

2017

The organization of turn-taking in fieldwork settings: A case study

Amy Brunett

Follow this and additional works at: <http://commons.emich.edu/theses>



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Brunett, Amy, "The organization of turn-taking in fieldwork settings: A case study" (2017). *Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations*. 748.

<http://commons.emich.edu/theses/748>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses, and Doctoral Dissertations, and Graduate Capstone Projects at DigitalCommons@EMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@EMU. For more information, please contact lib-ir@emich.edu.

The Organization of Turn-taking in Fieldwork Settings: A Case Study

by

Amy Brunett

Thesis

Submitted to the Department of English Language and Literature

Eastern Michigan University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

Linguistics

Thesis Committee:

Verónica Grondona, PhD, Chair

Daniel Seely, PhD

June 2017

Abstract

This linguistic study explores the role of turn-taking within 3 fieldwork sessions between a linguist and a native Mocho' speaker, aiming to address who overlaps more frequently and whether overlapping speech is a cooperative or competitive resource throughout the exchanges. I questioned whether the fieldwork recordings would have turn-taking similar to a conversation or whether the turn-taking would function like an interview, however, the turn-taking in these recordings function in a unique manner. Based on my analysis, the fieldwork exchanges have their own organization of turn-taking that incorporates aspects that are similar to both naturally-occurring conversation and classic interviews, encouraging overlap for the native language consultant to ensure accuracy of language data and transcription. Moreover, turn-taking system present in these fieldwork exchanges is dependent on both the sociocultural background of each speaker as well as their respective roles in language documentation efforts.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
List of Tables.....	iii
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Turn-taking concepts defined.....	3
1.2 Turn-taking and conversational style.....	6
1.3 Turn-taking and culture.....	7
1.4 Research Purpose.....	8
1.5 Subjects.....	10
1.6 Apparatus.....	10
Chapter 2 Analysis.....	12
Chapter 3 Discussion.....	26
Chapter 4 Conclusion.....	28
References.....	29
Appendix A.....	30
Appendix B.....	31

List of Tables

Table 1: Recording Metadata.....	11
Table 2: Speaker Turns.....	13
Table 3: Speaker Overlap.....	14

Chapter 1 Introduction

Between 2007 and 2009, Naomi Palosaari conducted linguistic fieldwork with a group of elders in Chiapas, Mexico, who speak a moribund language called Mocho'. It is estimated that there are no more than 30 speakers of this language (Palosaari, 2011). The linguistic fieldwork Palosaari did with the Mocho' community resulted in a comprehensive grammatical description of the phonology and morphology of the Mocho' language for her graduate dissertation. I obtained permission from Palosaari to use three different recordings from her field trips in order to analyze the structure of the turn-taking system between Palosaari and a native Mocho' speaker, Flaviano Juárez Mateo. Understanding a grammar of a language is important in the field of language documentation. Considering that linguists rely on successful fieldwork exchanges to ensure accuracy of linguistic data collection, this research into turn-taking is a step toward recognizing intercultural communication between linguists and native language consultants. According to Tannen 2012, "understanding turn-taking and its relation to cultural patterning provides a window on the working of conversational interaction as well as on intercultural communication." Therefore, through my case study, I am illustrating how recognizing turn-taking dynamics in fieldwork settings can provide insight into the varying styles of participants and how it relates to their roles and responsibilities in linguistic research.

To reiterate, fieldwork sessions are a different type of communicative exchange than naturally occurring conversation. For instance, Palosaari began recording each session with a specific topic in mind and pre-determined questions. Both speakers understood that Palosaari was in Chiapas for researching the structure of the Mocho' language. It was understood that her role was to ask questions and initiate topics during the session. Because of the specified topics and the designated authority of Palosaari to specify these topics, a fieldwork session resembles another type of communicative exchange: the interview. However, the turn-taking system present in these fieldwork exchanges do not only give authority to Palosaari. Indeed, Palosaari has the authority to ask certain questions but Juárez Mateo also has authority to overlap more frequently and to use his turn space to expand on topics that are important to him. After all, Juárez Mateo is a native Mocho' speaker and the expert on his language and his culture and the purpose of Palosaari's research is to accurately describe the phonology and morphology of the Mocho' language. Overall, I argue that a fieldwork session is its own type of communicative exchange with its own system of turn-taking organization, which accounts for the culture, style and role of Palosaari and Juárez Mateo.

In this thesis, I describe turn-taking distribution and overlapping talk as it occurs in fieldwork elicitation sessions between one linguist and one native language consultant. In section 1.1, I explain what turn-taking is and how it manifests in different types of speech exchanges such as naturally occurring conversations and interviews. In section 1.2, I describe conversation analysis and the notion of conversational style in terms of turn-taking. In section 1.3, I discuss how culture can influence turn-taking and conversational styles. In section 1.4, I present the research purpose and provide the guiding hypothesis of the research. Chapter 2 focuses on methodology with section 2.1 explaining the background of the subjects and with section 2.2. explaining the equipment used to analyze the data. Chapter 3 is the resulting analysis of three recordings with examples to illustrate turn-taking dynamics between Palosaari and Juarez Mateo. Chapter 4 contains a discussion of the findings and limitations of the study, Chapter 5 is the conclusion.

1.1 Turn-Taking Concepts Defined

Turn-taking, a research area of conversational analysis, was first described and extensively investigated by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, which resulted in their 1974 analysis that is still used to understand turn-taking systems within conversation. Turn-taking is how the speakers of a given exchange allocate speaker and listener roles by determining when to speak and how much speaking time is appropriate (Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson 1974). If Speaker A begins talking, Speaker A has initiated a turn and her turn lasts until she has finished speaking. If a speaker talks for a lengthy amount of time, their turn is considered to be an extended turn. Simultaneous talk between two or more speakers is considered to be an overlapping turn and is considered a turn-taking device (Sacks et al 1974). Overlapping talk is indicated within transcripts by double brackets at the start of overlapping speech and the brackets end when simultaneous speech ceases for each speaker like in Example 1 below.

1

Speaker A: Well, I know I am looking forward to the end of this [[election year

Speaker B: [[Oh I know]] it

Latching, another turn-taking device, occurs when Speaker B immediately begins talking after Speaker A has finished talking with no detectable or noticeable pause between the speech. In transcription, an equal sign is placed after Speaker A's speech and another equal sign is placed at the start of Speaker B's speech to indicate an instance of latching as shown in Example 2.

2

Speaker A: I'll be going up north this weekend

Speaker B: =which town up north.

Much research has been done on turn-taking and turn allocation within naturally occurring conversation and professional interviews, however, little if any work has been done on exchanges between linguists and native language consultants during fieldwork sessions. As researchers prioritize the need for documentation of understudied and endangered languages, it is important to examine the discourse between linguists and native speakers of endangered languages. Oftentimes, linguists who conduct fieldwork sessions are not members of the linguistic or cultural group of the individual they are eliciting from. In this case study, for instance, Palosaari is from the United States and is a native American English speaker while Juárez Mateo is from Chiapas, Mexico and is a native speaker of a moribund language known as Mocho'. Neither participant is a native speaker of Spanish, however, Spanish is the language both participants use in order to understand one another. Through an analysis of the turn-taking system between Palosaari and Juárez Mateo, I am expecting to understand more about the stylistics of each

speaker and whether each participant's unique cultural background impacts the distribution of turns present during their exchanges.

In order to understand the turn-taking present in the fieldwork exchanges, I referred to literature about turn-taking in the context of naturally occurring conversations, interviews and intercultural communication. According to Johnson 2000, naturally occurring conversations tended to have equal distribution of rights and duties (mutual contingency) and interviews had predefined plans (asymmetrical contingency). Two salient aspects of natural conversation are mentioned: the topic is not specified in advance and the topic is negotiated. Interviews, on the other hand, are more of a "verbal exchange" than an instance of discourse. There are also two types of interview. Survey research interviews are characterized by an asymmetrical distribution of power. For example, the interviewer controls how long and when the interviewee speaks. This is typical of a job interview, for instance. Sociolinguistic interviews, however, allow for more flexibility in the roles between interviewer and interviewee. The fieldwork exchanges examined in this thesis have characteristics of both a conversation and of an interview as the topics of the elicitation had been decided upon by Palosaari yet Jaurez Mateo uses his turn space to elaborate on information that is relevant to him and his heritage, ultimately negotiating the topic of each elicitation.

In regards to topic selection and topic negotiation, McMahan (1987) investigate speech patterns in oral history fieldwork and she notes that an oral history interview has some interesting dynamics at work. She identifies four constraints in the oral history interview: topical, goal-related, procedural and structural. In regards to topical constraints and turn-taking, she notes, "While the interviewer possesses more legitimate control of topic selection and management, the interviewee's legitimacy derives from having lived through the experience...Certain topics will

become the focus of extended turn expansions, while other topics may remain unrevealed.”

Though my study is not explicitly investigating oral history interviews, one important aspect applies. While Palosaari might initiate topics during the field-work sessions, Juárez Mateo’s native language is the focus and as a native language expert he has the right to negotiate the topic of an exchange and expand on points of interest. Therefore, Juárez Mateo asserts control by expanding his turn space in order to emphasize his knowledge of the Mocho’ language.

1.2 Turn-Taking and Conversational Style

In order to understand turn-taking in the context of each speaker’s conversational style, I referred to Deborah Tannen and her work in the Conversational Analysis framework. Tannen (2005) describes conversational style as the way in which something is said or done during an interaction. In other words, conversational style, an individual and social phenomenon, is how “speakers encode meaning” (Tannen, 2005). Tannen demonstrates the notion of conversational style by analyzing a naturally occurring conversation between six participants. While three of the participants were New York Jewish speakers, the other three were not native to New York. In an earlier analysis of this exchange, Tannen 1987 identified two main styles from the participants: “high involvement” (Jewish New Yorkers) and “high considerateness” (non-New York natives). Based on the turn-taking mechanisms, I found that Juárez Mateo exhibits a “high-involvement” style while Palosaari practices a “high considerateness” style.

Tannen (2005) also identifies the concepts *involvement* and *independence* as the two basic (and sometimes conflicting) conversational needs that all interactants (speakers) have. Tannen (2005) observed that the New York Jewish speakers maintained “conversational flow” when they were speaking with one another versus when they spoke to the others who were not from New York. Instead of having a successful interaction, the “cross-stylistic” exchange result-

ed in difficulties and/or misunderstandings on the part of the interactants. While the Jewish New York speakers considered their use of overlap as cooperative (i.e. evidence of enthusiasm and interest), the non-New Yorkers considered these overlaps as indicating lack of attention on the other speakers' part. A related aspect of overlap is that of persistence—how speakers reincorporate their statements back into the conversation despite the potential perception that they are lacking attention or interrupting. Persistence embodies how the conversation is organized for a high involvement speaker. With persistence, the listener's role is to show enthusiasm during the conversation. And the resulting style has the speakers finding space to speak on their own. This style—particular to high involvement speakers—conveys the importance placed on involvement with others despite the possibility of infringing on the alternative need for independence. While Juárez Mateo and Palosaari differ stylistically, Juárez Mateo's "high-involvement" style does not lead to miscommunication or conversational difficulties. Rather, Juárez Mateo's involvement and participation encouraged to ensure accuracy of language data and Palosaari's documentation and transcriptions. Therefore, as I will show in later sections, overlapping talk is welcome in the context of fieldwork exchanges rather than viewed as an interruption or a conversational misunderstanding.

1.3 Turn-Taking and Culture

Considering the role that culture has in relation to conversational style, I referred to Tannen's (1981) research, which propose "conversational style is both a consequence and indicator of ethnicity". To illustrate this, she evaluated Greek and American responses from interviews, questionnaires and open-ended discussion about their interpretations of interactions. Her findings indicate that even those Greek Americans who do not speak Greek have in fact "retained the influence of Greek communicative style"(p.1). After all, individuals learn their con-

versational style through communicative experience, family communicative habits being at the forefront for influencing style. Tannen concludes that conversational style is more likely to stay the same over generations as opposed to other ethnicity markers, including continuing to speak the parents' or grandparents' native language. By studying communicative techniques of a particular culture or ethnicity as well as whether or not the techniques are preserved over the generations, one can determine the extent of speakers adapting to new communicative strategies. Moreover, this approach can yield a working understanding of what the relationship is between discourse and heterogeneous societies. The fieldwork exchanges investigated in my case study are very unique in that both speakers come from very different cultural and linguistic backgrounds and are using a second language, Spanish, as a means to communicate with one another overall. Despite using Spanish to understand the logistics of the fieldwork exchanges, both speakers are influenced by their native and sociocultural perspectives. And moreover, both Juárez Mateo and Palosaari interact with one another with the understanding of their roles in language documentation efforts, Juárez Mateo is of course the research participant while Palosaari is the researcher/linguist.

1.4 Research Purpose

The aim of my thesis is to describe how Juárez Mateo and Palosarri organize turn-taking and how they manage overlapping talk, considering each speaker's linguistic and cultural differences as well as their roles in language documentation efforts. After all, Palosaari is a trained linguist with the goal of eliciting for phonological and morphological aspects of the Mocho' language while Juárez Mateo is a native language consultant who provides the forms of Mocho'.

The following questions guided my case study:

- Who overlaps more frequently?

- How is overlapping talk managed? Are overlaps considered to be problematic like an interruption or is they considered a cooperative linguistic strategy?
- What role does culture and ethnicity play in turn-taking mechanisms like turn allocation, overlap and extended turns?
- What is the function of overlap in regards to Palosaari's role as a researcher and Juárez Mateo's role as a native language consultant?

My guiding hypothesis states that the fieldwork exchanges have their own organization of turn-taking that incorporates aspects that are similar to both a naturally-occurring conversation and classic interviews. Even though the general topic has been specified by Palosaari in advance like in classic interviews, the organization of the turn-taking system present in these fieldwork exchanges allow for topic negotiation through the turn-taking system, a flexibility that is similar to natural conversations. Like a conversation, there is flexibility in the roles and topics initiated through turns between the researcher and the research participant. However, like an interview, question-answer adjacency pairs are preferred and the elicitation session has a predefined plan determined by the researcher. Because question-answer pairs are preferred, turn-allocation is limited. Although the elicitation session is specified in advance, the topic can be negotiated during the exchange depending on what linguistic and/or cultural information Juárez Mateo wants to provide. Through his turns, particularly through extended turns, Juárez Mateo uses the opportunity to exert situational control and elaborate on a particular point of interest, expanding his turn space and possibly holding the floor longer.

Likewise, the turn-taking system present in these fieldwork exchanges is dependent on the participants' respective roles in language documentation efforts. Thus, Palosaari's role as a

researcher and a linguist directly affects her turns, turn allocation and overlapping talk. Likewise, Juárez Mateo's role as native Mocho' language consultant also influences the turn-taking distribution. As such, Juárez Mateo does tend to have a higher rate of overlapping speech, however, his overlaps are not considered problematic but are rather encouraged in order to ensure accuracy of pronunciation and meaning for the language documentation efforts set forth by Palosaari. And similarly, Palosaari has a lower rate of overlapping speech throughout the exchange in order to facilitate successful and cooperative elicitation of linguistic information.

1.5 Subjects

There are two speakers in the three sampled elicitation sessions: Palosaari and Juárez Mateo. Juárez Mateo is a native Mocho' speaker. According to Palosaari (2011), Mocho' is a moribund Mayan language that belongs to the Kanjobalan branch and is probably spoken by no more than thirty people. All speakers are over the age of 70 and are bilingual in the local variety of Spanish. The primary concentration of speakers is found in the town of Motozintla de Mendoza, near the border of Guatemala. Juárez Mateo was 75 years old in 2009, is bilingual in Spanish and Mocho' and works as a traditional doctor in the community. Palosaari is a linguist who worked with Juárez Mateo as a graduate student. She is a native English speaker and is fluent in Spanish. The recordings are elicitation sessions for Palosaari's graduate studies. Both speakers use Spanish with Juárez Mateo giving Mocho' forms when prompted and Palosaari echoing the forms. Both speakers wished to be identified by name, hence no pseudonyms were used.

1.6 Apparatus

Three audio recordings from Palosaari's fieldtrips ranging from 2007 to December 2009 were used for analysis totaling 26 minutes and 11 seconds. Table 1 contains the metadata for

each recording. The ID refers to the specific recording title given by Palosaari during her research.

Table 1
Recording Metadata

ID	Location	Participants	Date	Topic	Transcribed Sample Time
FJM04Dec07	Motozintla, Mexico	Juarez Mateo and Palosaari	December 4, 2007	animals, phrases	6 minutes
FJM15Apr08	Motozintla, Mexico	Juarez Mateo and Palosaari	April 15, 2008	animals, politeness, questions	3 minutes 38 seconds
FJM18Dec09	Motozintla, Mexico	Juarez Mateo and Palosaari	December 18, 2009	directionals, questions	16 minutes 33 seconds

The author transcribed and annotated the interactions using ELAN software. ELAN is a software program that enables linguists to add transcriptions and annotations to audio or video streams. Both Palosaari and Juárez Mateo had a primary tier for what they actually said throughout an elicitation session—whether it was in Spanish or in Mocho'. A subtier for each speaker contained the English translation. In the tradition of conversation analysis, both the Spanish and the Mocho' forms were transcribed in either standard or modified orthographic conventions. Wherever possible, discourse conventions such as capital letters for raised pitch or colon marks for a sound stretch were applied directly to the transcript in ELAN. After each exchange was transcribed and translated, the ELAN file was exported into a text file, where the transcript was adjusted to reflect the places of overlap by using discourse conventions. Appendix A includes the

full list of discourse conventions used while Appendix B indicates the modified Mocho' orthography used in the examples.

Chapter 2 Analysis

In order to understand the turn-taking dynamics in fieldwork exchanges, three recordings between Palosaari and Juárez Mateo were obtained for this case study. The recordings were made in 2007, 2008 and 2009 where Palosaari had gone to Chiapas, Mexico to conduct linguistic fieldwork for her dissertation on the Mocho' language. There was no specific criteria for selecting the recordings in regard to topic or length of the exchange. And none of the recordings had previously been transcribed to account for the turns between Palosaari and Juárez Mateo. Rather, Palosaari had transcribed and analyzed the Mocho' forms provided by Juárez Mateo only, providing notes on the topic of each fieldwork session. I imported the audio files for each recording into the linguistic annotation program, ELAN. By using ELAN, I was able to add annotations corresponding to the exact time either Palosaari or Juárez Mateo was speaking. Moreover, I could account for when there was overlapping speech between the two and for how long the overlap occurred. When the ELAN file was fully annotated, I exported the file into a text file document in order to count the number of each speaker's turns and the number of times each speaker initiated an overlap. From there, I was able to determine the percentage of each speaker's speech in regards to how much they overlapped with the other speaker. Table 2 illustrates the turn allocation and percentages of overlap for Palosaari and for Juárez Mateo.

Table 2

Speaker Turns

Speaker	Turns (2007)	Turns (2008)	Turns (2009)
Juárez Mateo	126	70	341
Palosaari	40	44	235
Total	166	114	576

For the sake of this thesis, a turn is defined as a fundamental conversational segment that contributes to the whole of the conversation. It was identified in the data most often as a unit that was completed as a speaker took a breath and/or when the other speaker initiated a turn of their own. A turn can be lexical and comprised of only one word (e.g. ‘yes’) or it can be phrasal (e.g. ‘over there’) or clausal (e.g. ‘when I get home’). A turn could also be sentential and contain a completed idea (e.g. ‘the weather is bitter cold’). The data in Table 1 shows that Palosaari had fewer turns than Juárez Mateo in 2007, 2008 and 2009. As the rate of overlap was an aim for this thesis, I noted each instance of overlap for each speaker and divided the number of overlaps by the number of turns per recording. In Table 3, I provide the rate that each participant initiates overlapping talk from the 2007, 2008 and 2009 recordings.

Table 3

Speaker Overlap

Speaker	Overlap (2007)	Overlap (2008)	Overlap (2009)
Juárez Mateo	10.32%	24.29%	12.9%
Palosaari	17.5%	18.18%	5.96%

According to the data, Juárez Mateo initiates overlapping talk at a higher rate than Palosaari with the exception of the exchange in 2008 where Palosaari initiated overlaps 17.5% of her turns. A high percentage of overlap indicates a tendency for a “high-involvement” style of turn-taking while a low percentage would indicate a preference for a “high-considerateness” style of turn-taking. These linguistic styles were first described in 1978 by Deborah Tannen in regards to natural conversation. High-involvement speakers are more likely to ask questions, talk faster, louder and sooner. Overlap is more common as well. "High considerateness" speakers generally allow for longer pauses and hesitate more frequently. They do not impose one's topic, ideas, personal information nor do they use expressive paralinguistic effects as often. Some aspects of Tannen’s description of style fall out of the scope of this thesis. However, turn-taking mechanisms do play a significant role in style. Thus, this thesis determines the style of Juárez Mateo and Palosaari during their exchanges based on the turn-taking system alone. And unlike Tannen who focuses on naturally occurring conversation, my thesis explores turn-taking style in the context of linguistic fieldwork sessions.

Each sample is unique in where it begins and what topic is covered. The transcribed sample from 2007 is of the first part of the exchange, and it mostly focuses on obtaining permission to record Juárez Mateo. Overall, Juárez Mateo has more turns than Palosaari, holding the floor

for most of the exchange. Palosaari overlaps more often than Juárez Mateo in this sample with Palosaari overlapping at a rate of 17.5% of the sample. The transcribed sample from 2008, on the other hand, is 3 minutes and 38 seconds long. The session had been taking place prior to the sample transcript. Unlike the 2007 and 2009 exchanges, this particular sample starts not at the beginning of the recording but somewhere between the middle and the end of the session because the first part of the transcript was going over the basics of the elicitation in regards to recording procedures, topics covered and the permission to record. In this exchange, Palosaari is eliciting for animal terminology. Overall, Juárez Mateo holds the floor for most of the exchange with 70 turns, his turns doubling the total amount for Palosaari at 44 turns. Juárez Mateo initiates an overlap more often than Palosaari in this sample at a rate of 24.29%. Finally, the 2009 exchange focuses on the elicitation for directionals. The transcribed sample of the recording is around 16 minutes and 33 seconds. Again, Juárez Mateo spoke more than Palosaari with 341 turns and an overlap rate of 12.9%. Palosaari initiates overlaps less frequently than Juárez Mateo at a rate of 5.96%.

The following analysis provides examples from the three linguistic fieldwork sessions. Each example contains two parts: the text on the left is the actual speech of the participants, including both Spanish and Mocho' and the text on the right provides a free translation in English. Anytime a Mocho' form appears in an example, it is indicated in bold face font. The Spanish is in regular font. Under each example, a notation is given for which session the example came from. A pound sign (#) to the left of a line indicates a line of importance for the analysis itself and usually denotes overlapping speech. See Discourse Notations in Appendix for more information on the conventions used throughout the examples.

In the 2007 sample, Juárez Mateo had explained the importance of collaboration in documenting the Mocho' language, providing forms in his native Mocho' for words conveying materials used in fieldwork such as paper. He continues to emphasize the importance of paper and its pronunciation in the Mocho' language:

3

	120. JM: si suena aqui	yes, it sounds here
	121. P: bueno q[[eto']]	good paper
#	122. JM: [[qe- si]] qe- eso	qe- yes qe- that
	123. JM: qeto' sí aqui	paper yes here
	124. P: qeto'	paper

[Juárez Mateo - Palosaari 2007]

Juárez Mateo overlaps with Palosaari at line 122. The overlap takes place at what is considered the post-onset phase in Shegloff's terms (2000). According to Shegloff, this phase is when a speaker is currently speaking when the overlap is initiated and several syllables are said after the start of overlapping talk. Juárez Mateo uses a hitch, specifically he cuts off the word for paper and only pronouncing the first syllable 'qe'. But this interjection is not just an overlap but rather it is Juárez Mateo's attempt to ensure the correct pronunciation of the first syllable for the word paper. And because he repeats the syllable yet again, it illustrates that Juárez Mateo is ensuring accuracy of the pronunciation and establishing his role as a native Mocho' consultant. Through these linguistic resources, he is ensuring that Palosaari is pronouncing the Mocho' form correctly and transcribing it accordingly.

Example 4 begins as Juárez Mateo is explaining the cardinal directions with Palosaari.

4

209. JM: teNOOK ok'elaal	upward north
---------------------------------	--------------

	210. JM: sí	yes
#	211. P: para aRRI[[B A:::	for upward?
#	212. JM: [[pa- para]] arriba	for upward
	213. JM: [[pa'rriba	upward
#	214. P: [[al oeste o::	to the west or..?
	215. JM: sí pa'rriba	yes for upward

[Juárez Mateo - Palosaari 2009]

Example 4 illustrates two instances of overlapping talk, one overlap initiated by Juárez Mateo (line 212) and one by Palosaari (line 214). In the first instance of overlap, Palosaari registers that Juárez Mateo is about to begin talking during her turn and she increases the volume of her speech (line 211) in what is known as the pre-onset phase. According to Shegloff (2000), a pre-onset change indicates a marked difference in speech prior to an overlap. Her use of increased volume indicates her awareness that Juárez Mateo is about to start speaking during her turn, initiating an overlap. When Juárez Mateo begins speaking and the overlap in speech takes place, Palosaari uses a sound stretch on the last vowel of *arriba* /'upward'/. This particular instance of a sound stretch demonstrates a pre-resolution linguistic strategy with Palosaari neutralizing the overlapping talk as she ends her turn and enabling Juárez Mateo to start speaking. In lines 213 and 214, for instance, both the speakers start a turn simultaneously. In other words, they both self-selected to speak at the same time. While Juárez Mateo maintains what he began to say, Palosaari stops speaking before finishing her sentiment by using a sound stretch on the last word, *o*. This sound stretch works to neutralize the overlapping speech and permits Juárez Mateo to finish the turn in what is known as the pre-resolution phase.

In Example 5, Palosaari shortens her turn again in order to enable Juárez Mateo's turn to speak (108 and 109).

	104. P: es la calle para Motozintla	is the street to Motozintla
	105. JM: eso	that
	106. P: Moto--	Moto-
	107. P: ES	is
#	108. P: la- la CARRetera para [[mo-]]	the the road to Mo-
	109. JM: [[ca]]rretera= =motozintla	road Motozintla
	110. JM: [[para Comolapa	to Comolapa
#	111. P: [[y MAZapa	and Mazapa
	112. P: Comolapa	Comolapa

[Juárez Mateo - Palosaari 2009]

Up to this point, Palosaari has been drawing a map of locations and has identified what would be the street to Motozintla. In line 108, she is confirming the road when Juárez Mateo initiates an overlap at the first syllable of what would have been the word for Motozintla. However, since Juárez Mateo starts to overlap, Palosaari quickly terminates her turn to allow Juárez Mateo into the turn space (line 108). Based on Juárez Mateo's turn-taking strategies alone, Juárez Mateo would be considered a "high involvement" speaker in Tannen's terms as he actively engages with turns and overlaps in order to ensure accurate transcription. Furthermore, his role as an expert of the Mocho' language gives him more situational control of the topic and higher overlap rates. His knowledge of the language is critical to documentation efforts and both Palosaari and Juárez Mateo understand this. His overlaps often correspond to either correcting Palosaari's pronunciation or confirming that she has the correct form of the Mocho' language.

The main purpose of an elicitation session is to accurately and thoroughly transcribe the speech of the research participant. If the research participant did not overlap or interrupt in order to correct an aspect of the language, the aim of the session would be lost. Unlike some speech exchanges where overlap and interruption are avoided, these elicitation sessions permits overlap in the turn-taking system. This is why the occurrence of overlap in Juárez Mateo's speech is rela-

tively high. Even though overlap is permitted for Juárez Mateo, Palosaari minimizes any instances of competitive overlapping talk. This holds especially true for her own speech.

Example 6 shows different resources used by each speaker when they simultaneously self-select.

6

	67. JM: telek'o jiiinhaj	on that side is my house
	68. P: teli ek'o	on that side
#	69. JM: [[>tele--<]] telek'o	tele-- on that side
#	70. P: [[tela]]	tela
	71. P: telek'o	on that side

[Juárez Mateo - Palosaari 2009]

In Example 6, Palosaari is trying to pronounce *telek'o*. When both speakers self-select in lines 69 and 70, Juárez Mateo compresses and cuts off what he was beginning to say (*tele-*). When Palosaari cuts off her own turn in order to repair the overlap, Juárez Mateo is able to say the entire word (*telek'o*) fluently and at a slower pace. Again, Juárez Mateo is utilizing his expertise in his native language to maintain the turn space. Registering that Palosaari was about to start speaking at the same time, Juárez Mateo compresses his speech in order to get out the correct Mocho' form for the English phrase “on that side.” When Palosaari prematurely ends her turn, Juárez Mateo is able to continue at a regular pace, giving the entire Mocho' form for the phrase (69).

Like Example 6, Example 7 shows how Juárez Mateo increases the volume of his speech to maintain the turn (line 123).

#	123. JM: [[QETO']]sí aqui	paper yes here
	124. P: [[qeto']]	paper
	125. JM: sí suena para que suena el sonido el	yes, it sounds to make the sound of
	126. JM: el glotal como decimos nosotros si.	the glottal as we call it, right?

[Juárez Mateo - Palosaari 2007]

In 7, both speakers self-select at lines 123–124. Juárez Mateo’s speech is marked with increased volume, however, after Palosaari ends her turn, Juárez Mateo decreases the volume of his speech in what is known as the post-resolution phase. Although raised volume is considered a “competitive” resource by Sacks, Shegloff and Jefferson 1974, Juárez Mateo is not actually competing for the floor. There is no need to compete when the floor is open to him. In other words, Juárez Mateo has the right as a native language expert to overlap and hold the floor more frequently than say a typical interactant would be able to during an everyday conversation. And because these exchanges are different than both naturally-occurring conversation and interviews, Juárez Mateo’s use of overlap is encouraged rather than viewed as competitive. Overall, Juárez Mateo can assert control of turn-taking and turn-allocation because of his role as a research participant and because of the importance of language documentation.

According to Sacks, Shegloff and Jefferson (1974), adjacency pairs limit turn-allocation. Adjacency pairs are composed of two parts: 1) an utterance by a speaker (i.e. greeting, question, request) and 2) a second utterance by the next speaker (i.e. greeting, answer, acceptance/rejection of request). Elicitation sessions prefer question-answer pairs where the researcher/linguist asks a question and the native language consultant supplies the answer. This case study in particular

exclusively used question-answer sequences. Example 8 shows Palosaari clarifying what the term for ‘north’ is (line 176).

8

	170. JM: te te ok'elaal e elelaal	te te north and south
	171. JM: @[@	(laughter)
	172. P: [[ah momenta	ah one moment
	173. JM: @@	(laughter)
	174. P: ik'elaal	east/west
	175. JM: sí	yes
#	176. P: ok'elaal es que.	north is what?
	177. JM: I--	i—
	178. JM: ik'elaal	east/west

[Juárez Mateo - Palosaari 2009]

Palosaari’s question for clarification in line 176 is what one would typically expect for an elicitation: a researcher asking the questions of the research participant, specifically what the word for ‘north’ is. One might expect this questioning on the researcher’s part to make up most of the adjacency pairs found in the exchange, especially if one was to compare elicitations with interviews. Although question-answer sequences are preferred, Juárez Mateo also takes an active role in questioning. After all, if something that Palosaari is saying is unclear, Juárez Mateo has the responsibility to clarify and ensure he understands the task of the elicitation session. Example 9 shows Juarez Mateo asking a question of Palosaari.

9

	26. JM: te la	there
	27. JM: en castilla quiere decir alla	in Spanish that means there
	28. P: alla	there
	29. JM: sí	yes
#	30. P: alla donde quie[[RE.	wherever you want?
#	31. JM: [[>do]]nde [[donde don]]de<	where where where?
	32. P: [[alla alla]]	there there

a aquí aquí a

I point out this one here,
here this one

[Juárez Mateo - Palosaari 2009]

Palosaari actually attempts to initiate a question-answer sequence in line 30 when she tries to determine the deictic system for the English concept ‘there.’ In other words, she is trying to figure out what the Mocho’ form *te la* /‘there’/ means in regards to its spatial location. She asks *alla donde quiere* /‘wherever you want?’/. Instead of answering Palosaari’s question, Juárez Mateo responds with a repeated question of his own in line 31 to clarify what she is specifically eliciting for. His question in addition to her response constitutes an adjacency pair. In Example 10, a variant of the question in an adjacency pair is illustrated.

10

	214. P: al oeste o::	to the west or...
	215. JM: sí pa'riba	yes upward
	216. JM: sí	yes
#	217. JM: hace cuando estamos hablando = =lo este, no.	we were just talking about this, right?
	218. P: sí	yes

[Juárez Mateo - Palosaari 2009]

Juárez Mateo uses a variation of a typical question construction—the tag question—in line 217. Often a single utterance attached at the end of a sentence, the tag question is important because of its use as an exit technique for a turn. In other words, if a current speaker has completed a turn to a possible transition relevant place and has not selected a next speaker nor does the speaker find the other speaker starting a turn then the current speaker may add a tag question to exit from the turn.

Example 11 illustrates a type of overlap or what is known as a backchannel—a type of continuer in Sacks et al. terms.

11

	27. JM: si porque mire	yes, because look
	28. JM: lo que interes es esto	the interest is this
	29. JM: el le que a aqui si	is that here, yes
	30. JM: vamos a hacer una coordinacion= =entre de ustedes n[[o.	we are going to coordinate with you, no?
#	31. P: [[m:	mm

[Juárez Mateo - Palosaari 2007]

Example 11 is taken from a part of the exchange where Juárez Mateo has been using an expanded turn to mention his thoughts on the documentation of Mocho’ and how his work with Palosaari differs from earlier work with other researchers that came to the community. Palosaari has been listening attentively and to show her attentiveness, she responds with a backchannel in line 31, slightly overlapping with Juárez Mateo’s speech. Since backchannels indicate comprehension and interest to the current speaker, they are considered cooperative because of their contribution to the current speaker’s turn and the overall “success” of the exchange (Sacks et al 1974). Palosaari’s backchannel indicates listenership and attentiveness toward Juárez Mateo’s efforts as a research participant and expert of the Mocho’ language.

Like Palosaari, Juárez Mateo uses a backchannel to signal listenership and attentiveness as in Example 12.

12

	16. P: te iipalach	male turkey
	17. JM: te iipalach	male turkey
	18. P: iipalach [[::	male turkey
#	19. JM: [[hm	hm
	20. JM: aalni, aalni	heavy, heavy

[Juárez Mateo - Palosaari 2008]

Unlike Example 11, in Example 12, there is no expanded turn for either speaker. Rather, both Juárez Mateo and Palosaari are engaged in the elicitation process at this point in the transcript: Juárez Mateo is providing forms in his native language, Palosaari is echoing him, and Juárez Mateo is correcting any forms that have been mispronounced. Despite the fact that Palosaari is eliciting for animal terminology, Juárez Mateo prefers to give her context in addition to the term itself so he provides a sentence instead of responding with the term alone. Line 20 (*aalni* /'heavy'/) continues the sentence Juárez Mateo starts to provide in line 17 (*te iipalach* /'turkey'/) as he talks about the male turkey being heavy and eating too much corn. His tendency to expand turns in order to elaborate on a particular aspect of Mocho' by providing a longer response demonstrates situational control. His status as an expert Mocho' speaker grants him the right to hold the floor longer and to share linguistic knowledge he deems important. In regards to his backchannel at line 19, Juárez Mateo overlaps only slightly on Palosaari's turn with a *hm*. This non-lexical response (an utterance without referential meaning) signals he has heard Palosaari and that she pronounced the phrase *te iipalach* /'turkey'/ correctly. The latter explanation is evidenced by the next line (line 20) in which he continues with the next part of the sentence he is providing. Because backchannels can serve the function of listener agreement or assessment, Juárez Mateo is demonstrating both attention and assessment of Palosaari's attempts to produce Mocho' forms correctly. Thus, Juárez Mateo is simply giving feedback through his use of a backchannel.

Example 13 shows another type of overlap: conditional access to turn, which is an invitation into the turn space by the current speaker for the other speaker to assist in finishing or correcting the current speaker's speech (Sacks et al 1974).

	76. JM: sí, chu'uhto'je	yes, therefore
	77. JM: wook'	skinny
#	78. P: chu[[::: uh::]]to: je	therefore
	79. JM: [[chu'uhto'je]]	therefore
	80. JM: ch- chu'uhto'je	therefore
	81. JM: chu'uhto'je, wook'	therefore, skinny

[Juárez Mateo - Palosaari 2008]

Example 13 shows Palosaari using multiple sound stretches in the form for *chu'uhto'je* /'therefore'/(line 78). The use of these sound stretches indicate that Palosaari is inviting Juárez Mateo to assist her with the rest of the Mocho' form. Juárez Mateo does in fact overlap with Palosaari during the first sound stretch (line 79). Since Palosaari has not finished echoing the entire form for *chu'uhto'je* /'therefore'/ she uses an additional sound stretch after the overlap is over to maintain her invitation so that Juárez Mateo can assist anytime during her turn. Juárez Mateo and Palosaari both use variations of cooperative overlap to achieve different goals. While Juárez Mateo uses cooperative overlap to signal attentiveness to the language documentation efforts, Palosaari uses cooperative overlap to further invite Juárez Mateo's participation and expertise as a native language consultant.

Chapter 3 Discussion

Based on the analysis, there are several features of the sampled fieldwork interview dynamics that are of interest. First, adjacency pairs such as question-answer sequences in Chapter 3 (Examples 8, 9, and 10) are preferred for Palosaari to maintain the topic of the exchanges and limit turn allocation as the linguistic researcher. However, flexibility in topic negotiation and turn allocation is employed through conditional access to turn and extended turn time for Juárez Mateo because of his status as a Mocho' language expert (Example 13, Chapter 3). While Palosaari is a high considerateness interactant throughout these samples, Juárez Mateo is more of a high involvement speaker. Prior research on Mocho' discourse does describe the style of Native Mocho' speakers as encouraging of creative and stylized speech during conversations (Martin, 2000). There is noted amplified volume in speech and exaggerated paralinguistic features according to Martin 2000. Even though Palosaari is not a native Mocho' speaker, her interest in the language as a linguist shows Juárez Mateo that she is in solidarity with him and the interests of his community; however, more exchanges and conversations would have to be analyzed in order to claim that Juárez Mateo is using an ethnically Mocho' conversational style with Palosaari or other researchers.

It is important to remember that both Palosaari and Juárez Mateo are primarily using the Spanish language to communicate ideas with one another and it is their use of Spanish that continues the conversational flow of their interactions. However, neither of the two interactants are native speakers of Spanish. Palosaari is a native American English speaker while Juárez Mateo is a native Mocho' speaker. Their linguistic and cultural styles come from their native languages and so when they are using a second language as a means to maintain the fieldwork interviews,

there is an issue that some meanings and styles could be lost in the translation between either of their native languages and Spanish. Likewise, it is important to note that this research also contains limits in regards to translation as meaning of the free translations into English might not exactly correspond to the meanings in either Spanish and Mocho'.

The other limitations of this research in relation to translation is that I am not fluent in Spanish or Mocho' and I only have a basic knowledge of both languages. Free translations for the Spanish were checked by several native or fluent speakers of Spanish. Mocho' forms were both transcribed and translated according to Palosaari's dissertation as well as in person consultations with Palosaari herself. Because of the multilingual factors and because of the limitations of translation in these fieldwork samples, the process for transcribing and translating was much lengthier than transcribing a conversation of a language that is native to the transcriber. Thus, I was only able to transcribe 26 minutes of sampled discourse from Palosaari's field recordings to ensure accuracy and consistency in the transcription. However, in order to have a more detailed and accurate description of turn-dynamics within these fieldwork exchanges, it would be ideal to include more transcriptions of more fieldwork interviews. A larger sample of data would provide a fuller analysis of turn-allocation, overlap and resolution strategies.

Chapter 4 Conclusion

Overall, in order to understand the terminology and strategies of the turn-taking system it is useful to refer to Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974). This present research does deviate from their methodology and turn-taking philosophy by accounting for the cultural and stylistic differences of Palosaari and Juárez Mateo as well as factoring in the speakers role in language documentation efforts. Like a conversation, there is flexibility in speaker and listener roles. Like an interview, there is some specification of the topic for the communicative exchanges but because language documentation relies heavily on participation from the native language expert (Juarez Mateo), the language expert can exert situational control of the topics by elaborating on linguistic and cultural points of interest.

Fieldwork interviews are unique discourse environments and by analyzing the turn-taking system embedded in fieldwork exchanges, researchers can understand how research is conducted and managed through turns. Moreover, through analyzing turn allocation, overlap and repair, researchers can understand the notion of speaker and listener roles and whether there is a balance of talking opportunities or whether control of the topic is being employed. Further research can lead to a discussion of how to best facilitate a fieldwork elicitation session to ensure the native language expert has adequate turn time to express their linguistic and cultural knowledge. This research builds upon prior research into the technical side of turn-taking while also exploring how culture, roles and stylistics are encoded through the turn-taking system. Ultimately, this research hopes to illustrate the importance of analyzing the fieldwork interview within the field of discourse analysis, which is an understudied type of exchange.

References

- Hellwig, B., Utyvanck, D.V., Hulsbosch, M.: ELAN—linguistic annotator. 2012. Manual, Version 4.3.2. Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, The Language Archive.
- Johnson, M. (2000). Interactions in the oral proficiency interview: problems of validity. *Pragmatics*, 10(2).
- Martin, L. (2000). Parallelism and the spontaneous ritualization of ordinary talk: Three Mocho friends discuss a volcano. *Translating Native Latin American Verbal Art: Ethnopoetics and Ethnography of Speaking*, 104-124.
- McMahan, E.M. (1987). Speech and counterspeech: Language-in-use in oral history Fieldwork. *The Oral History Review*, 15(1), 185-207.
- Palosaari, N. E. (2011). *Topics in Mocho' phonology and morphology* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Utah).
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A., Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2000). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language in Society*, 29(01), 1-63.
- Tannen, D. (1981). Indirectness in discourse: Ethnicity as conversational style*. *Discourse processes*, 4(3), 221-238.
- Tannen, D. (1984). *Conversational style*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Tannen, D. (2005). New York Jewish conversational style. *Intercultural Discourse and Communication: The Essential Readings*, 135-149.

Appendix A: Discourse Notations

Discourse Notations

#	Analyst's signal of a significant line
WOrd	Capitalization indicates loud(er) pitch
word word word	Bolded item indicates Mocho' form
word^	Raised intonation
>word word<	Indication of compressed speech
word::	Indication of a lengthened sound (i.e. sound stretch)
wor-	A dash shows a sharp cut-off
@ @	Symbol for laughter
/word/	Uncertainty in transcription
word,	½ second pause
word.	Word final intonation
A: word [[word B: [[word	Square brackets aligned across adjacent lines denote the start of overlapping talk.
A: word= B: =word	No discernible pause between the two speakers' turns (i.e. latching)
word word*	The star indicates words said to an outside party

Appendix B: Modified Orthography for Mocho'

Vowels:

Short- a, e, i, o, u

Long- aa, ee, ii, oo, uu

Falling tone- àà, èè, ìì, òò, ùù

Consonants:

č, š, ŋ, j, k, l, m, n, p, r, s, t, y, w, b, ts, q

Glottalized Consonants:

t̚, tz̚, č̚, k̚, q̚, ʔ

Note: The following symbols are sometimes represented differently in the literature on Mocho':
č, š, ŋ. The symbol č is often noted as *ch*. The symbol š is often expressed as *x*. Finally, ŋ is often written as *nh*.