

Short, Michael, and Geoffrey Leech. 2007. *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. New York: Routledge.

Yasuyuki Usuda

Imitation in conversation: From the viewpoint of conversation analysis (poster)

In our daily conversation, we often tend to imitate another person's way of speaking or mannerisms. This mimicking can be of one's own past actions or utterances or those of another person, with an occasional exaggeration in the mannerism or the words. The utterance or action may or may not have occurred. The person or character being imitated may or may not exist. For example, one can mimic "Spiderman" eating "Ramen," which is a fictional situation, or what one's spouse did the other day. The overall question in this study is the role of mimicry in conversation. Mimicry in itself has not been researched here, but some studies focusing on related topics have been considered (Goodwin 2002, 2007; Heath 2002; Holt 1996, 2000, 2007; Nishizaka 2008; Yamamoto 2014). Studies have shown that imitating another person or oneself, as spoken in the past, shows an affiliative attitude to the prior utterance. Imitating enables other participants in a conversation to share this attitude as well. Based on these studies, it is fruitful for a better understanding of conversation to investigate the particular function of mimicry. It may be different from quoting, reporting, or gesturing, which have been the focus of prior studies. To investigate the role of mimicry in conversation, the authors adopt the methodology of conversation analysis (CA) using video-taped data and detailed transcripts. The study is conducted in two steps. The first is to demonstrate that mimicry constitutes a part of an action such as storytelling, together with preceding utterance, action, or situation. Storytelling usually involves one person, but mimicry can involve more than one participant. This study illustrates that the preceding action to the mimicry and the mimicry itself are in a relationship similar to one between the utterance that precedes the punch line and the punch line in storytelling. This step enables us to examine mimicry in the framework of the studies on storytelling. In the second step, we examine what course of action takes place between the mimicry and the preceding utterance or action. It is expected that the mimicry and the preceding utterance or action have a particular relationship, which will not be as strong as conditional relevance (Sacks and Schegloff 1973) but a more moderate one. The result of this study is as follows: mimicry and its preceding utterance or action constitute a course of action similar to storytelling, in that both consist of a description of the referred event and its climax. This means that mimicry functions to bring forth a sympathetic attitude toward the preceding utterance or action (see also Holt 1996) as well, because the action constitutes storytelling, a form of cooperation. Moreover, mimicry causes a sympathetic reaction among other participants relevant in the next immediate position of the prior utterance. This study shows that mimicry can evoke a strong and immediate sympathetic reaction when compared to other types of actions, such as reporting or quoting.

References

- Goodwin, Charles (2002). Time in Action. *Current Anthropology*, 43 (S4), 19-35.
- Goodwin, Charles (2007). Interactive Footing. *Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction*, 16-46.
- Heath, Christian (2002). Demonstrative suffering: The gestural (re)embodiment of symptoms. *Journal of Communication*, 52 (3), 597-616.
- Holt, Elizabeth (1996). Reporting on Talk: The Use of Direct Reported Speech in Conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 29 (3), 219-245.
- Holt, Elizabeth (2000). Reporting and Reacting: Concurrent Responses to Reported Speech. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 33 (4), 425-454.
- Holt, Elizabeth (2007). "I'm eyeing your chop up mind": reporting and enacting. *Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction*, 47-80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, Harvey & Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8 (4), 289-327.
- Nishizaka, Aug (2008) *The Body Distributed: An Ethnomethodological Study of Social Interaction*. Tokyo: Keiso Shobo.
- Yamamoto, Mari (2014) *Monogatari no ukete ni yoru serifu hatuwa: San-yosya kan no kyokan kankei no kouchiku ni kansuru kaiwa bunseki teki kenkyu*. (Lines utterances by receivers of storytelling: A conversation analytic study on construction of affiliative relationship between participants) unpublished doctoral dissertation, Hokkaido University.

Emma Valtersson, Elliott Hoey, Paul Hömke, Tayo Neumann, William Schuerman & Kobin H. Kendrick

F-insertion: Using fuck for pursuing, escalating, and sanctioning (lecture)

When is swearing relevant? In this paper, we use conversation analysis (e.g., Sidnell & Stivers, 2013) to situate swearing in its sequential contexts of use. Focusing on the word *fuck* and related expletives in sequence-initiating actions (*wh*-interrogatives and imperatives), we show how speakers “insert” *fuck* into these turn formats—a practice we refer to as “*f*-insertion”—in pursuing responses that have been withheld, upgrading and escalating pursuits, and sanctioning inapposite responses. The analysis is based on 31 cases of *f*-insertion collected from recordings of naturally occurring interactions in English.

The basic features of the practice can be seen in the example below. Here, *fuck* is inserted into a repair initiation and orients to an inapposite use of a recognitional person reference (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979). It starts with Travis giving an assessment of the looks of *Helen Wood*, a sex worker who had been in the news recently. By using her name instead of describing her, he treats his recipients Paul and Kevin as able to recognize the reference. Rather than agree or disagree with Travis’s assessment, Paul and Kevin both initiate repair, indicating trouble with recognizing the *Helen Wood* reference (lines 3-4). Travis produces a repair solution, adding the recognitional demonstrative *that* to his initial formulation (line 5), which treats the referent as accessible to his recipients, and thereby reveals his understanding of the problem as being one of hearing not recognition.

01 TRA: Helen Wood’s not very good looking for a prostitute
 02 though is she °so°
 03 PAU: What,
 04 KEV: WHO?
 05 TRA: That Helen Wood.
 06 (.)
 07 TRA: You know the [one who’s: been sleeping with-]
 08 PAU: [**Who(h) the(h) fu(h)ck is He(h)l[en] Wo(h)od.**
 09 TRA: The one who slept with Rooney.

After a short gap (line 6), Travis continues his turn with a description of the referent (line 7), orienting to the inadequacy of his repair solution. However, in overlap with this, Paul again initiates repair with *Who the fuck is Helen Wood* with interpolated laughter particles (line 8). This treats the repair solution itself as a further source of trouble. By inserting *fuck* into the turn format, Paul does more than just pursue an adequate repair solution; he also sanctions Travis for his lack of recipient design, treating the identity of Helen Wood as being in common ground when it was not. As this example shows, the practice of *f*-insertion appears in a sequential context in which one participant’s actions are misaligned, uncooperative, or otherwise not ‘with’ those of his or her coparticipants in some respect, which makes systematically possible the sanctioning we observe.

With this paper, we examine a number of sequential environments in which participants use *f*-insertion. Rather than investigate swearing in terms of politeness, group identity, formality, or register, as is done in much pragmatics research on the topic, we situate the deployment of swearing in the very course of action in which it is inextricably embedded.

References

- Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. IN G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 15-21). New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Sidnell, J. & Stivers, T. (Eds.). (2013). *The handbook of conversation analysis*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

Manon Van der Laaken

Addressing psychosocial distress? A multi-perspective analysis of the effects of the Distress Thermometer and Problem List on the openings of doctor-patient interaction in follow-up oncology consultations (lecture)

There is a widely-shared consensus that in follow-up cancer care, patients do not just need their physicians to heal them, they also require them to address their psychosocial concerns: their stress, their fears and their uncertainties (see e.g. Arora, 2003). However, many studies indicate that physicians tend to limit themselves to biomedical concerns in their consultations, and avoid psychosocial topics (e.g., Beach et al., 2004). Screening instruments such as the *Distress Thermometer and Problem List* (DTPL), which measure patients’ psychosocial distress, are increasingly being used as discussion prompts to facilitate the discussion of psychosocial problems during the consultation. They have been shown to increase the number of psychosocial issues discussed during consultations, and physicians’ awareness of them (Detmar et al., 2002). However, they do not seem to lead to lower “anxiety, depression and perceived needs” compared to control patients (Boyes et al., 2006: 169), and in the interaction “HRQoL issues [*Health Related Quality of Life issues*] tend to be overruled by biomedical