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This article considers points in turn construction where conversation researchers have shown that talk routinely continues beyond possible turn completion, but where bodily-visual behavior doing such turn extension work is found. The bodily-visual behaviors examined share many features with verbal turn extensions, but it is argued that embodied movements have distinct properties that make them well-suited for specific kinds of social action, including stance display and by-play in relation to simultaneous verbal turns and sequences.

Our study is in line with a research agenda that takes seriously the point made by C. Goodwin (2000a, 2000b, 2003), Hayashi (2003a, 2003b, 2005), Iwasaki (2009), and others that scholars seeking to account for practices in language and social interaction do themselves a disservice if they privilege the verbal dimension; rather, as suggested in Stivers & Sidnell (2005), each semiotic...
system/modality, although coordinated with others, has its own organization. With this exploration of bodily-visual turn extensions, we hope to contribute to a growing understanding of how these different modes of organization are concurrently managed, and in concert, by interactants in carrying out their everyday social actions.

INTRODUCTION

In this article, we investigate points in interaction where conversation researchers have shown that talk routinely occurs, but where we find bodily-visual behavior not only coordinated with talk but, interestingly, also extending beyond the possible completions of verbal formulations. We call these bodily-visual practices (BVPs). Research on turn extension has concentrated on verbal (i.e., lexico-grammatical) material added after the possible completion of turns (transition-relevance places [TRPs]). Independent of studies of turn extension, analysts of human interaction have long attended to BVPs and their coordination with, and indeed co-organizing of, turns and sequences of action (see the next section of this article for a review).

In this study, we offer a typology of BVPs used in positions shared by what are traditionally considered turn extensions or turn increments—that is, in post-completion positions. We find that BVPs may extend beyond canonical verbal TRPs, and we also find that BVPs are employed at what Gene Lerner (1991, 1996, 2002) has termed “semi-permeable” points within turn-constructional units (TCUs)—points where, in our data, BVPs may continue and verbal turn construction may cease. Indeed, analysis of BVPs, in relation to turn construction, reveals that BVPs are capable of beginning within ongoing verbal TCUs—that is, they may accompany, and indeed elaborate, the actions of verbal turns and then extend past verbal TRPs. Finally, in analyzing those BVPs that simultaneously begin with verbal turn construction, we have discovered that the coordination of bodily-visual with verbal turn-constructional practices may create conditions for discontinuation of a verbal turn with its action being completed only bodily-visually.

In accounting for BVPs extending beyond verbal TRPs, our research has, thus, naturally broadened our domain of analysis from turn continuation to turn construction proper and, indeed, to sequence construction. Although our cases and our findings are presented in terms of the theme of this special issue of Discourse Processes—namely, their relevance to turn extension—we present a typology of BVPs as they are deployed not only in post-completion position,

1In this article, we use the term verbal to indicate both lexico-grammatical and prosodic formulations.
but also in turn and sequence construction, more broadly viewed. We show that BVPs and verbal formulations are systematically different from verbal extensions alone after possible turn completion, and that BVPs and verbal formulations are coordinated in ways relevant to, and functionally overlapping with, what we think of as turn extensions. Based on analyses of a progression of cases, we argue that BVPs can do the same work as verbal turn extension and, in fact, that at specific points in the interaction, BVPs *can do work that verbal units cannot.*

Our study of BVPs, turn continuation, and turn construction began when we noticed extensions being formed up with bodily-visual, rather than verbal, material. Our study has, thus, grown out of attention to the ends of verbal turns. However, although we contextualize this research within the study of verbal turn construction, we do not view BVPs as a set of practices secondary or supplemental to verbal practices. Our interest is in the coordination of BVPs with verbal action.

In prior accounts of verbal practices through which speakers add on to their own possibly complete turns (Couper-Kuhlen & Ono, 2007; Davidson, 1984; Ford, Fox, & Thompson, 2002; Walker, 2004), one common form of extension involves the addition of grammatical material that extends the previous turn structure in a manner that is integrated with the previous grammatical structure. Couper Kuhlen and Ono termed such continuations “glue-ons,” as exemplified in (1):


1—>

Gor: .t O:kay .h I: sh- I shall leave you. .h

2—>

to get on with your hard stud\100ying.  

3—>

that I know I interrupted. .hhhhhh

4—>

rather[ru\100edly

5  Dan: [(Oh yes.)

In (1), Gordon’s turn comes to possible completion with “you” (line 1). The addition of “to get on with your hard studying” forms a purpose clause grammatically integrated with the previous TCU. A further extension past a TRP comes at line 3, with “that I know I interrupted,” forming a relative clause modifying “your hard studying.” Finally, the addition of “rather rudely” creates further adverbial modification. Comparable to this type of verbal turn continuation, in our research, we have found points of possible verbal turn completion after which the same “speaker” produces what is arguably a turn extension, but one done through bodily-visual means.

In examining cases of BVPs beyond points of possible turn transition, we have also found cases for which Lerner’s (1996) notion of the “semi-permeability” of components of emerging TCUs is relevant. In a number of studies, Lerner has demonstrated that interactants produce smooth speaker transition not just at
canonical TRPs, but also at other structural points in unfolding TCUs. One speaker produces a (grammatically incomplete) preliminary component of a turn, and another speaker produces a collaborative completion of the turn unit. Lerner’s (1991, 1996, 2002) research draws attention to collaborative parsing and forming up of turns-in-progress. For example, in (2), Vera is describing her father’s recent knee operation to Cindy. Her turn comes to a TRP at line 3, but a gap emerges at line 4. In line 5, just as Vera is adding “a whole knee replacement,” an appositive extension (a free noun phrase) beyond her TRP, Cindy adds an if-clause to the syntax of Vera’s turn (second arrow). Cindy’s if-clause functions as a “B-Event” statement (Labov & Fanshel, 1977)—in this instance, a check of her understanding of what Vera has been explaining and a prompt for Vera to produce the projected other option (besides what is “normally” done by the surgeon):

(2) Knees 83 (Ford, 1993):
1 V: If he didn’t wanna keep being active, an’ do sports n’ things, right now, at his age, an’ with the bad condition of his knee, they normally put in a plastic knee.
2 3 4 (0.2)
⇒ 5 V: A whole knee replacement.
⇒ 6 C: [If he didn’t wanna be active.
7 V: If he didn’t want to be active, but since he wanted to be active,

Cindy’s appendor question (Sacks, 1995, p. 528; Schegloff, 1997, p. 511; Sidnell, 2012/this issue) reproduces part of Vera’s line 1, and it also forms an adverbial clause extension beyond the TRP at line 3. In this and in other instances, then, extensions of turn units can be produced both by the same speakers and by other speakers, even where both speakers are adding talk past the same TRP.

Whereas Lerner’s (1991, 1996, 2002) research on collaborative turn construction and semi-permeability of TCUs focused on sharing of lexico-grammatical turn construction between different participants, the notion of semi-permeability of TCUs is also useful in understanding cases where the same participant shifts to a BVP in completing an ongoing turn. In our collection, in the midst of verbal turn construction, a speaker can shift to a BVP alone, and we find these points are comparable to the structurally permeable grammatical points where Lerner (1991, 1996, 2002) found collaborative syntax to be used.

We have found five temporal positions of verbal and visual semiotic systems to be particularly striking in our data:

Type 1: After a possibly complete verbal turn, a BVP is initiated in the same interactional space where a verbal increment might be used.
Type 2: At a TRP after a preliminary turn component (Lerner, 1996), the speaker treats the turn as permeable, using a BVP to “gesture” toward completion.

Type 3: A BVP is initiated during the course of a verbal turn, and it is continued into the pause following a TRP.

Type 4: A BVP is initiated within a verbal turn or at a TRP and continues, paralleling a verbal action sequence.

Type 5: Beginning within a verbal TCU, a BVP is initiated by the current speaker and responded to with a BVP by a recipient within the same TCU and before a TRP is reached. On “reading” the recipient’s bodily-visual response, the current speaker then discontinues the verbal TCU-in-progress, as the action has been treated as complete through the recipient’s bodily-visual response.

We show how each of these constellations of verbal practices with BVPs has implications for turn construction and turn continuation.

Our article demonstrates our commitment to taking seriously the point made by C. Goodwin (2000a, 2000b, 2003), Hayashi (2003a, 2000b, 2005), Iwasaki (2009), Mondada (2006, 2007), and others, that researchers seeking to understand language and social interaction do our field a disservice if they privilege the verbal dimension; rather, as argued in Stivers and Sidnell (2005), each semiotic system/modality, although coordinated with others, has its own organization. We suggest that our job, as interactional linguists, is to come to understand how these different modes of organization are concurrently managed—in concert—by interactants in carrying out their social actions.²

We are clearly narrowing our investigation to those BVPs that occur at or near a place of possible turn completion (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974), well aware that bodily-visual behavior is occurring all the time in social interaction, and is not necessarily organized relative to verbal turn constructional practices.³

In what follows, we begin with those BVPs that share features with verbal turn-constructional practices, and then move to BVPs that have constructional properties that distinguish them from verbal practices. In our conclusion, we suggest that such differences may motivate particular uses of verbal and bodily-visual modalities.

We first review research on multimodality in turn construction. We then examine the five types of temporal relation between verbal practices and BVPs that

---

²We acknowledge that, as part of a symposium and special issue on “turn continuation,” our article does indeed privilege the verbal, as our point of departure in our research process involved attending to the possible ends of verbal turns (i.e., the site for turn extensions as examined in previous research).

³We return to this point in our conclusion.
we have observed in our data, considering how BVPs relate to turn construction and turn continuation. Finally, we present our conclusions and their implications for our understanding of talk and BVPs.

RESEARCH ON MULTIMODALITY IN TURN CONSTRUCTION

Much research has been dedicated to the verbal properties of talk-in-interaction and on how participants achieve social actions verbally and through talk (Heritage, 1984, 2002; Pomerantz, 1984; Sacks & Schegloff, 1979; Sacks et al., 1974; among others). In addition, a growing body of conversation analytic research has focused on multimodality and talk-in-interaction. These studies have found that speakers rely not only on verbal resources, but also on a range of nonverbal resources, such as gaze (C. Goodwin, 1979, 2000b; Lerner, 2003; Rosanno, 2006), gesture (C. Goodwin, 1986; M. H. Goodwin, 1980; M. H. Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Heath, 1982; among others), prosody and intonation (Couper-Kuhlen & Ford, 2004; Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 1996; Ford & Thompson, 1996; Selting, 1996; among others), and other forms of bodily conduct (Hayashi, 2003a, 2003b, 2005; Iwasaki, 2009; Kendon, 1990; among others).

Our research contributes to this growing body of work on multimodality and talk-in-interaction; instead of privileging talk, we look at how BVPs are oriented to by the participants and how such practices contribute to the unfolding talk on a moment-by-moment basis. Before we turn to the five relations between verbal turn construction practices and the types of BVPs we have found in our data, we highlight some parallels to, and similarities with, other research in the field—namely, C. Goodwin (2000a, 2000b, 2003), Hayashi (2003a, 2003b, 2005), and Iwasaki (2009).

Conversation analytic research has consistently shown that talk and other modalities can mutually elaborate and contextualize one another. As Hayashi (2005) noted, the turn-at-talk is an “interactively sustained domain of multimodal conduct” (p. 21), and these “multimodal packages” (pp. 21–22), of which BVPs are a crucial part, contribute to the unfolding of talk-in-interaction. Hayashi (2005) showed how a speaker begins a description verbally and ends with a gesture, followed by the recipient producing a turn that linguistically interprets what the speaker had indicated gesturally. Thus, the pre-positioning of a gesture before talk occurs across speakers, not only within one speaker’s turn, and the projection space can be utilized by a co-participant. The crucial aspect of projectability of possible next items due, hence, results not only from talk so far, but also from visual and bodily conduct so far.

Hayashi (2003b, 2005) argued that in addition to speakers’ ability to produce the verbal equivalent of another speaker’s gesture to show or test their under-
standing of that gesture, speakers can also mirror each others’ bodily conduct to show understanding via BVPs. BVPs can move the talk forward such that the progress of a current verbal TCU may be discontinued if the participants have established mutual understanding displayed through an exchange of BVPs. Our work also corroborates prior work on the importance of participant frameworks and projectability, which result not only from talk, but also from visual and bodily conduct (C. Goodwin, 2000a, 2000b, 2003; Hayashi, 2003a, 2003b, 2005; Schegloff, 1984). Lerner’s (1996, 2002) work on the permeability of turns has been taken up by Iwasaki (2009), who showed that multimodal practices can open up turns for other participants, creating interactive turn spaces within TCUs. Displays of understanding, recognition, and affiliation are made relevant before the current speaker finishes a TCU. In our study, we also examine how BVPs may be organized relative to semi-permeable points in emerging TCUs (i.e., how a participant makes relevant a next action by a co-participant at a place where a current verbal TCU is not yet [possibly] complete).

INTERACTIONAL LINGUISTICS AND MULTIMODAL TURN CONSTRUCTION: FIVE RELATIONS BETWEEN VERBAL PRACTICES AND BVPs

Let us begin with types of BVPs sharing features with verbal turn-constructional practices. As we progress, we introduce BVPs that have constructional properties distinct from verbal turn units.

Recall that the first type of temporal positioning between a BVP and verbal turn-constructional practices is the circumstance in which a BVP is initiated in the same interactional space where a verbal increment might be used:

Type 1: After a possibly complete verbal turn, a BVP is initiated in the same interactional space where a verbal increment might be used.

Extract (3) illustrates a bodily-visual turn extension that uses the same interactional space in which a verbal turn extension could be used. In (3), Molly and Brian, a heterosexual couple, are having dinner. As part of Molly’s graduate study, they are allowing themselves to be videotaped, and the video camera becomes a focus of their talk. Leading up to this extract, Brian has been arguing that the video camera is affecting their interaction. His claim is that pretending they are not aware of the camera is worse than focusing on it:

(3)
1 Brian: That’s worse offense than focusing on its: presence.
2 \(\Rightarrow (1.6)\) \((B\text{ raises eyebrows, moves chin back, head slightly left})\)
3 Molly: >D’you< hear that? (spoken with gaze to camera)
4 (0.4)
5 Brian: Yeah? You think? (still holding eyebrow raise & forehead wrinkle)
6 (1.5) (B forehead still wrinkled, moves head and looks at camera; gazes back at M)

Brian’s comment in line 1 comes to a TRP, where he raises his eyebrows and moves his chin back and his head slightly left (line 2)—a complex BVP visible in Figure 1. In other words, after a possibly complete verbal turn, Brian’s BVP initiates a new unit in the same interactional space where a verbal turn extension might also be used.

Let us compare the BVP exemplifying Type 1, Example (3), with what we know about verbal turn extensions. We note first that, like verbal turn extensions, this BVP is added after a TRP during an emerging gap, just where lexico-grammatical-prosodic extensions have been found to occur. Second, again as with verbal turn extensions, the BVP comes where a recipient response is relevant, but delayed. Third, and unlike glue-ons, the explicitly integrated verbal turn increments, the BVPs, do not constitute “dependent” structures in grammatical terms, as verbal turn extensions have been argued to do (e.g., Couper-Kuhlen & Ono, 2007). Finally, we note that at the possible end of the BVP in (3), Brian’s facial expression and head position are held, and they are held into the talk of the recipient, with the overlap not treated as problematic, whereas verbal overlap has been shown to consistently do interactional work and to regularly involve targeted resolution (Jefferson, 1983, 1986; Lerner, 1989; Schegloff, 2000, 2002). Thus, the fact that one can continue to hold a BVP even into the next speaker’s verbal turn without leading to problems and overlap resolution (e.g., raised volume of speaker during overlap, repair initiation; Schegloff, 2000) is evidence for the distinct status of overlapping BVPs, as compared with overlapping talk, as schematized in Figure 2.

FIGURE 1 Brian and Molly (Extract (3), line 2). Note. Brian raises eyebrows, moves chin back, and tilts head slightly to the left.
Let us turn now to the second type of temporal positioning between a BVP and turn-constructional practices:

Type 2: At a TRP after a preliminary turn component, the speaker treats the turn as permeable, using a BVP to “gesture” toward completion.

In Extract (4), a BVP is used after what Lerner (1996) called a “preliminary turn component” to gesture toward a “final turn component.” Lerner (1996) showed that preliminary turn components not only make relevant a final turn component, but that the latter are often, in fact, produced by the co-participant. Thus, preliminary turn components provide an opportunity for collaborative completion and testify to the fact that turns are semi-permeable—that is, a next speaker may begin a collaborative completion at precise points in the unfolding of a TCU. Extract (4) shows that BVPs can be used following such a preliminary turn component at a point in the interaction where collaborative completion is possible, but is not taken up by a co-participant. Instead, the BVP “gestures” toward the final component. The focal segment begins at line 10:

(4) Molly is telling Brian about an e-mail she received from the caterer for the couple’s upcoming wedding reception. It seems the two will need to tip the bartender, but Brian suggests that the caterer hire the bartender and take on paying the tip himself:

1 B: =Let’s- Let’s have him, Let’s have him provide his own then. (0.3)
2
3 B: .hh That way the ti-it’ll be that’ll be of- Get us out of:
4 (.) havin’ thi extra tip ↓ on top,=
5 M: =mm mm:, He said the bartender would make the ↑ tips then.
6 (0.5)

FIGURE 2 Visualization of temporal emergence of bodily-visual practice (BVP) in Extract (3). Note, TRP = transition-relevance place; TCU = turn-constructional unit.
In either case, in his scenario, M: >tks< In either case, in his scenario, (0.7) the bartender, (0.3) B: gets everything at the bar? [Well] (0.3) Depending on what happens, if some of the servers end up bartending, then they’ll probably split some of the bartending tips, [but if they don’t bartend at all:; ((M = rightward gesture))]

In lines 10 through 13, seeing the contingency in Brian’s suggestion, Molly constructs a two-part contrast formulated with two hypothetical if-clauses, only the first of which has an expressed main clause (at least up through lines 15 and 16). At “but if they don’t bartend at all:;” she dips her head and gazes at Brian with widened eyes and a rightward hand gesture, as shown in Figures 3a and 3b, inviting him to infer the consequent of her verbal if-clause. As we discuss later, by inviting inference here, Molly is arguably treating the consequent, which could be verbalized, as obvious and projectable.

We might compare Molly’s BVP at line 16 in this extract to Brian’s eyebrow raise and chin retraction in Extract (3), and to the position and function of verbal turn extensions. Just as in Extract (3), Molly’s BVP is added after a possible TRP and an emerging gap. As with verbal turn extensions, the additional action of the BVP comes where a recipient response may be relevant, but delayed. However, in this instance, Molly produces a BVP at a semi-permeable point in the unfolding verbal turn structure. The BVP does not constitute a “dependent” structure in grammatical terms, but it comes where a dependent grammatical unit could be placed.

FIGURE 3 Molly (rightward gesture with head dipped and her gaze toward Brian) and Brian (“blank” face; Extract (4), line 16): (a) end of lines 13 and 14; (b) second rightward gesture with head dipped and gaze held.
So far, we have examined BVPs that occur in the same places where verbal units could occur. Extract (3), with Brian and Molly talking about the camera, illustrated Type 1, where a BVP occurs in the same interactional space where a verbal turn extension could. Type 2 captures the occurrence of a BVP at a semi-permeable point in the unfolding of a TCU. Here, just as described by Hayashi (2005) for his Japanese extract, the BVP follows a “preliminary component” and it “gestures toward” the “final component.” To illustrate this, we provided Type 2, Extract (4) wherein Molly’s gaze, head dip, and blank face follow the verbal preliminary component: “if they don’t bartend at all::”.

These examples have demonstrated how gestures and talk can occur simultaneously and without interfering with each other (cf. Kendon, 1985, p. 217). As we have noted, it is well-established that participants orient to verbal actions as temporally and linearly bounded such that overlaps are avoided, do particular actions, or are subject to accounting and repair. In contrast, BVPs (such as Brian’s gaze, head position, and facial expression in (3)) freely extend into the talk of a next speaker, without accounting or repair. Hence, BVPs can form relations with verbal turns and units without impeding the unfolding talk but, rather, extend the talk and co-organize the action.

We now turn to cases in which BVPs begin during verbal turn construction, again overlapping—and deployed simultaneously—with talk, and forming relations with verbal turns and units in ways that verbal formulations could not:

Type 3: A BVP is initiated during the course of a verbal turn, and it is continued into the pause following a TRP.

In Extract (5), Abbie has just reported that her father is going to Norway to visit his ailing mother. As an expansion of the sequence, Maureen does a questioning action (line 1) by forming a B-Event statement, a candidate understanding, based on her inference that Abbie is of Norwegian heritage. After further sequence expansion involving pursuit of elaboration on the part of Maureen but withholding of elaboration by Abbie (in lines 7 and 8; representing verbal and bodily-visual formations, respectively), Abbie produces a verbal turn accompanied by a cluster of BVPs (head shaking, eye widening, and eyebrow raising; see Figures 4a and 4b):

(5) Norwegian girl (game night):
1 Maureen: So you’re a Nor-Nor\textsuperscript{vegian} girl.=
2 Abbie: =No.
3 \hspace{1cm} (0.4)
4 Terry: [No-
5 Abbie: [No, Absolutely not a drop.
Abbie’s response to Maureen’s question is done as a simple denial—that is, without an account or elaboration, as would be relevant and even projectable (Ford, 2002). By withholding elaboration, Abbie initiates a little interactional “game,” “doing withholding of talk” (see the following), in which Maureen further pursues and even guesses at the explanation for Abbie’s denial that she is of Norwegian heritage. As part of the game, Abbie accompanies her “Nope” in line 7 with widened eyes, raised eyebrows, a slight headshake, and a tight-lipped smile, as shown in Figure 4b. Her tightly closed lips with the production of the final sound of “Nope” potentiate her action of withholding, as the unreleased, final, voiceless bilabial both visually and acoustically demonstrates refusal to say more.

There are three key differences between Abbie’s BVP in Extract (5) and the verbal turn extensions considered in previous research on turn extension; in examining these differences, we can further see how BVPs can work in ways that verbal turn extensions cannot.

The first key difference is that the BVP begins within a verbal TCU and extends beyond the verbal TRP into the emerging silence. The second difference is that Abbie’s BVP does not constitute a “dependent” structure in grammatical terms. On the contrary, it is deployed simultaneously with a verbal TCU,
and shares post-TRP interactional territory with a turn extension. However, we emphasize, it begins where a separate verbal unit could not—namely, within Abbie’s own TCU. Third, as illustrated in Figures 4a and 4b, Abbie’s facial expression and gaze are held through the talk of the recipient, with the overlap not treated as problematic.

Because it is carried out simultaneously with a verbal action, the complex BVP in Extract (5), thus, reveals a set of properties, which allow it to play an interactional role not possible with a verbal turn continuation, as schematized in Figure 5.

We turn now to a further instance of a BVP doing work that a verbal turn continuation could not do:

Type 4: A BVP is initiated within a verbal turn or at a TRP and continues, paralleling a verbal action sequence.

Let us consider Extract (6), a continuation of Extract (5). Here, a continuing and dynamic set of BVPs parallel Abbie’s verbal turn continuation. Further, with the continuing BVPs, Abbie proposes a shift in the participation framework, introducing a simultaneous side sequence or by-play (Goffman, 1981; M. H. Goodwin, 1997), with a third party added to the interaction, Terry. More important, Terry is a knowing recipient (C. Goodwin, 1979, 1981, 2007) with respect to the information Abbie is withholding. Terry knows Abbie’s ancestry; therefore, she knows the solution to the puzzle of Abbie’s not being Norwegian but having a grandmother in Norway.

Notably, the series of BVPs in (6) shares territory with the verbal turn extension in (5) at its beginning in that it emerges within Abbie’s verbal TCU (line 7) and extends the overall action beyond the verbal TCU into a post-TRP pause, and in that elements of Abbie’s facial expression are continued into the post-TRP gap, with variations of the tight-lipped smile and eyebrow raise:

![FIGURE 5](attachment:figure5.png)

**FIGURE 5** Visualization of temporal emergence of bodily-visual practice (BVP) in Extract (5). *Note.* TRP = transition-relevance place; TCU = turn-constructional unit.
FIGURE 6  Terry and Abbie (Extract (6)). Note. Lines 11 through 13: Turning toward Terry, Abbie maintains eyebrow raise and tight-lipped smile; Terry turns to meet Abbie’s gaze.

(6) In a continuation of Extract (5), Abbie invites Terry to co-conspire in the guessing game:

4  Terry: [No-
5  Abbie: [No, Absolutely not a drop.
6  Maureen: ↑No?
7  Abbie: °Nope,°
8  [((BVP described in extract (5), not repeated here))
9  .]
10 Maureen: How’s that po[ssible,
11⇒ [((A turns toward T, holding facial expression))
12  Maureen: He’s not [your father,
13⇒ [((T moves head to meet A’s gaze))

[see Figure 6]
14  Abbie: [He is my father.
15⇒ [((A turns back to M with a nod))⇒ [see Figure 7a]
16⇒ (0.4) =((A holds gaze toward M)) [see Figure 7b]
17  Abbie: But they’re not Norwegian.
18  (0.4)
19  Terry: They just live-
20  Abbie: They just live [(in Oslo).

Extract (6) illustrates the fourth type of positioning between a BVP and a verbal turn that we find in our data.4 Abbie’s continuous BVP, with changing elements, begins within a verbal TCU (with her “Nope” in line 7), continues through a silence (line 9) and through Maureen’s following question (line 10). At this

4It comes out later (beyond the extracts) that Abbie’s grandparents were refugees from Hungary, who settled in Norway after the 1956 uprising in Hungary.
FIGURE 7 Abbie and Maureen (Extract (6), lines 15 and 16): (a) Abbie turns back toward Maureen; (b) Abbie nods and holds gaze toward Maureen.

point, and in overlap with Maureen’s guess at line 12, Abbie extends her BVP further to initiate a bodily-visual sequence, a side sequence, in the form of by-play with Terry. Through this extended BVP, Abbie produces a shift in the participation framework by initiating a bodily-visual sequence that parallels the verbal sequence. Abbie’s sequence-initiating BVP is minimally responded to by its recipient, Terry, whose responsive BVP involves her move to meet Abbie’s gaze (see Figure 6).

As with the BVPs discussed so far, those in Extracts (5) and (6) do not represent “dependent” grammatical structures. In addition, as the BVPs are started and continued, they overlap with two verbal turns by another speaker, without occasioning repair or other accounting for the overlap.

We come now to the last relation between verbal and bodily-visual actions that we illustrate, showing how BVPs can, in certain contexts and for particular purposes, be better fitted to an action than can speech—in this case, where a comparable verbal action might be regarded as too explicit or even taboo:

Type 5: Beginning within a verbal TCU, a BVP is initiated by the current speaker and responded to with a BVP by a recipient within the same TCU and before a TRP is reached. On “reading” the recipient’s bodily-visual response, the current speaker then discontinues the verbal TCU-in-progress, as the action has been treated as complete through the recipient’s bodily-visual response.

Extract (7) is taken from a meeting of medical professionals’ discussion of drug trials by pharmaceutical companies for the treatment of osteoporosis. Ned, a clinician and researcher, has indicated that he has doubts about the experimental protocol used in the study they are currently considering. Gwen, a medical researcher, has taken up this skepticism, and asked if there was any scientific rationale offered for the problematic method in the study. As the extract begins, Ned has just reported the drug company’s rationale, but he has done so with an
emphasis on the fact that this is not a rationale that he fully endorses. Ned has indicated skepticism regarding the drug company’s methods, and he has done so both verbally and through a side-to-side rocking of his head as he produces the assessment that the method “just smells bad.” It is at this point that Gwen produces the question with which Extract (7) begins:

(7) Meeting of medical clinicians and researchers; the topic is bone-density treatments:
19⇒Gwen: So, at least there would be some scientific
20⇒⇒ (((G=wavering hand gesture & nod [Ned=mirrors G’s
gesture & nods])))
21 .)
23⇒Gwen: [myeh: okay,
24 Ned: (((nodding & continued hand gesture))

As Gwen is forming up her verbal action, a first pair part doing an understanding check, she is simultaneously producing a wavering hand gesture that, in this context, suggests a skeptical epistemic stance with regard to the proposition she is checking out (see Figure 8). Recall that Ned has just expressed skepticism both verbally and bodily. Simultaneous with Gwen’s verbal turn-in-progress, and simultaneous with Gwen’s continuing hand gesture, Ned does the same hand gesture, although a bit lower and closer to the table, and he also produces a series of repeated vertical head movements or nods. Thus, Gwen’s BVP initiates an adjacency pair in which Ned responds with an affirmative head movement.

---

5See Ford (2008) for a fuller analysis of this sequence.
and an echoic gesture. We call attention to the fact that not only is the original speaker’s verbal turn simultaneous with her BVP, but her recipient’s response is also produced within the same emerging verbal TCU. Ned’s BVP response occasions Gwen’s discontinuing of her verbal turn-in-progress. In leaving her syntactic and prosodic trajectory incomplete, Gwen is precisely treating Ned’s response as sufficient to show that the action conveyed by the combination of Gwen’s verbal construction and by the simultaneous BVP has been successfully accomplished. Thus, although the verbal trajectory of her turn is not completed, the action is clearly completed, and she moves on to produce a sequence-closing third with “myeh: okay.”

The key observation we take from this case with respect to turn construction and turn continuation is that Gwen’s initiating BVP and Ned’s responsive one both differ from verbal turn extensions, not only in their simultaneity with the verbal TCU, but also in that, together, as a sequence within an unfolding TCU, they jointly establish the irrelevance of completing the verbal TCU formulation in progress. In a sense, the combination of the verbal trajectory and the BVP creates a condition under which a bodily-visual response from the recipient serves to complete the adjacency pair. Once again, the BVPs cannot be considered grammatically “dependent” structures, as verbal turn continuations are. BVPs, then, have their own organization and constitute a resource for participants for a range of positions and forms of action that verbal turn extensions cannot do.

Our data have revealed five types of temporal positioning of verbal and visual semiotic practices. Types 1 through 4 involve BVPs occurring past TRPs or continuing through a sequence, each progressively more distinct from what verbal turn extensions do. Type 1 occupies a position just past a TRP, much like a verbal increment, but the BVP itself is continued into, and through, the recipient’s verbal response. Type 2 involves a semi-permeable point in the construction of a turn, with the BVP gesturing toward completion of an action that is grammatically or verbally incomplete. Types 3 through 5 all began within a verbal TCU, with Type 3 extending the action through a BVP past a TRP, and Type 4 producing a parallel sequence distinct from, although related to, the ongoing verbal sequence. With Type 4, we see how the fact that BVPs can be simultaneously deployed with verbal actions supports the opportunity for BVP side sequences—in this case, by-play. Finally, Type 5 demonstrates that because a BVP can be initiated during a still-emerging TCU, a recipient’s responsive BVP at this moment, before the speaker reaches a TRP, can occasion discontinuation of the verbal action formulation.6

---

6Our use of the word *types* implies that each type has several exemplars; this is indeed the case, although we have had space to illustrate only one instance of each type in this article. We hope that our typology will encourage further research into the ways in which the body is used in formulating turn extensions.
CONCLUSION

Our aim in this article has been to highlight the role of BVPs in the management of turn continuation and turn construction. We have accomplished this by explicating the consummate skill with which participants in everyday interactions coordinate BVPs with verbal practices, and we have considered the temporal and interactional properties of BVPs in comparison to verbal practices, particularly attending to how BVPs relate to possible TRPs and occasions.

We have presented extracts illustrating five types of coordination between BVPs and verbal turns in relation to possible turn transition. Each type shows a different way in which verbal and bodily-visual systems interact to enhance meaning-making and action-doing among participants. We have endeavored to demonstrate that each semiotic modality, although coordinated with others, has its own principles and properties of use.

As promised, we now turn our attention to the question of why BVPs might be preferred for some types of actions in interaction. The fact that BVPs allow two courses of action to be pursued at once provides one answer to this question.

Ekman (1976, p. 22) showed that gestures can be used in instances where verbal resources are somehow restricted. For example, a hairdresser involved in talk on the phone may use bodily-visual means to invite a customer to come in and sit down. Kendon (1985) argued that gestures can be used when a speech channel is blocked either by noise or because it is already in use because they “evidently, need not intrude upon the sustained forms of talk” (p. 222). We are not convinced that bodily-visual actions always serve as secondary resources in place of verbal actions. Indeed, our cases strongly suggest that BVPs have functional capabilities making them uniquely fitted to particular actions.

BVPs allow speakers to produce action such that the speaker adeptly indexes something that could be verbalized; but, by using a bodily-visual modality, she or he displays an orientation to the action as one that should be obvious and, therefore, inferable—one that is best done as a BVP to maintain a playful withholding and initiate by-play, or one that should not be verbalized for reasons of professional conduct. In other words, our data show that participants have well-founded social motivations for drawing on nonverbal practices in the places we find them.

We have seen these motivations illustrated throughout the analysis of our extracts. In the case of Abbie’s guessing game in Extracts (5) and (6), for example, the BVPs contribute to the playful action she constructs while withholding verbal information from Maureen. In (7), we see that for both Gwen and Ned, the possibility of doing a BVP instead of finishing a vocal turn allows them to stay “off the record” to avoid verbalizing assessments that their professional code may forbid explicitly stating.
The temporal-interactional properties of BVPs, thus, make them particularly useful for managing delicate issues, as with Gwen and Ned in (7), and stance displays. For example, Brian, in Extract (3), expresses his stance toward the intrusiveness of the video camera; and Abbie, in (5) and (6), displays herself as momentarily “in control” of giving out information.

We hope to have made a convincing case for embracing BVPs in the study of turn extension and turn construction. We have seen that BVPs do occur in the “territory” of turn extensions, and that BVPs have specific properties that are skillfully coordinated with verbal turn-constructional practices. Finally, we have suggested that motivations for the use of BVPs involve exploiting their particular temporal-spatial-interactional properties to perform actions that, at a particular point in the interaction, could be, but need not or should not be, verbalized.

As interactional linguists, we hope (and welcome) to have made a modest contribution to the challenge of coming to understand how these different modes of organization interact and are deployed by people as they construct turns and manage transition relevance in carrying out social actions.
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