

AFFECTIVITY IN CONVERSATIONAL STORYTELLING: AN ANALYSIS OF DISPLAYS OF ANGER OR INDIGNATION IN COMPLAINT STORIES¹

Margret Selting

Abstract

This paper reports on some recent work on affectivity, or emotive involvement, in conversational storytelling. After presenting the approach, some case studies of the display and management of affectivity in storytelling in telephone and face-to-face conversations are presented.

The analysis reconstructs the display and handling of affectivity by both storyteller and story recipient. In particular, I describe the following kinds of resources:

- the verbal and segmental display: Rhetorical, lexico-semantic, syntactic, phonetic-phonological resources;
- the prosodic and suprasegmental vocal display: Resources from the realms of prosody and voice quality;
- visual or "multimodal" resources from the realms of body posture and its changes, head movements, gaze, and hand movements and gestures.

It is shown that the display of affectivity is organized in orderly ways in sequences of storytelling in conversation. I reconstruct (a) how verbal, vocal and visual cues are deployed in co-occurrence in order to make affectivity in general and specific affects in particular interpretable for the recipient and (b) how in turn the recipient responds and takes up the displayed affect. As a result, affectivity is shown to be managed by teller and recipient in storytelling sequences in conversation, involving both the reporting of affects from the story world as well as the negotiation of in-situ affects in the here-and-now of the storytelling situation.

Keywords: Affectivity in conversation; Interactional linguistics; Multimodality of interaction; Storytelling; Complaint stories.

1. Introduction

There are currently two prevalent frameworks for conceptualizing affect and emotion, the 'organismic' and the 'interactional' (Hochschild 1979, 1983). While in the

¹ Many of the ideas for the analyses in this paper originated in data sessions of the project 'Emotive involvement in conversational storytelling': I am grateful to Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, Elisabeth Reber, Maxi Kupetz, Marco Paetzel, Jana Scheerer, Ulrike Pohlmann and Michael Wendt for sharing their ideas with me. The analyses in this paper were presented, among others, at the Universities of California at Los Angeles and Santa Barbara, at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Clark University in Worcester. For comments and discussions I am most grateful to Chuck and Candy Goodwin, Geoffrey Raymond, John DuBois, Ceci Ford, Andrea Golato, Michael Bamberg and all the other participants who contributed valuable ideas and helpful comments.

organismic school of thought expressions of the face and the body as well as vocal expressions are seen as directly revealing speakers' emotions, in the interactional school of thought emotions are conceptualized as 'displays' performed in interactional contexts with communicative intent (Harré 1986). Goffman's work on response cries (1978) was seminal in establishing the interactional framework. He argued that cries of pain, anger, disgust, fear, etc. are more an "interactional arrangement" than natural outbursts or overflowings from inside the individual. They are social performances and constitute events in the interaction order. This implies that they are controllable and can be 'managed' in the furtherance of interactional goals (Hochschild 1983).

The present analysis is clearly aligned with the interactional, and thus social constructionist, framework in its approach to affectivity. It aims at investigating the interactional 'display' of affect or emotive involvement - without wishing to deny that there may be a feeling quality accompanying these displays. However, whereas Goffman and Hochschild rely primarily on anecdotal evidence for their claims, the present analysis is based on the micro-analysis of naturally occurring conversational interaction to explore the reconstruction of affect in storytelling and the affective displays which participants produce to accompany and/or respond to stories in the here-and-now.² After presenting the approach taken here in more detail, I will present some case studies of the display and management of affectivity in storytelling in telephone and face-to-face conversations.³

Following Ochs & Schieffelin (1989: 7), the term 'affect' is used as a broader, superordinate term. 'Affect' thus comprises everything related to emotive involvement in the broader sense, that means: 'Emotions' ('Emotionen') - including 'basic emotions', 'feelings' ('Gefühle'), 'moods' ('Stimmungen', 'Launen'), 'dispositions' ('Veranlagungen', 'Dispositionen'), and 'attitudes' ('Einstellungen') (cf. *ibid.*). Much of this has more recently also been subsumed under the term 'stance' ('Haltung'; cf. Stivers 2008; M.H. Goodwin & C. Goodwin 2000).⁴

For the analysis of storytelling, this study relies on the classical investigations of storytelling in Conversation Analysis (CA) which have described the sequential organization and embedding of stories within natural turn-by-turn talk (Sacks 1971, 1986; Jefferson 1978; Ryave 1978; C. Goodwin 1984; cf. also Quasthoff 1980, 2001; Quasthoff & Becker 2005), laying the groundwork for the conception of narrative as an interactional achievement. Yet with the exception of Goodwin, these studies are exclusively concerned with verbal aspects of storytelling. Both Bamberg (1997) and M.H. Goodwin (e.g., 1997) have since looked into the display of affect and affectivity in storytelling in conversation. While Bamberg concentrates on verbal display, Goodwin also incorporates facial and gestural communication between participants.

² This work was carried out within the project 'Emotive involvement in conversational storytelling', directed by Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and myself; the project is being funded by the Cluster of Excellence 'Languages of Emotion' at the FU Berlin.

³ Some of the general issues and problems in the analysis of affect displays in interaction are the following: How do participants and analysts recognize affect displays? How do participants and analysts treat, interpret and perhaps even name the displayed affect? How can we as analysts justify or warrant our analysis?

⁴ Some authors seem to use the terms 'stance and affect' more or less interchangeably, or as a paired expression. With Local & Walker (2008) I agree in taking 'stance' as the more general term (cf. *ibid.*: 745), including 'affect'.

Some recent work on the communication of morality also touches on questions similar to the ones I am pursuing here (cf. e.g., Christmann & Günthner (1996) and Günthner (1997, 1999, 2000)).

In the terminology adopted here, the display of affectivity or emotive involvement in interaction is interpretable (by the interlocutors as well as by the researchers) as (a specific) affect in function of the conversational activity it is embedded in. In storytelling the specific affective interpretation of a verbal report and/or prosodic-gestural (re-)enactment of heightened emotive involvement may be proposed by teller but will ultimately be locally negotiated by teller and recipient(s) collaboratively. Interlocutors use verbal (i.e. lexical, syntactic), prosodic (voice-related) and visual (i.e. gestural, facial and other body-related) cues as resources in conversational storytelling in order to reconstruct affective stances in the story world as well as to display and make interpretable associated affective stances in the here-and-now. In these contexts storytellers 'manage' affect by staging its reconstruction and display in recipient-designed ways as well as by responding to the interlocutors' displays in particular ways. The technical term affectivity is used to refer to such displayed emotive involvement and its management in interaction.

The display of affectivity in storytelling is a complex matter, though. The affect that is being displayed by the storyteller will most commonly not be an 'in-situ' affect, i.e. an affect experienced in the here-and-now of the time of the telling, but a 'reconstructed affect', i.e. an affect in the storyworld that is being represented and told by the storyteller to and for the story recipients (cf. Günthner 2000). The reconstructed affect of the storyworld may not be the same in kind or in strength, as the original one in the real world; reconstructed affects may be presented as either stronger or the same or milder than the original one, depending on the particulars of the situation and the speaker's self presentation in it. Nevertheless, apart from presenting reconstructed affectivity, the storyteller also displays emotively involved assessments or evaluations of the events presented as in-situ displays of affectivity. These latter both show the storyteller's stance toward the events told in the story and make relevant the story recipients' responses to the storytelling.

2. Database

The present analysis is based on a corpus of audio and video recordings of German conversations. The audio data come from a corpus of everyday private telephone conversations between close friends in colloquial German. The speakers, aged around 25 years, come from the North of Germany, in particular the area surrounding Berlin. The video data consist of 8 everyday face-to-face conversations with 2 or 3 participants in their home environments each, also from the area of Berlin-Potsdam. For these data the project devised a recording technique adopted from Anssi Peräkylä and Johanna Ruusuvuori (2006): We used 3 cameras plus an extra audio flash recorder. The 3 cameras were focussed to capture both the total situation as well as the faces and bodies of the participants facing each other separately. For data analysis, all four recordings were synchronized and combined into one film, allowing analysts to look at the same sequences from 3 different perspectives as well as to have access to a high-quality audio-recording.

For the compilation of a collection of data for the analysis of affectivity in storytelling, we include everything that looks like 'telling' in a wider sense (cf. Schegloff 2007 on a distinction between 'storytelling' and 'tellings of other things'). For the analysis presented here, I selected storytellings with displays of a particular affect, namely 'anger' ('Ärger'), 'annoyance' ('Genervtsein'), 'fury' ('Wut'/'Zorn') or 'indignation' ('Entrüstung', 'Empörung'). The stories typically turned out to be what in Conversation Analysis (CA) has been described as 'complaint stories' (cf. e.g. Drew & Holt 1988; Drew 1998; Mandelbaum 1991/1992; cf. also 'Beschwerdegeschichten' in Günthner 2000).⁵ Complaints have been described as interactionally occasioned and constructed.⁶ It has been shown that recipients of complaint stories are expected to respond with sympathy and/or alignment and affiliation.⁷ Most recently, Ogden (in press) shows how the unified construction for 'making a complaint' is realized with different formats when positioned at different sequential locations so as to accomplish different actions, viz. 'proposing to close down one's own sequence' (X-complaint) or 'proposing to continue a sequence by seeking affiliation' (cf. p. 39). Affiliation means "that the hearer displays support of and endorses the teller's conveyed stance" (Stivers 2008: 35).

In the materials analyzed here, storytellers complain about the behavior of non-present third parties or about events or states-of-affair they have encountered in the past. Complaints about the misconduct of an interlocutor in the interaction, or about deplorable states-of-affair that tellers currently have to deal with, might be constructed in different ways.

The data have been transcribed according to a transcription system developed by a group of German interactional linguists in 1998, revised in 2009 (Selting et al. 1998, 2009). This system is similar to the transcription system used in CA, but it attempts to be more linguistically systematic, especially with respect to the notation of prosody in talk-in-interaction. The notation conventions can be found in the appendix.

3. Aims and methods

In the following, I will analyze in detail the verbal and vocal display and handling of affectivity by both storyteller and story recipient in some case studies. In particular, I will look at the way the following kinds of resources are used in their sequential context:

- the verbal and segmental display: Rhetorical, lexico-semantic, syntactic, and phonetic-phonological resources;

⁵ According to Drew (1998: 322), "one of the central tasks of complaint narratives is to describe the other's behavior, in the circumstances, as having constituted a transgression. The egregiousness [= 'Ungeheuerlichkeit', M.S.] of someone's conduct is assembled through the account given of that conduct".

⁶ Although, as Drew & Holt (1988: 399) say, "complaints are constitutive features of the troubles they report", i.e. the complaint plays a "constitutive role [...] in formulating the nature of the trouble which occasioned the complaint" (ibid.), "formulating a version of the trouble in a complaint is shaped by interactional contingencies, such as the responses of the complaint recipient, especially the extent to which the recipient affiliates with the complainant" (ibid., with reference to Emerson & Messinger 1977: 128-31).

⁷ Drew & Holt (1988: 410) phrase this as follows: "In telling about a grievance or trouble, a speaker may expect or seek (as a preferred response) the recipient's sympathy."

- the prosodic and suprasegmental vocal display: Resources from the domains of prosody and voice quality;
- in video data: Visual resources from the domains of body posture and its changes, head movements, gaze, and hand movements and gestures.

It will be shown that the display of affectivity is organized in orderly ways in sequences of storytelling in conversation. I will try to reconstruct (a) how verbal, vocal and visual cues are deployed in co-occurrence in order to make affectivity in general and specific affects in particular interpretable for the recipient and (b) how in turn the recipient responds and takes up the displayed affect. As a result, affectivity is shown to be managed by teller and recipient in storytelling sequences in conversation, involving both the reporting of affects from the story world as well as the negotiation of in-situ affects in the here-and-now of the storytelling situation.

Some of the stories analyzed here are not first, but second or subsequent stories. Or they are used as sample stories to back a claim. Their structure is shaped by their positions in their context. In this analysis, however, I am not dealing with this.

4. An initial extract: A complaint story with affiliative responses

The following extract (1) is taken from a face-to-face conversation and thus we need to take verbal, vocal as well as visual resources into account. I am at first presenting an abbreviated transcript for an overview of the sequence.

The three participants, all about 25 years old, share a flat in Berlin. Hajo has just been telling about his meeting with a man who owns a parking permit. With her story, Carina backs up her claim that people who have a parking permit must necessarily be walking disabled. She tells a story about how she inadvertently used a parking place for the disabled and had to pay a high fine. Her primary addressee and recipient is Hajo (in a striped shirt); Franz does not seem to really be included in the conversation here, he is quiet and responds only very little.

(1) LoE_VG_03_Parkausweis Gehbehinderte

((During the entire telling, Carina looks at Hajo. Franz just sits next to Hajo. Also, for the entire telling, Carina's left arm is on the backrest of the sofa.))

{0:06} 01 Car: krichst du diese ´PARKgeschichte krichst du
this parking thing you only get

´NUR wenn du gEhbehindert bist.
when you are walking disabled

02 (-)

03 Haj: ab[er-]
but

{0:09} 04 Car: [hab] ich ja `AUCH schonmal versucht anzufechten.
I also tried to contest that once

234 Margret Selting

{0:10} 05 ich war ja 'Aumal achtzig prozent?
I also was eighty percent (disabled) once

06 Haj: hm,
hm

{0:13} 07 Car: und hab ↑`!AU:S! ver`SEHN im be`hIndertenpark (.)
and inadvertently used a parking spot

dings (.) gestanden.
for the disabled

08 Haj: hm,
hm

{0:16} 09 Car: und echt ↑`FÜNF minuten in son `lAden rein
and really five minutes into a store

und wieder rAus und hatte n `ZETtel dran.
and out again and I had a ticket

{0:19} 10 Haj: hm=[hm,]
hmhm

11 Car: [<`FUCK.>]
<whispery, l>
fuck

12 <<whispery>`SIEBzig euro.>
seventy euros

13 (-)

{0:21} 14 Haj: <<pressed, h>``*!OAH!;>
oah

{0:22} 15 Car: ↑`SIE:Bzig Euro `für (.) im be`hInderten (-)
seventy euros for using a parking spot

<<dim>`pArkplatz [(stEhn).>
for the disabled

{0:25} 16 Haj: <<len>``HOLla.>
holla

{0:26} 17 Car: und dann `bIn ich hab ich da mein (.)
and then I was I sent them my

be↑` HINDertenausweis hingeschickt;
disabled card

{0:29} 18 und (-) ↑` TRAlala:;=
and blablaba

19 =<<all>und -SO-> (--)
and so

{0:30}	20	<<t>`NIX.> nothing
	21	bin nich ↑ GEHbehindert; am not walking disabled
	22	und (.) and
	23	du musst ↑`HUNdert prozent= you must hundred percent
	24	=wenne ↑`HUNdert prozent bist dann biste wohl when you are a hundred percent disabled you seem to be `Immer `GEHbehindert. always walking disabled
	25	(1.0)
{0:36}	26	Haj: <<p> der is doch nor↑`mAl ge↑↑`LAUfen.> but he was walking normally

Carina complains that once she was fined for having used a parking place for the disabled and had to pay the high fine of 70 Euros even though she was 80 percent disabled at the time. Hajo responds affiliatively to this complaint.

In order to show how Carina and Hajo make their emotive involvement interpretable to each other I will at first provide details on the sequential organization of the telling and then on the resources being deployed to make the actions recognizable as emotively involved.

Overall sequential organization of Carina's complaint story

The story consists of the following parts:

<i>Segments</i>	<i>Carina's actions</i>	<i>Hajo's responses</i>
01	argument (gen. ref.: <i>du</i> 'you')	
03		projection of disagreement?
04	Car moves out of argument (ref.: <i>ich</i> 'I')	
05	Car prefaces possible story (ref.: <i>ich</i> 'I')	
06		Hajo gives her ticket for the story
07-22 with	Car tells story	
	07-10 series of events	reciprocity tokens
	11-12 climax of story: complainable	

14		affiliative response (“sound object”, response cry)
15	evaluation of the complainable in the here-and-now	
16		second affiliative response (response cry)
17-19	list of post-complainable reactions taken by Car	
20	result	
21-22	start of a list of arguments by authorities	
23-24	Car moves back into argument (gen. ref.: <i>du</i> 'you')	
26		Haj responds to Car's argument

Neither the climax of the complaint story nor the responses are delivered in a neutral manner, tone or voice. Rather, they are keyed as emotively involved by using resources from various kinds of verbal, vocal and visual signaling systems. In the signaling of emotive involvement, i.e. 'more-than-neutral' involvement that may be interpretable as suggesting a particular affect, it is in particular the usage of 'marked' cues that is relevant, i.e. cues that deviate from the forms for the signaling of behavior of the same speaker in surrounding segments of talk. So, the words 'marked' and 'marking' are deployed as technical terms here: The 'marked' realization of a cue is always a more noticeable or more conspicuous one in comparison to its 'unmarked' counterpart. Clearly 'marked' and 'unmarked' realizations of cues are often poles of a continuum with possibly more or less marked realizations in between them.

The question now to be asked is:

Where and how do the participants signal and interpret emotive involvement?

In the more detailed extracts given in the following, visual actions have been notated in double parentheses. When they are used concomitantly with the verbal and vocal production of a unit, they have been placed in an extra line, with straight vertical lines synchronizing the two lines which notate the co-occurring phenomena, like in segments 4ff, 9, ..., 14 and so on.

Carina's story preface and the series of events leading up to the climax

Carina's story preface and Hajo's response in segments 5-6 do not show any emotive involvement. The first cue to suggest heightened emotive involvement is used by Carina in 7:

```
{0:13} 07 Car: und hab |↑`!AU:S! ver`SEHN im be`hIndertenpark (.)
                and have inadvertently in disabled park
                |((nodding))
```


dings (.) gestanden.
thing stood
 and inadvertently used a parking spot for the disabled

Rhetorically and lexically, Carina makes it clear that her offense was committed inadvertently: *aus Versehen im Behindertenpark(platz)*. Prosodically, this very expression is started with an extra-strong accent with an extra-high pitch peak and some lengthening in the syllable *AUS*, although this syllable is not the stressed syllable of the expression; i.e. the primary stress is shifted from *aus verSEHN* to *!AUS! verSEHN* in order to signal this item as the main focus here. Furthermore, Carina produces it with three accented syllables in dense succession, with only one and then two syllables between them. After the accented syllables, the continued unit is "disturbed" by two micropauses, suggesting a word search. Visually, Carina accompanies all her accented syllables with nodding head movements, thus reinforcing them. Especially through the prosodic marking, Carina projects her story as a complaint story here: She will tell a story about how the focused-on inadvertedness of her position will not be taken into due consideration, and that being eighty percent disabled is not sufficient for being allowed to use a parking place for the disabled.

In Carina's telling of the series of events in 7-10 the structures in segment 9 are remarkable:

{0:16} 09 Car: und echt ↑`FÜNF minuten in son |`lAden rein
and really five minutes in such a shop to
 |((slashes arm

 |und wieder rAus und hatte n |`ZETtel dran.
and again out and had a ticket at
 |horizontally and then |vertically))
and really five minutes into a store and out again and I had a ticket
 ((lets arm drop onto her thigh with a slapping noise))

Rhetorically and lexico-semantically, she now focuses on the short period of time that she was away from her car: *FÜNF minuten* ('five minutes').

Syntactically, her unit is complex and dense here: There are three syntactic clauses, all of them without mentioning the implied subject *ich* ('I'), the first two also implying but not spelling out the verb or predicate:

und echt ↑`FÜNF minuten in son `lAden rein
'and really five minutes into the shop'
 und wieder rAus
'and out again'
 und hatte n `ZETtel dran.
'and had a ticket'

Prosodically, these three dense constructions (Günthner 2005) are bound together in one single intonation unit with four rhythmically accented syllables which are delivered in a steady tempo. The short period of time in which she here reports to have carried out an action quickly is iconically suggested by her formulating them all in one single unit and, additionally, performing fast horizontal slashing or slapping arm and hand gestures. The end of the series of events, her finding the ticket at her car, is accompanied by a vertical

gesture that suggests itself as a final one. Immediately after this, she drops her arm onto her thigh and thereby produces a punctuating noise. All the time, her gaze is directed at Hajo, thus inviting him to respond. Hajo responds with a reciprocity token *hm:hm*.

Carina's story climax

In overlap with Hajo's reciprocity token, Carina in 11 produces the swear word *FUCK* and then in 12 gives the sum she had to pay as a fine.

```
{0:19} 10 Haj:      hm=[hm,]
        11 Car:      [|<`FUCK.>]
                    <whispery, 1>
                    |((nodding, gazing at Haj))

        12          |<<whispery>`SIEBzig euro.>
                    seventy euros
                    |((with raised eyebrows))

        13          (-)

{0:21} 14 Haj:      |<<pressed, h>`*!OAH!;>
                    |((with wide opened eyes and outh,
                    | and with raised eyebrows))
```

Rhetorically and lexico-semantically, the swear word is of course remarkable. In addition, it realizes a code-switch into English. This unit presents the ticket as a very negatively evaluated nuisance. For the young people in conversation here, the height of the sum given in 12, seventy euros, is an extreme-case formulation (Pomerantz 1986). The two units can be described as a response cry (Goffman 1978, 1981), *FUCK*, and an elaboration of it (C. Goodwin 1996: 393ff.).

Syntactically, the climax is realized with maximally short constructions with one single and two words constituting the syntactic units.

Prosodically, the units show falling accents with final falling pitch. With her voice quality, however, Carina creates a contrast to her prior units: *FUCK* is delivered in a lower pitch register, both *FUCK* and *SIEBzig euro* are realized in a whispery voice.

In addition, Carina produces a head nod with *FUCK* and raises her eyebrows when uttering *SIEBzig euro*.

With all these cues together Carina suggests segments 11 and 12 as the climax of her story. All these cues clearly construct these units as conspicuous and thus signal heightened emotive involvement. The specific affect that she displays is more difficult to interpret, though. Her strong negative assessment suggests the interpretation of 'anger', 'indignation' because of her being treated unfairly (for 'indignation' see Günthner 2000).⁸ Yet, this 'anger' and 'indignation' is not displayed as in-situ, but as reported thought, that is, as a reconstructed affect belonging to her story world (cf. *ibid.*). In contrast to other complaint stories in which reconstructed 'anger' and 'indignation' is displayed with more sonorant cues, Carina's 'anger' and 'indignation' is displayed with

⁸ Of course there is the general problem of naming affects. It should be kept in mind that such namings are interpretive ascriptions to displayed behavior that must be warranted in the analysis.

more subdued cues here: Whispery voice and low pitch register. Through this, her affect seems to be displayed as a past experience, resigned-to now.

The interpretation of the displayed heightened emotive involvement as 'anger' and 'indignation' can be warranted by taking Hajo's response into account: After a brief lapse, he responds with the sound object (Reber 2008) **/OAH!/**, in a high pitch register, with rising-falling pitch, and in a tense, pressed voice. After Carina's brief formulation of her climax, Hajo responds with a maximally short response cry which consists of one single syllable. Concomitantly, he gazes at Carina with suddenly his eyes wide open, his mouth open, and raised eyebrows. All these features together constitute a conventional response cry (Goffman 1981) to display astonishment at and affiliative agreement with the prior speaker's negative assessment of some event presented in the prior turn. Hajo shows himself in agreement with Carina's assessment of the events as egregious. His visual enactment of raised eyebrows at 14 and 16 even converges at Carina's enactment of raised eyebrows at 12, thus aligning himself with her enactment of facial expression. The pause in segment 13 and Hajo's slightly late response can in this case be analyzed as an additional signal of his astonishment.⁹ In addition, Hajo's response is quite brief and he does not project to elaborate on it. This seems to lead to Carina's expansion of her climax. Pictures 1 and 2 show Carina's and Hajo's facial expression in segments 12 and 14.



Picture 1



Picture 2

Carina's evaluation of the complainable in the here-and-now

In segment 15, Carina produces an in-situ evaluation of the complainable of her story:

```
{0:22} 15   Car:  |↑`SIE:Bzig Euro `für (.) im be`hInderten (-)
                seventy euros for      in a disabled
                |((nodding in synchrony with accented syllables,
                |gazing at Haj))
```

⁹ On delays in the signaling of surprise cf. also Wilkinson & Kitzinger 2006: 164ff.

```

|<<dim>`pArkplatz [(stEhn).>
      parking place
|((nodding in synchrony with accented syllables,
|then gaze away from Haj))
seventy euros for using a parking place for the disabled

{0:25} 16   Haj:  |<<len>`HOLla.>
      |((with still raised eyebrows))

```

Rhetorically and lexico-semantically, she does not add anything new, but only formulates the egregious fine in a more elaborate form again. Syntactically, this is a non-finite construction, mentioning only the bare fact, with the mentioning of the extreme sum of the fine in a topicalized position, but it is longer than the first rendering. Prosodically, the topicalized extreme sum is presented with an accented syllable rising to an extra-high pitch peak and carrying some lengthening, thus signaling the focus of the unit right from the beginning. The words in the rest of the unit carry a high number of additional secondary accents, namely five; these are not rhythmically organized but separated by two brief pauses. Nevertheless, the accentuation is dense (cf. Selting 1994), with only few unaccented syllables between the accented ones, even though most of the accents are not very strong. The unit ends in soft voice. Visually, Carina nods her head in synchrony with the accented syllables, at first she still gazes at Hajo and then directs her gaze away from him.

In this case it is not only the verbal, vocal and visual marking that displays the emotive involvement, but also the fact that Carina repeats the egregious fact again, even in more or less the same words as before. She thus draws attention to the egregious fact again. But in contrast to the first rendering, as the climax, which seemed to re-enact her affect in the storyworld, she now seems to comment on and evaluate the egregious fine for Hajo in the here-and-now and thus creates another opportunity for Hajo to respond. Carina's in-situ evaluation of the complainable seems to be weaker and 'calmer' than her prior reconstructed rendering of it.

Again, this analysis can be warranted with reference to Hajo's response at segment 16. Hajo provides *HOLla* with marked rising-falling pitch. Just as Carina's second formulation of her climax was longer than her first, so Hajo's second response cry is longer: It now has two syllables. And in comparison to his prior response at 14, this second response cry is prosodically and visually less marked. Prosodically, there is no pressed articulation any longer, but slow tempo. Hajo continues the visual marking of his first response: He is gazing with his eyes wide open and with raised eyebrows, but does not add new signals. This means: Just as Carina's in-situ evaluation of the complainable was weaker than her first re-enactment of it, so now Hajo's second response is weaker than his first. Nevertheless, it is a fully affiliative response to Carina's complaint story.

Analyzing the sequence, the form and succession of the two adjacency pairs by Carina and the interaction between Carina and Hajo here suggest the following interpretations:

- The first formulation is presented as if it were a reproduction of Carina's first response upon seeing the ticket, i.e. as reported thought, from the perspective of the character in the storyworld; the second formulation is displayed more like a second or later thought or reflection about the event, from the perspective of the storyteller in the here-and-now.

- In both his responses, Hajo builds on Carina's just prior formulations of her climax. Each of Hajo's responses matches Carina's prior formulation in structure and prosody.
- Hajo's slightly late and brief first response seems to lead to Carina's expansion of her climax.
- Carina and Hajo gaze at each other all the time and thus maintain a close interaction throughout this sequence.

Carina and Hajo thus display what M.H. Goodwin (1980) has called 'mutual monitoring' (cf. also C. Goodwin & M.H. Goodwin 1987). (On a different 'epistemic ecology' created through the two sequences in succession, see also C. Goodwin, in press.)

What we can see here is this: *A sequence for the collaborative treatment of affectivity* in climaxes of complaint stories, *with affiliative responses* by the recipient. The sequence consists of two adjacency pairs:

1st adjacency pair –

for the display and accomplishment of shared affectivity:

1 st pair part:	storyteller:	display of re-constructed affectivity with reference to complainable
2 nd pair part:	recipient:	affiliative response

2nd adjacency pair –

for the consolidation and exit from the display of shared affectivity:

1 st pair part:	storyteller:	in-situ evaluation of complainable, entails uptake of recipient's affiliation
2 nd pair part:	recipient:	affiliative response

Here, in this case of affiliative responses, *the display of affectivity in the second adjacency pair is weaker than in the first*, thus accomplishing the collaborative backing out of heightened affectivity.

The second adjacency pair seems to be necessary here, because the first adjacency pair on its own would seem to be too brief and laconic. The second pair thus dwells on the shared affectivity for a bit, before both speakers accomplish their return to less emotively involved talk. The evaluation in the second adjacency pair can be looked upon as a practice for the interactional accomplishment of the shared evaluation of the complainable. It thus constitutes an interactional practice in analogy to the individuals' internal 'appraisal' as a basis for their affective stances, as described in cognitive theories of affect.

Carina's continuation of her story

Carina goes on to tell about her reactions to the egregious fine: She tells that she tried to get around having to pay the fine. Segments 17-19 are presented with list intonation (Selting 2007), although in fact she only produces one single list item proper at 17, then generalized list completers (Jefferson 1990) at 18 and 19.

```
{0:26} 17   Car:  |und dann `bIn ich hab ich da mein (.)
                and then was I have I there my
                |((with raised eyebrows))
```

```

|be↑ HINdertenausweis hingeschickt;
disabled card          sent
|((with raised eyebrows,
|moving body and arms to and fro))
and then I was I sent them my disabled card

{0:29} 18 |und (-) |↑ TRAlala:;=
and          blablabla
|(( with raised eyebrows,
| moving body and arms to and fro))
          |((Fra nods briefly and gazes at Car))
19 =<<all>und -SO-> (--
and so

{0:30} 20 |<<t>`NIX.>
          Nothing
|((shakes head briefly))
21 bin nich ↑ GEHbehindert;
am not walking disabled

22 und (.)
and

```

The result of her efforts is given at 20 with a short *NIX*. on a low pitch register, accompanied by a lateral head shake. After this, in 21, she starts and projects another list through the use of list intonation: Presumably a list of counter-arguments that the authorities gave her. This list is abandoned and at 23, Carina resumes the topic from before her story, thus embedding her complaint story as an illustrative story into the argumentation.

Conclusions from the analysis of extract (1)

What we have seen so far can be summarized as follows:

(1) For the presentation of their stories as complaint stories, the storytellers use general rhetorical resources like the following:

- presentation of the 'offender' or 'offending' as acting or being unfair, irrational, offensive;
- presentation of the 'self' as acting fair, rational, justified.

(2) Participants use verbal, vocal and visual cues to signal their emotive involvement in telling and responding to the story. In particular, we saw the following cues being deployed:

(a) Verbal and vocal cues:

Rhetorically and lexico-semantically: Repetition of an action, extreme-case formulations, swear words or expletives; sound objects that function as response cries.

Syntactically: Short, dense "elliptical" constructions and clauses.

Prosodically: Prosodic marking cues such as extra-strong accents, extra-high pitch peaks, lengthenings, stress shift, dense accentuation, tempo changes, changes of pitch register.

Voice quality: Whispery voice; pressed, tense voice.

(b) Visual cues:

Head movements: Head nods and head shakes.

Arm and hand gestures: Slashing and slapping gestures.

Gaze: Eye movements, gaze direction.

Facial expression: Movements of the eyebrows.

(3) It is not single cues that suggest particular interpretations. It is rather their co-occurrence and density that speakers deploy in order to suggest the interpretation of their talk as emotively involved.

(4) In the extract at hand, the particular affect was interpreted as 'anger' and 'indignation'. The affect displayed was described as a reconstructed and even past and resigned-to affect from the story world, which was displayed with more subdued cues. The interpretations were warranted with reference to the recipient's affiliative responses, namely response cries that demonstrate the recipient's agreement and affiliation with the story teller's assessment of the events presented as egregious.

(5) The storyteller and recipient's display of reconstructed 'anger' and 'indignation' from the storyworld was followed by an in-situ evaluation of the complainable in the here-and-now, displaying a weaker form and making another recipient response relevant. Accordingly, the recipient's second response turned out to also be weaker than the first one. - After this, Carina treats Hajo's responses as unproblematic and continues her story by telling about her reactions to the egregious fine.

This trajectory of the sequences suggests that the display and affiliative uptake of affectivity in climaxes of storytelling is organized in a *sequence of two successive adjacency pairs for the collaborative treatment of affectivity with affiliation*: The first one to display and accomplish shared affectivity, the second one to consolidate and then exit from the display of shared affectivity. Displays of affectivity are weaker in the second adjacency pair than in the first.

(6) Even though this is a very unproblematic example, we could see how the storyteller's display of affect and the story recipients' treatment of it constituted some *negotiation and management of affectivity*: The storyteller who experienced the event told first-hand offers her affect display and evaluation, and the story recipient reacts to this. Hajo responds fully affiliatively to Carina's story climax with her display of reconstructed past 'anger' or 'indignation'. He even accommodates to her facial expression by also enacting raised eyebrows. Carina expands on the climax by evaluating the complainable in the here-and-now, slightly weaker, to which Hajo responds a bit weaker as well, i.e. exactly matching. This shows the interlocutors' precise monitoring and management of their displays of affectivity; they orient to each

other and adapt their displays towards each other (cf. also C. Goodwin & M.H. Goodwin 1987).

This extract shows how affectivity is displayed, responded to and negotiated in talk-in-interaction. This is what we refer to as the management of affectivity by participants in interaction.

Extract (1) shows a complaint story with the display of 'anger' or 'indignation' that the recipient responds clearly affiliatively to. This is by no means always the case. Indeed, so far our data show many more instances in which recipients do not respond as affiliatively. I will present such a case next.

5. A second extract: A complaint story with not fully affiliative responses

Extract (2) is taken from a telephone conversation. It will show that affectivity is displayed through prosodic cues. If in the recipient's response, the appropriate prosodic cues are lacking, the speaker is being perceived as only talking about an affect, but not experiencing it.

The following extract shows how Dolli tells her father about an argument she had with her boyfriend.¹⁰ The extract given is part of a longer telling, with segment 1 still referring to the previous part of the telling.

(2) T1-1: Vati and Dolli: 756-842 (ca. 15:00-15:58ff.)

- {0:00} 01 D: ähm: und äh so GEHT es nich; ne,
and it won't work like this you know
- 02 D: und dann SAGT er zu mir-
and then he says to me
- 03 .hh `dOlli ich ´wIll dir ja ´nIch zu `NAhe `trEten;
dolli I don't want to step on your toes
- 04 aber was `HAST du denn schon;
but what on earth do you possess
- 05 (--)
- 06 .hh und da hab ICH gedacht-(.)
and then I thought
- {0:12} 07 ↑~ HALlo -jUnge-
come on boy
- 08 also* (-)
thus
- 09 weite,
you know

¹⁰ This story shows parallels to the 'instigating stories' told by black girls in their play group, as described by M.H. Goodwin (1990: esp. 262f.).

- 10 D: [ich mein]
I mean
- 11 V: [.h hm,]
- 12 D: .h ich hab in DEM sinne ↑schOn n bisschen mehr;
I do possess a bit more in that sense
- 13 ich hab nämlich n ZIEL vor augn;
I have a clear goal
- 14 okee;=das hat er AUCH;
okay he also has that
- 15 aber [.hh ähm:]
but
- 16 V: [.h hm,]
- 17 D: weißte,
you know
- 18 ((stammers)) er hat sich da:
he has himself there
- {0:20} 19 klA:r hat er jetzt durch die firma gut GE:LD-
sure he earns well now in the company
- 20 und .h ähm: kann alles Absetzen-
and can deduct everything
- 21 wie auch IMmer-
whatever
- 22 aber w: wie isser da ↑RAN gekommen;=
but how did he get there
- 23 =ja wieder nUr durch MICH;=weißte,
only because of me you know
- 24 V: hm,
- {0:34} 25 (-)
- 26 D: .h <<h, rhythmic> und `dIs hat mich ↑`SO ge``WU:RMT,>
and that bothered me so much
- 27 ich `WILL dir ja nich zu ↑`NAhe `trE[ten,
I don't want to step on your toes
- 28 V: [JA:;
yes
- 29 den=
that
- 30 =den SPRUCH find ich
I think that saying

246 Margret Selting

31 oder den SATZ find ich also NICH so dOll,
or that sentence I don' t think so much of

32 weil: ((clears her throat))
because

33 er müßte dAnn mal ÜberLEgen:,
he should once remember

{0:45} 34 äh wie ER dazu jekommn is.
how he got there

35 .hh

36 D: .h ja bloß er SIEHT es nich so;=[ne,]
yes but he just doesn' t see it that way, you know

37 V: [(und)]
and

38 V: ich meine: lEtztlich habt IHR
I mean you have in the end

39 <<all> also dAs WAS ihr habt->
what you've got after all

{0:53} 40 eigntlich so zumindestens nach MEInem empfindn
you have actually achieved

zuSAMMN jeschafft.
together in my view

41 D: ja; h
yes

42 V: .hh und äh:: dass dAnn jemand da AUSbricht,
and if somebody then turns his back on this

43 und sagt also was HAST du denn schon,
and says look what on earth do you possess

44 dit find ich also OoCH nich so toll;=
I don' t think that's so great either

45 [(=muß ich sagn;)]
must I say

46 D: [=fand ich ↑`GANZ schön `KRASS muss ich ehrlich sagen;]=
I thought that was really bad I must say

47 V: =ja;
yes

48 D: .h weißte,=ich mein: (.)
you know I mean

49 ich hab zu ihm geSAGT-
I said to him

- {1:06} 50 ähm: Tilo-
- 51 w: was (.) was WÄR denn (.) geWEsen, (--)
 what what would have been
- 52 ich HÄTT mir den ähm: fernseher auch alleINE kaufen
 können;
 I could have bought the tv on my own

Dolli, a young woman of about 25 years, is complaining to her father about her boyfriend. Even though this is not a neatly delineated little story with a neat climax, it nevertheless is clearly the telling about an argument that Dolli had with her boyfriend Tilo. In the following, I will show the overall sequential organization and then go through the extract in detail.

Overall sequential organization of Dolli's complaint story and Vati's responses

The extract shown here consists of the following parts:

- 2-4 Dolli announces and reports talk by her boyfriend,
 7-27 Dolli reports her own (thought) evaluation of this talk,
 28-44 Vati's explicit reaction to Dolli's telling,
 45 Dolli repeats or even upgrades her evaluation,
 48ff. Dolli tells about her (verbally explicit) reaction to her boyfriend.

Dolli's reporting talk at 2-4

Dolli announces her boyfriend's talk at 2 in present tense form, *dann SAGT er zu mir-*, thus rhetorically foregrounding his talk as still very present to her (cf. also Günthner 2000: 362f.). After her announcement, Dolli presents her boyfriend's talk at 3-4 like a direct quotation, as reported speech, with all address terms and indexicals given from his perspective at the time of the argument:¹¹

- {0:00} 02 D: und dann SAGT er zu mir-
 and then says he to me
 and then he says to me
- 03 .hh `dOlli ich ´wIll dir ja ´nIch zu `NAhe `trEten;
 dolli I want you PART not to close step
 dolli I don't want to step on your toes
- 04 aber was `HAST du denn schon;
 but what own you PART yet
 but what on earth do you possess

¹¹ On reported speech cf., for instance, Günthner (1997, 1999), Couper-Kuhlen (1999), Klewitz & Couper-Kuhlen (1999).

Rhetorically and lexico-semantically, the boyfriend is presented as producing two pieces of problematic behavior:

(1) addressing his girlfriend Dolli in an overly formal manner by - besides using her name as an address term - a conventional warning of his imminent trespassing into her (emotional) territory (segment 3),

(2) asking a downgrading and upsetting question by presupposing that she does not have anything of value in her life.

The particles *ja*, *denn* and *schon* here all enhance these actions.

Prosodically, the accented syllables in 3 are produced rhythmically and 4 is produced in a hyperarticulated manner (Ogden 2006¹²), i.e. with markedly pressed and precise articulation, both devices serving to make the utterances more noticeable. The utterances are thus phonetically made to be noticed as unusually marked.

Both kinds of resources taken together suggest the interpretation that Dolli is reporting her boyfriend's offensive announcement and pejorative question in an emotively involved way. After this, she pauses, but when no response from the recipient is forthcoming, she goes on to report on her own responses to the reported talk.

Dolli's report of her own (thought) evaluation of her boyfriend's talk at 6-27

In segment 6, Dolli starts with an announcement again, this time presented as more distant to her in the present perfect form

{0:08} 06 D: .hh und da hab ICH gedacht-(.)
 and then have I thought
 and then I thought

and then first produces a conventional response cry (Goffman 1981)

{0:10} 07 D: ↑⁻HALlo -jUnge
 hello boy
 come on boy

with stylized intonation: What is called a 'call contour', consisting of two successive level plateau tones, the first on a high plateau and the second on a lower plateau, usually the interval of about a minor third between them. This marked prosody again draws attention to this utterance and suggests that it is produced in an emotively involved way.

After still no response from her father is forthcoming, Dolli now sets out to elaborate on her thought responses, albeit in a noticeably hesitating manner. In 8, she begins a new unit, but then abandons it again. After a micropause she produces the tag-question *weißte*, a more prominent one than the more frequently used *ne*, and then continues with the beginning of a new unit. This obviously elicits Vati's recipient response token *hm*, at 11. After this, starting with 12, Dolli elaborates on her evaluation of her boyfriend's talk. In this, she produces two kinds of arguments against the

¹² Ogden refers to Lindblom (1990) for this terminology.

downgrading of herself by her boyfriend: Firstly, she has even more than he has, namely a goal in life (12-15) and secondly, he got his good job only with her help (19-23). Both these arguments are responded to by Vati with reciprocity tokens (16 and 24).

- {0:11} 08 D: also* (-)
thus
- 09 weißte,
you know
- 10 D: [ich mein]
I mean
- 11 V: [.h hm,]
- 12 D: .h ich hab in DEM sinne ↑schOn n bisschen mehr;
I own in that sense quite a bit more
I do possess a bit more in that sense
- 13 ich hab nämlich n ZIEL vor augn;
I have PART a goal before eyes
I have a clear goal
- 14 okee;=das hat er AUCH;
okay that has he also
okay he also has that
- 15 aber [.hh ähm:]
but
- 16 V: [.h hm,]
- 17 D: weißte,
you know
- 18 ((stammers)) er hat sich da:
he has himself there
- {0:20} 19 klA:r hat er jetzt durch die firma gut GE:LD-
sure has he now through the company good money
sure he earns well now in the company
- 20 und .h ähm: kann alles Absetzen-
and can everything deduct
and can deduct everything
- 21 wie auch IMmer-
how also ever
however
- 22 aber w: wie isser da ↑RAN gekommen;=
but how is he there come to
but how did he get there
- 23 =ja wieder nUr durch MICH;=weißte,
PART again just through me you know
only because of me you know
- 24 V: hm,

{0:34} 25 (-)

26 D: .h <<h, rhythmic> und `dIs hat mich ↑`SO ge`´WU:RMT,>
and that has me so bothered
 and that bothered me so much

27 ich `WILL dir ja nich zu ↑`NAhe ´trE[ten,
I want you PART not to close step
 I don't want to step on your toes

28 V: [JA:;
yes

After a brief pause in 25, Dolli displays and formulates her affective response verbally explicit: <<h, rhythmic> und `dIs hat mich ↑`SO ge`´WU:RMT,>, something that could be translated as an informal idiom for 'and this so much annoyed me'. She then cites her boyfriend's warning of his imminent trespassing into her (emotional) territory from 3 again, *ich `WILL dir ja nich zu ↑`NAhe ´trE[ten*, with, however, a different intonation contour. Here, the layering of voices suggests the interpretation of parody.

In the explicit formulation of affect in 26, Dolli uses the idiomatic expression *gewurmt*, a saying summarizing that she was very annoyed, and upgrades it with the intensifier *so*.¹³ Both these items are produced in a prosodically marked way: They are both articulated as accented syllables; the intensifier *so* is produced with a jump to an extra high pitch peak; and the accented syllable *wurmt* is realized with an unusually complex rising-falling-rising pitch movement. In the repetition of her boyfriend's warning, Dolli uses fewer accented syllables and no noticeable rhythmic organization, but altogether a more melodic contour with another pitch jump to an extra high pitch peak in the word *NAhe* and a voice quality suggesting parody. Furthermore, she deploys final mid-rising pitch, thus projecting more-to-come, e.g. a continuation of the quotation as she originally produced it at 4.

But in overlap with the final syllable of her repetition, Vati already starts his response.

Vati's explicit reaction to Dolli's telling (28-45)

{0:34} 26 D: .h <<h, rhythmic> und `dIs hat mich ↑`SO ge`´WU:RMT,>
and that has me so bothered
 and that bothered me so much

27 ich `WILL dir ja nich zu ↑`NAhe ´trE[ten,
I want you PART not to close step
 I don't want to step on your toes

28 V: [JA:;
yes

¹³ According to Drew & Holt (1988: 416), "idioms are a resource whereby speakers may formulate complaints [...]. They are used to summarize such complaints, and they may be a special means of seeking to have the other side sympathize with the teller over the matter about which he or she is complaining - often in circumstances where such affiliation or sympathy has not been forthcoming or otherwise cannot be relied upon."

- actually so at least according to my feeling*
- zuSAMMN jeschafft.
together achieved
you have actually achieved together in my view
- 41 D: ja; h
yes
- 42 V: .hh und äh:: dass dAnn jemand da AUSbricht,
and eh that than somebody there breaks out
and if somebody then turns his back on this
- 43 und sagt also was HAST du denn schon,
and says PART what have you than yet
and says look what on earth do you possess
- {0:59} 44 dit find ich also OOOCH nich so toll;=
that think I PART also not that high
I don' t think that's so great either

Firstly, Vati uses Dolli's prior second argument (from 19-23) as his own first reason at 32-34: Her boyfriend would have to consider how he achieved things; this is responded to by Dolli with a comment on her boyfriend's different point of view (36). Secondly, at 38-40 Vati points out that in his opinion Dolli and her boyfriend achieved their assets together. This is acknowledged and confirmed by Dolli with *ja*; (41).

Finally, Vati draws a conclusion, in which he also uses a paraphrase of Dolli's boyfriend's reported talk, and which culminates in his repeat of his own prior second assessment: *dit find ich also OOOCH nich so toll*; The repetition varies from the original formulation phonetically: The pronunciations *dit*, *ick* and *OOCH* make use of phonetic features of the Berlin vernacular and this suggests a more informal style than the original items *den SATZ* and *also*. On the other hand, however, the pronunciation of the adjective *toll* ('great') here is more formal than the original variant *doll* as used in 31. Nevertheless, the items suggesting more informal Berlin style seem to be strong enough to suggest Vati's style-shifting towards a more informal style here. The continuation of his talk is realized in overlap with Dolli's talk; it seems to move into mumbling. Prosodically, Vati's talk in these segments is unmarked.

Altogether, Vati's repeated second assessment seems to be similar to his first version of it: It is presented as agreeing and aligning with Dolli's complaint and implicit assessment, but it is displayed as emotively neutral, even though it seems to shift a little bit towards a more informal style.

Dolli's repeated or even upgraded evaluation (46)

To Vati's repeated second assessment in 44, Dolli immediately reacts with her own upgraded assessment in 46.

- {1:00} 45 V: [(=muß ich sagen;)]
must I say
- 46 D: [=fand ich ↑`GANZ schön `KRASS muss ich ehrlich sagen;]=
found I PART pretty tough must I sincerely say
I thought that was really bad I must say

- 47 V: =ja;
yes
- 48 D: .h weißte,=ich mein: (.)
you know I mean
- 49 ich hab zu ihm geSAGT-
I have to him said
I said to him
- {1:06} 50 ähm: Tilo-
- 51 w: was (.) was WÄR denn (.) geWEsen, (--)
what what would PART have been
what would have been
- 52 ich HÄTT mir den ähm: fernseher auch alleIne kaufen
I had me the ehm tv also alone buy
können;
could
I could have bought the tv on my own

Sequentially, in relation to both her own complaint and implicit first assessment as well as Vati's second assessment, this is an explicit (re)formulation of her own prior first implicit assessment, and at the same time her reaction to Vati's second assessment.

Lexico-semantically, the informal-style adjective *krass* is used as a strong negative assessment term here, but it is softened with the modal particles *ganz schön* ('pretty much'). Through these items Dolli converges at her father's prior shift to an informal style. Syntactically, the assessment is phrased as a sentence with the finite verb in initial position, thus projecting a final comment on the issue (cf. also Günthner 2000: 239). The syntactic unit is expanded beyond its first possible completion point by adding a conventional formulation of 'doing being honest' (*muss ich ehrlich sagen*). With this, however, Dolli now presents herself as less actively accusing her boyfriend, but as more passively suffering as a consequence of his behavior. Prosodically, the modal particle *GANZ* and the adjective *KRASS* realize primary accents, with the first accent starting with a pitch jump to a high pitch peak. The items constituting the assessment are thus focused on. With two falling pitch movements in the accented syllables and the rather longish unaccented formulation of 'doing being honest' Dolli produces a less melodic and more overall long-range falling pitch movement, thus suggesting a calmer mood here. Altogether, Dolli clearly displays her assessment as emotively involved again here. But this time, through the features just explicated, she does not seem to suggest the interpretation of 'annoyance', like before, but rather something 'more passive' like 'being hurt' or 'being offended'.

Vati responds immediately with a confirmation: *ja*; in 47. After this, Dolli carries on to report her reaction to her boyfriend's talk. While before, she reported her thoughts, from 48 onwards she reports what she really said to him.

The interaction between Dolli and her father with respect to the display of affectivity

Dolli first displays emotive involvement in reporting her boyfriend's talk as upsetting at 3-4, largely through her deployment of prosodic marking. When no or only relatively weak recipient tokens are provided by her father, she goes on to report her thoughts about this, culminating in her verbally explicit and prosodically marked display of annoyance at 26-27. This is responded to by Vati's criticism of her boyfriend's talk, which is verbally explicit yet prosodically unmarked - Vati thus can be interpreted as displaying emotive neutrality here. Vati displays an epistemic stance rather than an emotive one, indicating this by repeatedly deploying the stance markers *find ich* ('I think') (cf. segments 30, 31, 44). He concludes his response with a repetition of his explicit criticism at 44, explicitly agreeing with Dolli, yet in an emotively rather neutral way but with shifting a little bit towards a more informal style. Right after this, in 46, Dolli comes in with a repeated and upgraded evaluation of her boyfriend's talk, in relation to Vati's criticism, again displaying emotive involvement. This time, however, rather than suggesting the interpretation of 'annoyance', the affect suggested now is more like 'being hurt'. Vati in 47 again responds with a confirmation immediately, before Dolli continues her telling about the argument with her boyfriend.

Dolli thus is the one to display emotive involvement in general and suggests the interpretation of specific affects in particular. Many of Dolli's in-situ offers to respond are left unresponded to by Vati.¹⁴ When he does respond, he agrees with Dolli's assessments, yet he does so in a rather neutral, slightly didactic, manner, perhaps thus contextualizing his role as Dolli's father, his 'doing being father'. Altogether, he does seem to suggest the interpretation of emotive understanding (Empathie), yet in a weak way.¹⁵

Intermediate conclusion from the analysis of a case with disaffiliative responses

(1) Affectivity in storytelling is often displayed within and as part of reported speech or reported thought. The story character or story events that the storyteller complains about to the story recipient are presented in ways that make emotive involvement and particular affects interpretable.

(2) In addition to the devices used in extract (1), we saw the following in extract (2):

Verbal resources:

- lexically explicit naming of affects

Prosodic resources:

- rhythmic organization of accentuation

¹⁴ Cf. Mandelbaum (1991/1992: 109ff.) on the subtle disattending of complaints, by not taking up opportunities to expand on the complainant's turn, as cues to the recipient's non-cooperation.

¹⁵ Dolli's father shows alignment, but only weak affiliation. One might suppose that he can't respond stronger because that might bring Dolli into trouble of various kinds. On the use of assessments as a resource in making relevant and establishing social identities and social relations in interaction see Raymond & Heritage (2006).

Phonetic resources:

- hyperarticulation

(3) In extract (2), the recipient did not supply responses matching in affective loading. Dolli's father responded - all in all - emotively "cooler" in comparison to Dolli's prior displays of annoyance and thus contextualized his 'doing being father'. This interpretation was largely due to his not using prosodic cues for making affectivity displays interpretable. If we nevertheless assume that this kind of interaction between father and daughter is a rather "normal", "unmarked" kind of interaction in this kind of context and participant relationship, my analysis has shown this: With respect to affect display, there is no display of matching affects here, no reciprocity in the display of affectivity. Exactly this not-matching of affect displays seems to make us as researchers analyze this as 'doing being father' here, that means: Something contextually specific.

(4) When the recipient provided responses not matching in affectivity, the storyteller could be seen to continue and even upgrade her own subsequent displays of affective involvement, thus creating further in-situ opportunities for the recipient to respond in a better matching manner.

(5) The interaction between the participants can be described as 'managing affectivity'. The responses by the recipient cause the storyteller and displayer of affect to alter their subsequent displays of affect. Here, Dolli's initial display of 'annoyance' is "transformed" to her later display of 'being hurt' through Vati's treatment of it. Affectivity thus can be observed to be locally and sequentially constructed and managed by the participants in conversation. There is no simple "mirroring" of affects.

6. A third extract: Another complaint story with not fully affiliative responses, now face-to-face

The following extract (3) is from a face-to-face conversation between three young people who live in the area of Berlin-Potsdam. Lara and Lori live together and have been invited for breakfast by Bastian. Bastian uses a Brandenburg regionalized variety of speech. The three have just briefly been talking about Lara and Lori looking for a new flat to rent, when Bastian in line 8 produces the preface of a story. He then delivers a story in which he complains about the differing success of citizens and supermarkets to get the administration of the town of Burg to run a bus again between the living quarters and the supermarkets: Two years' fights of the citizens did not bring the desired result whereas, in contrast, when the supermarkets only made one single appeal, a bus was immediately installed again.

(3) LoE_VG_02_Brandenburger Nahverkehr
(Aufnahme LoE_VG_02_li_re, ab 01:14:12, Transkription: Michael Wendt, Margret Selting)
(Duration of extract: 0.00 min – 1.16 min)

{0:04} 01 Lar: steigen wa sofort mit EIN machen wa;
we join immediately, we do

256 Margret Selting

- 02 Bas: na in BRANdenburg findste immer leere häuser;
well in Brandenburg you always find empty houses
- 03 Lar: hm=hm;
- 04 Bas: WEEste;
you know
- 05 uff den janzen DÖRfern un so;
in all the villages and so on
- 06 aber da brauchste wieder n AUto;
but on the other hand you need a car there
- 07 Lar: m:ja;;
yes
- {0:14} 08 Bas: in bUrg ham se t jetzt `ENDlich geschafft
in Burg they finally managed
wieder n `BUS fahren zu lassen; (.) ne,
to set up a bus service again, you know
- 09 dann wa:rns ik gloobe zwEe jahre lang war
by then it was I think for two years there was a
`RUF´bus,
bus to call
- {0:21} 10 .h wo du halt ´ANrufen musstest,
where you had to phone in
- 11 Lar: hm=hm;
- 12 Bas: und dann kam der örtliche TAXIunter´nehmer,
and then the local taxi enterpriser came
- 13 und hat dich irjendwo `HINjefahren; (.)
and took you somewhere
- 14 fü:r (-) ähm `BUSpreis [sozusagen;
for a busfare so to speak
- 15 Lor: [BUSpreise;
bus fares
- 16 Lor: hm=hm;
- 17 Bas: und den rEst (-) wat der an Ü:BERSchuss hatte,
and the rest what he had on overrun
- 18 hat dann (.) sozusagen vater `STAAT bezahlt;=
then the government paid for so to speak
- {0:31} 19 Bas: =oder: [(.)] sagen wir mal ruhig die kom`MUne;
or let's say the community paid
- 20 Lar: [hm=hm;]
- 21 Lor: [ACHso;]
oh
- 22 Lor: oh is das SCHLIMM;=ne?

- oh that's bad, isn' t it
- 23 <<laughing> hach so richt[ig*]
oh, really
- 24 Bas: [ja:; (.)
yes
- 25 war aber [´billiger als n `BUS] fahren
but it was cheaper than setting up a
Lor: [´GOTTver`lassen;=ne]
godforsaken, isn' t it
- Bas: zu lassen; ne,
bus line, you know
- (0:37) 26 nur is ihnen aber `UFFje´fallen:,
but they simply noticed
- 27 dass viele viele `RENT´ne:r,
that many many senior citizens
- 28 die: ´EINKaufen müssen und so:, (1.0)
who must go shopping and the like
- 29 ja:: doch: äh: nich zu den
don' t come to the
↑ `Supermärkten kommen;
supermarkets however
- 30 und die hatten wohl mächtige
and they had huge
ge↑`WINNein´brü:che,
losses of profit
- (0:47) 31 .hh und dann ham wirklich (.)
and then, really
- <<all> Unjelogen die drei ↑`Supermärkte
honestly, the three supermarkets
- bei uns ´oben,> (.)
at our place up there
- 32 hAm sich be´SCHWE:RT,
complained
- 33 dass dass keene <<falsetto> ↑`KUNdschaft>
that no customers are coming
mehr <<falsetto> ´kommt?>
anymore
- {0:52} 34 Lor: hm,

258 Margret Selting

- 35 Bas: <<all> oder 'WEnijer kundschaft kommt?> (.)
or fewer customers come
- {0:53} 36 <<all> und seit ↓ 'DEM lassen die den ↑ 'BUS wieder
and since then they started the bus service
fahrn;
again
- {0:54} 37 <<h, all> dt 'kAnn doch wohl nich
I can't
- <<falsetto> ↑ '!WAHR! sein;>
believe it
- 38 (--)
- {0:56} 39 die lEute loofen ↑ '!STURM!
the people protest
- 40 zwEe JAHre lang?
for two years
- 41 dass wieder n ↑ 'BUS 'FÄHRT,
that a bus goes again
- {1:00} 42 (--) und 'NISCHT pas<<falsetto>↑ 'SIERT?>
and nothing happens
- 43 Lor: [aber:]
but
- 44 Bas: [und] die machen Eene EINGabe,
and they launch one single petition
- {1:02} 45 =und <<all> `!ZACK! [fährt n `bUs;>
and ((sound object)) there's a bus going again
- 46 Lor: [↑ge ↓ -NAU:-]=
=der finanzielle LEIdensdruck (-)
the financial strain
- [[((laughs)) <<with laugh particles> MACHT das]
makes it possible
- 48 Bas: [((laughs laughs))]
- Lor: [dann auf einmal> .hh]
suddenly then
- {1:05} 49 Bas: [<<h,p,all> das is der helle
it's sheer
<<falsetto, hypoart.> ↑ 'WAHNsinn;>]
lunacy
- 50 Lor: JA*;
yeah
- 51 (---)

{1:07} 52 Bas: na die ham wohl ge'SACHT,
well they must have said

53 also wir bezAhlen hier so und so viel
okay we pay so much business

geWERbesteuer,
tax here

54 und davon [MÜSSte man ja eigentlich äh:]
and that should eh

{1:10} 55 Lor: [will↑-KOMmen im kapita↓-LISMus-]
welcome to capitalism

56 (1.0)

57 Lar: ja;=mit unseren 'WOHNungspreisen sind wir
well regarding our rents we have

jetz ↓`OOCH uffm (-) globalisierten: (-)
now also arr(ived) at global

ka[pitalismus=]ma ang=
capitalism

58 Bas: [`WIR `nIcht;]
not us

59 Lar: =↑Ihr noch [nIch;]
not you

60 Bas: [hähähä::]

61 Lor: hm=hm;

Overall sequential organization

The following table gives an overview of the overall sequential organization of this example of story telling.

<i>segments</i>	<i>Bas' storytelling</i>	<i>Lor's and Lar's responses</i>
8	Bas announces story telling by producing a story preface	
		no negative responses from recipients
9-36	Bas tells story	
9-21	Bas gives background of story	
		recipients respond
22-25		Lor initiates side sequence
	responded to by Bas	
26-36	Bas tells the series of major events of the story	

		with Lar's and Lor's full attention, but little other responses
36	story climax: presentation of the scandalon	
		not much response from recipients
37	Bas gives an explicit evaluation/assessment of the story events	
		yet still not much response from the recipients, not even in the pause notated at segment 38
39-45	Bas produces expansion of story telling, with elaboration on the contrast only inexplicitly made before, suggesting stronger negative evaluation than before	
46-47		Lor responds, suggesting something like "I have always known it", i.e. agreement and affiliation with Bas, yet at the same time distancing herself from Bas, downgrading the relevance of the story events by suggesting them as recurrent
48-49	simultaneously with Lor's elaboration on her first response, Bas produces laughter and a response cry, suggesting yet another and still stronger evaluation than the ones before	
50-51		not much response from the recipients
52-54	Bas continues with detailing of the story events	
55		Lor interrupts Bas with another response in line with her prior one in lines 46-47, i.e. suggesting the story events as recurrent in capitalism
	Bas abandons the turn	
57		Lar initiates topic shift

In sum, sequentially, Bas tells a complaint story till its climax and evaluation to which his recipients Lor and Lar after some time fully attend but show little response. This seems to lead to Bas' expansion and detailing, which provide further points of relevance at which his recipients then could respond with affiliation. Lor, however, responds with affiliation but also downgrading the assessment of the story as egregious by presenting them as recurrent. Simultaneously, Bas produces laughter and a response cry suggesting a stronger evaluation of the story events, to which again the recipients do not respond

much. Bas' further detailing is interrupted by Lor's repeated downgrading of the egregiousness of the story events or of his emotive involvement, similar to before. Now, Bas gives up and joins in in Lar's initiation of topic shift.

Even though Bas is evidently not very successful in eliciting his recipients' affiliative responses, he clearly tells a complaint story. And he clearly tells his story in an ever more emotively involved manner. In the following, I will describe the resources in detail that Bas deploys in order to make his utterances interpretable as emotively involved - and that Lor deploys in downgrading Bas' evaluation and involvement.

Bas' story preface at segment 8

Rhetorically and lexico-semantically, the running of the bus in Burg is presented as an achievement arrived at after many efforts ('in Burg they finally managed to run the bus again', especially the phrasing *ENDlich geschafft* 'finally managed', segment 8). Prosodically, this preface is not remarkable. In his posture, Bas is still sitting with his hands tucked under his thighs, the two primary accented syllables in the words *ENDlich* and *BUS* are accompanied with head movements. Compared to the units before, Bas' articulation is a bit more precise and his accents might be a bit stronger, but the story preface does not suggest heightened emotive involvement yet.

Bas then leaves a gap for the recipients to respond, adds the potential turn-exit particle *ne*, and, after no explicit response has come forward, starts telling his story as shown at 9.

Bas' story telling till the story climax (segments 9-36)

The background to his story is again presented in an unmarked manner at 9-25, with still similar 'normal', unmarked prosody and hands-under-thighs posture and head movements, like in the preface. The recipients are responding in several places (see 11, 15-16, 20-23), still eating and looking at him occasionally. With respect to the signaling of affectivity, Lor can be observed to display disapproval by initiating a side sequence and assessing the situation depicted by Bas as *SCHLIMM* ('bad') in 22. As, however, this is displayed in a prosodically neutral, unmarked way, it is only a display of weak disapproval.

Bas goes on to tell the series of major events of the story from 26 onward. Now, however, the presentation of his storytelling slowly changes.

{0:37} 26 Bas: nur is ihnen aber `UFFje´fallen:,
only have they however noticed
 but they simply noticed

27 dass viele viele `RENT´ne:r,
that many many senior citizens
 that many many senior citizens

28 die: ´EINkaufen müssen und so:, (1.0)
who shopping must and so
 who must go shopping and the like

- 29 | ja:: | doch: äh: nich zu den
PART PART eh not to the
 | ((nods)) |
 don' t come to the
- | ↑`SU | permärkten kommen;
supermarkets come
 | ((nods)) |
 supermarkets however
- 30 und die hatten wohl mächtige
and they had PART mighty
 and they had huge
- | ge↑`WINNein`brü:che, |
profit collapses
 | ((full attention of Lor und Lar)) |
 | ((from here on Lor's shoulder turned away from Bas))
 losses of profit
- {0:47} 31 .hh und dann ham wirklich (.)
and then have really
 and then, really
- <<all> Unjelogen | die drei ↑`Supermärkte |
honestly the three supermarkets
 | ((rythm gesture on the beat)) |
 honestly, the three supermarkets
- bei uns ´oben,> (.)
at ours up there
 at our place up there
- 32 hAm sich be´SCHWE:RT,
have complained
 complained
- 33 dass dass | keene | <<falsetto> ↑`KUNDSchaft>
that that no customers
 | ((nods)) |
 that no customers are coming
 mehr <<falsetto> ´kommt?>
any more come
 anymore

segment	14	26	27	
item	BUSpreis	UFFjefallen	RENTner	
f0 value Hz	116.8	253	182.7	
segment	29	30	31	33
item	SUpermärkten	geWINNeinbr	SUpermärkten	KUNDSchaft
f0 value Hz	266.5	216	238.9	287.6
segment	37	39	41	42
item	WAHR	STURM	BUS	pasSIERT
f0 value Hz	302.05	282.91	264	393.92

Table 1. f0 measurements of pitch peaks at segments 26-42

As Table 1 shows, the f0 values in the pitch peaks in segments 29-33 are all fairly high as compared to the lower values measured in the preceding segments 14-27.

Furthermore, this marking is added to by using falsetto voice quality in the accented syllables and words at 33, thus suggesting even higher pitch. Altogether, pitch constitutes very dynamic contours in these segments. All prosodic units in 30-35 end with final rising pitch. In the story climax at 36, which is presented with fast tempo,¹⁷ Bas then combines a markedly low pitch valley with a markedly high pitch peak.

Visually, at segment 31, Bas changes his posture and uses his hands to produce rhythmic gestures on the beats; his hand and head movements are all synchronized with his accented syllables.

All in all, the use of these resources makes recognizable that Bas moves into increased emotive involvement which seems to reach a culmination in the climax of his story at 36, where he presents the scandalon.

```
{0:53} 36 Bas:  <<all> und seit ↓ `DEM lassen die den ↑ `BUS wieder
                  and since then let  they the  bus again
                  fahrn;>
                  ride
                  and since then they started the bus service again
```

Nevertheless, the recipients do not respond much to his story climax. And this seems to cause Bas to move into yet more displays of emotive involvement.

Bas' first expansion of his storytelling at segments 37-45

At 37, in place of the recipients' responses, Bas gives a lexico-semantically explicit assessment of the story events, evaluating them negatively as unbelievable with *dt kAnn doch wohl nich !WAHR! sein*; (*I can't believe it, literally: 'that can't be true at all'*).

¹⁷ Whereas in 35 fast tempo is deployed to contextualize the repair as such, in 36 it seems to iconically symbolize the town authority's fast reaction to the supermarkets' complaint.

{0:54} 37 Bas: <<h, all> dt 'kAnn doch wohl nich
 that can PART PART not
 I can't
 <<falsetto> | ↑ `!WAHR! | sein;>
 true be
 | ((nods)) |
 believe it
 38 (--)

Prosodically, this unit is produced in a high pitch register, with an extra strong and extra high pitch peak plus falsetto voice quality in the primary accented syllable *WAHR* as well as with fast tempo. Additionally, Bas nods his head concomitantly with the primary accent. In comparison to the units before, there is thus a higher number of co-occurring marked cues, designed to make this unit clearly noticeable in its context. In co-occurrence with the negative assessment, they suggest Bas' strong anger, or more precisely: Indignation ('Empörung, Entrüstung') as the particular affect displayed here.¹⁸

After again the recipients do not respond much,¹⁹ in 39-45 Bas expands his story and gives the logic of his story again: He elaborates on the contrast between the citizens' and the supermarkets' success in getting a bus to run, this time making the contrast verbally more explicit than before. His talk suggests maximally strong emotive involvement now, by deploying the following cues.

{0:56} 39 Bas: die lEute loofen | ↑ `!STURM! ? |
 the people go storm |
 | ((right fist clenched)) |
 the people protest
 40 zwEe JAHre lang?
 two years long
 for two years
 41 dass wieder n | ↑ `BUS | `FÄHRT,
 that again a bus rides
 | ((nods)) |
 that a bus goes again
 {1:00} 42 (--) und `NISCHT pas | <<falsetto> ↑ `SIERT?> |
 and nothing happens
 | ((nods)) |
 and nothing happens
 43 Lor: [aber:]
 but
 44 Bas: [und] die machen | Eene | | EIN | gabe,=
 and they make one petition
 | ((nods)) | | ((nods)) |
 and they launch one single petition

¹⁸ 'Indignation' is here conceived of as 'anger' combined with moral condemnation (cf. Günthner 2000).

¹⁹ Cf. again Mandelbaum 1991/1992 and above in this paper.

```
{1:02} 45      =und <<all> | `!ZACK! | [fährt n | `bUs;> | ]
and           rides a bus
              | ((nods)) | | ((nods)) |
and           ((sound object)) there' s a bus going again
```

Rhetorically and lexico-semantically, Bas deploys the idioms *loofen STURM* (literally 'go storm', i.e. *protest fiercely*) (39), the extreme-case formulation *NISCHT pasSIERT* ('nothing happens') (42) with reference to the citizens' many appeals and the responses, and contrasts these with making a single appeal (*Eene EINGabe* 'one single petition' at 44) and the idiomatic sound object *ZACK*, symbolizing sudden events or actions, with reference to the supermarkets' single appeal and the response. With this, he constitutes a kind of second climax of his storytelling to which Lor responds immediately.

Syntactically, we observe short laconic clauses at 39, 41-45 and an expansion at 40, all packaged in separate prosodic units.

Prosodically, the contrast is contextualized as well: Bas produces primary accents with extra high pitch peaks (39, 41,42), an extra strong accent (39), falsetto voice quality (42), rising or even high-rising final pitch (39-42) in order to build up suspension in the first part of the contrast pair. He deploys less marked pitch in 44 and only an extra strong accented syllable *!ZACK!* and final falling pitch in connection with fast tempo in 45 to contextualize the outcome of the supermarkets' petitions.

Visually and vocally, Bas makes a clenched right fist in 39, then embodies nodding head movements concomitantly with primary accents throughout the expansion at 41-45. He now gazes continuously at Lor, after 45 also at Lar.

Sequentially, this expansion creates new possible completion points of the story at which the recipients could respond in alignment and affiliation with Bas, e.g. at the ends of segments 38 and 45. The one in 38 is ignored again; at the end of 42, in 43, Lor begins with an affiliative *aber*: ('but'), but then relinquishes the turn to Bas.

Because of his strong overall marking, Bas' expansion at segments 39-45 suggests the interpretation of even stronger negative evaluation and emotive involvement than before. The **display rule for the speaker's contextualization of emotive involvement** behind this seems to be: The more cues are deployed and the stronger the verbal, phonetic-prosodic, and visual marking of units are realized, the clearer and the better the display will be recognizable as a contextualization of emotive involvement. The particular affect will then be interpretable within the context.

Lor's responses at segments 46-48

Finally, now, at segments 46-47, Lor responds with $\uparrow ge \downarrow NAU:-$ ('exactly'), suggesting something like "I have always known it", i.e. agreement and affiliation with Bas, yet at the same time distancing herself from Bas.

```
{1:02} 45      Bas:  =und <<all> | `!ZACK! | [fährt n | `bUs;> | ]
and           rides a bus
              | ((nods)) | | ((nods)) |
and           ((sound object)) there' s a bus going again
46      Lor:      [ |  $\uparrow ge \downarrow NAU:-$  | ]=
                  Exactly
```


Bas' laughter and response cry at segments 48-49

At 49, Bas produces a response cry (Goffman 1981), suggesting yet another and still stronger evaluation than the ones before, but at the same time framing them like self-talk.

```
{1:05} 49   Bas: [ | <<h,p,all> das is der helle
                |           it is the bright
                | ((shakes head, collapses
                |
                | <<falsetto> ↑ `WAHNSinn;>] |
                |           madness
                |
                | hypoart.; looks straight, like self-talk) |
                | it' s sheer lunacy

50   Lor:   JA*;
        yeah

51   | (---) |
        | ((Lor gazing in from of herself, |
        | pressing lips together in |
        | posture of "knowing smile")) |
```

His response cry *das is der helle WAHNSinn*; ('that's sheer lunacy') makes use of a conventional phrase which in this specific context is another display of indignation ('Empörung, Entrüstung'). We observe an extreme-case formulation (*helle WAHNSinn*). Prosodically, the unit is produced in a high pitch register, fast tempo, low voice, with an extra high pitch peak plus falsetto voice quality in the primary accented syllable and word. The entire unit is furthermore hypoarticulated, i.e. produced with little tension and precision. This fits well with his visual/vocal embodiment here which enacts a contrast of embodied posture to before: After displaying his collapsing shoulders at segment 48, he now displays a head shake and the further collapsing of his body. After Lor and Lar have withdrawn their gaze from him at 48, he gazes ahead (in front of himself). This, in connection with low voice, contextualizes his unit as if it were designed to be self-talk. Sequentially, in response to Lor's prior downgrading, he thereby withdraws from his recipients. At the same time, he makes a strong display of affect which makes recipients' responses and uptake relevant next.

Yet, like before, the recipients do not respond much, Lor only provides the response particle *JA?*; ('yeah') (50), and a pause ensues in which Lor gazes in front of herself and produces a tight-lipped smile that suggests something like "I've always known this". Picture 5 shows the participant postures at segment 50-51.



Picture 5

Bas' second expansion of his storytelling at segments 52-54

Bas continues with detailing the story events, now in a neutral manner, without display of emotive involvement. At 55, however, Lor interrupts Bas with another response in line with her prior one in lines 46-47: *will*↑-KOMmen im kapita↓-LISmus- ('welcome to capitalism').

54 Bas: und davon [MÜSSte man ja eigentlich äh:]
and thereof must one PART actually
 and that should eh

{1:10} 55 Lor: [| will↑-KOMmen im kapita↓-LISmus |]
welcome in Capitalism
 | <<hyperarticulated, stilized contour>> |
 | ((gazing at Bas, raising eyebrows, |
 | then gaze in front of herself and |
 | pressing lips together again)) |
 welcome to capitalism

56 (1.0)

Rhetorically, this idiom of ironic welcome suggests the story events as recurrent and typical for capitalism. Prosodically, this is reinforced by deploying a stylized intonation contour with a higher and a lower pitch plateau contour. Furthermore, Lor's hyperarticulation of this unit, i.e. her tense and precise articulation, contrast with Bas' prior hypoarticulation in segment 49. Her tight-lipped smile invites inferences, invokes a typification: It suggests herself as knowing and the other as lacking some of this, at least momentarily. All these cues combine to suggest the interpretation of Lor's downgrading and perhaps even mildly ridiculing Bas' affect in telling his story.

This analysis is warranted by Bas' reaction: He abandons his unit in 54 and a lapse of 1.0 seconds ensues. After this, Lar shifts topic and Bas quickly joins in in developing the new topic. In this negotiation of the cultural vision or understanding of capitalism, Bas gives up.

Intermediate conclusion from the analysis of extract (3)

(1) In this face-to-face conversation, Bas uses verbal, vocal and visual resources to contextualize the development of events in his story and to make the climax recognizable for the recipients. Basically, the verbal and vocal resources are similar in kind and usage to those that the participants used in the telephone conversation that we looked at before:

rhetorically and lexico-semantically:

- presentation of parties in a conflict as contrasting,
- use of idioms, idiomatic sound objects, and response cries,
- use of intensifiers and extreme-case formulations,

syntactically:

- complex sentence, but split up into several clauses prosodically,
- short clauses,
- pivot-construction,

phonetic-prosodically:

- short prosodic units,
- dynamic pitch contours,
- high pitch register,
- extra-high pitch peaks,
- parallel final rising pitch,
- falsetto voice quality,
- extra-strong accents,
- sound lengthenings,
- changes to fast tempo,
- changes to low voice to suggest 'self-talk',
- hypoarticulation,
- laughter and laughter particles within words.

In addition, Bas and Lor used *visual resources* to stage and display his emotive involvement. In particular, we observed the following cues:

- hand movements,
- clenched fist gesture,
- slashing and pointing gestures,
- head nods and head shakes,
- gaze and withdrawal of gaze,
- tight-lipped smiles and other facial expressions,
- collapsing of body posture.

The more numerous and active his movements become, the more Bas seems to be displaying his emotive involvement.

(2) *Laughter* is displayed by Lor (at 23 and 47) and by Bas (at 48). Bas' display of anger or indignation is accompanied by laughter only late in the telling, that means: After Bas' expansion has culminated in a kind of second climax in segment 45, to which Lor has responded with downgrading. Bas' laughter seems to join in with Lor's mock laughter, both have eye contact during their collaborative laughter. Laughter is in all cases here used as a cue to suggest irony or even sarcasm. This interpretation of irony or sarcasm largely results from the mismatch between the verbal presentation of the complaint on

the one hand and the display of laughter on the other hand. In all cases, this laughter is not an open kind of laughter like in amusing stories, but a kind of subdued laughter functioning as a cue to suggest it as 'mock laughter', i.e. "improper", not-really-meant-as-such laughter.

7. Final conclusions

Speakers display their emotive involvement in face-to-face conversation with the same kinds of verbal and vocal phonetic-prosodic cues as in telephone conversation. Face-to-face conversation also involves visual cues which usually reinforce the verbal and vocal display, but sometimes also contradict it. Altogether, telephone and face-to-face interaction constitute different 'semiotic ecologies' (C. Goodwin, in press).

With respect to syntactic and phonetic-prosodic cues, it is in particular the use and construction of changes from unmarked to marked (or vice versa) realization of cues that is deployed for the signaling and contextualization of affectivity.

In addition, in face-to-face conversation, visual resources such as body posture and its changes, and hand and head movements, especially rhythmic gestures, may be deployed in synchrony with accented syllables in order to accompany, underline and reinforce verbal cues. Their lack, as in telephone conversation, does not preclude the participants' display, recognition and management of affectivity. As example (2) shows, it is the verbal and vocal resources, i.e. those described as phonetic and prosodic, that seem to be most crucial and constitutive of the display and recognition of affectivity in talk-in-interaction. When the 'wording' displays affect, but the 'tone' does not, this is demonstrably not interpreted and treated as 'emotively involved' by the participants in the next turns.

There seems to be a *display rule for the speaker's contextualization of emotive involvement*: The more cues are deployed and the stronger the verbal, prosodic, and visual marking of units are realized, the clearer and the better the display will be recognizable as a contextualization of emotive involvement. The particular affect has to be interpreted within the sequential and semantic context.

In unproblematic cases, the display and affiliative uptake of affectivity in climaxes of storytelling is organized in a *sequence of two successive adjacency pairs for the collaborative treatment of affectivity with affiliation*: The first one to display and accomplish shared affectivity, the second one to consolidate and then exit from the display of shared affectivity. Displays of affectivity are weaker in the second adjacency pair than in the first.

In more problematic cases of disaffiliative responses, the lack of affiliation leads to the storyteller's expansion and re-doing of displays of affectivity. Even though the recipient may withhold affiliative responses or provide disaffiliative responses, in all cases, *the storytellers can be observed to orient to receiving matching responses*: The *recipients' withholding of affiliative responses* to the climax of the story with the display of emotive involvement causes the storyteller to *expand* the storytelling in order to presumably provide new points of relevance for recipient responses. The expansions may display even stronger and clearer emotive involvement, presumably in order to again and more clearly elicit affiliative responses.

Methodologically, these latter points demonstrate the most important validation method for our analyses, the "next-turn-proof-procedure" (Sacks). Hypotheses and

descriptions can be validated by showing that and how in next turns participants in talk-in-interaction orient to the objects and devices under analysis.

In all three examples we could see how the storyteller's display of affect and the story recipients' treating of it constituted the *negotiation and management of affectivity*.

- In extract (1), Hajo responded fully affiliatively to Carina's story climax with her display of reconstructed past 'anger' or 'indignation'. He even converges at the structure of her just prior displays and at her facial expression. It was shown how the storyteller and recipient monitor each other closely and thus manage their displays of affectivity throughout the sequences. This shows the interlocutors' precise monitoring and management of their displays of affectivity. Here, where the interlocutors produce matching displays of affect, Carina treats Hajo's displays of his agreement and affiliation as unremarkable and immediately continues her telling.

- In extract (2), Vati's rather neutral responses, not matching Dolli's affectivity, led to Dolli's display of changed affects: From initial 'annoyance' to later 'being hurt'. For the analyst, Vati's withholding of emotive involvement could be reconstructed as a particular kind of activity: An instance of 'doing being father'.

- In extract (3), Lor's and Lar's not matching responses were described to lead to Bas' expansion and detailing of his complaint or even indignation story, with each time stronger assessments and stronger displays of affectivity, until, finally, he demonstrably retreats into 'self-talk' and then gives up his topic.

In many cases, the display of 'anger' or 'indignation' is accompanied by *laughter*. This laughter is not an open, clear kind of laughter, but a subdued, "forced" one that suggests 'mock laughter'. It seems to be designed to modify the displayed affectivity, to display the complainant's distance and affective control in relation to the complaint, as, for instance, when 'anger' as the affect of the storyworld is modified by laughter in the here-and-now. This suggests that in the case of 'anger', heightened emotive involvement seems to be treated by the participants as something negative, which is also expressed in the common phrasing "Du brauchst dich gar nicht aufzuregen/ärgern!" ('You need not get upset!' or the like). This, in turn, would account for *the recipients' not responding with displays of the same affect, say anger and indignation, of their own*. There is *no simple "mirroring" of affects* in natural social interaction. Logically for interaction, recipients would rather be expected to perform the complementary task of perhaps soothing, calming down, de-escalating the speaker's emotive involvement.

The case studies have shown that in everyday conversations emotive involvement in general or the specific affect in particular – except in cases of so-called "great" or pathological emotions – does not seem to be something that uncontrollably flows out of an individual or can be captured with reference to only its individual and cognitive reality. Emotive involvement and affectivity is displayed, responded to and negotiated in talk-in-interaction. This is what we call the 'management of affectivity by the participants in interaction'.

References

- Bamberg, M. (1997) Emotion talk(s). The role of perspective in the construction of emotions. In S. Niemeier & R. Dirven (eds.), *The language of emotions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 209-225.

- Christmann, G.B., and S. Günthner (1996) Sprache und Affekt. Die Inszenierung von Entrüstung im Gespräch. *Deutsche Sprache* 1: 1-33.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. (1999) Coherent voicing: On prosody in conversational reported speech. In W. Bublitz & U. Lenk (eds.), *Coherence in spoken and written discourse: How to create it and how to describe it*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 11-32.
- Drew, P. (1998) Complaints about transgressions and misconduct. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 31.3-4: 295-325.
- Drew, P., and E. Holt (1988) Complainable matters: The use of idiomatic expressions in making complaints. *Social Problems* 35.4: 398-417.
- Emerson, R.M., and S.L. Messinger (1977) The micro-politics of trouble. *Social Problems* 25: 121-34.
- Goffman, E. (1978) Response cries. *Language* 54: 787-815.
- Goffman, E. (1981) *Forms of talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goodwin, C. (1984) Notes on story structure and the organization of participation. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 225-246.
- Goodwin, C. (1996) Transparent vision. In E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff & S.A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 370-404.
- Goodwin, C. (in press) Constructing meaning through prosody in aphasia. To appear in D. Barth-Weingarten, E. Reber & M. Selting (eds.), *Prosody in interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Goodwin, M.H. (1980) Processes of mutual monitoring implicated in the production of descriptive sequences. *Sociological Inquiry* 50: 303-317.
- Goodwin, M.H. (1990) *He-Said-She-Said. Talk as social organization among black children*. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Goodwin, M.H. (1997) By-play: Negotiating evaluation in storytelling. In G.R. Guy, C. Feagin, D. Schriffin & J. Baugh (eds.), *Towards a social science of language, Vol. 2: Social interaction and discourse structures*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 77-102.
- Goodwin, C., and M.H. Goodwin (1987) Concurrent operations on talk: Notes on the interactive organization of assessments. *IPRA Papers in Pragmatics* 1.1: 1-54.
- Goodwin, M.H., and C. Goodwin (2000) Emotion within situated activity. In A. Duranti (ed.), *Linguistic anthropology: A reader*. Malden, MA/Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 239-257.
- Günthner, S. (1997) The contextualization of affect in reported dialogues. In S. Niemeier & R. Dirven (eds.), *The language of emotions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 247-275.
- Günthner, S. (1999) Polyphony and the 'layering of voices' in reported dialogues: An analysis of the use of prosodic devices in everyday reported speech. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31: 685-708.
- Günthner, S. (2000) *Vorwurfsaktivitäten in der Alltagsinteraktion*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Günthner, S. (2005) "Dichte Konstruktionen". *InLiSt* (Interaction and Linguistic Structures) 43 (<<http://www.uni-potsdam.de/u/inlist/issues/43/index.htm>>)

Harré, R. (1986) An outline of the social constructionist viewpoint. In R. Harré (ed.), *The social construction of emotions*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 2-14.

Hochschild, A.R. (1979) Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure. *American Journal of Sociology* 85.3: 551-575.

Hochschild, A.R. (1983) *The managed heart. Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jefferson, G. (1978) Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In J. Schenkein (ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 219-248.

Jefferson, G. (1990) List construction as a task and interactional resource. In G. Psathas (ed.), *Interaction competence*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, pp. 63-92.

Klewitz, G., and E. Couper-Kuhlen (1999) Quote-unquote. The role of prosody in the contextualization of reported speech sequences. *Pragmatics*. 9.4: 459-485.

Lindblom, B. (1990) Explaining phonetic variation: A sketch of the HandH theory. In W.J. Hardcastle & A. Marchal (eds.), *Speech production and speech modelling*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 273-296.

Local, John, and Gareth Walker (2008) Stance and affect in conversation: On the interplay of sequential and phonetic resources. *Text & Talk* 28-6: 723-747.

Mandelbaum, J. (1991/1992) Conversational non-cooperation: An exploration of disattended complaints. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 25: 97-138.

Ochs, Elinor, and Bambi Schieffelin (1989) Language has a heart. *Text* 9.1: 7-25.

Ogden, R. (2006) Phonetics and social action in agreements and disagreements. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 1752-1775.

Ogden, R. (in press) Prosodic constructions in making complaints. To appear in D. Barth-Weingarten, E. Reber & M. Selting (eds.), (in press). *Prosody in interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Peräkylä, A., and J. Ruusuvoori (2006) Facial expression in an assessment. In H. Knoblauch, B. Schnettler, J. Raab & H.G. Soeffner (eds.), *Video analysis: Methodology and methods*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, pp. 127-142.

Pomerantz, Anita (1986) Extreme case formulations: A way of legitimizing claims. *Human Studies* 9: 219-29.

Quasthoff, U. (1980) *Erzählen in Gesprächen*. Tübingen: Narr.

Quasthoff, U.M. (2001) Erzählen als interaktive Gesprächsstruktur. In K. Brinker et al. (eds.), *Text- und Gesprächslinguistik. HSK 16. Volume 2: Gesprächslinguistik*. Berlin etc.: de Gruyter, pp. 1293-1309.

Quasthoff, U.M., and T. Becker (eds.) (2005) *Narrative interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Raymond, Geoffrey, and John Heritage (2006) The epistemics of social relations: Owning grandchildren. *Language in Society* 35: 677-705.

Reber, E. (2008) Affectivity in talk-in-interaction: Sound objects in English. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Potsdam.

- Ryave, A. (1978) On the achievement of a series of stories. In J. Schenkein (ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 113-132.
- Sacks, H. (1971) Das Erzählen von Geschichten innerhalb von Unterhaltungen. In R. Kjolseth & F. Sack (eds.), *Zur Soziologie der Sprache*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, pp. 307-314.
- Sacks, H. (1986) Some considerations of a story told in ordinary conversation. *Poetics* 15: 127-138.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2007) *Sequence organization in interaction. A Primer in Conversation Analysis. Volume 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scheutz, H. (1992) Apokoinukonstruktionen. Gegenwartssprachliche Erscheinungsformen und Aspekte ihrer historischen Entwicklung. In A. Weiss (ed.), *Dialekte im Wandel*. Göttingen: Kümmerle, S., pp. 243-264.
- Scheutz, H. (2005) Pivot constructions in spoken German. In A. Hakulinen & M. Selting (eds.), *Syntax and lexis in conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 103-128.
- Selting, Margret (1994) Emphatic speech style - with special focus on the prosodic signalling of heightened emotive involvement in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 22.1994: 375-408.
- Selting, Margret (2007) Lists as embedded structures and the prosody of list construction as an interactional resource. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 483-526
(<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.07.008>).
- Selting, M.; P. Auer, B. Barden, J. Bergmann, E. Couper-Kuhlen, S. Günthner, U. Quasthoff, C. Meier, P. Schlobinski, and S. Uhmman (1998) Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem (GAT). In *Linguistische Berichte* 173: 91-122.
- Selting, Margret et al. (2009) Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem 2 (GAT 2). To appear in *Gesprächsforschung – Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion* (www.gespraechsforschung-ozs.de)
- Stivers, Tanya (2008) Stance, alignment, and affiliation during storytelling: When nodding is a token of affiliation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41.1: 31-57.
- Wilkinson, Sue, and Celia Kitzinger (2006) Surprise as an interactional achievement: Reaction tokens in conversation. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 69.2: 150-182.

Appendix: Transcription conventions

(for details see Selting et al. 1998 and 2009)

Sequential structure

[]	overlap and simultaneous talk
[]	
=	latching

Pauses

(.)	micropause
(-), (--), (---)	brief, mid, longer pauses of ca. 0.25 - 0.75 secs.; until ca. 1 sec.
(2.0)	estimated pause, more than ca. 1 sec. duration
(2.85)	measured pause (notation with two digits after the dot)

Other segmental conventions

<i>und=äh</i>	assimilations within units
;, ::, :::	segmental lengthening, according to duration
<i>äh, öh, etc.</i>	hesitation signals, so-called 'filled pauses'
*	cut-off with glottal closure

Accentuation

<i>akZENT</i>	strong, primary accent
<i>ak!ZENT!</i>	extra strong accent
<i>akzEnt</i>	weaker, secondary accents

Pitch at the end of units

?	rising to high
,	rising to mid
-	level
;	falling to mid
.	falling to low

Notation of pitch movement in and after accented syllable

`SO	falling
˘SO	rising
ˉSO	level
˘˘SO	rising-falling
˘˘SO	falling-rising
↑	pitch jump up to peak of accented syllable
↓	pitch jump down to valley of accented syllable

Rhythm

/xxx /xx x/xx	rhythmically integrated talk: '/' is placed before a rhythmic beat
---------------	--

Conspicuous pitch jumps

↑	to higher pitch
↓	to lower pitch

Changed register, end indicated by final '>'

<<l>	>	low register
<<h>	>	high register

Laughter

<i>haha hehe hihi</i>	laugh syllables	
<i>((laughter))</i>	description of laughter	
<<laughingly>	>	notation of voice quality, end indicated by final '>'

Changes in loudness and speech rate, end indicated by final '>'

<<f>	>	=forte, loud
<<ff>	>	=fortissimo, very loud
<<p>	>	=piano, soft

<<pp> >	=pianissimo, very soft
<<all> >	=allegro, fast
<<len> >	=lento, slow
<<cresc> >	=crescendo, continuously louder
<<dim> >	=diminuendo, continuously softer
<<acc> >	=accelerando, continuously faster
<<rall> >	=rallentando, continuously slower

Breathing

.h, .hh, .hhh	inbreath, according to duration
h, hh, hhh	outbreath, according to duration

Other conventions

((nods))	non-verbal/visual and extralinguistic activities and events
<<noddingly> >	concomitant para- and extralinguistic activities and event with notation of scope
<<whispery> >	description of voice quality
()	unintelligible according to duration
(solche)	uncertain transcription
(solche/welche)	possible alternatives
((...))	omissions in the transcript
talk talk talk	parallel verbal and visual actions
((nods))	