el <u>g</u>rupo.
29   A1:   [si<u>::::</u> ><u>A</u>hora es qu<u>E</u> esta todo el=
30   B1:
31   A1: =mundo bien relaj[<u>a</u>::do.] (0.3) ><u>P</u>or eso que Daniel tiene que ponerle mano=
32   B1:   [aja:::] si:::
33   A1: =dur[<u>a</u> a toda g<u>en</u>te]. <
34   B1:   [<<u>e</u>so si e verd]a

Appendix 2

1 A2: >Entonces hermana <u>B</u>etsy qué cuenta, < (0.3) <u>ch</u>isme nO:: por favor
                                        (1.0)
2 B2:   ((laughter))
3 A2: <u>A</u>lgo imporTA:NTE,
                          (1.0)
4 B2:
5 A2: E::y <u>LA</u>vense los pies pa' me<u>te:r</u>se:: (0.3) <u>NI::</u>ños <u>LA</u>vense los pies >°pa' me<u>te:r</u>se.<
                          (1.0)
6 B2:
7 A2: e:: liAN (.03) ><u>P</u>ero en lescale::ra Elia::n,
                          (2.0)
8 B2:   >[<u>L</u>a hermana °<u>K</u>atia.]
9 A2: Oo::o[(hh)h que asada no]s dimos
                        (0.7)
10 B2: ah(hh) pues yo me vine para a<u>ca</u> (.) y de a<u>qui</u> no(hh) ha(hh)y ─n(hh)o h(hh)a(hh)y=
11 A2:
12 B2: =na(hh)die q(hh)e m(hh)e mu(hh)[eve. ((laughter))]
13 A2:   [N<u>o:::</u> e' que a<u>qui:</u>]<u>s</u>ta (.03) ─<u>quis</u>ta: bien <u>fuer</u>::te. ><u>A</u>=
14 B2:
15 A2: = m<u>I</u> me da <u>pena</u> dejar all<u>A</u> a mi cuñado °pero.
                          (1.0)
16 B2:
17 A2: <u>QU</u>i<u>e::n</u> e::s? (.) e:: Car<u>li</u>tos?
                          (.03)
18 B2: Quien e::?
                          (0.3)
19 A2: ><u>E</u>se ca:rro no ° lo cono::zco.
                           (10.0)
20 B2:
21 A2: NO<u>::</u> (.03) A::h (.03) ><u>E</u>s <u>E</u>ste:: (O.3) el Cr<u>I</u>stof[er.
22 B2:   [a:]::h.
                          (2.0)
23 A2: ><u>S</u>i me voy a me<u>ter</u>. (.) pero mas <u>ta:r</u>de p'que estoy <u>bien</u> <asoliadisim[a::],>=
24 B2:   [a<u>::</u>]y si le hace=
25 A2:
26 B2: =[da::no].
                          (.03)
27 A2: =[u<u>::</u>y] >[Ay no °yo se sabe qu<u>e::</u>? (.) e::l ─ me met<u>I</u> ahora que vin<u>iero</u>[n ay] que=
28 B2   ((laughter))
29 A2: =can<u>sa:</u>da qued<u>E</u> al otro d<u>i:</u>a. (.03) <u>por</u>que <u>dis</u>que quise nada:r. y >ma<u>ñ</u>ana voy a=
30 B2:
31 A2: =cocinar yo creo que no me voy °a meter.< <u>S</u>i yo creo que lo que deben hacer es=
32 B2:

                              (0.3)
33 A2: =aquia °f<u>ue</u>[::ra].
34 B2:   [<u>si</u>::]:: ><u>Y</u>o <u>di</u>je a::y ese asador deber<u>I</u>a estar por aq<u>uI</u> cerq<u>ui</u>[::ta],
34 A2:   [aja::](hh)
                      ((laughter))

Appendix 3

1   A3: ((Laughter)) he::y <u>A</u>m::ber, what' <u>up</u> gi<u>:::</u>rl,?=
2   B3: = ><u>H</u>ey gi<u>::::</u>rl, <u>N</u>othi:ng, ><u>I</u>'m a<u>b</u>out to go to Spanish.< So:: what are your pla::ns for=
3   A3:
4   B3: =the <u>w</u>eeke:nd.
                                  (.03)
5   A3: gi::rl I don't even ha:ve no<u>::</u>ne. (.) I'm just <u>gla:</u>d I don't have to <u>w</u>ork.=
6   B3:
7   A3: =whatabo (.) you.
                                  (0.3)
8   A3: ((Sigh)) of <u>co</u>:u(hh)rse I don't <u>h</u>ave to work. ><u>W</u>hen you <u>h</u>ave a jo<u>:</u>b like <u>I</u>:: do?=
9   B3:
10 A3: = <u>SA</u>turdays are op(hh)tion(hh)al. ((laughter))
11 B3:   [O::h(hh). I wish <u>mi</u>::ne we<u>:::</u>re.]
12 A3:   [I wish the <u>bank</u> would let you w]ork every=
13 B3:
14 A3: =other <u>Sa</u>:turda<u>::</u>y.=
15 B3: =<u>you</u> <u>SHO</u>::uld s<u>TI:ll</u> <u>BE</u> <u>AT</u> the <u>ba</u>::nk (.) >And we would be working this Saturday=
16 A3:
17 B3: = to<u>ge</u>::the::r or the n<u>e</u>:xt <'<u>C</u>ause I'm off °this Saturday. (.)   [<u>Du</u><u>:::</u>h],
18 A3:   ((laughter)) <u>Un</u>[f<u>o</u>rnat]ely °not.
19 B3:
20 A3:
21 B3: ><u>W</u>here are you w<u>o</u>rking at tod[ay?]
22 A3:   [((Si]gh)) gi<u>::</u>r(hh)l, uni<u>ver</u>sity and you know I <u>Ha:</u>te=
23 B3:
24 A3: =°that place.=
25 B3: =>What's going on in <u>P</u>etal?
                                  (0.3)
26 A3: ><u>O</u>h my Go<u>::::</u>d, (.) Mar<u>qui</u>:ta <u>t</u>exted me this mo::rni::ng and said that <u>PA</u>mela lost her=
27 B3:
28 A3:= <u>O</u>:ther ba::by.
                                  (.01)
<u>29 B3</u>: Re::ally?=
30 A3: =Y[e<u>:::</u>s.]

Appendix 4

1 A4: >D̲o you e:at with you <u>left</u> ha:nd or right hand? (.) <u>right</u> ha:nd.
                    (0.3)
2 B4: (   )=
3 C4 = >W̲ell I e̲at with bo:th and actually write with <u>both</u> (.) <u>too</u>.
4 A4:=<u>Y</u>e<u>a</u>:h?=
5 B4:
6 C4: =uh-huh bu:t (.) (it could be)/ (i could eat) more be̲:tter with my <u>left</u>.=
7 A4: =<u>M</u>o[:re (.) <u>B</u>]etter. (0.1) it's m<u>o</u>:re (.) goo:̲:d or -or <u>Better</u>.
8 B4:   [B<u>e</u>:tter.]
                    (0.3)
9 C4: b<u>e</u>:tter.=
10 A4: you can sa:y mo::re <u>Better</u>. (0.3) >J̲ust like more f<u>a</u>:ster.
                    (.)
11 B4:
12 C4:
13 A4: you are f<u>a</u>:ster. (0.3) or mo:re f<u>a</u>:[st.]
14 B4:
15 C4:   [m<u>a</u>]:n (this is so unc<u>om</u>fortable) but I (could) weight
16 A4:
17 B4:
18 C4: =like the s<u>a</u>:me,
                      ((long pause))
19 A4:
20 B4:
21 C4: >I̲t is me:: (.) or these have a lot of <u>o</u>::il?
                    (0.3)
22 A4: <u>s</u>eriously (.) >G̲o ahead and e::at, (.)= >'nd don't even worry a<u>bout</u> it.<
                    (0.3)
23 B4:
24 C4: w<u>e</u>::[ll.]
15 A4:   [Y]ou kn<u>ow</u>? (.01) >Y̲ou wouldn't have to be so <u>wor</u>ry about if you exercise.<
                  (.03)
26 B4:
27 C4:
28 A4: s<u>e</u>riously.
                    (0.3)
29 B4:
30 C4: well Michael sa:ys, (0.1) that (you can eat something) and if you <u>ex</u>ercise does m<u>e</u>:an
31 A4:
32 B4:
33 C4:= it's g<u>o</u>::ing to go °away.