

On affiliation and alignment: Non-cooperative uses of anticipatory completions in the context of tellings

Short title: On affiliation and alignment

Marja Etelämäki^a, Trine Heinemann & Anna Vatanen^{b*}

^aDepartment of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies, Faculty of Humanities,
University of Oslo, Norway

^bResearch Unit for Languages and Literature, Faculty of Humanities, University of
Oulu, Finland

*Corresponding author, Email: anna.vatanen@oulu.fi

Postal address: Faculty of Humanities, FI-90014 University of Oulu, P.O. Box 1000,
Finland.

Tel. +358 40 722 5284

Size: 12 783 words

128 kilobytes

Abstract

In this paper, we address the larger notion of cooperation in interaction and its underlying dimensions as defined in Conversation Analysis: alignment and affiliation. Focusing on three cases from three different languages (Danish, Estonian and Finnish) we investigate a specific practice, that of anticipatory completions, in a particular context, that of storytelling, and show that the practice of completing another speaker's turn in an anticipatory manner is not de facto definable as either an aligning or non-aligning action, nor can it be said to be either affiliating or non-affiliating. Through our analyses, we aim to distinguish and illustrate the manifold layers of and perspectives to alignment and affiliation and argue for their relevance for studies of interactional phenomena. We conclude that the notion of cooperation and its implementation through affiliating and/or aligning actions is a multi-layered and complex issue, the intricacies of which are best understood and captured through detailed sequential analyses.

Keywords

Conversation Analysis, alignment, affiliation, cooperation, anticipatory completions, tellings

Autobiographies

MARJA ETELÄMÄKI is an Associate Professor at the Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies, University of Oslo. Her research concerns the relation of grammar to social interaction. In particular, she has worked on indexical elements such as pronouns and particles, and on particular forms of requests. Lately, her interests have included also the ways in which agency and experience are construed dynamically in the course of interaction by means of the personal system of Finnish.

TRINE HEINEMANN is an independent scholar, associated with the Finnish Centre of Excellence in Research on Intersubjectivity in Interaction. Her research interests include the relationship between linguistic format and action, for instance with respect to requests, the impact of the material world on interaction, as well as how language is used in a range of institutional settings, for instance in home help visits and audiology consultations.

ANNA VATANEN is a postdoctoral research fellow at the Research Unit for Languages and Literature at the University of Oulu, Finland. She has also worked at the Centre of Excellence on Intersubjectivity in Interaction at the University of Helsinki. The phenomena she has investigated include turn-taking organization, silent moments in

interaction, various units of language, social actions, and multiactivity. She is interested in cross-linguistic comparisons and works on both Finnish and Estonian data.

Introduction

That the human “interaction engine” (Levinson, 2006) is largely pro-social in that it aims at social bonding and cooperation is something that has been suggested across disciplines (e.g., Allwood, 1976; Axelrod, 1984; Clayman, 2002; Enfield, 2006; Grice, 1975). In the field of Conversation Analysis, cooperation has been considered in terms of alignment and affiliation, with alignment being understood as cooperation at the *s t r u c t u r a l* level, including aspects such as facilitating and supporting the proposed activity/sequence, accepting proposed interactional roles, accepting presuppositions and terms, and matching formal (grammatical) design preferences, whereas affiliation should be understood as cooperation at the *a f f e c t i v e* level, including aspects such as displaying empathy, matching, supporting and endorsing stance, and cooperation with action preferences (Stivers et al., 2011: 20–21, see also Lindström and Sorjonen, 2013; Steensig, 2012). But though cooperation – and with this also alignment and affiliation – is seemingly considered one of the most basic underlying dimensions of interaction and human sociality, there is as yet a strong paucity of work that specifically addresses how affiliation and alignment can be defined and distinguished and whether these concepts have any actual analytical relevance in contributing to our understanding of social cooperation. In practice, affiliation and alignment are typically employed in the conversation analytic literature as descriptions of how particular turns-at-talk can be

more or less cooperative (e.g., Couper-Kuhlen, 2012; Gorisch et al., 2011; Heritage, 2011; Kaukomaa et al., 2013; Lee and Tanaka, 2016 and the articles in that special issue; Steensig and Larsen, 2008) and the two terms are sometimes used even interchangeably (see, e.g., Steensig and Drew, 2008 for a discussion of this). This somewhat muddled landscape is reflected by the fact that two recent handbook entries on affiliation and/or alignment explicitly call for “continued research [...] of how affiliation and alignment play out in different types of activities and sequential contexts” (Lindström and Sorjonen, 2013: 367; see also Steensig, 2012).

In the service of defining and distinguishing affiliation and alignment further and in order to demonstrate the analytical relevance of these concepts for understanding social cooperation, we, in this paper, investigate the underlying dimensions of alignment and affiliation as they are employed and/or oriented to by participants in interaction through a particular interactional practice, that of producing an anticipatory completion. This practice has largely been understood and described as being, *prima facie*, both aligning and affiliating: On the structural level, anticipatory completions can be understood as aligning, in so far as they are built to be grammatically contiguous with a turn-constructional unit (TCU) already in progress, and as they propose a completion of that TCU (e.g., Lerner, 1996a, 2004; Szczepek, 2000a). Anticipatory completions are also known as ‘pre-emptive completions’, ‘co-completions’, ‘collaborative completions’,

‘co-constructions’ or ‘collaborative productions’ (e.g., Hayashi, 1999; Helasvuo, 2004; Lerner, 1996a, 2002, 2004; Szczepek, 2000b). As many of these terms suggest, anticipatory completions are typically discussed as being employed for cooperation also on the affective level, i.e., being affiliative, in so far as they are used, for instance, to help out a current speaker with finding a word, to express understanding of, and agreement with what a current speaker is articulating, or to form an in-group with a current speaker. From conversation analytic explorations of other practices that are prima facie cooperative, we know, however, that any such practice may, when employed in a specific sequential position, in fact be *n o n - a l i g n i n g*, *n o n - a f f i l i a t i v e*, or both (see, e.g., Antaki, 2012; Steensig, 2012; Steensig and Larsen, 2008; Stivers, 2008).¹ A smaller body of research has made such observations for anticipatory completions, noting that this practice can also be used for competitive turn taking (e.g., Brenning, 2015: 226–229; Lerner, 2002; but see Szczepek, 2000a for a somewhat opposing view) and teasing activities (Bolden et al., 2019; Brenning, 2015: 229–231; Hayashi, 2013; Szczepek, 2000b) as well as for subverting – derailing or exaggerating – the action-in-progress (Bolden et al., 2019).²

Following the implications of this line of research, we will use anticipatory completions as a window into exploring affiliation and alignment as different levels of social cooperation. As we shall demonstrate, anticipatory completions aptly reveal the multi-

faceted face of cooperation – and non-cooperation – as they can, e.g., be designed to be cooperative or non-cooperative from the beginning, they can be locally non-cooperative but yet cooperative with respect to a larger sequential trajectory, or they can end up being non-cooperative even if they were designed to be cooperative.

Data and methodology: Three examples of anticipatory completions produced in tellings in Danish, Estonian and Finnish

The data that forms the basis for the subsequent analysis consist of a collection of anticipatory completions sourced from interactional corpora in three languages: Danish, Estonian and Finnish. These corpora each include both face-to-face and telephone conversations of an everyday nature, i.e., taking place between friends and family members in relatively informal settings. We have included in our collection all instances in which one participant produces a turn-at-talk that is grammatically contiguous with a clearly unfinished turn-constructive unit being produced by a co-participant. While the three languages were chosen for very practical reasons, namely that each author is a speaker of (at least) one of these languages and has access to interactional corpora in that language, we are also implicitly attempting to prove a methodological point: while speakers of different languages are known to have available to them and use different types of resources for implementing specific interactional practices (see, e.g., Sidnell

and Enfield, 2013, for a discussion and examples of this), the dimensions of cooperation are presumably of universal relevance for all human beings. Thus, while the different grammatical structures of Danish, Estonian and Finnish do mean that the way in which the anticipatory completion is produced in each of the languages may differ,³ the underlying reasons and the outcomes of this practice are the same.

The three anticipatory completions that we will analyze in this paper are presented below, to illustrate how speaker B in each case produces a turn that is a grammatical continuation of speaker A's turn-in-progress:⁴

(1) Finnish

- A: *ja sit totta kai ku se on*
 PRT PRT of course PRT DEM3.SG be.3
 and then of course when/as it has been
- niinku kaasuuntunu*
 PRT gasify-PPC
 like gasified
- B: *ni se räjähtää.*
 PRT DEM3.SG explode-3
 so/then it explodes.

(2) Estonian

- A: *ta- nagu otsustab ikkagi:: .hh*
 3SG PRT decide:3SG anyway
 she- like decides anyway .hh
- B: *lähtuvalt teistest.*

based.on other:PL:ELA
based on others.

(3) Danish

A: *det der legat hun havde søgt*
DEM.SG.N stipend.N 3SG.F have.PST seek.PTCP
that scholarship she had applied for in

i forskningsrådet<
PREP research.council-DEF
the research council<

B: *>det fik hun?<*
DEM.SG.N get.PST 3SG.F
>that she got?<

Both the structure and the interactional impact of each of the three anticipatory completions will be discussed in more detail in the remainder of this paper; suffice for now to point out that in all three examples, speaker B's turn:

- (a) is grammatically fitted to a prior incomplete TCU delivered by A, and
- (b) serves to bring that TCU to a possible completion.

What is not evident from the three examples as they are presented above is that they are all produced in the context of story tellings, and, moreover, were initially identified by us as being in some way non-cooperative in the context of that activity. As tellings constitute an interactional environment in which participants are already known

to negotiate and attend to both structural alignment and affective affiliation during all its phases (e.g., Stivers, 2008), and as a sense of non-cooperation seemed like a good starting point for exploring this issue, we have thus chosen the three examples above to be investigated in more analytic detail for the remainder of this paper. With this, we hope to shed some light on the range of ways in which participants in interaction can produce turns-at-talk that embody affiliation, non-affiliation, alignment, non-alignment, or a combination of either, at different levels of interaction and to different degrees of cooperation.

Non-cooperative anticipatory completions in tellings

In order for a telling to be produced successfully, the turn-by-turn talk that is ordinarily in play (Sacks et al., 1974) is suspended and participants take on the roles of teller and recipient, respectively. A prospective teller, for instance, can use various cues to indicate that he or she is about to launch a telling and simultaneously to provide the recipients with indications of what kind of telling is being launched and what kind of reaction it makes relevant next. Similarly, in order to conclude a telling (and return to turn-by-turn talk), the teller does work to make the end of a telling recognizable as such. Recipients, in turn, monitor the teller's actions in order to participate as recipients of a telling, thus drawing on the cues provided by the teller in order to respond

appropriately, as recipients, at each stage of the telling (e.g., Drummond and Hopper, 1993; Duranti and Brenneis, 1986; Goodwin, 1984; Jefferson, 1978; Kjærbeck and Asmuß, 2005; Mandelbaum, 1989; Sacks, 1972, 1992).

In the context of tellings, the production of an anticipatory completion can be a highly cooperative move (e.g., Brenning, 2015). For instance, when used at the conclusion of a telling to indicate understanding that the telling is complete, anticipatory completions support and facilitate the activity, and match the formal design preferences in the sense that they are grammatically fitted to the prior turn, thus aligning with the prior turn. Moreover, anticipatory completions may display affect in relation to the content of the telling, thus affiliating with the telling. Anticipatory completions are, however, intrinsically contradictory with respect to alignment and affiliation, i.e., cooperation. While they do align with the activity and match the formal design preferences of the previous turn, they do not align with the proposed interactional roles, i.e., those of speaker and listener. Moreover, while they may be used for displaying empathy and support the stance of the telling, they do not necessarily cooperate with action preference. They are, thus, not *g e n e r i c a l l y* cooperative nor non-cooperative. As we shall demonstrate in the following analysis, anticipatory completions that are produced in the context of tellings can also be less cooperative, for instance when they are produced too early in the telling (examples 1 and 3), when the recipient does not

30 ANN: [*ni se räjähtää.= aivan,*]
 PRT DEM.SG explode-3. exactly
 so/then it explodes. exactly.

The anticipatory completion that Anna produces in line 30 is delivered at the end of a telling initiated by Beea about a ‘bonfire video’ from YouTube. Before Beea initiated this telling, the two women have agreed that the tv-show ‘Funniest Home Videos’ often shows videos that are not really funny, because the events shown could be dangerous and people get hurt. As an example of this, Anna has told about the Russian version of the show, where the videos (according to her) are of the type where people ‘pour gasoline on something, ignite it and then it explodes’. As we can see from the following, Beea’s telling is thus both topically and interactionally triggered – or, locally occasioned (Jefferson, 1978):

Example 1a

1 BEE: >*no siis ku< ^mä oon näh^ny hei jo- jonku*
 PRT PRT PRT 1SG be.3 see-PPTCP PRT some.GEN
 NO SIIS KU I have seen hey o- one ((that was))

2 *sellasen ihan (.) jossain juutuubissa*
 DEM3.ADJ-GEN totally some.INE youtube-INE
 such a totally (.) somewhere like in YouTube

3 *joku (.) näytti sellasen niinku*
 someone show-PST DEM.ADJ-GEN PRT
 someone (.) showed such like

ann *^lifts cup ^moves cup to lips^*

4 *^ihan hirveen kokon^ sytyttämivideon^*
 totally horrible-GEN bonfire-GEN ignition.video-GEN

According to Routarinne (2003: 88–98; see also Mazeland, 2007), parentheticals can serve to introduce relevant background information or to direct the recipient’s affective stance towards what is being told, and as we see here in lines 9–10, Beea expands on a particular position, namely that Finns would not behave dangerously around bonfires, as they are ‘so familiar’ with the dangers because of the Finnish midsummer bonfire tradition. That the parenthetical remark constitutes a shift, both in the focus of Beea’s telling and in the general stance towards the topic, is evident from Anna’s behaviour: before this, she has taken on the position of a telling recipient, first by producing the continuer *mmm* in line 7, then by taking her tea cup, moving it towards her lips and beginning to take a sip (line 9), thus indicating that the ordinary turn-by-turn organization of talk has been suspended and that Beea has been allocated the role of a teller. However, at the point at which it becomes evident that the focus of the telling has shifted, i.e., when Beea produces the word *kaikki* (‘all [Finns]’), Anna removes the tea cup from her lips (line 10) and produces a token of disagreement *älä viitti*, ‘don’t say’ (line 11), in overlap with Beea’s talk. This disagreement is produced with laughter particles and a smile on Anna’s face, a smile that she holds throughout her inbreaths in lines 13 and 14. While Beea is taking a serious stance towards the topic of ‘bonfire videos’ by seeking to explicate how Finns would not put themselves in such a situation, Anna through her smile and her disagreement proposes a more humorous stance towards the same topic (on ‘turn-opening smiles’, see Kaukomaa et al., 2013). When

Beea fails to reciprocate Anna's smile and continues her telling, Anna now makes an explicit bid for producing a telling by stating overtly that she has 'a story about this' (line 17). As the continuation of example 1 illustrates, however, Beea ignores this bid and continues her telling. It is in this context that Anna produces the anticipatory completion (line 30):

Example 1c

```

bee      +waves left hand over shoulder+lowers left hand, lifts
          right hand over shoulder+
ann      -->^leans back in chair,
          releasing elbow from table-->
20 BEE:  +↑valelee sen          niinku  +^bensalla    sill(h)ee+
          douse-3 DEM.SG-GEN PRT      gasoline-ADE DEM.MAN
          douse it with gasoline l(h)ike

bee      +waves right hand over shoulder, then lowers it
          +lifts left hand, fingers pinched
          in a 'holding a can' position-->
ann      -->^flicks hair from face with left hand^
          places cup on saucer-->
21      +loron loron sen^      niinku+ ja sit^[ne   tekee
          IDEO IDEO DEM.SG-GEN PRT      PRT PRT DEM.PL do-3
          gurgle gurgle it and then they make
22 ANN:                                     [
          [mm

bee      -->+moves left hand, 'pouring' gasoline'-->
ann      -->^
23 BEE:  sellasen^+  niinku (0.5) tällasen  niinku
          DEM.ADJ-GEN PRT          DEM.ADJ-GEN PRT
          the kind of like (0.5) this kind of like

bee      -->+lowers left hand,
          lifts right hand slightly+
24      vanan      siihen      niin[ku kameran+  lähelle+
          trail-GEN DEM.SG-ILL PRT      camera-GEN close-ALL
          a trail there like close to the camera
          [

```

25 ANN: [joo
yeah

bee +moves hand together, 'striking a match', then
lowers hands+

ann Anods^

26 BEE: ja sit +niinku siit ^sytyt[tää^+
PRT PRT PRT DEM.SG-ELA ignite-3
and then ignite it from there

27 ANN: [
[mm

bee +lifts hands to breast height+throws
hands over shoulders-->

28 BEE: -> ja sit totta +kai+ ku se on
PRT PRT of course PRT DEM.SG be.3
and then of course when/as it has been

bee -->+moves hands forwards-->

29 -> niinku+ [kaasuuntunu]
PRT gasify-PPTCP
like gasified
[]

30 ANN: => [ni se räjähtää.= aivan,]
PRT DEM.SG explode-3. exactly
so it explodes exactly

Although Anna has clearly stated that she has a story to tell, she accepts the role of being a recipient to Beea's continued telling, thus aligning with the telling's sequential progression. Her contributions during this sequence consist only of minimal response tokens (lines 22, 25 and 27), however. Though Beea does work to animate the telling by enacting the pouring of gasoline on the bonfire in line 21 (e.g., Niemelä, 2010; Sidnell, 2006) and thus further soliciting affiliation from Anna, Anna produces neither nods (see Stivers, 2008) nor facial expressions (see Kaukomaa et al., 2013) to display such

affiliation and instead remains in a position of passive reciprocity, leaning back in her chair and maintaining a blank face.

At this point then, we have a telling produced by Beea underway through which she is basically indicating the position that Finns (unlike Russians) would not pour gasoline excessively onto a bonfire before igniting it, because they are familiar with how to properly ignite bonfires. Anna has clearly resisted affiliating with this position, first by explicitly disagreeing with this stance (line 11), then by stating that she has a story to tell about exactly that kind of situation (line 17). Beea, however, has persisted in her telling (and the stance encompassed in it), seeking Anna's affiliation through additional means, for instance through enactment. In this context, Anna's resistance towards Beea's telling and the stance encompassed in it is further evidenced through the production of the anticipatory completion in line 30. The anticipatory completion clearly aligns with the formal design preferences of Beea's turn (lines 28–29) in that it provides the *ni(in)* ('so/then') clause projected by the *ku(n)* ('as/when') initiated clause and is thus syntactically fitted to that turn. The anticipatory completion is, however, positioned slightly early and in overlap with *kaasuuntunu*, 'gasified', which renders it a sense of pre-emptiveness in that it indicates that Anna does not need to wait for the production of the word 'gasified' to be able to demonstrate her understanding (see, Sacks, 1992: 140–142; Vatanen, 2014: 121–151; Vatanen, 2018). This is further

31 BEE: *ni siit +tulee sellanen+ niinku mieletön*
 PER DEM.SG-ELA come-3 DEM.ADJ PRT mindless
 so it becomes such like an insane

bee -->+lowers both hands to lap+

32 *flekkis niinku+ suunnilleen et se+*
 flame PRT approximately PRT DEM.SG
 flame like approximately so that

bee +raises right hand, throws it over shoulder-->
 33 +(0.5)

34 ANN: *joo.*
 yeah

bee -->+lowers right hand to table-->
 ann ^moves left hand to right arm, brushes arm-->
 ann <looks down and left-->

35 BEE: *vuff+ (.)^ja (.) silleen <et sit (0.5)*
 IDEO PRT DEM.MAN PRT PRT
 wuff (.) and (.) like then (0.5)

36 *ku mä näin sen mä olin*
 PRT 1SG see-PST-1SG DEM.SG-GEN 1SG be-PST-1SG
 when I saw it I was

ann <looks to BEE>>
 ann -->^

37 *<silleen et hei et oikeesti^*
 DEM.MAN PRT PRT PRT really
 like hey seriously

38 *et ei toi oo hauskaa et*
 PRT NEG.3 DEM.SG be fun-PAR PRT
 like that is not fun like

bee -->+

39 *tos on tullu ruu[miita.]+*
 DEM.SG-INE be.3 come-PPTCP corpse-PL-PAR
 that has produced corpses

40 ANN: []
 [°nii::,°]
 yeah

bee +takes cup, lifts to mouth>>

41 ANN: *+siis (.) mmhm tämä kyseinen,=*
 PRT DEM.SG in.question
 you see (.) mmhm this ((video)) in question

42 =en tiedä olik^s se just tää
 NEG-1SG know be-PST-Q DEM.SG exactly DEM.SG
 I don't know if it was exactly this one

(Followed by a story about Anna's brother who had seen the videos that had been circulated in e-mails and who had then used gasoline for their midsummer bonfire.)

Instead of responding to the anticipatory completion, for instance by confirming or rejecting it, Beea provides her own completing *ni(in)* ('so/then') clause, 'so it becomes such like an insane flame like approximately so that (0.5) vuff'. Content-wise, this clause is not very different from Anna's 'so it explodes'. In terms of affect, however, Beea's *ni(in)* clause is much more loaded; the explosion is (once more) enacted gesturally and through the sound object *vuff*. In thus providing the climax of her telling once again and in an affective manner, Beea provides another slot in which an affiliative, evaluating response could be produced by Anna. Anna, on the other hand, appears to maintain her resistance, producing only minimal response tokens (lines 34, 40) as before (e.g., example 1c, lines 22–27). In the face of Anna's resistance, Beea produces her own evaluation (lines 35–39). Anna receipts the evaluation with *nii*, produced with low volume and level or flat pitch and as a separate unit from what follows. In this context, the *nii* treats the stance taken by Beea as inadequate (see Sorjonen, 2001: 185–198). Moreover, Anna immediately after the production of *nii* in line 40 launches her own telling (lines 41–42) which reasserts her own prior stance. The

particle *siis* at the beginning of the turn (line 41) frames the telling as a ‘my side’ telling bearing emotive content that draws from Anna’s personal experience (Hakulinen and Couper-Kuhlen, 2015). The telling explicitly expresses that Beea’s telling was no news to her and that furthermore, she had personal experience over the matter Beea’s telling was about, and that her experience goes against Beea’s stance.

In example 1, the anticipatory completion is thus non-cooperative in various respects. Although it aligns with respect to the grammatical progression of the first part of the compound TCU by being grammatically fitted, it does not align with the sequential progression of the telling, leaving the response slot for the teller to fill herself. It also fails to affiliate with respect to the evaluative-affective stance towards the story.

Moreover, it fails to align with respect to the whole tellability – and therefore relevance – of the story, since it demonstrates that the story was no news to its recipient.

Circumventing evaluation of a co-participant’s intimate friend

Example 2 is from an Estonian face-to-face interaction between two young women, Margit and Katrin. The anticipatory completion *lähtuvalt teistest*, ‘based on others’ is produced by Katrin in line 25 where it completes Margit’s utterance *ta nagu otsustab ikkagi*, ‘she (like) decides anyway’ in lines 23–24. In theory, the clause *ta nagu otsustab*

ikkagi is syntactically complete, since it could be understood as encompassing an implicit object nominating what it is that is decided (cf. the English ‘she (like) decides anyway’). However, in this context (shown below) the TCU in progress is both pragmatically and prosodically incomplete, and the anticipatory completion produced by Katrin takes the TCU to its possible end in a grammatically contiguous manner.

Example (2) (Estonian): Too good [AN3]

23 MAR: *ta=i `suuda noh, ta=e- ta- nagu*
 3SG NEG be.able PRT 3SG NEG 3SG PRT
 she is not able to uhm, she (not-) she- like

24 *otsustab `ikkagi:: .hh*
 decide-3SG anyway
 decides anyway .hh

25 KAT: *läh[tuvalt `teistest.]*
 based.on other-PL-ELA
 based on others.

This anticipatory completion comes at the end of Margit’s telling about what might happen in her budding relationship. Margit is dating a woman, Miina, who is also known to Katrin. Miina, however, is still in another relationship, and in her telling Margit explicates how she will feel if Miina will not leave her current partner. We will first focus on what happens in the sequence leading up to the production of the anticipatory completion:

Example 2a

mar >>looking at phone, texting^looks up, puts phone on table-->

1 MAR: *noo, kui meil nagu ei `tule midagi^ välja sis*
 PRT CONJ 1PL-ADE PRT NEG come anything out then
 well, if/when it doesn't work out for us then

mar -->^

2 *on `minu õppetund^ `see konkreetselt=et `isegi*
 be.3SG 1SG-GEN lesson DEM concretely COMP CONJ
 the lesson for me is concretely that even

mar ^lifts hands together, spreads them-->

mar ≤looks at KAT, then away≤

3 *kui inimene on ^ästi ≤spontaanne, .hhh≤*
 CONJ person be.3SG very spontaneous
 if/when the person is very spontaneous, .hhh

mar -->^circles hands up and down-->

kat +nods+

4 KAT: *mm^+[mm:?]*
 []

5 MAR: *[e `äs]ti:, `süda on avatud ja:+ ta on ` täiesti*
 very heart be.3SG open and 3SG be-3SG totally
 um very:, the heart is open and she is totally

6 *t- sada protsenti `toeks sulle ja*
 hundred percent-PAR support-TRA 2SG-ALL and
 s- hundred percent supporting you and

mar -->^lowers hands to lap^

7 *kõik on nagu jumala ↑`pööfikt,^ .hhh^*
 everything be.3SG PRT god-GEN "perfect"
 everything is like totally perfect, .hhh

mar ^lifts right hand, moves it up and down,
 then lowers it to lap^

mar ≤looks at KAT -->

8 *siis tema see ^`maine see::, see:: ≤ i- `ing- ^*
 then 3SG-GEN DEM reputation DEM DEM (ang-)

then her reputation the::, the:: a- ang-

kat +nods-->
mar ^lifts right hand, then lowers it again^
mar -->≤
9 +^`ingellikkus,^≤
 angelic.character
 angelic character

10 (0.5)

mar ≤looks at KAT-->
kat -->+

11 KAT: mh[mmh,]
 []
12 MAR: [see `lu-] ta=i- ta=i: ≤+suuda nendest vanadest
 DEM1 3SG NEG 3SG NEG be.able DEM.PL-ELA old-PL-ELA
 it (lu-) she('s) not- she's not able to break (out from)

mar -->≤
13 mustritest `välja murda lihsalt;=et ta=ei `suuda (et)≤
mold-PL-ELA out break simply COMP 3SG NEG be.able (COMP)
the old molds simply, she's not able,

kat +nods+
mar ^lifts both hands, moves them up and
 down^takes glasses off and puts them on table-->
14 +ta=on ^ liiga `hea selleks;=(et) ^[t:a=i-]+
 3SG be.3SG too good DEM-TRA (COMP) 3SG NEG
 she's too good for that. she (does) not-

15 KAT: []
 [mhmmh,]

Ultimately, Margit is here portraying the potential failure of her (future) love interest. She first ascribes a range of positive features to Miina (*spontaanne*, ‘spontaneous’, line 3, *süda on avatud*, ‘open-hearted’, line 5, and *sada protsenti toeks*, ‘hundred percent supporting’, line 6). These features are, however, preceded by a compound conjunction

isegi kui, ‘even if’, which projects an alternative description to follow. The alternative description is expressed in what follows in lines 8–13, where Margit suggests that it is exactly the positive aspects of Miina’s character that will result in her not leaving her current partner. In predicting a possible negative outcome of her (future) relationship with Miina and attributing the blame for it to Miina, Margit can be heard to ‘sow the seeds’ of a complaint sequence. As noted by Drew and Walker (2009), however, a recipient of a putative complaint might face a dilemma: how to agree and affiliate with the other and simultaneously avoid the risk of ‘going too far’ and escalating the complaint to a point where the other does not want to go. In example 2, this dilemma is further aggravated by the fact that if Katrin joined the complaint, she would go on record as having complained about a person who might eventually end up being Margit’s partner for life.

Katrin’s solution appears to be partial affiliation: during Margit’s delivery of the negative sides of Miina (lines 12–14), she nods repeatedly, thus displaying support for Margit’s stance (e.g., Stivers, 2008). But when Margit’s description is potentially complete after *lihsalt* (‘simply’, line 13), Katrin produces no uptake at all. That uptake at this point is relevantly missing is evident by the fact that Margit first repeats part of her turn, then produces a rather generalizing upshot of her telling (‘she’s too good for that’, line 14). At this point, the recipient Katrin produces the acknowledgment token

mhmh (line 15), though slightly late in the ‘transition space’ (see Jefferson, 1986).

Having continuously nodded throughout Margit’s telling (line 5 and onwards from line 9), Katrin now nods more firmly in conjunction with the acknowledgement token. Both the *mhmh*, which indicates passive reciprocity (Jefferson, 1985), and the nod constitute non-aligning actions at the (possible) end of a telling in so far as they treat the telling as incomplete (Stivers, 2008). In our case, this causes a problem in turn taking which leads to talk produced in overlap:

Example 2b

```

mar                                     -->^
mar                                     ^strokes hair
                                     with both hands three times-->
mar                                     <jerks head sideways<
kat                                     +nods-->
16 MAR:  .h ta `mõ[tleb kogu=aeg=et,    ]^<.HOHH<^+siis see
          3SG think-3SG all time COMP      then DEM
          .h she thinks all the time that, .HOHH then the
          [                               ]
17 KAT:  [ta=ei `taha nagu,            ]
          3SG NEG want PRT
          she doesn't want like

kat                                     -->+
mar      <shakes head<
18 MAR:  <`kaaslane mis mõtleb<    ja siis .hh+
          partner what think-3SG and then
          partner what (will/does) s/he think and then .hh

mar                                     -->^folds
                                               hands^
19      [ `laps=kellega sa juba    `arjunud      ja sis ^see]^
          child who-COM 2SG already get.used.to-PTCP and then DEM

```

the child whom you (are) already adapted to and then
 []
 20 KAT: [ja mis ma sellega `sellele teen ja,]
 and what 1SG DEM-COM DEM-ALL do-1SG and
 and what (shall) I cause to this (person) and

 kat +nods-->
 21 MAR: et, + [mis ma `tollele] teen, ja `tollele (ei)
 COMP what 1SG DEM2-ALL do-1SG and DEM2-ALL (NEG)
 what shall I cause to that (person), and that (person)
 []
 22 KAT: [mhmh,]
 PRT
 uhhuh,

While Margit launches a new and expanded description of Miina's character (lines 16, 18–19), Katrin initiates a formulation of a possible upshot of Margit's previous talk (line 17) but self-interrupts and leaves the floor to Margit. Margit's description is this time presented as a report of Miina's thinking which (like the enactment done by Beea in our previous example) can be interpreted as a pursuit of an affiliative response (cf. Holt, 2007). In reporting Miina's (alleged) thoughts, Margit seems to be building a three-part list of factors that might prevent Miina from breaking with her current partner to enter into a (proper) relationship with Margit. First, she poses the question of how it would affect the current partner (line 18), then how it would affect the partner's child (line 19) and finally how it would affect 'that person and that person' (see Jefferson, 1991, on 'generalized list completers'). Using a list construction maximizes the projectability of a turn: a completion can be projected to occur upon the production of the third item of the list and, in terms of content, each item of the list can be expected to

share some degree of ‘sameness’ (Jefferson, 1991). In other words, a list-in-progress makes it possible for the recipient to predict what is going to be said and when what is said is possibly complete, thus making it possible for the recipient join in. After Margit has produced the first part of a list and a particle chain *ja siis*, ‘and then’ followed by an inbreath (line 18) that indicate continuation, Katrin joins in and produces the generalizing utterance *ja mis ma sellega sellele teen ja*, ‘and what (shall) I cause to this (person) and’ (line 20). Katrin’s turn indicates understanding of Margit’s telling, perhaps to the degree that she could be interpreted to truncate the description-in-progress. The anticipatory completion that is produced in line 25 similarly appears to be truncating Margit’s (by now rather expanded) telling:

Example 2c

```

kat                                     -->+
mar      ≤looks at KAT                  ≤
23 MAR: -> ≤ta=i  `suuda noh,≤ ta=e++ta- nagu
           3SG NEG  be.able PRT  3SG NEG 3SG PRT
           she is not able to uhm, she (not-) she- like

24      -> otsustab`ikkagi::.hh
           decide-3SG anyway
           decides anyway .hh
mar      ^lifts hands, then lowers them to lap^
25 KAT: => läh^[tuvalt`teistest.]
           based.on  other-PL-ELA
           based on others.
           [
26 MAR:  [ oma elu      `te]iste::,^
           own life      other-PL.GEN
           (on her) own life (on) others::,
```

27 (0.5)
 28 MAR: `lehtu- `lähtuvalt teistest täpselt.
 based.on other-PL-ELA exactly
 bise- based on others exactly.

In lines 23–24, Margit initiates the upshot of her three-part list, stating (broadly speaking) that her future love interest, Miina, makes decisions based on what other people will think and feel. While Katrin has hithertofore been relatively non-responsive to Margit’s telling, she now produces the anticipatory completion *lähtuvalt teistest*, ‘based on others’, to the upshot initiated by Margit, *ta nagu otsustab ikkagi*, ‘she decides anyway’. With this anticipatory completion, Katrin shows that she has understood and is able to at least partially paraphrase the basic message that was delivered and projected through Margit’s telling. This is ratified through Margit’s subsequent repeat of the completion (line 28), which is furthermore confirmed by the adverb *täpselt*, ‘exactly’.

Though the anticipatory completion produced by Katrin is thus ratified by Margit, it is not entirely cooperative: Through its production, Katrin can avoid making an explicit assessment or evaluation of the person Margit is talking about. That an evaluation is missing we see from the fact that Margit’s confirmation (line 28) is followed by a one second pause (line 29), which only ends when Margit takes a turn and produces an evaluation concerning Miina’s behaviour herself (line 30):

Example 2d

29 (1.0)

mar <looks at KAT>>

30 MAR: ja <see=on nii `haige.
and DEM1 be.3SG so sick
and it is so sick.

31 KAT: see on ni `kahju tegelikult. vaata ku palju
DEM1 be.3SG so shame actually look-2SG.IMP how much
it is so shame actually. y'see how many

32 `vare- `valesi inimesi on `koo:s.
wrong-PL.PAR person-PL.PAR be.3SG together
wo- wrong people are together.

Margit's evaluation is followed by a second evaluation by Katrin (lines 31–32). Katrin's evaluation is not focused on Miina, but concerns people's behaviour generally. In other words, Katrin displays her stance to the potential complainable in generic terms, i.e., by ascribing the type of behavior just relayed by Margit to 'many people' rather than to Miina in particular. Thus, she shows that she shares the same negative stance as Margit with respect to the kind of behaviour in general, without evaluating Miina as an individual (cf. Mandelbaum, 1991/1992: 116). Moreover, she does it as a parallel assessment that does not claim direct access to the experience that is reported (see Heritage, 2011).

To sum up the elements of cooperation in example 2, we begin by noting that the anticipatory completion by Katrin (line 25) is grammatically aligning and it aligns with the overall activity of the telling by taking the turn initiated by Margit to its projected end. By doing so, however, Katrin reverses the turn-taking system so that she herself is no longer the recipient of a telling; most notably this means that she can avoid producing the evaluative-affective response that would otherwise be relevant in this position. In this way Katrin both fails to align with the sequential organization of the telling and to affiliate with Margit. However, when observing the overall sequence, we can see that elsewhere throughout the telling Katrin does display affiliation, e.g., by nodding. Furthermore, her anticipatory completions (lines 20, 25) display her understanding of the telling and her production of a second, responsive assessment (line 31) displays her agreement with Margit. Unlike example (1) above, where Anna seemed to be more generally non-cooperative towards the telling produced by Beea, in this example (2), such non-cooperativeness is not evident from the launching of the telling. Rather, it seems that the non-cooperative nature of Katrin's anticipatory completion is in this case due to conflicting preferences: were Katrin to align and affiliate with Margit's telling at the point at which the upshot is produced, she would be evaluating Miina – a person who is close to Margit – negatively and in that way would be heard as taking a negative stance towards a person who Margit has just expressed a wish to spend a significant amount of her future with.

Completing a telling prematurely

Our third example comes from a Danish telephone conversation between Fie and Regitze who have been friends for a long time. The anticipatory completion is in line 14, *det fik hun* ('that she got'). It completes a so-called left-dislocated construction, where an initial lexical noun phrase (*det der legat hun havde søgt i forskningsrådet*, 'that scholarship she had applied for in the research council', lines 12–13) is followed by a full clause with a pronoun that is co-referential with the initial noun phrase:

Example (3) (Danish): Regitze & Fie [TH)S2)014]

```
12 Fie:      det der legat      hun      havde      søgt      i
            DEM.SG.N stipend.N 3SG.F have.PST seek.PTCP PREP
            scholarship she had applied for in

13          fors[kningsrådet<
            research.council-DEF
            the research council<
            [
14 Regitze: [>det      fik      hun?<
            DEM.SG.N get.PST 3Sg.F
            >that she got?<
```

Fie and Regitze are catching up with each other on the phone. Fie's daughter, Tine, has recently started a PhD abroad. The PhD is currently un-funded and Tine has decided to use the first six months trying to secure funding or – alternatively – secure a part-time job to finance the PhD herself. Regitze knows of this plan from previous talks with Fie

and also knows that the first six months of Tine's PhD are coming to an end. At the point where the excerpt begins, Fie has been listing what has happened recently in her family and in lines 1–3, as part of this listing, she mentions that Tine has come home 'about a week ago' (line 3). This information is ambiguous as to whether Tine is merely visiting her parents or whether she has returned home for good (i.e., has abandoned her PhD). In reaction to the informing about Tine's whereabouts, Regitze inquires what she has decided to do (lines 6–8):

Example 3a

01 Fie: *Jerh. .h[hhhh Å' Tine kom hjem her*
 PRT CONJ 1nameF come.PST home.to LOC
Yeah. .hhhhh And Tine came home here
 [

02 Regitze: [*Jerh.*
 PRT
Yeah.

03 Fie: *fo:r (.) en: (0.5) uge siden,*
 PREP ART.INDF.C week.C POSTP
about (.) a: (0.5) week ago,

04 Regitze: *Jerh?*
 PRT
Yeah?

05 Fie: *.clhhh så*ehm: (.) vi: >vi' så'n< [>.hh å' kære-<*
 CONJ 1PL 1PL ADV/PRT CONJ
*.clhhh so*ehm: (.) we: >we're like< >.hh and boyf-<*
 [

06 Regitze: [*Hva' har hun-*
what have 3SG.F
[What has she-

07 (0.2)

08 Regitze: *bestemt sig f[or,*

In most circumstances, projecting the valence of news and affiliating with it is considered a pro-social action by which participants can display a great degree of mutual understanding. In terms of shared knowledge, Regitze and Fie both do rather elaborate work to display their mutual understanding: By producing the inquiry in lines 6–8, Regitze shows that she knows that there is a decision to be made by Tine.⁶ Fie similarly orients to Regitze as a knowing recipient by including the epistemic marker *jo* in her response (line 10) (Heinemann et al., 2011), thus indicating that the fact that Tine had applied for a scholarship is already known to Regitze. This knownness is further highlighted by Fie’s use of the demonstrative determiner, *det der legat* (‘that scholarship’) (line 12). Finally, the anticipatory completion *det fik hun* (‘she got it’) produced by Regitze (in line 13) is construed to be both aligning and affiliative. It is grammatically aligning as it constitutes a syntactic completion of Fie’s left-located construction.⁷ It aligns also action-wise by completing the good news Fie appeared to be about to deliver (*det der legat hun havde søgt det fik hun*, ‘the scholarship that she had applied for that she got’). Moreover, in terms of prosodic delivery, Regitze’s completion is affiliating with the stance projected in the beginning of Fie’s telling: the strong emphasis on *fik* (‘got’) and the relatively strong rising intonation together render the completion a sense of happiness and incredulity, both of which are features that fit well with the adjective *heldig* (‘lucky’) with which Fie introduced the news (line 10).

In terms of sequential progression, however, Regitze’s anticipatory completion is less cooperative, as it in effect pre-empts a more extended telling by treating the news-delivery as complete at this point. That an extended telling was potentially relevant at this point has at least partially been projected through Fie’s initial response in lines 9–13, not just through her use of *jamen* which projects an extended answer (line 9): the past perfect tense of the verb ‘apply’, *havde søgt* (‘had applied’, lines 9–10) indicates that an episode has been completed and has no present consequences (e.g., Comrie, 1985; see also Seppänen, 2007) – in the context above *havde søgt* thus serves to imply that Tine’s application was unsuccessful in a similar fashion to Sacks’ (1992: 175–187) ‘first verbs’ (see also Schulze-Wenck, 2005). By stating that Tine was ‘lucky’ (line 10) Fie thus indicates a more complex situation than that of simply applying for a grant and then getting it, and projects that there is something more to tell at this point than what would be accomplished through the delivery of ‘good news’. Fie’s reception of Regitze’s anticipatory completion clearly shows this:

Example 3b

15 (0.3)

16 Fie: >å-< fået afslag på de[t f:-
 CONJ get.PTCP rejection.C PREP DEM.SG.N
 (and) got rejection on that (got)

17 Regitze: [Jerh,

PRT
Yeah,

18 Fie: (0.1) det ringede de så å' sagde (0.2)
DEM.N call.PST 3PL ADV CONJ say.PST
(0.1) that they then called and said (0.2)

19 f:redagen inden hun skulle på: *ehm .clhh
Friday.DEF.C PREP 3SG.F must.PST PREP
the F:riday before she was going on a: *ehm .clhh

20 på konference,
PREP conference.C
on a conference,

21 Regitze: Je[rh,
PRT
Yeah,
[

22 Fie: [.hhhh (0.2) atehm: >det havde hun
CONJ/COMP DEM.3SG.N have.PST 3SG.F
.hhhh (0.2) thatehm: >she had gotten it

23 fået alli'vel me' te'bagevirkende kraft t[e' første april,
get.PTCP ADV PREP retroactive force.C PREP first april
anyway with reverse effect from the first of april,

24 Regitze: [N:e:jh,
PRT
N:ø:h,

25 Fie: .mflh[h >fordi-< fordi der var en der
CONJ CONJ LOC be.PST one REL
.mflhh >because-< because there was? someone had
[

26 Regitze: [Ih hvor dejligt.
PRT how lovely
Oh how lovely.

27 Fie: var faldet fra?
be.PST fall.PTCP PREP
dropped out?

Regitze's completion is followed by a short pause (line 15) and no uptake from Fie.

Instead, Fie continues her own turn-at-talk by tying lines 13 and 16 together with *å*

(‘and’), thus sequentially deleting Regitze’s completion. Notably, at the end of line 15, Fie abandons the projected *det fik hun* (‘she got’), which, through its similarity to Regitze’s completion at this point, could have indicated a next, new completion. Instead, Fie adds more material to further extend the telling (*det ringede de så og sagde fredagen inden hun skulle på konference*, lines 18–20), thus further delaying the delivery of the upshot and providing more detail to expand the telling. To a certain extent, then, it seems as if Fie here is building her turn to avoid creating any (new) positions in which Regitze can interpret the delivery of the news as almost complete. And indeed, Regitze now aligns with her role as a recipient of a telling, by producing only acknowledgement tokens (lines 16 and 20) until Fie’s telling is both grammatically and pragmatically complete in line 23, at which point Regitze can now (again) affiliate with the news/telling in a more appropriate place and in a more appropriate manner. She does this first with the negative response token *nej*, line 24 (Heinemann, 2005), which is prosodically marked through stretching, voice quality, emphasis and rising intonation to indicate positive disbelief, and then with the more directly evaluating *ih hvor dejligt* (‘oh how lovely’) (line 26).

In example 3, the anticipatory completion produced by Regitze is overwhelmingly designed to be cooperative. It is built to be aligning with the sequential progressivity of delivering good news as well as being affiliative with the positive stance of that news.

Nevertheless, this anticipatory completion is non-cooperative at other levels: by embodying the upshot of good news, it short-circuits Fie's delivery of an extended telling; moreover, the affiliative stance it embodies is directed towards the 'simple' achievement of getting a scholarship, whereas the real 'luckyness' projected in the telling is directed towards the more complex situation of getting a scholarship after an initial rejection.

Concluding discussion: The complexities of cooperation, alignment and affiliation

In the previous sections, we have considered three examples in which the recipient of a telling produces an anticipatory completion. We have done so in order to illustrate the analytic relevance of concepts such as alignment and affiliation for understanding social cooperation. We now draw together our observations by comparing the different ways in which alignment and affiliation interrelate and come into play in the three examples.

We can begin by observing that in all three examples, the anticipatory completions are *g r a m m a t i c a l l y* aligned with (i.e., fitted to) the prior TCU-in-progress, i.e., they "match the formal design preference of the previous turn" (Stivers et al., 2011: 21). In terms of *t e m p o r a l* alignment, however, the three anticipatory completions differ: In example 2, the anticipatory completion is slightly delayed, following a stretched

syllable as well as an inbreath produced by the speaker of the TCU-in-progress. By contrast, the anticipatory completions in examples 1 and 3 are delivered early, i.e., in overlap with the TCU that they are designed to complete. In terms of sequential temporality (sequential alignment), these two examples differ, however, in so far as the anticipatory completion in example 3 is produced early not just with respect to the TCU-in-progress, but also with respect to the whole of the telling sequence, whereas the anticipatory completion in example 1 is delivered early with respect to the TCU-in-progress, but late with respect to the overall telling sequence. These differences with respect to the temporal alignment of the anticipatory completions are also reflected in the degree to which they can each be understood to be cooperative, or not: In example 1, the combination of early turn-completion but late sequential alignment renders the anticipatory completion a sense of reluctant pre-emptiveness, which fits well with the general observation that its producer was in fact resisting the telling and instead trying to get to tell a story herself. In example 3, the overall early production of the anticipatory completion consolidates the impression of extreme cooperativeness that both participants also subsequently orient to. Finally, the somewhat delayed ‘offering’ of a grammatically contiguous (aligned) completion in example 2 can be seen as reflecting the dilemma that its producer is apparently caught in, with respect to how to deal with the problem of responding appropriately but without being heard as criticizing the love-interest of her co-participant.

The three anticipatory completions also differ with respect to the issue of *a c t i v i t y* alignment, i.e., to what degree they each serve to “cooperate by facilitating the proposed activity or sequence” (Stivers et al., 2011: 21). In broad strokes, we might suggest that the anticipatory completions in all three examples aligned with the ongoing activity, in so far as they each provided a potential upshot of a telling. The different ways in which this was done and – in particular perhaps – *w h e r e* this was done across the three examples, however, further reflect the intricate relationship between alignment and cooperation. In example 3, the upshot embodied by the anticipatory completion was produced early, in fact before the telling had even been properly launched and can as such be understood as non-aligning with respect to the overall activity of producing a telling; had it not been ignored or resisted by the teller the anticipatory completion would effectively have served to short-circuit the telling. By contrast, the anticipatory completions in examples 1 and 2 were both produced at a point where an upshot had been, not only projected, but in fact pursued. While the participants producing these anticipatory completions can thus be heard to collaborate (though somewhat belatedly) in bringing the telling activity to an end, these anticipatory completions are not exclusively cooperative, as they also reverse the turn-taking system and with this the roles of teller and recipient. As shown by Lerner (1996a), such reversal can be restored, if the teller confirms the anticipatory completion, and the confirmation is followed by a

sequentially relevant next turn by the producer of the anticipatory completion. In our examples, that sequentially relevant next action would be the expression of an evaluative-affective stance towards the telling as a whole. In both example 1 and example 2, such evaluative-affective stance is noticeably absent after the anticipatory completion has been produced, even though the tellers in different ways attempted to create a new slot in which such evaluation could be produced: in example 2, the teller confirmed the correctness of the anticipatory completion, thus attempting a return to the original turn-taking system that had been reversed through the production of the anticipatory completion. In example 1, by contrast, the teller effectively deleted the anticipatory completion by continuing her description of the event, upgrading and animating this description to pursue the absent evaluative-affective stance. Both of these solutions provide a new place for an affective-evaluative response, yet, in neither of these two examples did the recipient produce such a response at the first possible transition relevance place.

Just as the three examples of anticipatory completions we have considered here differ in various ways with respect to cooperation at the structural level, i.e., alignment, so they differ with respect to cooperation at the affective level, i.e., affiliation. In fact, only in example 3 we can claim that the anticipatory completion is “maximally pro-social” because its producer through it matches “the prior speaker’s evaluative stance” and

“display[s] empathy” (Stivers et al., 2011: 21). Thus, despite its many non-aligning features (see above), the anticipatory completion in example 3 clearly comes across as highly cooperative at the affective level: through its early production it serves to demonstrate the degree to which the two participants share common ground and intersubjectivity – so much so that the recipient of the telling is able to predict the upshot with only a very few cues. Furthermore, this anticipatory completion was prosodically laminated to display an affective-evaluative stance that clearly aligned with the overall projection of good news. By contrast, both example 1 and 2 involve anticipatory completions that are not – at least at an initial glance – as cooperative at the affective level. In both cases, the anticipatory completion does serve to match the prior speaker’s stance, in so far as the content delivered through the completion matches what has been projected by the previous speaker whose turn is completed (cf. Lerner, 1996b: 311, on how anticipatory completions can be “used perversely”, i.e., to “tack an implausible completion onto the prior speaker’s turn”; see also Brenning, 2013: 364–365, and Bolden et al., 2019). Similarly, the anticipatory completions in both examples 1 and 2 can be said to be affiliative in so far as they both serve to “cooperate with the preference of the prior action” in bringing a telling to its projected end at a time at which this is relevant. On the other hand – and as noted above – the way in which the tellings are brought to their projected ends in examples 1 and 2 is perhaps not in accordance with preference organization: the production of the anticipatory completions

makes it possible for the story-recipient to avoid producing a more affective-evaluative response and so neither in example 1 or 2 does the producer of the anticipatory completion affiliate with the teller by displaying empathy.

Finally, the three examples we have considered suggest, when taken together, that affiliation and alignment are not merely momentary and local accomplishments that can be gaged from a turn-by-turn analysis. Considering example 3, for instance, we can quite easily conclude (as others have done before us, e.g., Stivers, 2008; Stivers et al., 2011) that alignment and affiliation are separable as levels of cooperation so that any given turn-at-talk can be aligning, but not affiliating, and vice versa. We can also – and more interestingly, perhaps – conclude that both alignment and affiliation are matters that can be oriented to at different levels of interaction, i.e., at the level of the turn, the activity, the sequence, and perhaps even at the level of interpersonal and relational considerations (see, e.g., Mandelbaum 1991/1992). Thus, in all of our three examples, it should be evident that any aspect of (non)alignment and (non)affiliation that is accomplished by the participants locally and momentarily, i.e., turn-by-turn, must be considered also for its impact within the larger sequential context of the telling.

In example 1, for instance, the anticipatory completion comes across as a highly non-cooperative move, not just because it is both locally and sequentially non-aligned (i.e.,

early, in overlap with the TCU-in-progress and late with respect to the completion of the telling), nor because it is produced in lieu of a more affiliating display of empathy, but also because the producer of the anticipatory completion has displayed a lack of affiliation throughout the telling and subsequent to her production of the anticipatory completion proceeds to initiate her own telling, with no regard for the telling that has just been (inappropriately) concluded. In example 1, then, we can say that the local and momentary non-alignment and non-affiliation that are accomplished through the anticipatory completion are both constitutive of and constituted by the overall lack of cooperation that is displayed throughout the whole of the sequence.

By contrast, the anticipatory completion of example 2, which shares many of the same local and momentary traits of non-alignment and non-affiliation with that of example 1, can ultimately be understood as much more cooperative, when considering the larger sequential context in which it is produced. Most notably, when comparing to example 1, we can see that though the anticipatory completion in example 2 is both non-aligning (i.e., somewhat delayed) and non-affiliative (i.e., lacking a display of empathy), this is exclusively a local and momentary lack of cooperation: throughout the preceding telling sequence, the producer of the anticipatory completion did in fact display affiliation by attending closely to the various points of the telling; moreover, she does work to subsequently match the teller's stance by eventually producing an evaluative-affective

response when this is made relevant for the second time. In example 2, then, the anticipatory completion constitutes only a momentary and very local lack of alignment and affiliation – and one that was, as we suggested, done for cause, i.e., to avoid being heard as criticizing the teller’s love-interest. Similarly, the seemingly contradictory nature of the overwhelmingly non-aligning, yet strongly affiliating anticipatory completion in example 3 can only be understood as being highly cooperative when considering the larger context in which it is produced.

As this summarizing conclusion suggests, issues of cooperation, alignment and affiliation are complex and interrelated. By focusing on one particular practice as it is employed in one particular interactional context, we hope to have identified at least some of the many issues that may be relevant when attempting to employ concepts such as alignment and affiliation in analytically relevant ways. In particular, we hope to have demonstrated that a purely local determination of alignment and/or affiliation may in reality say very little about the degree to which participants in interaction can be said to cooperate, or not. That is, matters such as whether any given turn-at-talk can be identified as being, for instance, either grammatically aligned (i.e., matching the formal design preferences of the turn), aligned with respect to the ongoing activity (i.e., facilitating the activity or sequence) or as being locally affiliative in terms of matching the stance expressed in the prior turn or through displaying empathy with that stance, do

not in and by themselves determine the overall (non)cooperativeness of that turn-at-talk (and by implication the speaker producing that turn-at-talk). While the current tendency in CA and other related interactionally oriented studies seems largely to be oriented towards the investigation of large corpora and collections with methodologies adopted from natural sciences and quantitative studies in order to establish taxonomies of interactional order, we thus suggest that the true intricacies of everyday interaction and in particular matters such as affiliation, alignment and – more generally – cooperation are best studied through single-case analyses of larger extended sequences, as only there it is possible to determine how participants in interaction manage to produce unique social situations and to respond to and interact in unique social situations in a methodical manner and over and over again.

Acknowledgements

The Finnish Centre of Excellence in Research on Intersubjectivity in Interaction, University of Helsinki, has provided the intellectual environment, working space, and technical equipment for this work.

Funding

The first author was funded by the Kone Foundation, the second author by a Marie Curie Fellowship (FP7-PEOPLE-2013-IEF, Grant agreement number 628892).

ENDNOTES

¹ Note that where these and other studies use terms such as ‘un’(cooperative), ‘mis’(aligning) or ‘dis’(affiliating), we use the term ‘non’(cooperative, aligning, affiliating) to reflect the scalar nature of cooperation, alignment and affiliation that our analysis suggests.

²See Haugh and Obana (2015) on similar findings concerning the related practice of grammatically fitted continuations that are produced after another speaker has completed a turn.

³It is relevant to note that although Danish is typologically distinct from Estonian and Finnish, all three languages are similar in that they provide for an early projection of a turn-in-progress compared, for instance, to Japanese, cf. Fox et al. (1996) and Tanaka (2000).

⁴In all three cases, the data has been transcribed in accordance with the system developed by Gail Jefferson (see, e.g., Atkinson and Heritage, 1984: ix–xvi; Jefferson, 2004) and analyzed using Conversation Analysis. The transcripts present the original language, morpheme-by-morpheme glosses (a list of glossing symbols can be found in the Appendix) and a more idiomatic English translation. For the Estonian and Finnish examples, which are from face-to-face interactions, we also provide a limited description of those non-verbal aspects that we have deemed relevant for the analysis. The embodied actions of the participants have been transcribed according to Mondada (2014). The symbols +, \wedge , and \leq each annotate where a described nonverbal action begins and ends.

⁵Adverbial *ku(n)*-clauses can also constitute a second or third unit in a multi-unit turn, and can moreover also be used as increments. In both these cases, *kun*-clauses do not, as in Extract (1), project an additional clause.

⁶Presumably she also knows that it is about a time this decision is made.

⁷In fact, Fie's own continuation of the news delivery in line 15 suggests that Regitze's completion would have been word perfect, as Fie here initiates but then abandons the delivery of the upshot in exactly the same way: *det fi-*, 'that got-' (line 16).

References

Allwood J (1976) *Linguistic communication as action and cooperation*. Gothenburg Monographs in Linguistics, Vol. 2. Department of Linguistics, Göteborg University.

Antaki C (2012) Affiliative and disaffiliative candidate understandings. *Discourse Studies* 14(5): 531–547.

Atkinson JM and Heritage J (1984) *Structures of social action*. *Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Axelrod R (1984) *Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.

Bolden GB, Hepburn A and Potter J (2019) Subversive Completions: Turn-Taking Resources for Commandeering the Recipient's Action in Progress. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 52(2): 144–158.

Brenning J (2015) *Syntaktische Ko-Konstruktionen im gesprochenen Deutsch*
[Syntactical co-constructions in spoken German]. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag
Winter.

Clayman SE (2002) Sequence and solidarity. In: Thye SR and Lawler EJ (eds)
Advances in group processes: Group cohesion, trust and solidarity. Oxford: Elsevier
Science, pp. 229–253.

Comrie B (1985) *Tense*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Couper-Kuhlen E (2012) Exploring affiliation in the reception of conversational
complaint stories. In: Peräkylä A and Sorjonen M-L (eds) *Emotion in interaction*.
Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 113–146.

Drew P and Walker T (2009) Going too far: Complaining, escalating and disaffiliation.
Journal of Pragmatics 41: 2400–2414.

Drummond K and Hopper R (1993) Back channels revisited: acknowledgement tokens and speakership incipency. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 26(2): 157–177.

Duranti A and Brenneis D (eds) (1986) The audience as co-author. Special issue, *Text* 6(3).

Enfield N (2006) Social consequences of common ground. In: Enfield N and Levinson SC (eds) *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition and interaction*. Oxford: Berg, pp. 399–430.

Fox BA, Hayashi M and Jasperson R (1996) Resources and repair: A cross-linguistic study of syntax and repair. In: Ochs E, Schegloff EA and Thompson SA (eds) *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 185–237.

Goodwin C. (1984) Notes on story structure and the organization of participation. In: Atkinson JM and Heritage J (eds) *Structures of social action. Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 225–246.

Goodwin C (1996) Transparent vision. In: Ochs E, Schegloff EA and Thompson S (eds) *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 370–404.

Gorisch J, Wells B and Brown GJ (2011) Pitch contour matching and interactional alignment across turns: An acoustic investigation. *Language and Speech* 55(1): 57–76.

Grice HP (1975) Logic and conversation. In: Cole P and Morgan JL (eds) *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 43–58.

Hakulinen A and Couper-Kuhlen E (2015) Insisting on ‘my side’: *Siis*-prefaced utterances in Finnish. *Journal of Pragmatics* 75: 111–130.

Hakulinen A, Vilkuna M, Korhonen R, Koivisto V, Heinonen TR and Alho I (2004) *Iso suomen kielioppi*. [Comprehensive grammar of Finnish]. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Haugh M and Obana Y (2015) Transformative continuations, (dis)affiliation, and accountability in Japanese interaction. *Text & Talk* 35(5): 597–619.

Hayashi M (1999) Where grammar and interaction meet: A study of co-participant

completion in Japanese conversation. *Human Studies* 22: 475–499.

Hayashi M (2013) Turn allocation and turn sharing. In: Sidnell J and Stivers T (eds) *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 167–190.

Heinemann T (2005) Where grammar and interaction meet. The preference for matched polarity in responsive turns in Danish. In: Hakulinen A and Selting M (eds) *Syntax and lexis in conversation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 375–402.

Heinemann T, Lindström A and Steensig J (2011) Addressing epistemic incongruence in question-answer sequences through the use of epistemic adverbs. In: Stivers T, Mondada L and Steensig J (eds) *The morality of knowledge in conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 107–130.

Helasvuo M-L (2004) Shared syntax: the grammar of co-constructions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36: 1315–1336.

Heritage J (2011) Territories of knowledge, territories of experience: empathic moments in interaction. In: Stivers T, Mondada L and Steensig J (eds) *The morality of knowledge in conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 159–183.

Holt E (2007) 'I'm eyeing your chop up mind': reporting and enacting. In: Holt E and Clift R (eds) *Reporting talk: Reported speech in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 47–80.

Jefferson G (1978) Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In: Schenkein J (ed) *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 219–248.

Jefferson G (1985) Notes on a systematic deployment of the acknowledgement tokens 'Yeah' and 'Mhm'. *Papers in Linguistics* 17(2): 197–216.

Jefferson G (1986) Notes on 'latency' in overlap onset. *Human Studies* 9(2/3): 153–183.

Jefferson G (1991) List construction as a task and resource. In: Psathas G (ed) *Interactional competence*. New York: Irvington Publishers, pp. 63–92.

Jefferson G (2004) Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In: Lerner GH (ed) *Conversation Analysis. Studies from the First Generation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 13–31.

Kaukomaa T, Peräkylä A and Ruusuvuori J (2013) Turn-opening smiles: Facial expression constructing emotional transition in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 55: 21–42.

Kjærbeck S and Asmuß B (2005) Negotiating meaning in narratives. An investigation of the interactional construction of the punchline and the post punchline sequences. *Narrative Inquiry* 153: 1–24.

Lee SH and Tanaka H (2016) Affiliation and alignment in responding actions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 100: 1–7.

Lerner G (1996a) On the “semi-permeable character” of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In: Ochs E, Schegloff EA and Thompson SA (eds) *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 238–276.

Lerner G (1996b) Finding “face” in the preference structures of talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 59(4): 303–321.

Lerner G (2002) Turn-sharing: The choral co-production of talk-in-interaction. In: Ford CE, Fox BA and Thompson SA (eds) *The language of turn and sequence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 225–256.

Lerner G (2004) Collaborative turn sequences. In: Lerner G (ed) *Conversation Analysis. Studies from the first generation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 225–256.

Levinson SC (2006) On the human “interaction engine”. In: Enfield NJ and Levinson SC (eds) *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition and interaction*. Oxford: Berg, pp. 39–69.

Lindström A and Sorjonen M-L (2013) Affiliation in conversation. In: Sidnell J and Stivers T (eds) *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 350–369.

Mandelbaum J (1989) Interpersonal activities in conversational storytelling. *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 53(2): 114–126.

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

Maynard DW (2003) *Bad news, good news. Conversational order in everyday talk and clinical settings*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.

Mazeland H (2007) Parenthetical sequences. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 1816–1869.

Mondada L (2014) Conventions for multimodal transcription. Available at: https://franz.unibas.ch/fileadmin/franz/user_upload/redaktion/Mondada_conv_multimodality.pdf (accessed 20 October 2016).

Niemelä M (2010) The reporting space in conversational storytelling: Orchestrating all semiotic channels for taking a stance. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 3258–3270.

Routarinne S (2003) *Tytöt äänessä. Parenteesit ja nouseva sävelkulku kertojan vuorovaikutuskeinoina*. [Girls talking. Parentheses and rising intonation as narrator's interactional devices] SKST 903. Helsinki: SKS.

Sacks H (1972) On the analyzability of stories by children. In: Gumperz J and Hymes D (eds) *Directions in sociolinguistics: the ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 325–345.

Sacks H (1974) An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation. In Bauman R and Sherzer J (eds) *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 337–353.

Sacks H (1992) *Lectures on Conversation*. Vol. 2. Oxford, UK. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks H, Schegloff EA and Jefferson G (1974) A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50: 696–735.

Schulze-Wenck S (2005) Form and function of 'first verbs' in talk-in-interaction. In Hakulinen A and Selting M (eds) *Syntax and lexis in conversation: Studies on the use of linguistic resources in talk-in-interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 319–348.

Seppänen E-L (2007) Suomen perfektin merkityksestä keskusteluaineiston valossa. [The meaning of the perfect tense in Finnish in the light of conversational data]. *Virittäjä* 101: 2–26.

Sidnell J (2006) Coordinating gesture, talk, and gaze in reenactments. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 39: 377–409.

Sidnell J and Enfield N (2013) Language diversity and social action. A third locus of linguistic relativity. *Current Anthropology* 53(3): 302–321.

Sorjonen M-L (2001) *Responding in conversation. A study of response particles in Finnish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Steensig J (2012) Conversation Analysis and affiliation and alignment. In: Chapelle CA (ed) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge, UK: Wiley-Blackwell. DOI: 10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0196

Steensig J and Drew P (2008) Introduction: questioning and affiliation/disaffiliation in interaction. *Discourse Studies* 10(1): 5–15.

Steensig J and Heinemann T (2014) (Particle-prefaced) responses to wh-questions in Danish: Formats for resisting and orienting to the constraints of wh-questions. Presentation delivered at ICCA-2014, UCLA, USA.

Steensig J and Larsen T (2008) Affiliative and disaffiliative uses of *you say x* questions. *Discourse Studies* 10(1): 113–132.

Stivers T (2008) Stance, alignment, and affiliation during storytelling: when nodding is a token of affiliation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41: 31–57.

Stivers T, Mondada L and Steensig J (2011) Knowledge, morality and affiliation in social interaction. In: Stivers T, Mondada L and Steensig J (eds) *The morality of knowledge in conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3–26.

Szczepek B (2000a) Formal aspects of collaborative productions in English conversation. *InLiSt – Interaction and Linguistic Structures* 17. URL: <http://www.inlist.uni-bayreuth.de/issues/17/inlist17.pdf>

Szczepek B (2000b) Functional aspects of collaborative productions in English conversation. *InLiSt – Interaction and Linguistic Structures* 21. URL: <http://www.inlist.uni-bayreuth.de/issues/21/inlist21.pdf>

Tanaka H (2000) Turn projection in Japanese talk-in-interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 33(1): 1–38.

Thompson SA, Couper-Kuhlen E and Fox B (2015) *Grammar in Everyday Talk. Building Responsive Actions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vatanen A (2014) *Responding in overlap. Agency, epistemicity and social action in conversation*. PhD dissertation, Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian and Scandinavian Studies, University of Helsinki.

Vatanen A (2018) Responding in early overlap: Recognitional onsets in assertion sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 51(2): 107–126.

Appendix

List of glossing symbols

1	first person
3	third person
ADE	adessive
ADJ	adjective
ADV	adverbial
ALL	allative
ART	article
C	common gender
COM	comitative
COMP	complementizer
CONJ	conjunction
DEF	definite
DEM	demonstrative pronoun
ELA	elative
F	feminine
GEN	genitive
IDEO	ideophone
ILL	illative

IMP	imperative mood
INDF	indefinite
INE	inessive
LOC	locative
MAN	manner
N	neuter gender
NEG	negation
PAR	partitive
PL	plural
POSTP	postposition
PREP	preposition
PRT	particle
PST	past
PTCP	participle
PPTCP	past participle
Q	question particle
REL	relative
REFL	reflexive pronoun
SG	singular
TRA	translative

Infinitive and present tense forms are not glossed when the context and translation indicate these forms clearly enough.