

Copyright
by
Kathryn Hickerson Henning
2006

The Dissertation Committee for Kathryn Hickerson Henning
certifies that this is the approved version of the
following dissertation:

EVERYDAY (RE)ENACTMENT:
REPORTING STRATEGIES
IN NON-NARRATIVE TALK-IN-INTERACTION

Committee:

Jürgen Streeck, Supervisor

Barry Brummett

Leslie Jarmon

Joni Jones

Elizabeth Keating

**EVERYDAY (RE)ENACTMENT:
REPORTING STRATEGIES
IN NON-NARRATIVE TALK-IN-INTERACTION**

by

Kathryn Hickerson Henning, B.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
the University of Texas at Austin
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin
May 2006

For Meg

**EVERYDAY (RE)ENACTMENT:
REPORTING STRATEGIES
IN NON-NARRATIVE TALK-IN-INTERACTION**

Publication No. _____

Kathryn Hickerson Henning, Ph.D.
The University of Texas at Austin, 2006

Supervisor: Jürgen Streeck

While all instances of reported speech involve “speech within speech, utterance within utterance,” as Voloshinov states (1986: 115), interactants realize and mobilize reports in varied ways, in the service of situated, diverse projects. However, the research on reported speech has largely overlooked this internal diversity, with individual studies opting to treat reports as either reproductions of actual prior utterances or inventions by current speakers, exclusively. Furthermore, the research on reported speech

has focused almost solely on conversational narratives, failing to consider reported speech in an array of interactional environments, despite the integral relationship between reported speech and reporting context.

In contrast, this study devotes analytical attention to how interactants manage the internal diversity of reported speech in the furtherance of situated projects, looking exclusively at non-narrative episodes of talk-in-interaction. In particular, this analysis provides empirical descriptions of two reporting strategies, or presentation formats involving the local and interactional management of reports; namely, the practical reenactment presentation format, in which reporters present, and recipients take up, reports as authentic, "faithful" repeats of actual prior utterances, and the creative enactment presentation format, in which reporters present, and recipients take up, reports as inventions by the current speaker that are nonetheless not the current speaker's own talk in the current exchange. This analysis then considers in some detail the multiple uses to which these presentation formats can be put, from a social-

interactional perspective, within several non-narrative conversational activities, outlined here.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
THE RESEARCH ON REPORTED SPEECH	9
THE QUESTION OF FORM	9
THE QUESTION OF REPRESENTATION	13
<i>Definitional Inconsistency</i>	14
<i>Theoretical Impossibility</i>	15
<i>Empirical Inadequacy</i>	16
THE QUESTION OF FUNCTION	19
<i>Empathy Production</i>	20
<i>Dramatization</i>	22
CONVERSATIONAL PRACTICE	28
<i>Polyvocality</i>	28
<i>Assessment</i>	30
<i>Alignment</i>	31
<i>The Current Study</i>	34

METHODOLOGY	36
ANALYTICAL PERSPECTIVE	36
<i>Critical Discourse Analysis</i>	40
<i>Discourse Analysis in Social Psychology</i>	41
<i>Conversation Analysis</i>	42
DATA AND METHOD	48
PRACTICAL REENACTMENT FROM PRIOR INTERACTIONS	52
CONVEYING	55
CORROBORATING	69
<i>Agreement Preference</i>	76
<i>Responsibility for Report</i>	87
PRACTICAL REENACTMENT FROM ONGOING INTERACTIONS	89
CRITIQUING	90
<i>Agreement Preference</i>	94
<i>Responsibility for Report</i>	99
DERIDING	108
<i>Sequence Shape</i>	114
<i>Responsibility for Activity</i>	120
CREATIVE ENACTMENT	128
FORMULATING	130
<i>Reporter Orientation</i>	136

<i>Reported Speaker Orientation</i>	141
INSTANTIATING	151
<i>Sequence Shape</i>	160
<i>Evidential Claims in Presentation Formats</i>	164
CONCLUSION	174
REFERENCES	179
VITA	194

INTRODUCTION

In everyday interaction, talk is by default understood to be authored by, or to express the position of, the person who is producing it in the moment. However, the use of reported speech, or “speech within speech, utterance within utterance,” which is also simultaneously “*speech about speech, utterance about utterance*” (Voloshinov 1986: 115), is a frequently occurring conversational practice. As Bakhtin observes (1981: 337–338):

The transmission and assessment of the speech of others, the discourse of another, is one of the most widespread and fundamental topics of human speech. In real life we hear speech about speakers and their discourse at every step. We can go so far as to say that in real life people talk most of all about what others talk about -- they transmit, recall, weigh and pass judgment on other people's words, opinions, assertions,

information; people are upset by other's words, or agree with them, contest them, refer to them and so forth.

As this characterization suggests, while all reports involve "speech within speech," interactants realize and mobilize reports in varied ways, in the service of situated, diverse projects.

This internal diversity is not news in relation to reported speech. While the traditional research assumes that all reports are accurate reproductions of actual, prior utterances (Clark and Gerrig 1990), work by Tannen (1989) and Mayes (1990) documents that reporters routinely offer direct quotations of utterances that have clearly not been spoken previously. For example, Mayes (1990) found that at least 50% of the direct quotations in her data were obviously not reports of actual previous utterances, but rather "inventions of the speaker" (330).

Unfortunately, Tannen (1989), Mayes (1990), and others have mistaken this internal diversity for something that it is not, taking it as evidence that all reported speech is invention, or "constructed dialogue" (Tannen 1989, 2004).

While this position presents an alternative to the traditional understanding of reported speech (and its numerous problems, discussed in more detail to follow), this position also promotes a conceptualization of reported speech that is as extreme and totalizing as the traditional understanding. As a result, more recent research has largely neglected the internal diversity of reported speech, failing to examine it as an interesting phenomenon in its own right.

In addition, the more recent research that does consider how reported speech is manifested and mobilized for particular purposes in ongoing interactions is based almost exclusively on conversational narratives, with few exceptions (Baynham 1996, Vincent and Perrin 1999). This rather undivided focus on conversational narrative is problematic, however, in that reported speech and reporting context are reflexively related, such that participants' methods for realizing and utilizing reports contribute to the constitution of the reporting contexts in which the reports are put to use, and vice versa, a point that Voloshinov emphasizes when he says (1986: 119):

After all, the two actually do exist, function, and take shape only in their interrelation, and not on their own, the one apart from the other.

The reported speech and the reporting context are but the terms of a dynamic interrelationship.

Therefore, as Baynham (1996) argues, further progress in understanding reported speech necessitates "investigating speech reporting in a wider range of contexts" (80).

Consequently, this study devotes analytical attention to how interactants manage the internal diversity of reports in the furtherance of situated projects, looking exclusively at non-narrative episodes of talk-in-interaction. In particular, this analysis provides empirical descriptions of two reporting strategies, or presentation formats involving the local and interactional management of reports, that carry distinctive evidential claims (Hill and Irvine 1993) and that are both constituted by and constitutive of the conversational environments in which they operate (Goodwin and Duranti 1992). This analysis then considers the multi-functionality of these presentation formats (Jakobson 1990) in some detail, from a

social-interactional perspective, within several non-narrative conversational activities.

Chapter One provides a review of the literature on reported speech, examining it in terms of three consistently addressed questions: the question of form, the question of representation, and the question of function. A consideration of the interrelationship of these questions within the literature leads to a discussion of the more recent work on reporting speech as a conversational practice and the current study's place within this line of research. Ultimately, this chapter illustrates the importance of examining the internal diversity of reported speech within non-narrative conversational contexts.

Chapter Two discusses discourse analysis' conceptualization of talk as action and briefly sketches three of the more common discourse analytic research methods. This chapter also argues that, when examining social action, an emphasis on participants' own local and interactional management of that action is necessary. Finally, this chapter outlines the data and method of the current study, including its primary reliance on conversation analysis.

Chapter Three examines the practical reenactment presentation format in relation to reenactments of utterances from previous interactions. In brief, practical reenactment is a reporting strategy in which reporters present, and recipients take up, reports as authentic, "faithful" repeats of actual prior utterances. This format affirms both that some original utterance occurred and that the report is a relatively straightforward repeat of this utterance. The manner in which these affirmations both enable and constrain the successful use of reports in the non-narrative activities of conveying and corroborating is discussed here.

Chapter Four also considers the practical reenactment presentation format, but in relation to reenactments of utterances from ongoing interactions. Thus, this chapter focuses on reports that vary from the canonical "norm" of reported speech, though the affirmations that underlie the practical reenactment format still hold. The manner in which these affirmations both enable and constrain the successful use of reports in the non-narrative activities of critiquing and deriding is discussed here, particularly

in regard to the social-interactional implications of treating co-participants as reported speakers.

Chapter Five discusses the creative enactment presentation format. In contrast to the practical reenactment format, creative enactment is a reporting strategy in which reporters present, and recipients take up, reports as inventions by the current speaker that are nonetheless not the current speaker's own talk in the current exchange. Consequently, reporters using the creative enactment presentation format do not claim that the utterances they present were spoken previously by others. Rather, they affirm that a particular utterance is possible on the part of an actor in a given situation, and that the report is a verbalization of this otherwise unspoken utterance by the current speaker, not the current speaker's own talk, in the ongoing interaction. These affirmations both enable and constrain the successful use of creative enactments in the conversational activities of formulating and instantiating, as discussed here.

Though this typology is by no means exhaustive, either in terms of presentation formats or non-narrative conversational activities, it hopefully serves as a step

toward a better understanding of reported speech in talk-in-interaction, as well as a contribution to the numerous other research areas that rely upon the concept of reported speech in the consideration of other issues. I discuss the implications of this research, as well as possible directions for future work, in the concluding chapter.

THE RESEARCH ON REPORTED SPEECH

The literature on reported speech reaches from the classical teachings of Plato to present-day research, across a number of disciplines, including philosophy, linguistics, communications, sociology, anthropology, and literary criticism. Though extensive, this literature can be conceptualized in terms of three questions that it consistently addresses; namely, the question of form, the question of representation, and the question of function. A consideration of these questions leads to a discussion of the more recent literature on reporting speech as a conversational practice and the current study's place within this line of research.

THE QUESTION OF FORM

A majority of the traditional literature on reported speech focuses on the formal features of reports, dividing reported speech into categories based upon linguistic

properties. The most widely accepted distinction is that made between the prototypical forms of direct and indirect reported speech.

The following statement is a hypothetical example of direct reported speech by Miranda: "Jayme said 'I want you here tomorrow.'" The linguistic form of this hypothetical instance is lexically marked by verb tenses (want) and deictic terms (I, you, here, and tomorrow) as anchored in the reported situation, in which Jayme is the reported speaker. Also, this hypothetical instance of direct reported speech is syntactically constructed of an independent clause, "I want you here tomorrow," introduced by a quotative phrase, "Jayme said."

In contrast, the following is a hypothetical example of indirect reported speech by Miranda: "Jayme said that she wanted me there today." The linguistic form of this hypothetical instance is lexically marked by deictic terms (she, me, there, and today) and verb tenses (wanted) as anchored in the reporting situation, in which Miranda is the reporting speaker. Also, this hypothetical instance of indirect reported speech is syntactically structured as a

subordinate clause, "she wanted me to be there today," introduced by the complementizer "that."

In actual talk-in-interaction, however, the question of form is not so clear-cut. For example, though the research on reported speech almost unanimously assumes that introducing quotes with quotatives or complementizers is the method *de rigueur* for interactants, research by Mathis and Yule (1994) shows that zero quotatives, or instances of reported speech that are not introduced in either manner, are actually more common in talk-in-interaction. And extensive research by Günthner (1997, 1998, 2000, 2002), Couper-Kuhlen (1998), and Klewitz and Couper-Kuhlen (1999) demonstrates that "voicing," or the vocal animation of a reported speaker, is often the only indication addressees have that an instance of reported speech is occurring.

Furthermore, specialized forms of quotation occur that differ considerably from the theoretical prototypes of direct and indirect reported speech (Clark and Gerrig 1990). Free indirect quotation, for example, contrasts with both direct and indirect forms (Sternberg 1982). The following is a hypothetical example of free indirect reported speech by Miranda: "I said, did she mean tomorrow

or next week." Here, as in indirect reported speech, the deictic terms (she, tomorrow, next week) and verb tenses (did, mean) are anchored in the reporting situation. However, the embedded clause is interrogative ("Did she mean . . ."), and therefore independent, as in direct reported speech.

Incorporated quotation also differs significantly from the prototypical forms of direct and indirect reported speech (Clark and Gerrig 1990). The following is a hypothetical example of incorporated quotation by Miranda, again referring to Jayme, but this time quoting a character from the film *Jerry McGuire*: "If that's what she wants, she's going to have to 'show me the money.'" As an embedded clause, this quote has its own syntactic structure, which is imperative. However, this quote also has a grammatical relation in the utterance as a whole. Thus this report is at one and the same time both independent and subordinated, simultaneously bearing formal similarity to both direct and indirect reported speech.

As these specialized forms suggest, quotations in actual talk-in-interaction ultimately do not fall into neat formal categories. Nonetheless, formal classifications of

reported speech traditionally serve as the foundation for other categorizations (Sternberg 1982). Such is the case for research that endeavors to describe reported speeches representational features, or features that pertain to the relationship between the reported speech and the original utterance that the report is assumed to reproduce.

THE QUESTION OF REPRESENTATION

The representational features of reported speech have not been formulated as explicitly in the literature as the formal features have. For the most part, however, scholars have divided reported speech into categories based upon what Clark and Gerrig (1990) term the "verbatim assumption": a purported correlation between the formal features of the report and the accuracy of the reproduction of the original speech. Until relatively recently, this assumption was widely accepted within the literature, resulting in a long tradition of equating indirect quotation with paraphrase and direct quotation with repetition (Sternberg 1982).

Definitional Inconsistency

The literature lacks any consensus, however, regarding what constitutes reproductive accuracy for a direct quotation. For instance, according to Quine, "When we quote a man's utterance directly we report it almost as we might a bird call. However significant the utterance, direct quotation merely reports the physical incident" (1969: 219). For Banfield, however, direct reported speech "must be considered as a word for word reproduction" (1973: 9). And Coulmas argues that a speaker who uses direct quotation "commits himself to faithfully rendering form and content of what the original speaker said" (1985: 42).

What, then, needs to be present in an instance of quotation for it to be considered accurately reproductive of the speech that it reports? In some descriptions, a mere restating of the original words, or a "word for word reproduction," would suffice. In other descriptions, it is the "physical incident" that must be reproduced, presumably including features such as false starts, repairs, prosodic and vocal qualities, and so on. In still other descriptions even such homophony would not be enough to constitute accurate reproduction, if the report did not sufficiently

render the "content of what the original speaker said," which could depend upon non-reproducible aspects of the original context. The criteria vary, to say the least.

Theoretical Impossibility

From a theoretical perspective, some scholars argue that the accurate reproduction of any original speech is in and of itself impossible, regardless of the formal features of the report. In other words, because all utterances are inherently situated, each utterance is essentially unique.

This uniqueness rests "less in its physical make-up as a sequence of sounds and words than in the contextual coordinates that give that sequence its meaning and function as an expressive structure" (Sternberg 1982: 130).

In this view, to quote an instance of speech is to extract it from its original context, severing the ties that provide its original meaning and function, and thereby to alter it, necessarily and irrevocably.

Furthermore, to quote an instance of speech is to transplant it into a new context, a context that necessarily mediates its original situated meaning, even

when no trace of this mediation is apparent (Shuman 1993).

As Bakhtin observes, "the speech of another, once enclosed in a context, is -- no matter how accurately transmitted -- always subject to certain semantic changes" (1981: 340).

Tannen makes a similar point when she argues that "taking information uttered by someone in a given situation and repeating it in another situation is an active conversational move that fundamentally transforms the nature of the utterance" (1989: 105). Thus, as Sternberg states, "Accordingly, even if the original could be copied down to the last detail, its transplanting and framing in a new environment would impose on it a new mode of existence" (1982: 108).

Empirical Inadequacy

Even if accurate reproduction through direct reported speech were theoretically possible, research suggests that the notion is not necessarily relevant, for either reporters or addressees, during actual talk-in-interaction. Thus, reporters routinely offer direct quotations of utterances that have obviously not been spoken previously.

For example, Tannen (1989) provides several instances in which reporters directly quote the thoughts of both themselves and others. And both Tannen (1989) and Mayes (1990) offer numerous examples of direct quotations that are attributed to those who cannot speak, such as animals and very young children. All in all, Mayes (1990), using data from naturally occurring interaction, found that at least 50% of the direct quotations in her data were obviously not reports of actual previous utterances, but rather "inventions of the speaker" (330).

In addition, even if it were routinely achievable, accurate reproduction through direct reported speech would almost always go unnoticed by addressees, in that they would almost certainly be unable to recognize it as such. In most cases, an act of quotation gives its addressees all that they will ever know about the original. And even prior access to the original on the part of addressees is no guarantee of their recognition of accurate reproduction, as precise recall of previous utterances is a practical impossibility (Hjelmquist and Gidlund 1985, Lehrer 1989, Clark and Gerrig 1990). Thus, addressees are inevitably limited to a recovery procedure in which they attempt to

reconstitute an original from its report by way of probability; absolute correspondence is never determinable (Sternberg 1982).

Scholarly responses to the numerous problems plaguing the verbatim assumption vary. For instance, Tannen (1989, 2004) argues for abandoning the notion of reported speech altogether, claiming that the term reported speech is "a misnomer, an abstraction with no basis in the reality of interaction" (1989: 133), and proposing that the concept of "constructed dialogue" is a more accurate replacement. Alternatively, Clark and Gerrig (1990) claim that reported speech has nothing to do with the verbatim assumption "per se," but rather with "the depiction of selected aspects of the referent" (795).

Finally, the most common response is that explicitly outlined by Baynham (1996), in which researchers abandon the verbatim assumption while maintaining the formal distinctions between direct and indirect reported speech that serve as the assumption's foundation. Research within this line treats the form of direct report as a device for foregrounding the "objectivity" of a report (Holt 1996). Thus, use of direct report is thought to produce in report

recipients either affective identification with the reported speaker, through the reporter's channeling of the reported speaker's perspective, or heightened involvement in the dramatized event, through the reporter's stylistic inclusion of detail and specificity.

THE QUESTION OF FUNCTION

Though the verbatim assumption is now widely discounted within the literature (Buttny 1998), its pairings of form and representation still routinely serve as the basis for most categorizations regarding the functions of reported speech (Sternberg 1982). Applying the mimetic theory of Plato (2000) loosely, scholars attribute to the direct quotation/accurate reproduction pairing the discourse functions Plato identifies with mimesis (showing, imitating, depicting), while they assign the functions Plato associates with diegesis (telling, narrating, describing) to the indirect quotation/paraphrase pairing.

Empathy Production

In his discussion of mimesis, Plato (2000) stresses the empathetic aspect of imitation. Mimesis' ability to produce empathy for the original speaker in both the imitator and the audience motivates Plato's distrust of poets and his warning against "imitating any kind of illiberality or baseness, lest the fruit of imitation should be reality" (99). A significant portion of the literature on reported speech draws a similar causal connection between direct quotation/accurate reproduction and affective closeness with the reported speaker on the part of the reporter, and ultimately on the part of recipients, during an instance of reported speech (Sternberg 1982). As Wierzbicka (1974: 272) states:

The person who reports another's words by quoting them temporarily assumes the role of that other person, "plays his part," that is to say, imagines himself as the other person and for a moment behaves in accordance with this counter-factual assumption.

According to the literature on reported speech, this affective closeness is a product of direct quotation's formal features. For instance, Li (1986) argues that direct quotation produces empathy because the deictic center and syntax of the quotation are those of the original speaker, and thus the quotation expresses the original speaker's perspective. Similarly, Coulmas (1986) claims that, while indirect speech presents the reporting speaker's perspective, direct speech calls for the reporter to adopt the reported speaker's perspective, to the extent that the reporter's speech "remains the reported speaker's speech whose role is played by the reporter" (2).

Though widely accepted, the conflation of direct quotation/accurate reproduction with affective closeness is problematic. The framing of any direct quotation powerfully influences its presentation, and has as much, if not more, to do with how the speech is reported. As Sternberg points out, "As it is, direct speech itself exhibits the widest and most flexible variability in that it bestrides the whole scale of response, from identification to caricature and condemnation" (1982: 115).

From another direction, not only is formal directness insufficient to establish empathetic mimesis, but it is also unnecessary. Plato's emphasis on style, broadly understood, goes some way toward demonstrating that assuming the perspective of another does not require assuming that person's deictic ground and syntax. The production of empathy cannot be reduced to the structural form or assumed representational accuracy of direct quotation (Sternberg 1982).

Dramatization

Plato's concept of mimesis is also often put to new uses in the literature on reported speech. His metaphor of distance, which originally applies to matters of affect, is reinterpreted in terms of informational density and rhetorical effect, as specificity and realism, often conjoined under the rubric of dramatization (Sternberg 1982). In other words, direct quotation is thought to include more detail than indirect quotation, resulting in direct reports being "closer to" originals, and this "closeness" is thought to produce verisimilitude for report

recipients. Thus a portion of the literature on reported speech draws a causal connection between direct quotation/accurate reproduction and dramatization. As Tannen (1989) says, the use of direct report "creates a play peopled by characters who take on life and breath" (103).

Unlike earlier research on the function of reported speech, however, which emphasizes the perspective of the reported speaker, research on the dramatization function, pioneered by Goffman (1983, 1986), emphasizes the perspective of the reporting speaker. As Goffman states:

For what a speaker does usually is to present for his listeners a version of what happened to him.

In an important sense, even if his purpose is to present the cold facts as he sees them, the means he employs may be intrinsically theatrical, not because he exaggerates or follows a script, but because he may have to engage in something that is a dramatization -- the use of such arts as he possesses to reproduce a scene, to *replay* it.

(1986: 503-504, italics in original)

Goffman examines the perspective of current speakers through the concept of "footing," which he defines as the alignment individuals take up to themselves and others present as demonstrated in the way they "manage the production and reception of an utterance." Goffman claims that "participants over the course of their speaking constantly change their footing," as when using reported speech, and that shifts in footing can be thought of as "a persistent feature of natural talk" (1983: 128).

Goffman's approach is a conceptual leap in the research on reported speech, enabling scholars to focus on how current interactants use reports to further their situated projects during everyday talk. However, many scholars working within this approach (including Goffman himself, to some extent) maintain a concern with the formal/representational distinctions outlined within the verbatim assumption, treating direct report as specific and realistic, and treating specificity and realism as necessary elements in dramatization. As Tannen states, "The casting of thoughts and speech in dialogue creates particular scenes and characters," and "it is the

particular that moves readers by establishing and building on a sense of identification" (1989: 104).

Thus, within this line of research, dramatization is a product of direct quotation's formal features, a function of both the deictic and syntactic independence characteristic of direct report and the retention of the original utterance's prosodic and non-verbal aspects enabled by that independence (Lucy 1993). As Mayes states:

Thus basically a direct quote is assumed to be a verbatim reenactment of an actual previous utterance that may even include the original intonation and gestures. On the other hand, an indirect quote is merely a restatement of a previous utterance, and there is no expectation that words, sentence structure, intonation, or non-verbal messages should be preserved. (1990: 331)

Though widely accepted, the conflation of direct quotation/accurate reproduction with specificity and realism is problematic. As the work of Günthner (1997,

2002) and Klewitz and Couper-Kuhlen (1999) demonstrates, prosodic marking is not exclusive to any particular formal structure, including direct reported speech. In particular, Klewitz and Couper-Kuhlen (1999) illustrate that the prosodic marking of direct reported speech in conversation is not obligatory, and that the prosodic marking of indirect reported speech in conversation is "actually rather widespread, particularly in high-involvement talk" (16). Ultimately, Klewitz and Couper-Kuhlen conclude, "Any and all forms of reported speech may receive prosodic marking in spoken conversational discourse" (30).

Furthermore, even if direct report were somehow more specific than other forms of reported speech, the inclusion of specific detail, in and of itself, does not determine realistic effect. The perceived realism of any dramatic scene, or of any particular utterance within such a scene, depends to a great extent on a number of factors, including cultural notions regarding the nature of reality. The effect of verisimilitude cannot be produced or precluded by the formal structure or representational accuracy of the report alone (Sternberg 1982).

The discussion to this point goes some distance in establishing that a predetermined analytical concern with the formal distinction between direct and indirect report, treating the alternation between forms as a stylistic device, is problematic, particularly if researchers assume that there is a necessary and obvious correlation between form, representation, and function. As Sternberg observes, "Whatever the disparities in reporting techniques, in referential tonality as well as in emotional distance, they are not nearly so polar nor so unidirectional as the matchmakers would have us believe" (1982: 121). Thus, Klewitz and Couper-Kuhlen conclude, "these categories as traditionally defined are not necessarily the relevant ones for spoken interaction" (1999: 16). Rather, as Günthner puts it, "we seem to be dealing with a complex web of factors in the dynamic interrelationship of reported and reporting discourse, factors which have to be analyzed in the concrete interactive situation" (1997: 168).

CONVERSATIONAL PRACTICE

A number of scholars, such as Besnier (1993), Álvarez-Cáccamo (1996), Maynard (1996), Buttney (1997, 1998), Couper-Kuhlen (1998), Klewitz and Couper-Kuhlen (1999), Günthner (1997, 1998, 2000, 2002) and Holt (2000) adopt an analytical perspective on reported speech that differs significantly from the approach that dominates the traditional research. Rather than treating reported speech as a solely grammatical or stylistic device, research within this line considers reported speech as a conversational practice, focusing its attention on participants' methods for actualizing instances of report and putting them to use in everyday talk. This recent approach highlights the polyvocalic nature of report, borrowing from Bakhtin's insights regarding "heteroglossia," or the layering of voices intrinsic to all language use (1981, 1986).

Polyvocality

While Bakhtin argues that all language use by its nature contains multiple voices, he claims that instances of

reported speech overtly mark this polyphony. Thus Bakhtin (1971: 177) describes reported speech by saying:

It is meant not only to be understood in terms of its own referential object, but, by virtue of its character-defining capacity, or its typicality, or its colorfulness, it also appears as the object of another's (the author's) intention.

Günthner echoes this position when she states (2000:9):

One utterance can simultaneously belong to two persons (the quoted figure as well as the narrator), it can be anchored in two "worlds" (the storyworld and the narrating world), and it can carry two points of view (the quoted figure's perspective and the parodic, evaluative perspective of the narrator).

Thus, as Besnier (1993) claims, there is "a certain polysemic 'density'" to instances of reported speech in interaction, in that "the meaning of what is said becomes

complex and multiple when speakers use reported speech" (177).

Assessment

Using the concept of multivoicedness as a guide, scholars have extensively documented the evaluative function of reporting speech in assessing utterances, actions, and the social actors who produce them. Besnier (1993) is among the first to recognize the centrality of assessment in instances of reported speech. He details reporters' use of prosodic structure, deictic adverbs, and rhetorical stylization of quoted material to communicate affect during reports. Thus, he argues, reporters indirectly attribute feelings and/or personal characteristics to reported speakers while simultaneously communicating evaluations of them through these elements, thereby managing the audience's perception of reportees.

Similarly, Álvarez-Cáccamo (1996) discusses reporters' use of code displacement, or the non-isomorphic attribution of language choice, to implicitly evaluate reported speakers during instances of reported speech, while Holt

(2000) claims that reporters use prefatory glosses, the inclusion of laughter particles, and the prosody of the reported speech to produce implicit assessment of the speech that is reported. In addition, Couper-Kuhlen (1998) and Günthner (1997, 1998, 2000, 2002) note that reporters can prosodically and paralinguistically configure reported speech such that it constructs stances for reportees, what Couper-Kuhlen terms "vocal characterization" (1998: 21), by implicitly signaling the reported speakers' speech activities and affective positions, while simultaneously commenting on these aspects, as well as on the reported speakers themselves. Based upon such findings, and his own research on talking race, Buttny (1997) claims, "In each and every case of reported speech we find an assessment of some sort" (501).

Alignment

Interactants do not use reports solely for evaluating reported speakers, however. As Couper-Kuhlen (1998) and Günthner (1997, 1998, 2000, 2002) note, referencing what Silverstein (1993) terms its "metapragmatic character,"

reported speech can be used to construct stances for reporters vis-à-vis the stances it constructs for reportees. Buttny (1998) considers a roughly equivalent use of reported speech, which he discusses in terms of the discursive positioning of self. Similarly, Álvarez-Cáccamo (1996) refers to the alignment reporters take up in relation to the participants in the reported interaction as "strategic self-identification."

The interactional upshot of reporter/reported speaker alignment is its mobilization in relation to reporter/report-recipient alignment in the current interaction. Thus, analysis of reported speech as a conversational practice must consider not only the alignments of the "parties in the talk," but also the alignments of "the parties to the talk" (Edwards and Potter 1992: 125). As Couper-Kuhlen (1998), Günthner (1997, 1998, 2000, 2002) and Holt (2000) demonstrate, stance construction through verbal characterization ultimately invites reporters' co-participants to receive and evaluate the constructed stances in ways that are reporter-aligned. Álvarez-Cáccamo (1996) also notes that the strategic self-identification of reporters contributes to the

establishment of "situated power alliances" with the multiple inhabitants of the space of talk, including recipients. And Besnier (1993) points out that, through the act of reporting, participants establish "relationships between voices that place voices in different positions of responsibility vis-à-vis meaning," such that "speakers can negotiate the degree to which they take responsibility for different aspects of meaning" (178).

Furthermore, the recent research points out that alignment configurations vary from instance to instance in reported speech, such that similarly formed reports "may represent diverging or even opposite patterns of conversational power alliances" (Álvarez-Cáccamo 1996: 54). Thus, while every instance of report may be polyvocalic, individual reports "count" differently for interactants, depending on how the voices within each report are locally managed, relative to one another and to co-present interactants. Consequently, reported speech must be examined empirically, within the local organization of the reporting interaction.

The Current Study

Following the work of Besnier (1993), Álvarez-Cáccamo (1996), Maynard (1996), Buttney (1997, 1998), Couper-Kuhlen (1998), Klewitz and Couper-Kuhlen (1999), Günthner (1997, 1998, 2000, 2002) and Holt (2000) this study focuses on reported speech as a conversational device in everyday talk-in-interaction. Similar to other work within this line of research, this study treats the polyvocality of reported speech as a participants' resource, examining how interactants mobilize the tensions that exist among the multiple voices that inhabit any instance of reported speech to further their own projects within the moment-to-moment of the current exchange.

In addition, this study focuses exclusively on the use of reported speech in non-narrative contexts. The recent research on the use of reported speech in naturally occurring talk is based almost exclusively on conversational narratives, with few exceptions (Baynham 1996, Vincent and Perrin 1999). However, reporting context is an integral aspect of any instance of reported speech, a point Voloshinov emphasizes when he says (1986: 119):

After all, the two actually do exist, function, and take shape only in their interrelation, and not on their own, the one apart from the other.

The reported speech and the reporting context are but the terms of a dynamic interrelationship.

Therefore, as Baynham (1996) argues, further progress in understanding reported speech necessitates "going beyond the canonical narrative discourse context and investigating speech reporting in a wider range of contexts" (80).

Consequently, this study examines presentation formats for reported speech, report strategies that carry distinctive evidential claims (Hill and Irvine 1993) and that are both constituted by and constitutive of the conversational environments in which they operate (Goodwin and Duranti 1992). In particular, this analysis provides empirical descriptions of two presentation formats, which I term "practical reenactment" and "creative enactment." This analysis then provides detailed consideration of the multi-functionality of these presentation formats (Jakobson 1990) within several non-narrative conversational activities, from a social-interactional perspective.

METHODOLOGY

The present study focuses on the internal diversity of reported speech as a conversational device, examining how interactants locally manage reports to further their own projects within the moment-to-moment of the current exchange. In addition, the present study focuses exclusively on the use of reported speech in non-narrative episodes of talk-in-interaction, recognizing that reporting context is an integral aspect of any instance of reported speech. In order to best get at these issues, conversation analysis is adopted as the primary research method, within the broader analytical perspective of discourse analysis.

ANALYTICAL PERSPECTIVE

Generally speaking, discourse analysis (DA) is a post-positivist research approach that examines talk as action. In contrast to more traditional approaches to language, which treat language solely as an abstract system for

describing reality, DA looks at language as a participants' tool for reflexively constituting the social world (Atkinson and Heritage 1984, Nofsinger 1991, Psathas 1995, Hopper et al. 1986, Sacks 1992), locating language's meaning in its use (Potter and Wetherell 1987). Consequently, DA recognizes that all talk is multi-functional (Jakobson 1990), with a variety of meanings-in-use operating simultaneously during any particular instance of talk, including, for example, those that are linguistic (such as connecting phrases), pragmatic (such as requesting information), and/or social (such as saving face) in nature. Furthermore, DA recognizes that these functions operate at local and global levels, such that what counts as requesting information at the local level can also count as impression management at the global level, for example (Wood and Kroger 2000).

This understanding of talk as action is significantly influenced by Austin's (1962) theory of speech acts, along with Wittgenstein's (1953) work on language games. In particular, Austin was among the first to propose that, in addition to propositional content, all utterances also have illocutionary force, such that a person actually does

something when using language. Therefore the production of an utterance involves the simultaneous performance of a number of different actions, which Austin outlines as locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts, or the actions of saying something, the actions achieved in saying something, and the actions achieved by saying something, respectively (Holtgraves 2002).

Though Austin's initial theory has been systematized and extended by others, particularly Searle (1969), unresolved problems remain (Nofsinger 1991, Holtgraves 2002). However, as Holtgraves states, "the essential idea of speech act theory -- that in using language one is performing various actions -- is no doubt correct" (2002: 33). It is this essential idea that serves as a primary unifying principle within DA. As Wood and Kroger state (2000: 95):

The overall goal of analysis is to explain what is being done in the discourse and how this is accomplished, that is, how the discourse is structured or organized to perform various

functions and achieve various effects or consequences.

As a methodological perspective, however, DA is characterized by significant internal diversity (Wood and Kroger 2000), due in part to its multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary nature, having origins in philosophy, sociology, linguistics, and literary theory (Wood and Kroger 2000), while being practiced also in anthropology, communication, education, and psychology (Potter and Wetherell 1987). Consequently, varieties of DA differ in terms of their approaches to central methodological issues, such as what type of discourse should be analyzed, and at what analytical level. For a better grasp of this internal diversity, three of the major perspectives within DA are sketched briefly here: critical discourse analysis (CDA), discourse analysis in social psychology (DASP), and conversation analysis (CA).

Critical Discourse Analysis

Perhaps best exemplified by the work of Fairclough and Wodak (1997), CDA developed primarily within linguistics, though it is extensively influenced by post-structuralism (Potter 1996). As the name suggests, the guiding concern in CDA is the critical examination of social and cultural practices, often from within a Marxist perspective. Ultimately, CDA "emphasizes understanding discourse in relation to social problems; to social structural variables such as race, gender, and class; and above all to power" (Wood and Kroger 2000: 21).

CDA's emphasis on more abstract discourse functions contributes to its interest in discourse as a general concept, rather than as a particular instance of talk-in-interaction. CDA also tends to treat the direction of discursive influence as unidirectional and top-down, emphasizing that "people are *positioned by* and *effected through discourse*," and paying relatively little attention to the ways in which people effect discourse (Edley and Wetherell 1997: 205, original emphasis). Consequently, CDA tends to operate on a macro-analytic level and to work with

written texts, media discourse, and fictional work of various kinds (such as novels and movies).

Discourse Analysis in Social Psychology

Discussed definitively within the work of Edwards, Potter, and Wetherell (Edwards and Potter 1992, Potter and Wetherell 1987), DASP is arguably the most inclusive variety of DA. DASP reflects the influence of a number of perspectives and disciplines, including ethnmethodology, conversation analysis, post-structuralism, linguistic philosophy, and rhetoric (Wood and Kroger 2000). DASP is equally broad in terms of its guiding concerns.

Much work in DASP adopts a decidedly rhetorical perspective on the analysis of discourse. Such an approach is, as Tracy puts it, "attentive to the dilemmas of social life" (2002: 28). In other words, DASP recognizes that discourse is rhetorically organized (Potter and Wetherell 1995) and that actions are undertaken and resources are employed for particular purposes in particular interactions (Potter 1996, Tracy 2002). Central rhetorical themes in DASP include version construction, stance, accountability,

and management of stake and interest (Edwards and Potter 1992; Potter 1996, 1997; Tracy 2002).

More generally, work in DASP focuses on participants' practices and the resources upon which they draw in the accomplishment of such practices. In other words, in addition to a focus on talk as action, DASP emphasizes that talk is also a resource upon which participants draw in the realization of actions (Potter and Wetherell 1995).

According to DASP, these practices and resources are flexible and interrelated, such that all utterances can be seen as either action, resource, or both (Wood and Kroger 2000).

Conversation Analysis

Originating in the work of Sacks and his colleagues (Sacks 1992, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1978), CA developed out of sociology in the late 1960s and is related to Garfinkel's work (1967) in ethnomethodology (Heritage 1984, Wieder 1999). Though CA is sometimes thought to be at odds with discourse-analytic work, this contrast is seen primarily in relation to strictly linguistic approaches to

discourse analysis (Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998). Also, CA's relatively recent consideration of a broader range of data, such as organizational interaction (Heritage and Greatbatch 1991, Heritage 1997, Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998) suggests that its program is not as rigid as was once believed. Now, as Wood and Kroger state, "CA is more likely to be viewed as a variety of discourse analysis" (2000: 200, see also Pomerantz and Fehr 1997, Edwards 1998, and Holtgraves 2002).

Among the many varieties of DA, however, CA is unique in its emphasis on the local and interactional management of talk by participants, and its concomitant avoidance of what it terms "premature categorization" on the part of analysts (Schegloff 1993). As Schegloff (1997) argues:

For the events of human conduct, we are dealing with sentient beings who themselves orient to their context, under some formulation or formulations: who grasp their own conduct and that of others under the jurisdictions of some relevancies and not others; who orient to some of the identities they separately and collectively

embody, and at any given moment, not others. And because it is the orientations, meanings, interpretations, understandings, etc. of the *participants* in some socio-cultural event on which the course of that event is predicated -- and especially if it is constructed interactionally over time, it is *those* characterizations which are privileged in the constitution of *socio-interactional reality*, and therefore have a *prima facie* claim to being privileged in efforts to *understand* it. (166-167)

Sequential Action

Work within CA emphasizes the sequential nature of talk, the fact that utterances do not appear in isolation, but rather occur within the context of prior and subsequent talk, and the fact that the location of any particular utterance within a sequence of actions contributes largely to its meaning-in-use. As Nofsinger (1991: 50) states, "An utterance counts as some particular action not only because of what it says, but because of the talk that surrounds

it." In their effort to locate meaning-in-use in the moment-to-moment of talk-in-interaction, researchers in CA rely upon what is termed the "uptake" of utterances (Heritage 1984) in their analysis, a strategy that Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998: 15) describe as follows:

Throughout the course of a conversation or other bout of talk-in-interaction, speakers display in their sequentially 'next' turns an understanding of what the 'prior' turn was about. That understanding may turn out to be what the prior speaker intended, or not; whichever it is, that itself is something which gets displayed in the next turn in the sequence. We describe this as a next-turn-proof-procedure, and it is the most basic tool used in CA to ensure that analyses explicate the orderly properties of talk as oriented-to accomplishments of participants, rather than being based merely on the assumptions of the analyst.

The sequential nature of talk-in-interaction is further evidenced in CA's examination of adjacency pairs. As proposed by Schegloff and Sacks (1973), the concept of adjacency pairs describes the fact that, within talk-in-interaction, many actions routinely occur in two part sequences, with each part produced by a different speaker, such that greetings follow greetings, answers follow questions, and so forth. Consequently, these actions can be thought of as pairs, in which one action constitutes the first part of the pair and the subsequent action constitutes the second. Furthermore, these actions are categorized so that, as Nofsinger (1991: 51) states, "any given first pair part must be matched with one of a relatively few types of second pair parts." And finally, these actions demonstrate the notion of conditional relevance, in that, given a first pair part, a second pair part becomes expected, and if it does not occur, its absence is noticeable (Schegloff 1972).

Turn Organization

In addition to the organization of social actions, conversations also demonstrate the organization of turns-at-talk. Turn organization can be understood both in terms of how turns are structured and how turns are allocated among co-participants. The model proposed by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1978) describes both of these components of the conversational turn-taking system.

Turns consist of construction units, or TCUs, which can vary in length from single words to phrases, clauses, and complete sentences. Regardless of their length, however, TCUs have the feature of projectability, meaning that their intonational and syntactic features enable participants to anticipate their possible completion. These points of possible completion are termed transition relevance places, or TRPs, in that they make transitions from one speaker to another relevant.

When a TRP occurs, interactants have multiple options for allocating the next turn-at-talk in the sequential organization of the conversation. The current speaker may select the next speaker, who is then obligated to take a turn. If the current speaker does not select the next

speaker, then any co-participant may self-select as next speaker at the TRP. Finally, if neither of the above methods is used, the current speaker may continue the turn at the TRP.

DATA AND METHOD

The current study adopts CA as its primary method. CA is particularly useful here because its approach to the analysis of talk is helpful in overcoming many of the problems that plague much of the more traditional research on reported speech. For instance, because of its emphasis on the social, rather than purely linguistic, organization of talk, as well as its rejection of *a priori* categorizing and theorizing by analysts, CA allows for the avoidance of the verbatim assumption, discussed in Chapter 1. In addition, because CA relies on data that are naturally occurring, rather than invented or elicited, CA is well suited for the task of uncovering some of the lesser-known uses of reported speech, such as those in non-narrative episodes of talk-in-interaction, allowing analysts to "be

open to whatever phenomena the data reveal" (Goodwin 1984: 246).

The current study is based on 16 hours of videotaped, naturally occurring, face-to-face interactions. The interactions consist of informal conversations in English among the author's family members, friends, acquaintances, and cohorts. The participants number approximately 20 in total, both male and female, in good mental and physical health. Participants were not screened prior to participation, and the only criteria for inclusion was a willingness to participate.

In accordance with the regulations concerning the recording of human subjects at the University of Texas at Austin, all those who participated in the recording gave their verbal consent. However, in an effort to preserve the naturalistic quality of the data, other interventions on the part of the analyst, outside of her own naturally occurring participation in the interactions, were kept to a minimum. The presence of the camera and the activities of recording and observation were performed openly, however, and were reasonably obvious to all involved.

Over 200 reported speech sequences were identified holistically within the interactions, relying upon participants' orientations to the speech as reported for this identification. These sequences were isolated as separate video clips, averaging approximately 1 minute in length. These video clips were then transcribed, using the method first developed by Jefferson and since elaborated by others (Atkinson and Heritage 1984).

Based upon repeated viewings of the video clips, in conjunction with reference to the transcripts, reported speech sequences were organized into classes that emerged from the data. As the purpose of the current study is to analyze reported speech in non-narrative contexts, environments that consisted entirely of conversational narratives were set aside. The remaining classes were then examined in terms of the participants' methods for locally managing instances of reported speech in the furtherance of situated projects during non-narrative episodes of talk-in-interaction.

In particular, this analysis provides empirical descriptions of two presentation formats, which I term "practical reenactment" and "creative enactment," through

which participants realize and utilize reported speech in non-narrative talk-in-interaction. This analysis then provides detailed examination of these presentation formats from a social-interactional perspective, considering their distinctive evidential claims (Hill and Irvine 1993) and the variety of conversational activities through which they are constituted, and of which they are constitutive (Goodwin and Duranti 1992), thus enabling the diversity of ways in which reports can "count" for interactants.

PRACTICAL REENACTMENT
FROM PRIOR INTERACTIONS

As discussed in Chapter 1, the more recent research on reported speech points out that individual reports "count" differently for interactants, depending on how they are locally managed. Consequently, reported speech must be examined empirically, within the local organization of reporting interactions. However, as of this date, examinations of reported speech in naturally occurring talk have focused almost exclusively on one reporting context: conversational narratives, thus leaving relatively unconsidered the non-narrative uses of reported speech in everyday talk-in-interaction.

An examination of reported speech's use in exclusively non-narrative episodes illuminates an interesting feature of its multi-functionality, however: interactants treat the representational aspect of reports differently. Thus, sometimes participants treat reports as creative enactments, similar to Tannen's notion of "constructed

dialogue" (1989, 2004), in which reporters present, and recipients take up, reports as inventions of the current speaker. Other times, however, participants treat reports as practical reenactments, similar to Vlatten's concept of "doing being faithful" (1997), in which reporters present, and recipients take up, reports as authentic, "faithful" repeats of actual prior utterances. Furthermore, the particular treatment of any individual instance of reported speech seems to be intimately tied up with the conversational activity in which it is mobilized.

Interactants, then, do not strictly adhere to any one of the conceptualizations of reported speech proposed within the research, opting instead for diverse treatments of reports in the furtherance of situated projects during the moment-to-moment of talk-in-interaction. And, as Vlatten (1997: 22) states, "Ultimately, the most important thing is not how we as analysts label some form of quoted speech, but rather how speakers in conversation use it, and how co-participants orient to it." Thus participants realize reported speech through presentation formats, or report strategies that carry distinctive evidential claims (Hill and Irvine 1993) and that are both constituted by and

constitutive of the conversational environments in which they operate (Goodwin and Duranti 1992).

The practical reenactment presentation format, discussed here and in Chapter 4, affirms both that some original talk occurred and that the report is a relatively straightforward repeat of it in the current interaction. To be clear, the objective actuality of the original utterance is not necessarily a feature of instances in which the practical reenactment format is used. However, a close analysis of reported speech in non-narrative episodes of talk-in-interaction demonstrates that reporters often present, and recipients often take up, reports as practical reenactments, nevertheless. Thus, the affirmations that practical reenactment entails both enable and constrain the successful use of reports in a variety of non-narrative conversational activities.

As the most canonical form of reported speech is one in which reporters repeat talk that was originally produced during a prior interaction, this chapter focuses on conversational activities that involve such canonical reports, before moving on to activities, and thus reports, that vary more or less widely from this "norm."

CONVEYING

Conveying is a non-narrative interaction activity that incorporates instances of reported speech using the practical reenactment presentation format. Specifically, conveying is the repetition of another speaker's talk from a previous interaction, by the current speaker, who participated in the previous interaction, for a current interaction partner, who did not participate in the previous interaction. By using reported speech as practical reenactment in conveyings, speakers share their firsthand experience, and the informational benefit of that experience, with their addressees. The "Teeth" segment below provides an example of reported speech as practical reenactment in this activity.

Teeth

Mom, Kate, and Sandie are sitting at the kitchen table in Mom's house. Sandie is making telephone calls. Mom and Kate are discussing Mom's teeth.

23 you know- just get a toothpaste that
24 has- but ih I like whitening in mine
25 Sandie: They're not- they aren't open on
26 Fridays. I forgot

In this segment, Kate inquires as to what Mom is doing to make her teeth look so nice, saying "Are you los- using special whitening toothpa:ste or something?" at lines 1-2. Mom answers Kate's question directly with "um mmm" at line 3. Mom then elaborates on her answer with reported speech in lines 3-11. She says, "You know because she told me what to do. She said you need to <as you get older even though you don't smoke and drink a lot of coffee> tartar because uh that's what happens she said you don't get cavities anymore you get tartar and you get all that other mess." Mom continues reporting in lines 13-15, 17-20, and 22-24. Kate takes up Mom's report with continuers, saying "Um hmm" at lines 12, 16, and 21. Sandie then initiates a topic change at line 25.

Conveying occurs in this example in lines 3-11, 13-15, 17-20, and 22-24. Here Mom presents utterances in the current, non-narrative interaction as repeats of the

original talk of another speaker (Sandie) that occurred during a prior interaction in which Mom participated and Kate did not. As Mom does not qualify her practical reenactment in any way, her presentation here affirms both that the original talk occurred and that her repeat of it is relatively straightforward. Thus Mom shares with Kate her firsthand experience of the previous interaction by representing portions of it here.

This conveying is effectively touched off by Kate's question in line 1, which functions as an information request. Kate displays a lack of, and an interest in, information about what Mom is doing to make her teeth look so nice, saying "Are you los- using special whitening toothpa:ste or something?," to which Mom responds with "um mmm" at line 3. Mom goes on, however, to provide Kate with the informational benefit of her personal firsthand experience of a previous interaction with Sandie, which she introduces by saying "You know because she told me what to do." In turn, Kate takes up this conveying minimally throughout, treating it as unproblematic by responding with continuers at lines 12, 16, and 21. Thus both Mom and Kate

treat Mom's report here as a practical reenactment of previous talk.

As the "Teeth" segment suggests, conveyors affirm both that some original talk occurred and that the report is a relatively straightforward repeat of it in the current interaction, and recipients accept these affirmations, taking conveyings at face value, in instances that are treated as unproblematic. Consequently, conveyings are part of the conditionally relevant [answer + report] response in a [question] + [answer + report] sequence, with minimal addressee uptake in the absence of interactional difficulties. One interactional upshot of these affirmations is that conveyors are not responsible for the original utterances that they repeat; they are merely the messengers, so to speak.

The use of the practical reenactment presentation format also affirms, however, that conveyors are fully responsible for the reports they produce in the current interaction, in terms of those reports being relatively straightforward repeats of the original utterances. This responsibility is explicitly demonstrated when conveyors display a concern with "getting something right," so to

speak. For example, a conveyor may engage in self-repair of her report in an apparent effort to remain "faithful" to the original utterance. The "Secretary" segment provides an example.

Secretary

Pat, Lena, and Skeet, who are all off camera, are discussing the occupation of one of Kristen's friends. Kristen is a non-present family member.

- 1 Pat: D-is she still in school?
- 2 Lena: No, she's a- she-
- 3 Skeet: ()
- 4 Lena: She works at the college at uh
- 5 (1) Conway I don't know what she
- 6 does she's a secretary I think is
- 7 what Kristen said wasn't it?
- 8 Skeet: I'll tell you in a minute she
- 9 gave me her card
- 10 Lena: °I believe it was a secre- some kind
- 11 of-° I thought that's what Kristen
- 12 said, she was a secretary

13 Pat: °umm°

14 (3)

At line 1 Pat asks Lena whether Kristen's friend is a student. Lena answers Pat's question directly with "no" at line 2. Lena then elaborates on her answer, including an instance of reported speech, in lines 4-7. She says "She works at the college at uh (1) Conway I don't know what she does she's a secretary I think is what Kristen said," which she follows up with a question to her husband Skeet of "wasn't it?" Skeet responds with "I'll tell you in a minute she gave me her card" at lines 8-9. Lena continues her elaboration in lines 10-12, saying "°I believe it was a secre- some kind of-° I thought that's what Kristen said, she was a secretary." Pat takes up Lena's report minimally, saying "umm" quietly at line 13. A 3-second pause then follows.

Conveying occurs in this segment when Lena says, "she's a secretary" in line 6, which she attributes to Kristen with the post-positioned quotative phrase "I think is what Kristen said" in lines 6-7. Here Lena presents an utterance in the current non-narrative interaction as a

faithful reenactment of the original talk of another speaker (Kristen) that occurred during a prior interaction in which Lena (and apparently Skeet), but not Pat, were participants.

This conveying is effectively touched off by Pat's question in line 1, which functions as an information request, in that Pat displays a lack of, and an interest in, information about whether Kristen's friend is still in school, to which Lena responds with "no" at line 2. Lena goes on, however, to provide Pat with the informational benefit of her personal firsthand experience of a previous interaction with Kristen. However, Lena's practical reenactment here is marked by self-repair and epistemic qualification.

During her initial conveying in lines 6-7, Lena marks the quotative phrase "is what Kristen said" with "I think," demonstrating uncertainty regarding the faithfulness of her repeat of the original utterance. Furthermore, she attempts to verify her report with her husband Skeet, who presumably was a co-participant in the prior interaction, asking him "wasn't it?" at line 7. Finally, in lines 10-12, Lena self-interrupts twice and additionally qualifies her prior

practical reenactment by using the phrases "I believe," "some kind of," and "I thought." In doing so, Lena suggests that her practical reenactment here is not a relatively straightforward repeat of the original utterance. Thus Lena orients to her responsibility as a reporter using the practical reenactment presentation format, in that, though she affirms that the original talk occurred, she also extensively marks her conveying of that original utterance as questionable.

This marking does not appear to reflect negatively on Lena's conveying overall, however. Pat takes up Lena's conveying, including her epistemic qualification of her practical reenactment, minimally, responding with a quiet "umm" at line 13, which is followed by a 3-second pause. This uptake orients to Lena's conveying as non-problematic, suggesting that conveyors can fulfill their practical reenactment responsibilities alternatively, by marking questionable reenactments as such for addressees.

Of course, conveyors are not the only participants who can demonstrate a concern with their practical reenactment responsibilities. Conveyors' addressees may also do so, if they were co-participants in the prior interaction from

which the original utterance is reported, such as by problematizing conveyors' practical reenactments, and thus orienting to the responsibility of conveyors for producing relatively straightforward repeats of original utterances when using the practical reenactment presentation format.

The "Downsizing" segment is a case in point.

Downsizing

Dad, Mom, and their son-in-law Keith are discussing Keith's possible move. Sam and Sydney are trying to interject throughout; their utterances and utterances directed toward them are not transcribed here.

- 1 Mom: I thought you were [downsizing

2 Dad: [Ha ha ha ha yeah

3 I thought you were down[sizing

4 Mom: [Yeah that's

5 what Katie said

6 Keith: Really?

7 Mom: Katie said not as big, yeah

8 Dad: Yeah

9 Mom: [And-

10 Dad: [She said [you was going-

11 Keith: [Oh, not the-

12 Dad: She said you was going down to

13 three bedrooms instead of six

14 Keith: Yeah well [we-

15 Dad: [I- I mean three

16 [three bathrooms

17 Mom: [No no Kate said two bedroo::ms maybe

18 two bathroo::ms (.) [hardly any yard

19 Keith: [W- w- what we-

20 what we have that we don't use is

21 that extra living room

At lines 4-5 in this segment, Mom claims that Kate previously stated that she and Keith were relocating to a smaller home, or downsizing, saying "Yeah that's what Katie said." In response, Keith questions Mom about Katie's prior utterance, saying "Really?" at line 6, to which Mom responds with "Katie said not as big, yeah" at line 7. Dad then echoes Mom's response, producing his own "yeah" at line 8. After multiple attempts to take the floor in lines

9-11, Dad emerges in the clear at line 12. He elaborates on his prior answer to Keith at line 8 with an instance of reported speech in lines 12-13, referring to Kate and saying "She said you was going down to three bedrooms instead of six," which he self-repairs in lines 15-16 in overlap with Keith's response, saying "I- I mean three three bathrooms." Mom overlaps Dad's self-repair with an other-repair, however, using reported speech herself in lines 17-18, saying "No no Kate said two bedroo::ms maybe two bathroo::ms (.) hardly any yard." Keith then shifts the topic at line 19.

Conveying occurs in this segment in lines 12-13, when Dad refers to Kate and says, "She said you was going down to three bedrooms instead of six." Here Dad presents an utterance in the current non-narrative interaction as a repeat of the original talk of someone else (his daughter Kate) from a prior interaction in which he, and apparently Mom, participated, while Keith did not. This conveying is an elaboration on his echoed answer of "Yeah" at line 8 to Keith's question of "Really?" at line 6, which functions as an information request, in that Keith displays a lack of,

and an interest in, information about what Kate said previously.

Though Dad initiates self-repair of his practical reenactment in lines 15-16, he does not qualify his conveying in any other way, affirming both that the original talk occurred and that his repeat of it here, as repaired, is relatively straightforward. Thus Dad provides Keith with the informational benefit of his personal firsthand experience of a previous interaction with Kate. In turn, Keith does not problematize Dad's practical reenactment. Rather, Keith produces initial agreement with Dad's prior turn at talk at line 14, before he drops out of overlap with Dad's self-repair. Thus he takes Dad's practical reenactment here at face value.

Mom, who apparently participated along with Dad in the previous interaction with Kate, does not follow suit, however. Rather, she overlaps Dad's self-repair in lines 15-16 with an other-repair, using reported speech herself in lines 17-18, saying "No no" and attributing to Kate the utterance "two bedroo::ms maybe two bathroo::ms (.) hardly any yard." Thus, while affirming that the original talk occurred, Mom also simultaneously treats Dad's conveying of

that original utterance as faulty. Therefore, by performing other-repair on Dad's practical reenactment, Mom orients to, and evidences a concern with, Dad's conveying responsibility in the current interaction.

To recap, conveying is a non-narrative interaction activity that incorporates instances of reported speech using the practical reenactment presentation format. Speakers use conveyings, or relatively straightforward reenactments of actual utterances from other speakers during prior interactions, to satisfy their current addressees' information requests. Thus conveyings are part of the conditionally relevant [answer + report] response in a [question] + [answer + report] sequence, with minimal addressee uptake in the absence of interactional difficulties. Finally, conveyors and their co-participants can orient to conveyors' differentiated responsibility for their current talk in instances of conveyings, in that, while conveyors are not treated as responsible for the utterances that they report, they are treated as responsible for their reports of those utterances, in the sense that those reports must be seen as relatively straightforward repeats.

CORROBORATING

Corroborating is a non-narrative interaction activity that incorporates instances of reported speech using the practical reenactment presentation format. Like conveying, corroborating is the repetition of another speaker's previous talk by the current speaker. Unlike in conveyings, however, speakers do not use corroboratings for the purpose of providing information for the benefit of addressees. Rather, speakers use corroboratings either to support their stated claims or to display and support their tacit claims in the current interaction. By using reported speech as practical reenactment in corroboratings, speakers bring the positions of non-participants to bear, in effect, in the current interaction. The "Hurry Up" segment below provides an example of a corroborating of an explicit claim.

Hurry Up

Pat, Lena, Nana, Kate (off camera), and Keith (off camera) are talking about going to visit Ken's family members who are in town for the

holidays. Ken walks in the front door, and Pat addresses him.

- 1 Pat: Hurry up
- 2 Ken: You ready to go?
- 3 Pat: Carol said hurry [so grab the
- 4 potatoes
- 5 Keith: [Watch it
- 6 Ken: Let's go
- 7 Pat: ((mouths something to Kate))
- 8 Kate: [.hh hhh
- 9 Ken: [I was just getting a report

At the beginning of this segment, Pat issues a directive to Ken, telling him to "Hurry up" at line 1. Ken asks Pat "You ready to go?" at line 2. Pat responds with an instance of reported speech, saying, "Carol said hurry so grab the potatoes" at lines 3-4, which Ken takes up with "Let's go" at line 6. Pat then directs a mouthed utterance to Kate at line 7, and the exchange between Pat and Ken regarding the need to hurry comes to end.

Corroborating occurs in this example in line 3, when Pat says, "Carol said hurry." Here Pat presents an utterance in the current, non-narrative interaction as a repeat of the original utterance of another speaker (Carol) that occurred during a prior interaction. As Pat does not hedge or qualify her practical reenactment in any way, her presentation here affirms both that the original talk occurred and that her repeat of it here is relatively straightforward. Thus Pat reproduces Carol's previous utterance here, in effect, bringing it to bear in the current interaction.

Pat's corroborating here is offered in support of her stated directive to Ken to "hurry up" in line 1. When Ken does not accept Pat's directive in his next turn at talk, Pat introduces Carol's prior utterance into the current interaction, saying "Carol said hurry" at line 3. In doing so, Pat justifies her previously stated directive by aligning it with a prior injunction from Carol to "hurry." As Carol is one of the family members that Ken and Pat are planning to visit, the direction to "hurry" is especially relevant when she is its source. Thus Pat supports her

stated position here by aligning it was a position shared by someone else, in general, and by Carol, in particular.

In terms of uptake, Ken responds to Pat's corroborating with an agreement to act, saying "Let's go" in line 6. By accepting Pat's directive, Ken both aligns with Pat's stated position and grants the evidential benefit of Pat's corroborating relative to Pat's position in the current exchange. Thus Pat's corroborating is successfully achieved in this instance. A similar uptake of the corroborating of a tacit position occurs in the "Leno" segment below.

Leno

Keith, Kate, Mom, and Dad are discussing the war in Afghanistan.

7 says they're gonna rebuild
8 Afghanistan th- they say. rebuild?
9 >what are you gonna do?< they're
10 gonna move the rock from here [(.)
11 back [over to here?
12 Mom: [To there
13 Kate: [.Hh huh ↑hi know that's what
14 I said [it's like it [↓didn't look=
15 Dad: [Yeah
16 Mom: [That's all
17 they got
18 Kate: =like there's much there
19 to begin with
20 Dad: Yeah

Dad presents an instance of reported speech from the host of "The Tonight Show," Jay Leno, in lines 6-11, saying, "Well just like oh- uh- Jay Leno says they're gonna rebuild Afghanistan th- they say. Rebuild? >What are you gonna do?< they're gonna move the rock from here (.5) back over to here?" Mom overlaps Dad's utterance with an anticipated completion of "to there" in line 12, and Kate overlaps

Dad's utterance with laughter, agreement, and another description of Afghanistan in lines 13-14 and 18-19, saying ".Hh huh ↑hi know that's what I said it's like it ↓didn't look like there's much there to begin with." Mom and Dad then both overlap Kate's talk with agreement, Dad saying "Yeah" at lines 15 and 20, and Mom saying "That's all they got" at lines 16-17.

Corroborating occurs in this example in lines 6-11, when Dad says "Well just like oh- uh- Jay Leno says they're gonna rebuild Afghanistan th- they say. Rebuild? >What are you gonna do?< They're gonna move the rock from here (.5) back over to here?" Here Dad presents an utterance in the current, non-narrative interaction as a repeat of the original utterance of another speaker (Jay Leno) that occurred during a prior interaction, assumedly a previous broadcast of "The Tonight Show." As Dad does not hedge or qualify his practical reenactment in any way, his presentation here affirms both that the original talk occurred and that his repeat of it here is relatively straightforward. Thus Dad reproduces Jay Leno's previous utterance here, in effect, bringing it to bear in the current interaction.

Dad offers his corroborating here as both manifestation of, and support for, a tacit position on his part. Dad takes on Jay Leno's original utterance by reproducing it here without an addressee request, and by introducing it with the phrase "Well just like oh- uh- Jay Leno says" at lines 6-7. In doing so, Dad marks the original utterance as "just like" something, which in this case is Dad's own tacit position. In addition, Dad supports his position by identifying its source as Jay Leno, a generally known media personality. Thus Dad adopts the position expressed in the utterance as his own, and he simultaneously strengthens his adopted position by aligning it with someone else's position in general, and with Jay Leno's position in particular, as Jay Leno could be thought to have a celebrity's authority here.

In terms of uptake, both Mom and Kate respond to Dad's corroborating by displaying alignment with Dad's adopted position. Mom overlaps Dad's corroborating with an anticipated completion in line 12, and Kate overlaps Dad's corroborating with laughter, agreement, and her own similar description of Afghanistan in lines 13-14 and 18-19, saying, ".Hh huh †hi know that's what I said it's like it

↓didn't look like there's much there to begin with."

Through these alignment displays, both Mom and Kate orient to Dad's tacit position as presented in the corroborating and grant the evidential benefit of the corroborating relative to Dad's tacit position.

Agreement Preference

As the segments discussed thus far indicate, corroborating is a reporter-initiated non-narrative interaction activity that either supports speakers' stated claims or displays and supports speakers' tacit claims in naturally occurring exchanges. In either case, corroboratings make addressee uptake relevant, inviting alignment with speakers' positions and acceptance of corroboratings' evidential benefits through displayed agreement in post-corroborating slots. Thus the preferred sequence shape for corroboratings can be described as [claim + report] + [agreement]. This preference for agreement in corroborating sequences is evidenced in the ways addresses' manage disagreement. The "Ignorant" segment below provides two examples.

Ignorant

Two sisters, Lena and Nana, are talking about a family member who is in jail

- 1 Nana: I don't think it was-
- 2 I still don't think it was her,
- 3 I thought she- I think she's got
- 4 more sense than that
- 5 Lena: Well why did they fine her five
- 6 hundred dollars then, to-? Curtis
- 7 said they really (.) took her in
- 8 there and gave her the third
- 9 degree. She owned ↑up to ↓it.
- 10 (4)
- 11 Pat: Ignorant
- 12 Nana: I can't believe th- that she was
- 13 that ignorant
- 14 Lena: Well she is ignorant if she done that
- 15 Nana: °Yeah, so-°
- 16 Lena: And he's ignorant for asking her
- 17 to do it. Skeet said if she done it,
- 18 it was because of him, trying to

19 please him

20 (2)

Prior to the beginning of this segment, Lena attributes the extension of Toby's jail term to Toby's wife sending him marijuana in prison. Nana claims in lines 1-4 that she does not believe Toby's wife was the source of the marijuana.

She says "I don't think it was- I still don't think it was her, I thought she- I think she's got more sense than that." Lena then presents multiple facts, including an instance of reported speech, as support for her position in lines 5-9, saying "Well why did they fine her five hundred dollars then, to-? Curtis said they really (.) took her in there and gave her the third degree. She owned up to it."

Following a 4-second pause, Pat responds at line 11 by referring to Toby's wife as "ignorant."

Nana claims continued disbelief, however, at lines 12-13, saying "I can't believe th- that she was that ignorant," to which Lena responds with "Well she is ignorant if she done that" at line 14. Nana offers a quiet "yeah, so-" at line 15, which Lena effectively cuts off by saying "and he's ignorant for asking her to do it" in lines

16-17. Thus Lena claims that Toby asked his wife to send him the marijuana in prison, and she presents another instance of reported speech in lines 17-19, saying "Skeet said if she done it, it was because of him, trying to please him." A 2-second gap follows at line 20, and the exchange between Lena and Nana effectively comes to an end.

Corroborating occurs at two points in this segment, in lines 6-9 and 17-19. Here Lena presents two separate utterances in the current, non-narrative interaction as repeats of the original talk of two other speakers (Curtis and Skeet, respectively) that occurred during two prior interactions. The absence of hedges and/or qualifications in Lena's presentation affirms that the original talk occurred and that her repeats of it here are relatively straightforward. Thus Lena reproduces the previous utterances of Curtis and Skeet here, in effect, bringing them to bear in the current interaction.

Similar to Pat's corroborating in the "Hurry Up" segment above, Lena's first corroborating here is offered in support of a previously stated claim; specifically, her claim that Toby's wife was the source of the marijuana he received in prison. When Nana disagrees in lines 1-4,

saying "I still don't think it was her" and "I think she's got more sense than that," Lena presents several items as grounds for her claim, including a previous utterance from Curtis, saying in lines 5-9 "Well why did they fine her five hundred dollars then, to-? Curtis said they really (...) took her in there and gave her the third degree. She owned up to it."

In doing so, Lena justifies her position, in part by aligning it with Curtis' description of a prior interaction between Toby's wife and prison officials. As Curtis is Toby's father-in-law, he presumably has more access to information about this matter than Lena does. Thus, by reproducing Curtis' utterance here, Lena strengthens her stated position by aligning it with a position that is apparently shared by someone else, in general, and by someone with intimate access to relevant information, in particular.

Lena's corroborating is followed by a 4-second pause at line 10, a pause that belongs to Nana as the addressee of Lena's prior utterance. By taking a pass at line 10, Nana avoids replying explicitly to Lena's prior utterance. However, because agreement is the preferred response in a

corroborating sequence, as the discussion to this point indicates, Nana's lack of uptake here is, in effect, a display of a lack of agreement on Nana's part. Thus, through her non-production of a response, Nana both implicitly rejects Lena's stated position and denies the evidential benefit of Lena's corroborating in this instance.

In contrast, Pat, the non-addressed recipient in the immediate adjacency pair, takes up Lena's prior utterance after the 4-second pause, referring to Toby's wife as "ignorant" at line 11. By evaluating Toby's wife in a manner that agrees with Lena's stated claim, Pat both aligns with Lena's position and grants the evidential benefit of Lena's corroborating in the current interaction. As a result, Lena's corroborating in this instance is partially successful, despite Nana's non-response at line 10.

Lena's second corroborating here is also offered in support of a stated claim. At lines 16-19, Lena claims that Toby is "ignorant for asking" his wife to send him marijuana in prison. Immediately following this claim, Lena introduces a prior utterance from her husband Skeet into

the current interaction, saying "Skeet said if she done it, it was because of him, trying to please him." In doing so, Lena justifies her stated position by presenting Skeet's original utterance as support, an utterance that basically restates her own prior claim. As Skeet is generally respected among members of Lena's family as a good judge of character, Lena strengthens her stated position by aligning it with the nearly identical position of another family member, in general, and a well-respected family member in regard to the matter at hand, in particular.

As with her first corroborating, Lena's second corroborating here is followed by a significant pause; in this instance, a 2-second pause at line 20. By taking passes during this pause, both Nana and Pat avoid replying explicitly to Lena's previous utterance. However, because agreement is the preferred response in a corroborating sequence, the lack of uptake by either Nana or Pat here is, in effect, a display of lack of agreement on both of their parts. Thus, by not responding here, Nana and Pat both implicitly reject Lena's stated position(s) and deny the evidential benefit(s) of Lena's corroborating(s) in this segment. The "Bleed" segment below provides an example of

dispreferred uptake in a corroborating sequence supporting a tacit claim.

Bleed

Lena, Nana, and Keith (off camera) are talking about cleaning a deer carcass.

- 1 Nana: Billy um- Billy s- eh ah s- said
- 2 he hung them up by the head
- 3 and that way you know it's easier
- 4 for the blood to come out you know
- 5 I mean has he got it hung up
- 6 by the head or has he he got it
- 7 hung up by the legs?
- 8 Keith: Hung up by the hind legs
- 9 Nana: Well Billy said th- a:t that's crazy
- 10 (1.5) they're a lot easier to h-
- 11 he said they're a lot easier to
- 12 handle if you hang them up
- 13 by the head
- 14 (2)
- 15 Keith: Well i- (1) it's all skinned

16 and stuff no::w
17 (2)
18 Nana: I know but ha- he was saying
19 you know if if Ken ever [()
20 Lena: [Did he cut
21 his head off?
22 Keith: Yeah
23 Lena: He cut his head off Wanda,
24 it'll bleed

In lines 1-4 here Nana describes her son Billy's prior utterances regarding deer cleaning, saying "Billy um- Billy s- eh ah s- said he hung them up by the head and that way you know it's easier for the blood to come out." After a question-answer sequence with Keith in lines 5-8, which establishes that the deer carcass in the yard is hung up by its hind legs, Nana continues, including an instance of reported speech, saying "Well Billy said th- a:t that's crazy (1.5) they're a lot easier to h- he said they're a lot easier to handle if you hang them up by the head" in lines 9-13. Keith replies after a 2-second gap, with "Well i- (1) it's all skinned and stuff no::w," in lines 15-16,

and Nana projectably begins another report from Billy in lines 18-19, after another 2-second gap, saying "I know but ha- he was saying you know if if Ken ever ()." Lena effectively cuts Nana off, however, initiating a question-answer sequence with Keith in line 20 and thereby establishing that the deer carcass in the yard is already headless. Lena then brings the topic to a close in lines 23-24, telling Nana "He cut his head off Wanda, it'll bleed."

Corroborating occurs in lines 9-13 in this segment, when Nana says "Well Billy said th- a:t that's crazy (1.5) they're a lot easier to h- he said they're a lot easier to handle if you hang them up by the head." Here Nana presents an utterance in the current, non-narrative interaction as a repeat of the original talk of another speaker (her son Billy) that occurred during a previous interaction. Nana's corroborating both manifests and supports a tacit position on her part. By reproducing Billy's original utterances here in the absence of addressee requests, Nana effectively takes on the position expressed in the utterances. She simultaneously supports this adopted position by identifying Billy, a known deer hunter, as its source. Thus

Nana aligns her position with that of another person, in general, and someone with deer hunting experience, in particular.

Nana's corroborating fails, however, in that Keith, her addressee, produces a dispreferred response to it in lines 14-16. Keith's response is marked as dispreferred by the preceding 2-second pause and the inclusion of a "well" delay item, among other features, in his statement "Well i-(1) it's all skinned and stuff no::w." Thus Keith displays a lack of agreement with Nana, rejecting her tacit claim and the evidential benefit of her corroborating.

Furthermore, Lena steps in at line 20, effectively cutting Nana off by initiating a question-answer sequence with Keith that explicitly establishes the headless state of the deer in the yard. Lena then addresses Nana in lines 23-24, saying "he cut his head off Wanda, it'll bleed." Through her stress on the word "off" and her firm assertion of "it'll bleed," Lena explicitly disagrees with Nana's claim and denies the evidential benefit of her corroborating by explicitly asserting an opposing position.

Responsibility for Report

As discussed above in relation to conveyors, the use of the practical reenactment presentation format affirms that corroborators are not responsible for the original utterances they repeat. This lack of responsibility is a feature of all corroboratings. Indeed, the ability of utterances to function as corroboratings depends upon this lack of responsibility to a certain extent, in that it enables corroborators to introduce the positions of non-participants into the current interaction, as having evidential benefit.

Paradoxically, however, while depending on this lack of responsibility in one sense, corroborators simultaneously downplay it in another sense, aligning with the original utterances they reproduce in order for their practical reenactments to function as support for their claims in the current interaction. Corroborators are more than "just messengers"; they are interested parties in the activity in which reporting is used. Consequently, while conveyors may sometimes problematize their reports, as discussed above in relation to the "Secretary" segment,

corroborators do not, because to do so would undermine the very activity of corroborating.

In review, corroborating is a non-narrative interaction activity that incorporates instances of reported speech using the practical reenactment presentation format. In terms of sequential organization, corroborating is reporter-initiated and makes addressee uptake relevant, inviting displayed agreement in post-corroborating slots. Thus the preferred sequence shape for corroboratings can be described as [claim + report] + [agreement], though dispreferred sequences do occur.

Furthermore, speakers use corroboratings, or relatively straightforward practical reenactments of actual utterances from prior interactions, to support their stated claims or to display and support their tacit claims in the current interaction. Thus, unlike conveyors, corroborators do not mark their differentiated responsibility relative to their practical reenactments. Rather, corroborators instead allow a relatively paradoxical tension to exist between their lack of responsibility for, and their (sometimes identifying) alignment with, the original utterances they report.

PRACTICAL REENACTMENT
FROM ONGOING INTERACTIONS

Participants realize reported speech through presentation formats, or report strategies that carry distinctive evidential claims (Hill and Irvine 1993) and that are both constituted by, and constitutive of, the conversational environments in which they operate (Goodwin and Duranti 1992). The practical reenactment presentation format discussed here and in Chapter 3 affirms both that some original talk occurred and that the report is a relatively straightforward repeat of it in the current interaction. To be clear, the objective actuality of the original utterance is not necessarily a feature of instances in which the practical reenactment format is used. However, a close analysis of reported speech in non-narrative episodes of talk-in-interaction demonstrates that reporters often present, and recipients often take up, reports as practical reenactments, nevertheless.

Thus, the affirmations that practical reenactment entails both enable and constrain the successful use of reports in a variety of non-narrative conversational activities. This chapter focuses on conversational activities, and thus reports, that vary from the canonical "norm" of reported speech. Specifically, this chapter examines instances in which reporters repeat talk that was originally produced during the current, ongoing interaction.

CRITIQUING

Critiquing is a non-narrative interaction activity that incorporates instances of reported speech using the practical reenactment presentation format. Critiquing is the repetition by the current speaker of a co-participant's talk from the current interaction, addressed to the original speaker of the repeated talk. By using reported speech as practical reenactment in critiquings, speakers re-present and remark upon the prior utterances of current interactants, effectively holding them responsible as addressing selves (Goffman 1983) for their previous

utterances in the current exchange. The "Bike Race" segment below provides an example of reported speech as practical reenactment in this activity.

Bike Race

A family is playing Trivial Pursuit and discussing the Tour De France, which was the topic of the previous question. Sam interjects throughout, but his utterances and utterances directed at him are not part of the critiquing exchange, and therefore are not transcribed here.

- 1 Sandie: Weeeeee (.) [is that a bike race=
- 2 Kris: [Of course-
- 3 Sandie: =or [a foot race?
- 4 Mom: [Hih
- 5 Todd: [Yes it's a bicycle race=
- 6 Kate: =It's [a bike race
- 7 Dad: [a bike race
- 8 Sandie: I said [bike race and you said [no
- 9 Mom: [↑↓Ohhh [I
- 10 didn't- no, you're right

11 Dad: I said yes- [I said ()
12 Todd: [Don't listen to Patty
13 [()
14 Mom: [()
15 Sandie: Give us a green pie

At the beginning of this segment, Sandie discovers that her answer of "Tour de France" is the correct response to her Trivial Pursuit question. She then asks the other players "is that a bike race or a foot race?" at lines 1 and 3, overlapping Kris' failed start at line 2 and Mom's laughter at line 4. Todd, Kate, and Dad answer Sandie's question, stating that the Tour de France is a bike race in lines 5-7. Sandie then presents reported speech in line 8, addressing Mom with "I said bike race and you said no." Mom overlaps Sandie's utterance in response at line 9, first saying "↑↓Ohhh" and then saying "I didn't- no, you're right" at lines 9-10. After failed starts by Dad, Todd, and Mom in lines 11-14, respectively, Sandie brings the topic to a close, saying "Give us a green pie" at line 15.

Critiquing occurs in this example in line 8, when Sandie says, "I said bike race and you said no." Here

Sandie presents an exchange in the current, non-narrative interaction as a repeat of an exchange between herself and another current interactant (Mom) that occurred earlier in the ongoing exchange. As Sandie does not hedge or qualify her practical reenactment in any way, her presentation here affirms both that the original talk occurred and that her repeat of it is relatively straightforward.

Furthermore, Sandie's practical reenactment here presents Mom's original utterance as incorrect, in that it contrasts with Sandie's prior claim that the Tour de France is a bike race, a claim that is now supported by similar statements from Todd, Kate, and Dad in lines 4-6. Finally, Sandie addresses her practical reenactment to Mom by orienting to her physically and using the second person pronoun "you." Thus Sandie casts a prior utterance by Mom as faulty, and she holds Mom accountable for the production of this faulty utterance in the current exchange.

Mom responds to Sandie's critiquing at lines 9-10. After her expressive "↑Ohhh" utterance, Mom appears to begin a denial of Sandie's critiquing by saying "I didn't- ." Mom then self-corrects, however, saying "no, you're right" at line 10, thereby displaying agreement with

Sandie's practical reenactment. Thus both Sandie and Mom treat Sandie's report here as a relatively straightforward repeat of their prior talk. Furthermore, through her response Mom also displays agreement with Sandie's critiquing, accepting responsibility for the original utterance as faulty, as characterized by Sandie.

Agreement Preference

As the "Bike Race" segment suggests, critiquing is a non-narrative interaction activity that re-presents and remarks upon the prior utterances of current interactants, addressing them as reported speakers, and effectively holding them responsible for their previous talk in the current interaction. Thus critiquings make addressee uptake relevant, inviting alignment with speakers' positions and acceptance of speakers' characterizations of prior utterances through displayed agreement in post-critiquing slots. Consequently, the preferred sequence shape for critiquings can be described as [report + assessment] + [agreement]. This preference for agreement is also evidenced in the ways addresses' manage disagreement in

critiquing sequences. The "Philadelphia" segment below provides an example.

Philadelphia

Pat and Kate are discussing Kate's personal history, including her hometown of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, when Nana interjects.

- 1 Nana: Oh huh you act like
- 2 Philadelphia wasn't in
- 3 Pehhn[sylvahhniah ha ha ha
- 4 Pat: [Well I know [but she said-=
- 5 Kate: [Oh well no
- 6 but- but-
- 7 Pat: =I know that she didn't say
- 8 Pennsyl[vania
- 9 Nana: [She said she said she said
- 10 Pennsylvania and you said
- 11 Philahh[delphiahha ha
- 12 Kate: [Um hmm
- 13 Pat: [Yeah Philadelphia
- 14 Pennsylvania

15 Kate: Well there's lots of- there's
16 Pennsylvania Dutch Country too
17 but that's a big difference from
18 huh hah where I was raised
19 Pat: Then y'all moved to Arkansas?
20 Kate: Um hmm

Nana addresses Kate at the beginning of this segment, describing Kate's behavior in the current interaction by saying "Oh huh you act like Philadelphia wasn't in Pehhnnsylvahniah ha ha ha" with embedded laughter in lines 1-3. Pat and Kate respond in overlap in lines 4 and 5-6, respectively, with Pat's response ultimately emerging from the overlap in lines 7-8. Nana then overlaps Pat's response, pointing at Pat and addressing Kate with reported speech in lines 9-11, saying "She said she said she said Pennsylvania and you said Philahhdelphiah ha." Kate responds with "Um hmm" and a head nod in line 12, which Pat overlaps in lines 13-14. Kate then continues her response to Nana by saying "Well there's lots of- there's Pennsylvania Dutch Country too but that's a big difference from huh hah where I was raised" in lines 15-18. Pat then

initiates a topic shift in line 19, bringing the segment to a close.

Critiquing occurs in this example in lines 9-11, when Nana says "She said she said she said Pennsylvania and you said Philahhdelphiahh ha." Here Nana presents an exchange in the current, non-narrative interaction as a repeat of an earlier exchange between two current interactants (Pat and Kate). As Nana does not hedge or qualify her practical reenactments in any way, her presentation here affirms both that the original exchange occurred and that her repeat of it is relatively straightforward.

Furthermore, Nana's practical reenactment here presents Kate's original utterance as an inappropriate response to Pat's talk, as the extensive embedded laughter indicates, and as Nana's characterization in lines 1-3 of Kate's immediately prior behavior suggests. Finally, by pointing at Pat and referring to her as the "she" in the reproduced exchange, Nana addresses her practical reenactment to Kate, using the pronoun "you." Thus Nana casts a prior utterance by Kate as faulty, and she holds Kate accountable for the production of this faulty utterance in the current exchange.

Kate responds to Nana's critiquing at line 12 and lines 15-18, in overlap with an utterance by Pat in lines 13-14. By saying "um hmm" and nodding her head in line 12, Kate displays initial agreement with Nana's practical reenactment, affirming both that the original talk occurred and that the report is a relatively straightforward repeat of it. However, Kate follows her initial response with an account for her original utterance, saying "Well there's lots of- there's Pennsylvania Dutch Country too but that's a big difference from huh hah where I was raised" in lines 15-18. In doing so, Kate presents an alternate characterization of her original utterance, one in which she does not contrast Philadelphia with Pennsylvania, as Nana suggests, but rather specifies Philadelphia within Pennsylvania, a specification that Kate presents as important because of the "big difference" between places within Pennsylvania, such as those between Philadelphia, where Kate "was raised," and "Pennsylvania Dutch country."

Thus, both Nana and Kate treat Nana's report here as a relatively straightforward repeat of Kate's prior talk. However, though Kate's initial response displays agreement with Nana's practical reenactment, Kate's follow up

displays disagreement with Nana's critiquing, denying Kate's responsibility for the production of a faulty utterance, as characterized by Nana. Furthermore, Kate's disagreement is marked as such with the preface, which consists of the delay item "well," and with the embedded laughter particles, which serve to weaken the disagreement (Pomerantz 1996). Consequently, Nana's critiquing fails here, and Kate's rejection of Nana's critiquing evidences the preference for agreement that holds in critiquing sequences.

Responsibility for Report

Thus we can see that critiquers present, and addressees take up, critiquings as practical reenactments of talk that occurred previously in the current interaction, even in cases in which addressees reject the characterizations of the utterances. Obviously, critiquers are not responsible for the original utterances they repeat. This lack of responsibility is a feature of all critiquings; indeed, the ability of utterances to function as critiquings depends upon this lack of responsibility to a certain extent, in

that it enables critiquers to characterize utterances and to attribute them to other co-participants. Thus critiquers, like corroborators in Chapter 3, are more than "just messengers;" they are interested parties in the activity in which reporting is used.

While the use of the practical reenactment presentation format affirms that critiquers are not responsible for the original utterances they repeat, it also affirms that critiquers are fully responsible for the reports they produce in the current interaction, in terms of those reports being relatively straightforward repeats of the original utterances. Consequently, critiquers' current interaction partners may problematize critiquers' reports by calling their status as practical reenactments into question, thereby orienting to, and evidencing a concern with, the presentational responsibilities of critiquers. The "Tired" and "Air" segments below are cases in point.

Tired

Mom, Sandie, and Sandie's daughter Sydney are gathered in the kitchen

1 Sydney: Hey I heard you say tired
2 Mom: Tired? Are you tired?
3 Sydney: No[:::
4 Mom: [I actually- I didn't go to sleep
5 until two in the morning
6 but °I actually slept pretty good°
7 Sydney: I heard you say she- Sydney's tired
8 Sandie: ((hangs up phone))
9 Mom: I didn't say Sydney's tired
10 Sandie: ((clears throat))
11 Mom: I got to put my little check
12 in the bank

At the beginning of this segment, Sydney claims that she heard Mom make a statement involving the word "tired." Mom responds by asking Sydney if she is tired at line 2, which Sydney denies emphatically, saying "No:::" at line 3. Mom overlaps Sydney's response, describing her previous night's rest in lines 4-6. Sydney then presents reported speech in line 7, addressing Mom and saying "I heard you say she- Sydney's tired." Mom replies with "I didn't say Sydney's

tired" in line 9. Mom then initiates a topic shift in lines 11-12, and the exchange comes to a close.

Critiquing occurs in this example in line 7, when Sydney says, "I heard you say she- Sydney's tired." Here Sydney presents an utterance in the current, non-narrative interaction as a repeat of an utterance by a current interactant (Mom) that occurred earlier in the current interaction. As Sydney does not hedge or qualify her practical reenactment in any way, her presentation here affirms both that the original talk occurred and that her repeat of it is relatively straightforward.

Furthermore, Sydney's practical reenactment presents Mom's original utterance as incorrect, in that it contrasts with Sydney's emphatic denial of being tired in line 3. Finally, Sydney addresses her practical reenactment to Mom by orienting to her physically and using the second person pronoun "you." Thus Sydney casts a prior utterance by Mom as faulty, and she holds Mom accountable for the production of this faulty utterance in the current exchange.

Mom responds to Sydney's critiquing at line 9, when she says "I didn't say Sydney's tired." In doing so, Mom problematizes Sydney's practical reenactment, suggesting

that it cannot possibly be a relatively straightforward repeat of an original utterance, because the original utterance never occurred. Thus Mom orients to, and thereby evidences a concern with, the responsibility that Sydney's use of the practical reenactment format entails. By rejecting Sydney's practical reenactment in this instance, Mom also refuses to accept any responsibility whatsoever for the purported original utterance, and Sydney's critiquing fails as a result.

The "Air" segment below provides another example of critiquing recipients' orientation to the presentational responsibility of critiquers.

Air

A family is playing Trivial Pursuit and discussing the pronunciation of the word "era," which was part of the previous question.

1 Sandie: What do you say, era

2 ((pronounced [eara]))?

3 Keith: You said air

4 Dad: Era

5 Sandie: I'm pretty sure I didn't say air
6 would you [be- we can rewind it
7 Kate: [No I di- [I SAID THE=
8 Mom: [We all know=
9 Kate: =SECOND REICH which is
10 an error [()- era
11 Mom: =we all heard [it
12 Sandie: [Uh huh huh huh

Prior to the beginning of this segment, Keith learns that the latest Trivial Pursuit question contained the word "era," and he states that he thought Sandie said "air" when she originally read the question aloud. In lines 1-2 of the transcript, Sandie asks Keith how he pronounces the word "era." Rather than responding to Sandie's question, however, Keith presents reported speech in the next turn at talk, addressing Sandie and saying "You said air" in line 3. After an interjection by Dad, Sandie replies to Keith, saying "I'm pretty sure I didn't say air would you be- we can rewind it" in lines 5-6. Kate loudly reproduces her own prior response to Sandie's original utterance in lines 7 and 9-10, saying "I SAID THE SECOND REICH which is an error

()- era," and Mom overlaps Kate's utterance, saying "We all know we all heard it" in lines 8 and 11. Sandie overlaps both of these utterances with laughter in line 12, and the exchange effectively comes to a close.

Critiquing occurs in this example in line 3, when Keith says, "You said air." Here Keith presents an utterance in the current, non-narrative interaction as a repeat of an utterance by a current interactant (Sandie) that occurred earlier in the current interaction. As Keith does not hedge or qualify his practical reenactment in any way, his presentation here affirms both that the original talk occurred and that his repeat of it here is relatively straightforward.

Furthermore, Keith's practical reenactment here presents Sandie's original utterance as incorrect, in that it contrasts with the actual Trivial Pursuit question, as established by the game card. Finally, Keith addresses his practical reenactment to Sandie by orienting to her physically and using the second person pronoun "you." Thus Keith casts Sandie's prior utterance as faulty, and he holds Sandie accountable for the production of this faulty utterance in the current exchange.

Sandie takes up Keith's critiquing by saying "I'm pretty sure I didn't say air" at line 5, suggesting that the original utterance never occurred, and therefore that Keith's practical reenactment is not a relatively straightforward repeat, despite his presentation to the contrary. Thus Sandie orients to, and thereby evidences a concern with, the responsibility that Keith's use of the practical reenactment format entails. By rejecting Keith's practical reenactment in this instance, Sandie also refuses to accept any responsibility whatsoever for the purported original utterance, and Keith's critiquing fails as a result.

Interestingly, in this segment, non-addressed co-participants also take up Keith's critiquing, after Sandie's initial response. Kate loudly reproduces her answer to the previous Trivial Pursuit question, saying "I SAID THE SECOND REICH which is an error ()- era" in lines 7 and 9-10. In doing so, Kate presents her previous answer, which consisted of naming a specific era, as evidence that Sandie's prior question was not about "air," as Keith suggests. Mom then addresses Sandie in lines 8 and 11, saying "We all know we all heard it," thereby claiming

that "all" of the participants in the "we" "know" and "heard" Sandie say "era" and not "air." Thus Kate and Mom join Sandie in claiming that Keith's practical reenactment is not a relatively straightforward repeat, because the original utterance that he claims to repeat never occurred. Thus both Kate and Mom, in alignment with Sandie, orient to, and thereby evidence a concern with, the responsibility that Keith's use of the practical reenactment format entails.

To sum up, critiquing is a non-narrative interaction activity that incorporates instances of reported speech using the practical reenactment presentation format. Speakers use critiquings, or reports and characterizations of current interactants' utterances from earlier in the current interaction, to address current interactants as reported speakers and to hold them responsible for their prior utterances. As such, critiquing is a reporter-initiated activity that makes addressee uptake relevant, inviting displayed agreement by the original speaker of the critiqued utterance in the post-critiquing slot. Thus the preferred sequence shape for critiquings can be described as [report + assessment] + [agreement], though dispreferred

sequences do occur. Finally, addressees may orient to, and thereby evidence concern with, critiquers' presentational responsibilities in critiquing sequences, by suggesting that the original utterances did not exist, as presented in the practical reenactments.

DERIDING

Deriding is a non-narrative interaction activity that incorporates instances of reported speech using the practical reenactment presentation format. Deriding is the repetition by the current speaker of a co-participant's talk from the current interaction, immediately addressed to participants other than the original speaker of the repeated talk, and ultimately addressed to the original speaker of the repeated talk. By using reported speech as practical reenactment in deriding, speakers re-present and remark upon the prior utterances of co-participants, effectively ridiculing them for those utterances in the current exchange. The "Bad Thing" segment below provides an example of reported speech as practical reenactment in this activity.

Bad Thing

Mom, Kate and Sandie are discussing Mom's sister, Suzie, and Suzie's relationship with her boyfriend, Burt.

- 1 Mom: And she can call him I mean
- 2 it's not like- and then she calls him
- 3 all day long at work, >they call
- 4 each other, they have each other
- 5 on their computers< her and Burt
- 6 (1)
- 7 Mom: ↑Um ↓hmm
- 8 (1)
- 9 Mom: [(and now she-)
- 10 Sandie: [\$Mom said ↑um ↓hmm
- 11 [like it's a bad thing\$
- 12 Kate: [↑Um ↓hmm \$um hhmm\$
- 13 Mom: Well I mean you know, it's not like
- 14 she can't get in touch with him
- 15 if she wanted to, to find out
- 16 where he is and what he's doing

At the beginning of this segment, in lines 1-5, Mom claims that her sister, Suzie, can contact Suzie's boyfriend, Burt, easily, and that she frequently does so. When Mom's statement is not taken up by either of her addressees during the 1-second pause at line 6, Mom orients to her own prior utterance, emphasizing her claim by saying "Um hmm" with exaggerated prosody at line 7. After another 1-second pause, Mom begins another turn at talk at line 8, though Sandie effectively cuts her off, overlapping her with an instance of reported speech, saying "\$Mom said um hmm like it's a bad thing\$" with exaggerated prosody and a smile voice, or a vocal quality conveying that she is smiling while producing the utterance, at lines 10-11. Kate responds to Sandie's repeat by saying "um hmm" twice in line 12, once in overlap with repetition of Sandie's exaggerated prosody, and again with her own smile voice and embedded laughter particles. Mom replies with "Well I mean you know it's not like she can't get in touch with him if she wanted to, to find out where he is and what he's doing" in lines 13-16, and the exchange comes to an end.

Deriding occurs in this example in lines 10-11, when Sandie says “\$Mom said ↑um ↓hmm like it’s a bad thing\$.” Here Sandie presents an utterance in the current, non-narrative interaction as a repeat and a simultaneous characterization of an utterance by a current interactant (Mom) that occurred earlier in the current interaction. As Sandie does not hedge or qualify her practical reenactment in any way, her presentation affirms both that the original utterance occurred and that her repeat of it is relatively straightforward.

Furthermore, through her use of exaggerated prosody and a smile voice during her practical reenactment, Sandie presents Mom’s original utterance as inappropriate, in some sense. In addition, Sandie characterizes Mom’s original utterance as treating the frequent contact between Suzie and Burt “like it’s a bad thing.” In doing so, Sandie suggests that Mom’s original utterance is incorrect in this respect, at least according to Sandie.

Sandie addresses her practical reenactment and characterization to Kate, orienting to Kate physically and referring to Mom in the third person in the quotative phrase “Mom said.” In doing so, Sandie casts Kate, a co-

present interactant who is not the reported speaker, as the immediate addressee of her practical reenactment, and she casts Mom, the reported speaker, as the practical reenactment's ultimate addressee, or target.

As the selected next speaker, Kate takes up Sandie's deriding in the next turn, directing her gaze toward Sandie and repeating Sandie's practical reenactment of Mom's original utterance, including Sandie's exaggerated prosody, by saying "↑Um ↓hmm" in line 12. Kate then follows up this response by explicitly agreeing with Sandie's deriding, saying "\$um hhhmm\$" with her own smile voice in line 12. Consequently, both Sandie and Kate treat Sandie's report as a relatively straightforward repeat of Mom's prior talk. Furthermore, Kate displays alignment with Sandie's deriding of Mom's prior utterance and explicitly agrees with Sandie's characterization of Mom's utterance as faulty.

As the ultimate addressee in this deriding, Mom responds in the third turn, accounting for her original utterance by saying "Well I mean you know it's not like she can't get in touch with him if she wanted to, to find out where he is and what he's doing" in lines 13-16. In doing so, Mom treats Sandie's practical reenactment of her

original utterance as non-problematic, affirming both that the original talk occurred and that the report is a relatively straightforward repeat of it. However, though Mom's response treats Sandie's practical reenactment as non-problematic, it treats Sandie's deriding as problematic.

Mom presents an alternate characterization of her original utterance, one in which she does not negatively evaluate Suzie and Burt's frequent contact, as Sandie suggests, but rather emphasizes the ease with which Suzie could contact Burt. Furthermore, Mom marks this account as a disagreeing response, primarily through the inclusion of the preface, which consists of the delay items "well" and "you know" and the repair token "I mean." Thus, Mom displays disagreement with Sandie's deriding and denies responsibility for the production of a faulty utterance, as characterized by Sandie and, via alignment, Kate. In addition, Mom's management of her disagreement here evidences a preference for agreement in deriding sequences, while it constitutes Sandie's deriding as an only partial success.

Sequence Shape

As the “Bad Thing” segment suggests, deriding is a non-narrative interaction activity that re-presents and remarks upon the prior utterances of current interactants, effectively ridiculing co-participants for their previous talk in the current interaction. In addition, though immediately addressed to participants other than the original speakers of the repeated talk, deridings are ultimately addressed to the original speakers, creating a three-part sequence in which multiple uptakes are made relevant. Furthermore, deridings evidence a preference for agreement, inviting alignment with speakers’ characterizations of prior utterances through displayed agreement by all addressees. Consequently, the preferred sequence shape for deridings can be described as [report + assessment] + [agreement] + [agreement], in which the second position belongs to the immediate addressee and the third position belongs to the target, or ultimate addressee. The “Stocking” segment below provides another example of this preferred sequence shape for deridings.

Stocking

Mom, Kate, Sandie, and Keith are discussing
Sandie's missing Christmas stocking

- 1 Sandie: Where's my- why do you not have
- 2 my ↑stock↓ing?
- 3 Mom: I'm ↑look↓ing for it
- 4 (1)
- 5 Keith: Ta huh [huh huh huh huh huh huh]
- 6 Mom: [It's gotta be stuck back
- 7 there
- 8 Keith: [<I'm ↑look↓ing ↑for ↓it>]
- 9 Sandie: [I can see that she's sitting on her
- 10 ass [talking about=
- 11 Mom: [°Hhh°]
- 12 Sandie: =I'm looking [fhhor ihht
- 13 Kate: [Huh ha ha ha
- 14 [ha ha ha
- 15 Mom: [Well I'm going over this thinking
- 16 what the hell?
- 17 Kate: Where do all the instructions go?
- 18 Keith: On the kitchen table, we're gonna

At the beginning of this segment, Sandie asks Mom about her missing Christmas stocking, saying "Where's my- why do you not have my ↑stock↓ing?" at lines 1-2. Mom answers Sandie in line 3, telling her "I'm looking for it." After a 1-second pause, Keith laughs at line 5, which prompts Mom to overlap him with "It's gotta be stuck back there" at lines 6-7. Keith then presents an instance of reported speech, repeating Mom's prior utterance with exaggerated prosody by saying "<I'm ↑look↓ing ↑for ↓it>" at line 8. Sandie overlaps Keith's utterance with a sarcastic "I can see that" at line 9. Sandie then presents another instance of reported speech, repeating and commenting on Mom's prior utterance with embedded laughter by saying "She's sitting on her ass talking about I'm looking fhhor ihht" at lines 9-10 and 12. Mom and Kate overlap Sandie's utterance with laughter in lines 11 and 13-14, respectively. Mom then overlaps Kate's laughter by saying "Well I'm going over this thinking what the hell?" in lines 15-16. Kate then changes the topic of conversation to storing toy instructions, and the exchange effectively comes to an end.

Deriding occurs in this example when Keith laughs and repeats Mom's prior utterance with exaggerated prosody, saying "<I'm ↑looking ↑for ↓it>" at line 8. Here Keith presents an utterance in the current, non-narrative interaction as a repeat and a simultaneous assessment of an utterance by a current interactant (Mom) that occurred earlier in the current interaction. As Keith does not hedge or qualify his practical reenactment in any way, his presentation affirms both that the original utterance occurred and that his repeat of it is relatively straightforward.

Furthermore, by reproducing Mom's original utterance with exaggerated prosody, Keith presents her talk as inappropriate in some respect. Keith furthers this characterization by prefacing his practical reenactment with extensive laughter, casting Mom's prior utterance as ridiculous or humorous in some sense. Thus Keith casts Mom's prior utterance as faulty, and he pokes fun at Mom for the production of this faulty utterance in the current exchange.

Keith addresses his practical reenactment and assessment to the other co-participants in the current

interaction, as indicated by their recipient gaze during his turn at talk. Thus Keith casts both Kate and Sandie, co-present interactants who are not the reported speaker, as his immediate addressees, and he casts Mom, the reported speaker, as his ultimate addressee. Consequently, Keith selects either Kate or Sandie as the next speaker in the interaction, postponing Mom's uptake as the original speaker of the reported utterance until the third position in the deriding sequence.

Sandie takes up Keith's deriding in the next turn at talk, overlapping it with a sarcastic "I can see that" at line 9. Sandie then repeats Keith's practical reenactment of Mom's original utterance within her own characterization of it, saying "She's sitting on her ass talking about I'm looking fhor ihht" with embedded laughter at lines 9-10 and 12. In doing so, Sandie explicitly contrasts Mom's claim of "I'm looking fhor ihht" with Mom's apparent (in)activity of "sitting on her ass," presenting Mom's original utterance as counterfactual in this instance, and thereby specifying the inappropriateness that Keith's deriding suggests. Consequently, both Keith and Sandie treat Keith's practical reenactment as a relatively

straightforward repeat of Mom's prior talk. Furthermore, Sandie also aligns with Keith's deriding of Mom's prior utterance, collaborating in the deriding's achievement in the current exchange.

After her initial laughter at line 11 in overlap with Sandie's uptake of Keith's deriding, Mom responds as the ultimate addressee in the next turn at talk, overlapping Kate's laughter in line 14 by saying "Well I'm going over this thinking what the hell?" in lines 15-16. In doing so, Mom also treats Keith's practical reenactment of her original utterance as non-problematic, affirming both that the original talk occurred and that the report is a relatively straightforward repeat of it. However, Mom's response simultaneously treats Keith's conversational activity of deriding as problematic.

Mom accounts for her original utterance, providing an alternate characterization, one in which she is not lying, as Keith suggests, but rather looking for something mentally, by "going over this" and thinking "what the hell?" Furthermore, Mom marks this account as a disagreeing response, prefacing it with a "well" delay. Consequently, while Mom accepts that she produced the original utterance

and that Keith's repeat of it here is relatively straightforward, she disagrees with its characterization in the deriding, and she thereby denies responsibility for the production of a faulty utterance, as characterized by Keith. In addition, Mom's management of her disagreement here further evidences the preference for agreement that holds in deriding sequences, while it constitutes Keith's deriding as an only partial successful, similar to Sandie's deriding in the "Bad Thing" segment above.

Responsibility for Activity

Thus we can see that deriders present, and addressees take up, deridings as practical reenactments of talk that occurred previously in the current interaction. Deriders therefore affirm both that some original talk occurred and that their reports are relatively straightforward repeats of that talk, and recipients accept these affirmations when taking reports in deridings at face value. Thus the use of the practical reenactment presentation format affirms that deriders are not responsible for the original utterances

they repeat, though they are fully responsible for the reports they produce in the current interaction.

Deriders, however, like corroborators in Chapter 3 and critiquers above, are more than “just messengers;” they are interested parties in the activity in which reporting is used. Therefore, deriders also have activity-specific responsibilities, such that when engaging in deriding, they affirm that the utterances they re-present and comment upon are in some sense worthy of re-presentation and comment, a claim that deriders make, and typically specify, with the characterization of utterances during their practical reenactment. Consequently, deriders’ current interaction partners may problematize the activity of deriding by calling the status of the original utterance as “re-presentable” and “commentable” into question, thereby orienting to, and evidencing a concern with, the activity-oriented responsibility of deriders.

While the ultimate addressees, or targets, in the “Bad Thing” and “Stocking” segments above problematize the status of their original utterances as “deridable,” thereby orienting to the activity-based responsibility of deriders to some extent, the three-part sequence shape of deriding

allows these two instances to count as at least partially successful nonetheless, in that the immediate addressees of the deridings treat them as such. However, if a primary addressee does not take up a deriding in a manner that aligns with the reporter, the deriding is "dead in the water," so to speak, in that the absence of an agreeing response in the first post-deriding slot negates the need for a response from the target in the second post-deriding slot. Thus primary addressees can also problematize the status of original utterances as "deridable," thereby orienting to the activity-based responsibility of deriders, while simultaneously bringing deridings to swift, unsuccessful ends. The "She Knows" segment below is a case in point.

She Knows

Mom, Kate, and Sandie are discussing Mom's recent phone call from her sister Suzie. Keith's talk to the dog under the table is not transcribed here.

1 Kate: Now [who::: called you

2 at ↑one o'clock?

3 Mom: Sh- uh- yeah im- because she knows I
4 was- and then [of course he's not
5 there
6 Sandie: [She kno::ws
7 Kate: ((Discouraging expression directed
8 to Sandie))
9 He's not there?

At the beginning of this segment, Kate asks Mom about her phone call from her sister Suzie, saying "Now who:: called you at ↑one o'clock?" Mom answers Kate in lines 3-5, saying "Sh- uh- yeah im- because she knows I was- and then- of course he's not there." Sandie overlaps Mom's utterance, presenting an instance of reported speech by addressing Kate and repeating Mom's prior utterance with exaggerated emphasis, saying "She kno::ws" in line 6. Kate responds to Sandie's utterance with a dismissive facial expression in lines 7-8. She then turns her attention back to Mom at line 9, asking "He's not there?" and the exchange between Kate and Sandie effectively comes to an end.

Deriding occurs in this example when Sandie repeats a portion of Mom's prior utterance with exaggerated emphasis,

saying "She kno::ws" in line 6. Here Sandie presents an utterance in the current, non-narrative interaction as a repeat and a simultaneous characterization of an utterance by a current interactant (Mom) that occurred earlier in the current interaction. As Sandie does not hedge or qualify her practical reenactment in anyway, her presentation affirms both that the original utterance occurred and that her repeat of it is relatively straightforward.

Furthermore, by reproducing Mom's original utterance with exaggerated emphasis during her practical reenactment, Sandie presents Mom's original utterance as inappropriate in some respect. In doing so, Sandie suggests that Mom's original utterance is worthy of derision, at least according to Sandie. Thus Sandie treats Mom's prior utterance as faulty, and she holds Mom accountable for the production of this faulty utterance in the current exchange.

Finally, Sandie addresses her practical reenactment and characterization to Kate, orienting to Kate physically at the onset of her turn at talk. In doing so, Sandie casts Kate, a co-present interactant who is not the reported speaker, as the immediate addressee of her practical

reenactment, and she casts Mom, the reported speaker, as the practical reenactment's ultimate addressee, or target.

As the selected next speaker, Kate takes up Sandie's deriding in the next turn, momentarily directing her gaze toward Sandie and producing a dismissive facial expression in lines 7-8. Kate then follows up this response by explicitly re-directing her attention to Mom, looking at her and asking "He's not there?" in line 9, which is an explicit uptake of the last portion of Mom's prior utterance of "and then- of course he's not there" in lines 4-5. Consequently, though both Sandie and Kate treat Sandie's report as a relatively straightforward repeat of a portion of Mom's prior talk, Kate's dismissive facial expression and explicit re-orientation display disagreement with and non-alignment toward Sandie's deriding of Mom's prior utterance in this instance.

While the absence of any explicit uptake of Sandie's deriding on Kate's part makes determining Sandie's specific characterization of Mom's prior talk difficult here, what is clear is that, through her response, Kate treats Sandie's deriding as, in some sense, inappropriate. By thus problematizing the status of Mom's original utterance as

"deridable," Kate orients to, and thereby evidences a concern with, Sandie's activity-based responsibility to re-present and comment upon only those utterances that are worthy of re-presentation and comment. Furthermore, through this orientation Kate simultaneously brings Sandie's deriding to premature closure, negating the need for a response from Mom, the ultimate addressee in this instance, in the second post-deriding slot. Thus Sandie's deriding fails completely in this exchange.

To review, deriding is a non-narrative interaction activity that incorporates instances of reported speech using the practical reenactment presentation format. Deriding is the repetition by the current speaker of a co-participant's talk from the current interaction, immediately addressed to participants other than the original speaker of the repeated talk, and ultimately addressed to the original speaker of the repeated talk. Speakers use deridings to re-present and remark upon the prior utterances of co-participants, effectively ridiculing them for their previous utterances in the current exchange.

As such, deriding is a reporter-initiated activity that makes addressee uptake relevant, inviting displayed

agreement with the deriding by both the immediate addressee and the ultimate addressee in two post-critiquing slots. Thus the preferred sequence shape for deridings can be described as [report + assessment] + [agreement] + [agreement], in which the second position belongs to the immediate addressee and the third position belongs to the target, or ultimate addressee, though dispreferred sequences do occur. Finally, addressees may orient to, and thereby evidence concern with, deriders' activity-based responsibilities in deriding sequences, by suggesting that the characterizations of the original utterances as somehow "deridable" are inappropriate, and thereby also bringing deridings to swift, unsuccessful ends.

CREATIVE ENACTMENT

An examination of the use of reported speech in exclusively non-narrative episodes illuminates an interesting feature of its multi-functionality: interactants produce and take up the representational aspect of reports differently, in the furtherance of situated projects in the moment-to-moment of talk-in-interaction. Sometimes participants treat reports as practical reenactments, or repeats of actual prior utterances, as discussed in Chapters 3 and 4. Other times, however, participants treat reports as creative enactments, or inventions of possible, but otherwise unspoken, utterances. Thus, participants realize reported speech through presentation formats, or report strategies that carry distinctive evidential claims (Hill and Irvine 1993) and that are both constituted by and constitutive of the conversational environments in which they operate (Goodwin and Duranti 1992).

To be clear, reporters present, and recipients take up, creative enactments as inventions by current speakers

that are nonetheless not the current speakers' utterances in the ongoing interaction. Following Anderson's definition of evidentiality as "the kinds of evidence a person has for making factual claims" (1986: 273), we can see that the creative enactment presentation format's evidential claims are radically different from those of the practical reenactment presentation format, in that, while the use of the practical reenactment format is predicated on a claim of previous access, of some sort, to an actual prior utterance, the use of the creative enactment presentation format is predicated on a claim of current knowledge of social actors and their probable actions in either actual or projected situations.

Consequently, reporters using the creative enactment presentation format do not claim that the utterances they present were spoken previously by others. Rather, they affirm that a particular utterance is possible on the part of an actor in a given situation, and that the report is a verbalization of this otherwise unspoken utterance by the current speaker, rather than the current speaker's own talk, in the ongoing interaction. These affirmations both enable and constrain the successful use of creative

enactments in a variety of non-narrative conversational activities, as the analysis to follow demonstrates.

FORMULATING

Formulating is a non-narrative interaction activity that incorporates instances of reported speech using the creative enactment presentation format. Specifically, formulating is the invention by the current speaker of an applicable, but unspoken, utterance, for another, in the current interaction. By using reported speech as creative enactment in formulatings, reporters say the unsaid, representing utterances as those that their interaction partners would produce in the current interaction, were they not precluded from doing so, in some sense. The "Tasha" segment below provides an example of reported speech as creative enactment in this activity.

Tasha

A family is assembling toys on Christmas Eve.

1 Keith: ((hammering))

2 (2)

3 Keith: That's better

4 (4)

5 ((Tasha's dog tags jingle as she

6 moves about, off camera))

7 Kate: I know Tasha, are we

8 bother[ing you? she's just like=

9 Keith: [((hammering))

10 Kate: =I'm trying to sleep over [here

11 Mom: [They got

12 a cash register and then they got

13 her remote control chat ↑mobile

At the beginning of this segment, in lines 1-4, Keith is hammering a toy together. Keith's dog, Tasha, begins moving about off camera, as indicated by the jingling of her dog tags at lines 5-6. Kate looks in Tasha's direction and addresses her in lines 7-8, saying "I know Tasha, are we bothering you?" Kate then presents an instance of reported speech in lines 8 and 10, referring to Tasha and saying "she's just like I'm trying to sleep over here." Keith overlaps Kate's utterance with more hammering at line 9,

and Mom introduces a new topic, bringing the episode to a close at lines 11-13.

Formulating occurs in this segment in lines 8 and 10, when Kate refers to Tasha and says "she's just like I'm trying to sleep over here." Here Kate presents an utterance in the current, non-narrative interaction as an invention, on her part, of an applicable, but unspoken, utterance, for a co-present interactant (Tasha). As Tasha is a dog, and thus non-verbal, the status of Kate's report as an invention is obvious here, to participants and analysts alike, in that Kate's report could not possibly be a repeat of an actual prior utterance. However, as Kate does not hedge or qualify her creative enactment in any way, her presentation here affirms both that a particular utterance could occur on Tasha's part in the current interaction, and that the report is a verbalization of this otherwise unspoken utterance, by Kate.

Tasha's movement in lines 5-6 following Keith's hammering effectively touches off this formulating. Kate orients to Tasha's repositioning, sympathizing with Tasha by saying "I know Tasha, are we bothering you?" in lines 7-8. Kate goes on to verbalize Tasha's attitude of being

"bothered," addressing the other co-participants by referring to Tasha in the third person in the quotative phrase "she's just like" in line 8, and attributing to Tasha the utterance "I'm trying to sleep over here" in line 10. In doing so, Kate speaks the unspoken, on behalf of Tasha, representing an utterance as one that Tasha would say in the current interaction, were she not precluded from doing so by her non-verbal nature. The "Way to Go" segment below provides another example of reported speech as creative enactment in the conversational activity of formulating.

Way To Go

Keith is navigating his dogs through a very crowded living room in order to crate them.

7 Kate: [They're al- they're all like
8 there's no way to go::
9 Keith: Come here come [here Tash come on
10 Mom: [Come on ((smooching
11 sound))
12 Keith: Come here (1) now go [go that way
13 Sandie: [We don't need
14 batteries for this
15 Mom: Okay

In lines 1-3 of this segment, Keith is directing his dogs, Tasha and Keely, attempting to get them from one point to another in the crowded living room. The initial attempts by Tasha and Keely to execute Keith's commands result in them ineffectually bumping into objects off camera at lines 4-5, which Keith takes up with laughter in line 6. Kate then presents an instance of reported speech in lines 7-8, referring to Tasha and Keely and saying, "They're all they're all like there's no way to go..." Keith continues directing the dogs at lines 9 and 12, and Mom joins in at lines 10-11. The dogs successfully navigate the living

room, and Sandie initiates a topic shift at lines 13-14, effectively bringing the exchange to an end.

Formulating occurs in this segment in lines 7-8, when Kate refers to Tasha and Keely and says "They're al- they're all like there's no wa::y to go::." Here Kate presents an utterance in the current, non-narrative interaction as an invention, on her part, of an applicable, but unspoken (and presumably shared), utterance for two co-present interactants (Tasha and Keely). As both Tasha and Keely are dogs, and thus non-verbal, the status of Kate's report as an invention, rather than a repeat, is again obvious, to participants and analysts alike. However, as Kate does not hedge or qualify her creative enactment in any way, her presentation here affirms both that a particular utterance could occur on Tasha and Keely's part in the current interaction, and that the report is a verbalization of this otherwise unspoken utterance, by Kate.

This formulating is effectively touched off by the observably unsuccessful attempts of Tasha and Keely, at lines 4-5, to execute Keith's commands. Kate orients to these actions, verbalizing Tasha's and Keely's frustration

in lines 7-8 by addressing the other co-participants, referring to Tasha and Keely in the third person in the quotative phrase "They're al- they're all like," and attributing to Tasha and Keely the utterance "there's no wa::y to go::." Thus Kate speaks the unspoken, on behalf of Tasha and Keely, representing an utterance as one that they would say in the current interaction, were they not precluded from doing so by their non-verbal nature.

Reporter Orientation

As the segments discussed thus far suggest, formulating is a reporter-initiated non-narrative conversational activity. In an instance of formulating, the current speaker orients to some prior action in the available surround and thereby casts that action as a turn that establishes the conditional relevance of a report, constructing an [action] + [report] sequence. While the phenomenon discussed here bears some similarity to what Tannen (2004) terms "ventriloquizing," particularly when Tannen defines ventriloquizing as "the discursive strategy by which a participant speaks in the voice of a nonverbal third party

in the presence of that party" (402), important distinctions exist.

First, Tannen conceptualizes "nonverbal third parties" as intermediaries, treating them as interactional resources utilized by other participants for their own interpersonal purposes, such as occasioning apologies. In formulatings, however, reported speakers are "spoken on behalf of," rather than "spoken through," meaning that reporters offer utterances "for" reported speakers, taking up their points of view when addressing utterances to the other participants. Therefore, formulatings have much more in common with the "FO" footing that Scollon (2001: 94) describes in his discussion of the positions that adults can adopt in interactions involving nonverbal children.

Furthermore, reported speakers in formulatings are not exclusively non-verbal. While the formulatings discussed thus far occur on behalf of non-verbal interactants, and are occasioned by actions in the environmental surround, formulatings may also occur on behalf of verbal interactants, and, in such cases, they may be occasioned by actions that take place in the conversational surround, similar to the manner in which critiquings and deridings

are occasioned, as discussed in Chapter 4. However, while critiquers and deriders orient to previous turns at talk as prior utterances, using the practical reenactment format, formulators orient to previous turns at talk as demonstrations of the immediate, particular attitudes of others, demonstrations that reporters then verbalize, using the creative enactment format. The "Give Me" segment below is a case in point.

Give Me

Mom is calling her sister on the telephone, while Kate, Sandie, and Keith hold a separate conversation. The exchange between Sydney and Kate is not transcribed here.

- 1 Mom: Hello?
- 2 Keith: [Right
- 3 Mom: Hey is uh Suzie there?
- 4 (4)
- 5 Mom: [Hello?
- 6 Keith: [You'd have the smartest kids
- 7 in school

8 Sandie: ↑↓Oh::: [I kno:::w
9 Mom: [Give me- give me [Suzie
10 Kate: [Huh huh
11 huh huh huh
12 Sandie: Mom's like give me my sister
13 [I'm about to rip your head off
14 Mom: [Um hmm
15 (2)

At the beginning of this segment, Mom's telephone call to her sister's house is answered, as indicated by Mom's "Hello?" at line 1. Mom then asks for her sister at line 3, saying "Hey is uh Suzie there?" After a 4-second pause, Mom says "Hello?" again at line 5. Following some intervening talk by Keith and Sandie in lines 6-8, Mom demands to speak to her sister, saying "Give me- give me Suzie" at line 9. After Kate's laughter at lines 10-11, which is in response to the prior intervening exchange between Keith and Sandie, Sandie presents an instance of reported speech in lines 12-13, saying "Mom's like give me my sister I'm about to rip your head off." Mom addresses her telephone conversation partner with "Um hmm" at line 11, and a 2-second pause

follows, effectively bringing the current exchange to an end.

Formulating occurs in this segment in lines 12-13, when Sandie says "Mom's like give me my sister I'm about to rip your head off." Here Sandie presents an utterance in the current, non-narrative interaction as an invention, on her part, of an applicable, but unspoken, utterance for a co-present interactant (Mom). The status of Sandie's report as an invention is obvious here, to participants and analysts alike, in that Sandie does not repeat Mom's prior talk. Rather, Sandie presents an utterance that Mom observably does not say, and Sandie attributes this utterance to Mom, nonetheless.

This formulating is effectively touched off by Mom's end of the telephone conversation during this segment, particularly lines 5 and 9. Mom's difficulty in getting her sister on the other end of the telephone is evidenced by Mom's "Hello?" at line 5, which is a repeat of her initial "Hello?" at line 1, and by Mom's "Give me- give me Suzie" at line 9, which is a demand to speak with her sister, following her request of "Hey is uh Suzie there?" at line 3, and following the 4-second gap at line 4. Sandie orients

to Mom's conversational actions, verbalizing Mom's attitude as one of anger and frustration.

Sandie addresses the other co-interactants, referring to Mom in the third person in the quotative phrase "Mom's like," and attributing to Mom the utterance "give me my sister I'm about to rip your head off" in lines 12-13. Though Mom does provide some demonstration of frustration in the telephone exchange, by upgrading from a request to a demand, for example, Mom's displayed attitude pales in comparison to the disposition Sandie attributes to her, in which Mom emphasizes a possessive relationship with Suzie as "my sister" and threatens physical violence with "I'm about to rip your head off." In doing so, Sandie speaks the unspoken, on behalf of Mom, representing an utterance as one that Mom would say in the current interaction, were she not in some sense precluded from doing so.

Reported Speaker Orientation

Thus we can see that formulating is a reporter-initiated non-narrative conversational activity, in which the current speaker orients to some prior action in the available

surround, be it conversational or environmental, and thereby casts that action as a turn that establishes the conditional relevance of a report, constructing an [action] + [report] sequence. While co-participants may take up formulatings minimally, if at all, in the absence of interactional difficulties, as in the examples above, they may also respond to formulatings in their subsequent turns at talk, particularly when they are the current interactants who are cast as reported speakers in formulatings, as in the "Bomb Them" segment below.

Bomb Them

Nana, Keith, Lena, and Pat are talking about the war in Afghanistan. A separate telephone conversation is not transcribed here.

7 Nana: [Ha ha ha ha
8 Lena: peck peck peck and then you know,
9 when they could have dropped a bomb
10 one bomb over there and done as much
11 good [as all them peck peck pecking
12 Nana: [Yeah but you'd be killing all
13 them like that p-
14 Pat: Aunt Lena says bomb them, get it
15 over with
16 Lena: [\$That's what I say\$
17 Nana: [them poor little old- them poor
18 little old kids

Lena criticizes the management of the war in Afghanistan at the beginning of this segment, saying "they sent them bombs over there and just- just like a- just like somebody just pecking at them an old hen pecking at something peck peck peck and then you know, when they could have dropped a bomb one bomb over there and done as much good as all them peck peck pecking," in lines 2-6 and 8-11. After overlapping Lena's statement with laughter in line 7, Nana begins an opposing statement in lines 12-13, saying "Yeah, but you'd

be killing all them like that p-." Pat effectively cuts Nana off, however, presenting an instance of reported speech at lines 14-15, saying "Aunt Lena says bomb them, get it over with." Lena responds with "\$That's what I say\$" in a smile voice in a line 16, and the exchange continues.

Formulating occurs in this example in lines 14-15, when Pat says "Aunt Lena says bomb them, get it over with." Here Pat presents an utterance in the current, non-narrative interaction as an invention, on her part, of an applicable, but unspoken, utterance for a co-participant (Lena) in the current interaction. The status of Pat's report as an invention is clear here, in that, though Lena does produce a lengthy utterance in the immediately prior turn, Pat does not repeat it. Rather, Pat reports an utterance that Lena does not actually say, a fact that is available to analysts as well as participants, and Pat attributes this utterance to Lena, nonetheless.

This formulating is effectively touched off by Lena's prior utterance in lines 2-6 and 8-11. Lena's complaint about the management of the war in Afghanistan is evidenced by her characterization of the then-current bombing strategy as similar to the activity of "an old hen pecking

at something peck peck peck" in lines 6 and 8, and her claim that officials "could have dropped a bomb one bomb over there and done as much good as all them peck peck pecking" in lines 9-11. In lines 14-15, Pat orients to Lena's conversational actions, verbalizing Lena's attitude as one of impatience.

Pat addresses the other co-interactants, referring to Lena in the third person in the quotative phrase "Aunt Lena says," and attributing to Lena the utterance "bomb them, get it over with" in lines 14-15. Though Lena does provide some demonstration of impatience in her complaint, her displayed attitude differs somewhat from the disposition Pat attributes to her, in which Lena cavalierly calls for the summary bombing of "them," in order to "get it over with." Thus Pat speaks the unspoken, on behalf of Lena, representing an utterance as one that Lena would say in the current interaction, were she not in some sense precluded from doing so.

In turn, Pat's co-participants do not problematize her formulating. Nana does not orient to Pat's report at all, in fact, overlapping Lena's talk with her own response at lines 12-13 and continuing that response at lines 17-18.

More importantly, however, Lena explicitly agrees with Pat's formulating, saying "\$That's what I say\$" in line 16. In doing so, Lena directly affirms that Pat speaks on her behalf, that the utterance Pat presents is one that Lena would say in the current interaction, though Lena does not actually utter the talk that Pat attributes to her.

Reported speakers may also respond to formulatings in explicitly disagreeing ways, however. In doing so, they evidence the interactional risks inherent in formulatings, in that, by claiming that their interaction partners would produce particular utterances (absent preclusions) in immediate situations, formulators "put words into the mouths" of others. Moreover, these others are co-present, and thus available to reject the applicability of the utterances that are spoken on their behalf, as we can see in the "Reevaluate" segment.

Reevaluate

Keith works to retrieve Sandie's Christmas stocking from under the Christmas tree.

1 Keith: I see your stocking back there.

2 you want me [to grab it?

3 Sandie: [Can you reach it?

4 Keith: Yeah ((begins digging through pile

5 of presents under tree, off camera))

6 (2)

7 Mom: And look here's one (unclear)

8 this one

9 Kate: Huh huh huh then he's like

10 [well, I don't know

11 [((loud sound, things falling over))]

12 maybe I need to reevaluate that

13 (2)

14 Keith: I can reach it

At the beginning of this segment, Keith offers to retrieve Sandie's Christmas stocking, which is stuck under a pile of items under the Christmas tree, addressing Sandie and saying, "I see your stocking back there. You want me to grab it?" in lines 1-2. Sandie responds, asking Keith "Can you reach it?" in line 3. Keith answers affirmatively, saying "Yeah" in line 4, and he works to retrieve Sandie's Christmas stocking during the 2-second pause at line 6 and

the utterance by Mom in lines 7-8. Kate then offers an instance of reported speech in lines 9-12, referring to Keith and saying "Huh huh huh then he's like well, I don't know maybe I need to reevaluate that." Kate's utterance is overlapped by the sound of objects falling over in line 11, and after a 2-second pause at line 13, Keith takes up Kate's report, referring to the stocking and saying "I can reach it" in line 14, bringing the episode to a close.

Formulating occurs in this segment in lines 9-12, when Kate refers to Keith and says "then he's like well, I don't know maybe I need to reevaluate that," with laughter at the onset. Here Kate presents an utterance in the current, non-narrative interaction as an invention, on her part, of an applicable, but unspoken, utterance for a co-present interactant (Keith) in the current situation. The status of Kate's report as an invention is obvious here, in that Kate does not repeat a prior utterance by Keith, but rather attributes an utterance to Keith that he does not actually say, a fact that is available to participants and analysts alike.

This formulating is occasioned by the observably unsuccessful attempts of Keith to fulfill his claim from

line 4 of being able to reach Sandie's stocking. Keith's difficulty in reaching Sandie's stocking is evidenced both by the duration of his attempt and by its adverse effects, in that Keith works (unsuccessfully) to reach Sandie's stocking during the 2-second pause at line 6 and the utterance by Mom in lines 7-8, and in that Kate's report is overlapped by the sound of multiple items falling over, items that Keith observably dislodged from under the tree during the immediately prior turns. Kate orients to these actions on Keith's part, verbalizing his attitude as one of self-doubt.

Kate addresses the other co-participants, referring to Keith in the third person in the quotative phrase "then he's like" in line 9, and attributing to Keith the utterance "well, I don't know maybe I need to reevaluate that" in lines 10 and 12. Though Keith does provide some demonstration that he is encountering difficulty in reaching Sandie's stocking, by knocking over other items under the tree, for example, his displayed attitude does not coincide with the disposition Kate attributes to him, in which Keith questions his ability to ultimately fulfill his prior claim of being able to reach Sandie's stocking.

Thus Kate speaks the unspoken, on behalf of Keith, representing an utterance as one that he would say in the current interaction, were he not in some sense precluded from doing so.

While Mom does not take up Kate's formulating at all, even during the 2-second pause at line 13, Keith explicitly disagrees with it, referring to Sandie's stocking and saying "I can reach it" in line 14. Thus, Keith rejects the applicability of the utterance that Kate attributes to him, denying Kate's claim that she speaks on his behalf by presenting an utterance that he would say in the immediate situation, absent preclusions. Rather, Keith orients to Kate's formulating as faulty, and thereby evidences the interactional risk that Kate takes by "putting words into the mouth" of a co-present interactant.

To recap, formulating is a non-narrative interaction activity that incorporates instances of reported speech using the creative enactment presentation format. Speakers use formulatings, or inventions of the applicable, but unspoken, utterances of co-present interactants, to speak the unspoken, representing what their interaction partners are not saying, for whatever reason, in the current

interaction. In doing so, formulators orient to prior actions in the available surround and cast those actions as turns that establish the conditional relevance of reports. Thus formulatings take an [action] + [report] sequence shape, with minimal addressee uptake in the absence of interactional difficulties. Finally, reported speakers can take up formulatings in their next turns at talk, thereby orienting to, and evidencing a concern with, the interactional risks formulators take when "speaking for" co-present others in the current interaction.

INSTANTIATING

Instantiating is a non-narrative interaction activity that incorporates instances of reported speech using the creative enactment presentation format. Like formulating, instantiating is the invention by the current speaker of a possible, but unspoken, utterance, for another. Unlike formulating, however, instantiating presents talk as feasible for imagined others in projected situations. To be clear, an imagined interactant is not necessarily imaginary. Rather, an imagined interactant is either an

actual, non-present individual or a hypothetical, and thus also non-present, representative of some category of persons. Thus, instantiaters affirm that particular utterances are likely to occur on the part of such speakers in non-immediate, and therefore projected, interactions, and that reports are verbalizations of these unspoken utterances, rather than the utterances of the current speaker, in the ongoing interaction.

In addition, while formulators present reports as creative enactments on behalf of others, instantiaters present reports as creative enactments in support of claims, either their own or others, in the current interaction. Thus, by using reported speech as creative enactment in instantiations, speakers manifest possible utterances for evidential benefit in the current exchange. An instance of instantiating in support of a reporter's claim occurs in the "Competition" segment below.

Competition

Mom, Kate, and Sandie are discussing health insurance. Sam's utterances, and some of Mom's utterances, are part of a separate ongoing

exchange, and they are not transcribed here.

1 Kate: Well the thing is- .hh well see
2 ↑the problem ↓with HMOs is that they
3 so::: limit your selection of doctors
4 that you can't >pick and choose< so
5 there's like no::: (1) um competition
6 (1) you know what I'm saying?
7 so you can't be like if you don't
8 treat me nice I'm going to go
9 see such and such doctor because
10 they're like well you can go see em
11 but we're not gonna pay for it
12 Sandie: Yeah
13 Kate: You know you'll have to pay
14 for it so-
15 Mom: Um [hmm
16 Kate: [They don't have any incentive
17 really to treat you nice. HMOs are
18 horrible.
19 Mom: ↑They ↓are

At the beginning of this segment, Kate describes "the problem with HMOs," telling Mom and Sandie that "they so:: limit your selection of doctors that you can't >pick and choose< so there's like no::: (1) um competition (1) you know what I'm saying?" in lines 2-6. Kate then elaborates on her claim, providing two instances of reported speech in lines 7-11, saying "so you can't be like if you don't treat me nice I'm going to go see such and such doctor because they're like well you can go see em but we're not gonna pay for it." Sandie takes up Kate's elaboration with "Yeah" at line 12. Kate then offers a partial explication of her prior elaboration at lines 13-14, saying, "You know you'll have to pay for it so-", to which Mom responds with "Um hmm" at line 15. Kate then partially overlaps Mom's response with a paraphrase of her original claim, saying "They don't have any incentive really to treat you nice. HMOs are horrible" in lines 16-18. Mom agrees with Kate at line 19, saying "↑They ↓are," and the exchange effectively comes to an end.

Instantiating occurs in this example in lines 7-11, when Kate says, "so you can't be like if you don't treat me nice I'm going to go see such and such doctor because

they're like well you can go see em but we're not gonna pay for it." Here Kate presents two utterances in the current, non-narrative interaction as inventions, on her part, of possible, but unspoken, utterances by imagined others in projected situations. The first instance, in lines 7-9, presents an utterance as one that a general "you" says to a doctor: "if you don't treat me nice I'm going to go see such and such doctor." The second instance, in lines 10-11, presents an utterance as one that a general "they," presumably HMO representatives, says to an HMO member if that person tries to see a doctor who is not a provider in that HMO: "well you can go see em but we're not gonna pay for it." Thus Kate presents these utterances as feasible on the part of these imagined actors in the projected situations, and she presents her reports as verbalizations of these unspoken utterances in the current exchange, a presentation that is available to both participants and analysts.

Kate's instantiations here are offered in support of her claim that "↑the problem ↓with HMOs is that they so:: limit your selection of doctors that you can't >pick and choose< so there's like no:: (1) um competition" in lines

1-5. By creatively enacting two separate exchanges, one in which a patient gives her current doctor an ultimatum, saying "if you don't treat me nice I'm going to go see such and such doctor," and one in which an HMO representative says to that same patient, "well you can go see em but we're not gonna pay for it," Kate dramatically portrays "the problem with HMOs" for her audience members, illustrating how HMOs prevent patients from being able to "pick and choose" doctors. Thus Kate justifies her previously stated claim by supporting it with a tangible example, a report that relies upon its perceived likelihood in order to establish evidential benefit in the current interaction.

Both of Kate's current interaction partners treat her instantiating here as non-problematic. Sandie responds with agreement, saying "Yeah" at line 12, and Mom ultimately also responds to Kate's instantiating with agreement, saying "Um hmm" at line 15 and "↑They ↓are" at line 19. By explicitly accepting Kate's claim, both Sandie and Mom simultaneously align with Kate's position and grant the evidential benefit of Kate's instantiating relative to that position in the current exchange. Thus Kate's instantiating

is successfully achieved here. We can see another successful example of instantiating, this time in support of a claim by a reporter's co-participant, in the "I'm Sorry" segment below.

I'm Sorry

A family is having an informal conversation in their living room.

- 1 Kate: When a khhid comes out and apologizes
2 to you about something you knohhw
3 [ihht's ba::d
4 Kris: [You know it's [ba::d
5 Keith: [>I'm sorry I'm sorry
6 I'm [sorry<
7 Kate: [Hah hah hah hah before
8 [you even figure out what it is
9 Kris: [Before you even know

At lines 1-3 in this segment, Kate claims that if a child apologizes to an adult without any prodding, for some transgression that is at the moment unknown to the adult,

the adult can safely assume that the transgression is relatively egregious, whatever it might be, saying "When a khhid comes out and apologizes to you about something you knohhw ihht's ba::d." Kris overlaps Kate's claim with a partial repeat of Kate's prior utterance, saying "You know it's ba::d" in line 4. Keith then elaborates on Kate's claim, providing an instance of reported speech in lines 5-6, saying ">I'm sorry I'm sorry I'm sorry<." Kate takes up Keith's report in lines 7-8, orienting to it with laughter and emphasizing the upshot of the apology in the projected situation, saying "Hah hah hah hah before you even figure out what it is." Kris again overlaps Kate's talk with a partial repeat, saying "Before you even know" in line 9, and the exchange effectively comes to an end.

Instantiating occurs in this example in lines 5-6, when Keith says ">I'm sorry I'm sorry I'm sorry<." Here Keith presents an utterance in the current, non-narrative interaction as an invention, on his part, of a possible, but unspoken, utterance by an imagined other (a non-specific, representative kid), in a projected situation (an exchange between a kid and an adult in which the kid apologizes for some relatively egregious transgression, of

which the adult is as of yet unaware). Thus Keith presents this utterance as feasible on the part of this imagined actor in the projected situation, and he presents his report as a verbalization of this unspoken utterance in the current exchange (Keith is not apologizing himself, for example). Furthermore, this presentation is available as such to both participants and analysts alike.

Keith's instantiating here is offered in support of Kate's claim that "When a khhid comes out and apologizes to you about something you knohhw ihht's ba::d." By creatively enacting an exchange in which a child apologizes to an adult, using an anxious vocal quality and desperate reiteration, Keith dramatically portrays for his audience members why an adult would assume the worst about the child's transgression in such a situation. Thus Keith justifies Kate's previously stated claim by supporting it with a tangible example, a report that relies upon its perceived likelihood in order to establish evidential benefit in the current interaction.

Kate treats Keith's instantiating here as non-problematic. She responds to it with acceptance, orienting to it with laughter and stressing the upshot of the

creative enactment, that the child demonstrates anxiety and desperation prior to any knowledge, on the part of the adult, of the nature of the transgression in the projected situation, saying "Hah hah hah hah before you even figure out what it is." Kris again overlaps Kate's talk with a partial repeat, similarly emphasizing the upshot of Keith's creative enactment, saying "Before you even know" in line 9. Thus, both Kate and Kris accept Keith's support of Kate's position here, granting its evidential benefit in the current interaction, and Keith's instantiating is successfully achieved.

Sequence Shape

As the segments discussed thus far indicate, instantiating is a reporter-initiated non-narrative interaction activity that supports the current position of either a reporter or a reporter's co-participant in the on-going interaction. In either case, instantiations make addressee uptake relevant, inviting acceptance of the instantiations' evidential benefits and alignment with the supported positions through displayed agreement in post-instantiating slots. Thus the

preferred sequence shape for instantiations can be described as [claim] + [report] + [agreement], with the first two slots being taken by either one or two speakers. We can see another example of this production and uptake of instantiations in the "My Mother" segment below.

My Mother

Mom and Kate are discussing Mom's sister, Suzie.

Sydney's talk is part of a separate exchange, and as such, it is not transcribed here.

- 1 Mom: I just don't like the idea
- 2 I think it's rea::lly rea::lly tacky
- 3 how much time does she give
- 4 to her mother? that she can't do
- 5 this one little thing
- 6 tell these kids >or grandkids
- 7 or whatever< just give me two ↑hours
- 8 so I can do something for my mother
- 9 Kate: Um hmm
- 10 (2)

In a telephone conversation immediately prior to this segment, Mom invites her sister, Suzie, to go to the nursing home with her to visit their mother. Suzie declines Mom's invitation, however, claiming a prior engagement with her grandchildren. In lines 1-2 Mom describes Suzie's rejection of her invitation as inappropriate, saying "I just don't like the idea I think it's rea::lly rea::lly tacky." Mom then rejects Suzie's claim that she can't go, characterizing the visit to the nursing home as non-demanding, saying "how much time does she give to her mother? that she can't do this one little thing" in lines 3-5. Mom follows this claim with an instance of reported speech in lines 6-8, saying "tell these kids >or grandkids or whatever< just give me two ↑hours so I can do something for my mother." Kate takes up Mom's talk with "Um hmm" at line 9, and the exchange effectively comes to an end.

Instantiating occurs in this segment in lines 6-8, when Mom says "tell these kids >or grandkids or whatever< just give me two ↑hours so I can do something for my mother." Here Mom presents an utterance in the current, non-narrative interaction as an invention, on her part, of a possible, but unspoken, utterance by an imagined other

(her sister Suzie, who is not present), in a projected situation (an exchange between Suzie and her "kids >or grandkids or whatever<"). The status of Mom's report as an invention is available here, to participants and analysts alike, in that Mom explicitly problematizes the fact that producing this utterance is something that Suzie supposedly "can't do." Thus Mom presents her report as a verbalization of this unspoken utterance in the current exchange.

Mom's instantiating here is offered in support of her claim that the proposed visit to the nursing home is non-demanding, characterizing it as "one little thing" in line 5. By creatively enacting an exchange between Suzie and her "kids >or grandkids or whatever<," in which Suzie herself stresses the non-demanding nature of the visit to the nursing home, telling her addressees to "just give me two ↑hours" in the projected interaction, Mom dramatically portrays for her audience members the ease with which Suzie could make herself available to visit the nursing home. Thus Mom justifies her previously stated claim by supporting it with a tangible example, a report that relies upon its perceived viability in order to establish evidential benefit in the current interaction.

Mom's current interaction partner, Kate, treats Mom's instantiating here as non-problematic, responding with explicit agreement at line 6, saying "Um hmm." Through this response, Kate simultaneously aligns with Mom's claim and grants the evidential benefit of Mom's instantiating relative to that claim in the current exchange. Thus Mom's instantiating is successfully achieved in this instance.

Evidential Claims in Presentation Formats

Following Anderson's definition of evidentiality as "the kinds of evidence a person has for making factual claims" (1986: 273), the discussion to this point goes some distance in demonstrating that the evidential claims in creative enactment differ radically from those in practical reenactment, in that, while the use of the practical reenactment format is predicated on a claim of previous access, of some sort, to actual prior utterances, the use of the creative enactment presentation format is predicated on a claim of current knowledge of social actors and their probable actions in either actual or projected situations. While this analysis examines the intrinsic relationship

between these evidential claims and the non-narrative conversation activities which incorporate reports, the "Cute" segment below provides a final example of the relevant distinction between practical reenactment and creative enactment, as well as a demonstration of the interactional implications that these strategies have for participants.

Cute

Mom, Sandie, Keith, and Kate are discussing the possibility of Mom taking her grandnephew, Daniel, to the nursing home with her to visit her mother.

- 1 Mom: >That's what I'm saying< you couldn't
- 2 even take Daniel the::re
- 3 he would be horrendous you-
- 4 you ↑heard ↓him
- 5 ↑holler and ↓scream
- 6 (2)
- 7 and these are ↑old ↓people
- 8 Sandie: Yeah, they'd say ↑oh you're so cute

9 >↓like I try to say to him< and
10 he'd say SHUT UP [ha ha ha huh
11 Mom: [↑Ye↓ah
12 (1.5)
13 Kate: Hm[m?
14 Mom: [I ↑can't ↓handle that
15 Sandie: That's [what he says to you
16 Keith: [Goodness
17 Kate: Um [↓mmm
18 Keith: [SHUT UP
19 Sandie: He does he says shut up [stop talking
20 Keith: [↑shut up↓
21 Mom: ↓Um ↑hmm

At the beginning of this segment, in lines 1-7, Mom claims that she cannot take Daniel with her to the nursing home to visit her mother, because Daniel "would be horrendous"; he would "↑holler and ↓scream," which would be particularly troublesome because the inhabitants of the nursing home are "↑old ↓people," and thus presumably less able to handle such raucous behavior. Sandie takes up Mom's claim with agreement, saying "Yeah" in line 8. Sandie then elaborates

on Mom's claim, providing two instances of reported speech in lines 8-10, saying "Yeah, they'd say ↑oh you're so cute >↓like I try to say to him< and he'd say SHUT UP ha ha ha huh." Mom overlaps Sandie's report with agreement, saying "↑Ye↓ah" in line 11 and "I ↑can't ↓handle that" in line 14, in overlap with Kate, following a 1.5-second pause at line 12.

In overlap with Mom's utterance of "I ↑can't ↓handle that," Kate initiates repair of Sandie's prior utterance, addressing Sandie and saying "Hmm?" in line 13. Sandie responds to Kate's repair initiation by reaffirming her previous elaboration of Mom's claim, referring to Daniel and claiming "That's what he says to you" at line 15, which Keith overlaps with "Goodness" at line 16 and a partial repeat of Sandie's prior elaboration, saying ""SHUT UP" at line 18. Kate then explicitly disagrees with Sandie's elaboration, saying "Um ↓mmm" in line 17. Sandie again defends to Kate her previous elaboration of Mom's claim, this time with an instance of reported speech as practical reenactment, saying "He does he says shut up stop talking" in line 19, which Keith overlaps with a partial repeat of "↑shut up↓" in line 20. Mom then takes up Sandie's second

report with agreement, saying "↓Um ↑hmm" at line 21, and the exchange comes to a close.

Instantiating occurs in this segment in lines 8-10, when Sandie says "Yeah, they'd say ↑oh you're so cute >↓like I try to say to him< and he'd say SHUT UP ha ha ha huh." With this turn at talk, Sandie presents two utterances in the current, non-narrative interaction as inventions, on her part, of the possible, but unspoken, utterances of imagined others (her second cousin Daniel, who is not present, and a hypothetical group of "old people") in a projected situation (an exchange between Daniel and the residents of a nursing home in a possible future visit). Thus Sandie presents these utterances as feasible on the part of these imagined actors in the projected situation, and she presents her report as a verbalization of these otherwise unspoken utterances in the current exchange.

Sandie's instantiating here is offered in support of Mom's claim that she cannot take Daniel with her to the nursing home to visit her mother, because Daniel "would be horrendous." By creatively enacting an exchange in which Daniel is very rude, loudly telling elderly people, who are

complimenting him by saying "↑oh you're so cute," to "SHUT UP," Sandie dramatically portrays for her audience members exactly why Mom "couldn't even take Daniel the::re." Thus Sandie justifies Mom's previously stated claim by supporting it with a tangible example, a report that relies upon its perceived likelihood in order to establish evidential benefit in the current interaction.

Both Mom and Keith treat Sandie's instantiating as non-problematic here. In fact, Mom takes up Sandie's instantiating with explicit agreement, saying "↑Ye↓ah" in line 11. In addition, Mom stresses the upshot of the creative enactment, that she could not take Daniel with her to the nursing home, by referring to Daniel's behavior and saying "I ↑can't ↓handle that" in line 14, which she produces in overlap with Kate, following a 1.5-second pause at line 12. Furthermore, Keith takes up Sandie's instantiating with acceptance, displaying aligning dismay with "Goodness" at line 16 and producing a partial repeat of Sandie's prior elaboration, saying ""SHUT UP" at line 18. Thus, both Mom and Keith accept Sandie's support of Mom's position here, granting its evidential benefit in the current interaction.

In contrast, however, Kate problematizes Sandie's instantiating in this instance. First Kate addresses Sandie with a repair initiation, asking "Hmm?" in line 13. When Sandie reaffirms her instantiation in line 15, rather than repairing it, Kate explicitly challenges Sandie's instantiating, disagreeing with it by saying "Um ↓mmm" in line 17. Interestingly, this challenge of Sandie's instantiating relies upon a rejection of the likelihood of the projected interaction's occurrence, particularly in terms of Daniel's part in the exchange. This reliance is initially demonstrated in Sandie's uptake of Kate's repair initiation. When Kate asks "Hmm?" in line 13, Sandie responds with "'That's what he says to you" at line 15, orienting to Kate's repair as a question regarding the invention of Daniel's possible utterance, rather than, for example, the invention of the nursing home residents' utterance of "↑oh you're so cute." Thus, when Kate responds to Sandie's defense of her prior instantiation with explicit disagreement, saying "Um ↓mmm" in line 17, Kate is demonstrably rejecting the likelihood of the utterance improvised for Daniel in the projected situation, and thus

rejecting the evidential benefit of Sandie's instantiating in the current interaction.

More interestingly, Sandie's response to Kate's explicit disagreement relies upon a switch from the creative enactment presentation format to the practical reenactment presentation format, with a concurrent switch in evidential claims. When Kate demonstrably rejects the likelihood of Daniel's utterance in the projected exchange, Sandie responds with the statement "He does he says shut up stop talking" in line 19. Thus Sandie's claim in the ongoing interaction changes from one in which Daniel is likely to produce a certain utterance in a projected situation ("he'd say") to one in which Daniel habitually produces a certain utterance ("He does he says"). With this switch in reporting strategy, Sandie simultaneously alters her claim in the ongoing interaction, from one of current knowledge of social actors and their probable actions in situations to one of previous access, of some sort, to actual prior utterances; in this particular case, the utterance "shut up stop talking" on Daniel's part.

Finally, Sandie's new claim is successful in the ongoing interaction. Similar to their uptake of Sandie's

initial creative enactment, both Mom and Keith treat Sandie's practical reenactment here as non-problematic. Keith takes it up with acceptance, producing a partial repeat of Sandie's report in overlap of it, saying ""↑shut up↓" in line 20. Mom then takes up Sandie's report with explicit agreement, saying "↓Um ↑hmm" at line 21. Thus, both Mom and Keith align with Sandie in opposition to Kate's rejection of Sandie's instantiating, granting the evidential benefit of Sandie's practical reenactment in the current interaction. Most importantly, however, though Kate does not produce explicit disagreement with Sandie's report here, she does abandon her rejection of Sandie's creative enactment, and the exchange comes to a close.

In summary, instantiating is a non-narrative interaction activity that incorporates instances of reported speech using the creative enactment presentation format. Speakers use instantiations, or inventions of the possible, but currently unspoken, utterances of imagined actors in projected situations, to support claims, either their own or others, in the current interaction. Thus, by using reported speech as creative enactment in instantiations, speakers manifest possible utterances for

evidential benefit in the current interaction. In doing so, instantiaters invite displayed agreement from their current interaction partners in post-instantiating slots. Thus the preferred sequence shape for instantiations can be described as [claim] + [report] + [agreement], with the first two slots being taken by either one or two speakers, though dispreferred sequences do occur.

CONCLUSION

The current study has devoted analytical attention to the ways in which interactants manage the internal diversity of reported speech in the furtherance of situated projects, looking exclusively at non-narrative episodes of talk-in-interaction. In particular, this analysis has provided empirical descriptions of two reporting strategies, or presentation formats involving the local and interactional management of reports, that carry distinctive evidential claims (Hill and Irvine 1993) and that are both constituted by and constitutive of the conversational environments in which they operate (Goodwin and Duranti 1992).

The two reporting strategies laid out here have been practical reenactment, or the presentation of a report as a repeat of an actual prior utterance, and creative enactment, or the presentation of a report as an invention by the current speaker of a possible, but otherwise unspoken, utterance. The multi-functionality of these presentation formats (Jakobson 1990) has also been

discussed in some detail, from a social-interactional perspective, examining practical reenactment within the non-narrative conversational activities of conveying, corroborating, critiquing, and deriding, and examining creative enactment within the non-narrative conversational activities of formulating and instantiating.

This analysis has illustrated a number of interesting features of the local and interactional management of reported speech in naturally occurring talk-in-interaction. First, interactants do not strictly adhere to any one of the conceptualizations of reported speech proposed within the research, opting instead for diverse treatments of reports during moment-to-moment talk-in-interaction. As a result, the possibility of examining the internal diversity of reported speech as an interesting phenomenon in its own right, as well as the importance of avoiding both the verbatim and the construction assumptions in future research, has been demonstrated.

Furthermore, interactants manifest and mobilize reported speech in the furtherance of situated projects in a variety of activities, beyond the canonical one of producing conversational narratives. Consequently, the

viability of examining reported speech in non-narrative conversational episodes has been illustrated. Also, the danger of treating the dramatizing function of reported speech as its necessary and obvious effect is made clear, in that, though this function is amply demonstrated in conversational narratives, analysis of non-narrative interaction episodes illustrates that interactants can and do locally and interactionally manage reports in many ways, some of which are even at odds with the dramatizing function.

Of course, the typology of reporting strategies and non-narrative conversational activities presented here is by no means exhaustive. One additional reporting strategy that is not discussed here, but that is suggested by the data, is a self-(re)enactment presentation format, in which the current speaker presents reports as either repeats of her own previous utterances or inventions of possible utterances for herself. While such a presentation format would undoubtedly share some features in common with the reporting strategies of practical reenactment and creative enactment, the social and interactional implications of

self-quotation would also undoubtedly differ significantly from those of other-quotation.

Also, within the presentation formats of practical reenactment and creative enactment already discussed, numerous other non-narrative conversational activities are available for examination, as suggested by the data. For example, the activity of alluding appears to be another use to which the practical reenactment format is put, in which participants produce reports as repeats of the actual prior utterances of others, but repeats that are highly ambiguous in terms of their attributions, perhaps to allow for the affiliating action of "getting" the allusion on the part of the addressee. In addition, the conversational activity of impersonating appears to be another use to which the creative enactment format is put, in which current speakers produce reports as their own inventions, but inventions that allow the reporters to momentarily take on personae that are not their own.

Though this typology is by no means exhaustive, it should serve as a step toward a better understanding of reported speech in talk-in-interaction, as well as a contribution to the numerous other research areas that rely

upon the concept of reported speech in the consideration of other issues.

REFERENCES

- Álvarez-Cáccamo, C. 1996. The Power of Reflexive Language(s): Code Displacement in Reported Speech. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 33-59.
- Anderson, L. 1986. Evidentials, Paths of Change, and Mental Maps: Typologically Regular Asymmetries. In *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*, edited by W. Chafe and J. Nichols. Norwood, NJ: Ablex. 273-312.
- Atkinson, J.M. and J. Heritage, editors. 1984. *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Austin, J. 1962. *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bakhtin, M. 1971. Discourse Typology in Prose. In *Readings in Russian Poetics*, edited by L. Mateika and K. Pomorska. Cambridge: MIT Press. 176-196.

Bakhtin, M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination*, edited by M. Holquist, translated by C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: UT Press.

Bakhtin, M. 1986. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, edited by C. Emerson and M. Holquist, translated by V. McGee. Austin: UT Press.

Banfield, A. 1973. Narrative Style and the Grammar of Direct and Indirect Speech. *Foundations in Language* 10: 1-39.

Baynham, M. 1996. Direct Speech: What's it Doing in Non-Narrative Discourse? *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 61-81.

Besnier, N. 1993. Reported Speech and Affect on Nukulaelae Atoll. In *Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse*,

edited by J. Hill and J. Irvine. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
161-181.

Buttny, R. 1997. Reported Speech in Talking Race on Campus.
Human Communication Research 23: 477-507.

Buttny, R. 1998. Putting Prior Talk into Context: Reported
Speech and the Reporting Context. *Research on Language and
Social Interaction* 31: 45-58.

Clark, H. and R. Gerrig. 1990. Quotations as
Demonstrations. *Language* 66: 764-805.

Coulmas, F. 1985. Direct and Indirect Speech: General
Problems and Problems of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 9:
41-63.

Coulmas, F. 1986. Reported speech: Some general issues. In
Direct and Indirect Speech, edited by F. Coulmas. Berlin:
Mouton de Gruyter. 1-28.

Couper-Kuhlen, E. 1998. Coherent Voicing: On Prosody in Conversational Reported Speech. *InLiSt* 1. Konstanz: University of Konstanz.

Duranti, A. and C. Goodwin, editors. 1992. *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Edley, N. and M. Wetherell. 1997. Jockeying for Position: The Construction of Masculine Identities. *Discourse and Society* 8: 203-217.

Edwards, D. 1998. The Relevant Thing About Her: Social Identity Categories in Use. In *Identities in Talk*, edited by C. Antaki and S. Widdicombe. London: Sage. 15-33.

Edwards, D. and J. Potter. 1992. *Discursive Psychology*. London: Sage.

Fairclough, N. and R. Wodak. 1997. Critical Discourse Analysis. In *Discourse as Social Interaction*, edited by T.A. van Dijk. London: Sage. 258-284.

Garfinkle, H. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Goffman, E. 1983. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P.

Goffman, E. 1986. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Boston: Northeastern UP.

Goodwin, C. 1984. Notes on Story Structure and the Organization of Participation. In *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, edited by M. Atkinson and J. Heritage. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 225-246.

Goodwin, C. and A. Duranti. 1992. Rethinking Context: An Introduction. In *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, edited by A. Duranti and C. Goodwin. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 1-42.

Günthner, S. 1997. The Contextualization of Affect in Reported Dialogues. In *The Language of Emotions: Conceptualization, Expression, and Theoretical Foundation*, edited by S. Niemeier and R. Dirven. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 247–276.

Günthner, S. 1998. Polyphony and the "Layering of Voices" in Reported Dialogues: An Analysis of the Use of Prosodic Devices in Everyday Reported Speech. *InLiSt* 3. Konstanz: University of Konstanz.

Günthner, S. 2000. Constructing Scenic Moments: Grammatical and Rhetoric-Stylistic Devices for Staging Past Events in Everyday Narratives. *InLiSt* 22. Konstanz: University of Konstanz.

Günthner, S. 2002. Perspectivity in Reported Dialogues: The Contextualization of Evaluative Stances in Reconstructing Speech. In *Perspective and Perspectivization in Discourse*, edited by C. Graumann and W. Kallmeyer. Philadelphia: Benjamins. 347–374.

Heritage, J. 1984. *Garfinkle and Ethnomethodology*.
Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heritage, J. 1997. Conversation Analysis and Institutional
Talk: Analyzing Data. In *Qualitative Research*, edited by D.
Silverman. London: Sage. 161-182.

Heritage, J., and D. Greatbatch. 1991. On the Institutional
Character of Institutional Talk: The Case of News
Interviews. In *Talk and Social Structure*, edited by D.
Boden and D. Zimmerman. Cambridge: Polity Press. 93-137.

Hill, J. and J. Irvine. 1993. Introduction. In
Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse, edited by J.
Hill and J. Irvine. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 1-23.

Hjelmskjøl, E. and A. Gidlund. 1985. Free Recall of
Conversations. *Text* 5: 169-185.

Holt, E. 1996. Reporting on Talk: The Use of Direct
Reported Speech in Conversation. *Research on Language and
Social Interaction* 29: 219-245.

Holt, E. 2000. Reporting and Reacting: Concurrent Responses to Reported Speech. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 33: 425-454.

Holtgraves, T. 2002. *Language as Social Action: Social Psychology and Language Use*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hopper, R., S. Koch, and J. Mandelbaum. 1986. Conversation Analysis Methods. In *Contemporary Issues in Language and Discourse Processes*, edited by D.G. Ellis and W.A. Donohue. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hutchby, I. and R. Wooffitt. 1998. *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jakobson, R. 1990. *On Language*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.

Klewitz, G. and E. Couper-Kuhlen. 1999. Quote - Unquote? The Role of Prosody in the Contextualization of Reported Speech Sequences. *InLiSt* 12. Konstanz: University of Konstanz.

Lehrer, A. 1989. Remembering and Representing Prose: Quoted Speech as a Data Source. *Discourse Processes* 12: 105-25.

Li, C. 1986. Direct and Indirect Speech: A Functional Study. In *Direct and Indirect Speech*, edited by F. Coulmas. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 29-45.

Lucy, J. 1993. Reflexive Language and the Human Disciplines. In *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*, edited by J. Lucy. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 9-33.

Mathis, T. and G. Yule. 1994. Zero Quotatives. *Discourse Processes* 18: 63-76.

Mayes, Patricia. 1990. Quotation in Spoken English. *Studies in Language* 14: 325-363.

Maynard, S. 1996. Multivoicedness in Speech and Thought Representation: The Case of Self-Quotation in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 207-226.

Nofsinger, R. 1991. *Everyday Conversation*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Plato. 2000. *The Republic*, edited by G. Ferrari, translated by T. Griffith. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Pomerantz, A. 1996. Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: Some Features of Preferred/Dispreferred turn shapes. In *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, edited by J. Atkinson and J. Heritage. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 57-101.

Pomerantz, A. and A. Fehr. 1997. Conversation Analysis: An Approach to the Study of Social Action as Sense Making Practices. In *Discourse as Social Interaction*, edited by T.A. van Dijk. London: Sage. 64-91.

Potter, J. 1996. *Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction*. London: Sage.

Potter, J. 1997. Discourse Analysis as a Way of Analyzing Naturally Occurring Talk. In *Qualitative Research*, edited by D. Silverman. London: Sage. 144-160.

Potter, J. and M. Wetherell. 1987. *Discourse and Social Psychology*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Potter, J. and M. Wetherell. 1995. Discourse Analysis. In *Rethinking Methods in Psychology*, edited by J.A. Smith, R. Harre, and L. van Langenhove. London: Sage. 80-92.

Psathas, G. 1995. *Conversation Analysis: The Study of Talk-In-Interaction*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Quine, W. 1969. *Word and Object*. Cambridge: MIT press.

Sacks, H. 1992. *Lectures on Conversation*, vols. 1-2, edited by G. Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, H., E. Schegloff, and G. Jefferson. 1978. A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. In *Studies in the Organization of*

Conversational Interaction, edited by J. Schenkein. New York: Academic Press. 7-55.

Schegloff, E. 1972. Sequencing in Conversational Openings. In *Directions in Sociolinguistics*, edited by J. Gumperz and D. Hymes. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. 346-380.

Schegloff, E. 1993. Reflections on Quantification in the Study of Conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 26: 99-128.

Schegloff, E. 1997. Whose Text? Whose Context? *Discourse and Society* 8: 165-187.

Schegloff, E. and H. Sacks. 1973. Opening Up Closings. *Semiotica* 7: 289-327.

Searle, J. 1969. *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Shuman, A. 1993. "Get Outta My Face": Entitlement and Authoritative Discourse. In *Responsibility and Evidence in*

Oral Discourse, edited by J. Hill and J. Irvine. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 135-160.

Silverstein, M. 1993. Metapragmatic Discourse and Metapragmatic Function. In *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*, edited by J. Lucy. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 33-58.

Sternberg, M. 1982. Proteus in Quotation-Land: Mimesis and the Forms of Reported Discourse. *Poetics Today* 3: 107-156.

Tannen, D. 1989. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Tannen, D. 2004. Talking the Dog: Framing Pets as Interactional Resources in Family Discourse. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 37: 399-420.

Tracy, K. 2002. *Everyday Talk: Building and Reflecting Identities*. New York: Guilford

Vincent, D. and L. Perrin. 1999. On the Narrative vs. Non-Narrative Functions of Reported Speech: A Socio-Pragmatic Study. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3: 291-314.

Vlatten, A. 1997. *Quotatives, Reported Speech, and Constructed Dialogue in Everyday German Conversation: A Conversation Analytic Perspective*. Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.

Voloshinov, V. 1986. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, translated by L. Matejka and I. Titunik. Cambridge: Harvard UP.

Wieder, D.L. 1999. Ethnomethodology, Conversation Analysis, Microanalysis, and the Ethnography of Speaking (EM-CA-MA-ES): Resonances and Basic Issues. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 31: 163-171.

Wierzbicka, A. 1974. The Semantics of Direct and Indirect Discourse. *Papers in Linguistics* 7: 267-307.

Wittgenstein, L. 1953. *Philosophical Investigations*, edited by G. Anscombe and R. Rhees, translated by G. Anscombe. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wood, L. and R. Kroger. 2000. *Doing Discourse Analysis: Methods for Studying Action in Talk and Text*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

VITA

Kathryn Hickerson Henning was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on May 12, 1970, the daughter of Patricia Helen Hickerson and Raymond D. Hickerson. After receiving a Bachelor of Arts from the University of Central Arkansas in Conway, Arkansas, in May 1994, Kathryn went on to receive a Master of Arts from the University of North Texas in Denton, Texas, in May 1997. She then entered the University of Texas at Austin, Texas, in August 1998. During her time in Austin, Kathryn was a co-chair for the 9th annual Symposium About Language and Society, Austin (SALSA), as well as a co-editor of the SALSA proceedings, published as a special issue of the Texas Linguistic Forum.

After leaving Austin in 2001, Kathryn joined the faculty of the University of Central Arkansas in Conway, Arkansas, serving as a member of the Department of Writing and Speech for three years before being appointed Resident Master within the Residential College Program at the university. Kathryn currently lives and works in Conway,

Arkansas with her husband Keith and her daughter Margaret Grace.

Permanent Address: University of Central Arkansas, P.O.
Box 5153, Conway, Arkansas 72035

This dissertation was typed by Kathryn Hickerson Henning.