Action formation with janwai in Cantonese Chinese conversation

Liesenfeld, Andreas Maria

2019

Liesenfeld, A. M. (2019). Action formation with janwai in Cantonese Chinese conversation.
Doctoral thesis, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore.

<https://hdl.handle.net/10356/102660>

<https://doi.org/10.32657/10220/47757>

**NANYANG
TECHNOLOGICAL
UNIVERSITY**

SINGAPORE

**ACTION FORMATION WITH JANWAI
IN CANTONESE CHINESE CONVERSATION**

ANDREAS MARIA LIESENFELD

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

2019

Action formation with janwai in Cantonese Chinese conversation

Andreas Maria Liesenfeld

School of Humanities and Social Sciences

A thesis submitted to the Nanyang Technological University
in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

2019

Statement of Originality

I hereby certify that the work embodied in this thesis is the result of original research, is free of plagiarised materials, and has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other University or Institution.

01/03/2019

.....
Date

.....
Andreas Maria Liesenfeld

Supervisor Declaration Statement

I have reviewed the content and presentation style of this thesis and declare it is free of plagiarism and of sufficient grammatical clarity to be examined. To the best of my knowledge, the research and writing are those of the candidate except as acknowledged in the Author Attribution Statement. I confirm that the investigations were conducted in accord with the ethics policies and integrity standards of Nanyang Technological University and that the research data are presented honestly and without prejudice.

01 MAR 2019

.....
Date

.....
Professor Luke Kang Kwong Kapathy

Authorship Attribution Statement

This thesis contains material from one paper published from papers accepted at conferences in which I am listed as the author.

Chapter 3 is published as Liesenfeld, Andreas. "MYCanCor: A Video Corpus of spoken Malaysian Cantonese." *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC)*. 7-12 May 2018. Miyazaki, Japan. (2018). <http://aclweb.org/anthology/L18-1122>.

01/03/2019

.....
Date

.....
Andreas Maria Liesenfeld

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the people I have met in Perak, who have been so amiable and welcoming during my stay in Malaysia and who have made my work there such a pleasant and rewarding experience. My gratitude goes to everybody who agreed to be recorded, sharing so much of their social life with me as I was traveling through the watery plains and Karst mountains of Perak, through the city of Ipoh and through the many villages in the area. After returning to Singapore, I started watching some of these recordings over and over, exploring details of all your intricate ways of doing things with words. Sometimes this made me feel strangely familiar with many of you, even though we may only have met for a couple of minutes. It is astounding what only a minute long recording can unveil if one only observes careful enough. It was a rewarding journey and I have come to deeply appreciate this line of work under the umbrella of Conversation Analysis, its attention to detail and its observant attitude.

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to Professor Luke Kang Kwong for introducing this method to me, and for your guidance and continuous support of my professional development throughout the past years as well as the countless learning opportunities I was provided with at NTU and beyond. My sincere gratitude also goes to Professor Hiroko Tanaka for her unwavering support during the critical last stages of the writing process. Thank you for your invaluable feedback all the way from my first to my tenth draft and thank you for your dedication to teach me accurate scientific writing.

I would also like to thank Takashi Nakagawa for his friendship and support during my fieldwork in Malaysia, for hiking the Cameron Highlands with me and for the many nights sitting on that rooftop, drinking Port wine. My warmest thanks goes to all my teachers and colleagues at Nanyang Technological University, especially those who I had the pleasure working with during our weekly data sessions. Thank you for the fruitful discussions and support Professor Lim Ni Eng, Professor Kim Younhee, Yvonne Tse Crepaldi, Ratih Oktarini and Ng Gim Thia. I also thank Professor Zhang Songjian for his generous support and help during my time studying with him. I thank Professor Laura Kallmeyer for her invitation to visit the Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf and all the valuable lessons and opportunities working with her and the rest of the team in Germany, especially Vladan Sutanovac for his friendship and company exploring Düsseldorf.

Finally, I extend sincere expressions of gratitude to my family in Cologne and Guangzhou as well as to, the one and only, Chen Shiwei.

“J’ai tant rêvé de toi que tu perds ta réalité.”
– Robert Desnos

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Acronyms	vi
Symbols and transcription conventions	vii
Lists of Figures	ix
Lists of Tables	x
Summary	xi
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Motivation	1
1.2 Objectives and Specifications	2
1.3 Major contribution	2
1.4 Organisation of the Dissertation	2
2 Literature review	4
2.1 Defining concepts	4
2.1.1 Units of analysis	4
2.1.2 Action formation and ascription	7
2.1.3 The problem of action coding and typologies	10
2.2 Engines of sequence organization	11
2.2.1 Epistemic status	11
2.2.2 Deontic status	12
2.2.3 Agency	13
2.2.4 Type-conformity	13
2.2.5 Front-loading	14
2.3 Prior work on <i>janwai</i> (因為) and approximates in other languages	15
2.3.1 Causal connectors and causal coherence markers	15
2.3.2 Interactional studies of causal markers	17
2.4 The practice of accounting and the formation of accounts	19
3 The Malaysia Cantonese Corpus (MYCanCor)	23
3.1 Technical specifications	24
3.2 Data collection and sampling	24
3.3 Transcription	25
3.3.1 Word segmentation and annotation	26
3.4 Use in this study and beyond	27
3.4.1 Subject of this study: <i>janwai</i> -initial structures	27
3.4.2 Data representations and transcriptions used in this study	28

3.4.3	The sequential environment of <i>janwai</i> TCUs in the corpus	29
3.4.4	Types of sequential environments: Grouping of similar sequential structures in the corpus	29
4	Sequential environment 1: <i>janwai</i>-prefaced response formats	32
4.1	Initiating actions followed by a response with a turn-initial <i>janwai</i>	33
4.1.1	Data discussion	34
4.1.2	Deviant case analysis: Self-initiated repair of the turn-initial <i>janwai</i>	43
4.2	Chapter summary	44
5	Sequential environment 2: <i>janwai</i> as part of response formats	47
5.1	Responsive action featuring response tokens followed by <i>janwai</i>	48
5.1.1	Responsive actions featuring <i>janwai</i> following Telling-questions	49
5.1.2	Data discussion	50
5.1.3	Section summary	54
5.1.4	Responsive actions featuring <i>janwai</i> following Specifying-questions	54
5.1.5	Data discussion	54
5.1.6	Section summary	62
5.2	Other patterns: Responses featuring <i>janwai mel aal</i> or <i>janwai zou6 mel</i>	63
5.2.1	Data discussion	63
5.2.2	Section summary	70
5.3	Chapter Summary	70
6	Sequential environment 3: <i>janwai</i> as part of (non-responsive) action formats	74
6.1	‘Step-by-step’ production of <i>janwai</i> -structures as part of the formation of initiating action	75
6.1.1	Data discussion	75
6.1.2	Section Summary	82
6.2	‘In-one-go’ production of <i>janwai</i> as part of the formation of initiating action	83
6.2.1	Data discussion	83
6.2.2	Section summary	88
6.3	Other patterns: Formation of ‘back-tying’ involving <i>janwai</i>	88
6.3.1	Data discussion	89
6.3.2	Section Summary	94
6.4	Other patterns: The misalignment utterance <i>m4 hai6</i> followed by <i>janwai</i>	94
6.4.1	Data discussion	95
6.4.2	Section Summary	100
6.5	Other patterns: <i>Janwai</i> following an initiating action and a <i>mel</i> final particle	101
6.5.1	Data discussion	101
6.5.2	Section Summary	105
6.6	Chapter summary	105
7	Other sequential environments	108
7.1	Turn-initial <i>janwai</i> in environments with three or more speakers	109
7.1.1	Data discussion	109
7.1.2	Section summary	114
7.2	Usage of <i>janwai</i> to express cause-effect relations between utterances	114
7.2.1	Data discussion	114
7.2.2	Section summary	121
7.3	Usage of <i>janwai</i> + <i>noun phrase</i>	121
7.3.1	Data discussion	121
7.3.2	Section summary	125
7.3.3	Chapter summary	125

8 Conclusion	127
8.1 Summary of findings	127
8.1.1 Overview of sequential environments: <i>janwai</i> as part of action formation and ascription	127
8.1.2 <i>janwai</i> as a response token	127
8.1.3 <i>janwai</i> -prefaced accounts	129
8.1.4 Usage of <i>janwai</i> to format cause-effect relations between interactional units	129
8.1.5 Usage of <i>janwai</i> to format noun phrases of cause or reason	130
8.2 Concluding remarks	130
8.2.1 Questions and <i>janwai</i> responses	130
8.2.2 Interactional trouble and <i>janwai</i> -accounts	131
8.3 Further studies	133
8.3.1 <i>Janwai</i> as a responsive construction	133
8.3.2 Towards construticography of talk-in-interaction	134
Appendix: Data Excerpts	144
(1) “All the desks”	144
(2) “Tarnished reputation”	146
(3) “Six or nine months”	149
(4) “Why do they feel this way”	151
(5) “What to why”	153
(6) “Hiking takes a week”	156
(7) “Hire an admin”	157
(8) “Oily not black”	159
(9) “Work after graduation”	161
(10) “Are you divorced”	162
(11) “Google Maps”	164
(12) “Poor government”	165
(13) “Prospering Kampongs”	168
(14) “Verifying the tax”	170
(15) “Puts on airs”	174
(16) “You need to wash”	176
(17) “Bought as a kid”	178
(18) “Doing research”	185
(19) “Days off”	187
(20) “Winter clothes”	190
(21) “Hot spring”	192
(22) “Paid survey”	195
(23) “Pioneer”	196
(24) “Football shoes”	198
(25) “You are Lala”	201
(26) “Penang Hokkien”	203
(27) “Volleyball championship”	205
(28) “Language Problems”	208
(29) “Home for Chinese New Year”	210

Acronyms

Arg1/Arg2	Argument 1/Argument 2
BAAL	British Association for Applied Linguistics
CA	Conversation Analysis
CHAT	CHAT Annotation Format
CLAN	TalkBank Annotation Editor
CSI/CSII	Constructional Schema I/II
DA	Dialog Act
DAMSL	Dialog Act Markup in Several Layers
DIT	Dynamic Interpretation Theory
EM	Ethnomethodology
FPP	First Pair-part
HKSCS	Hong Kong Supplementary Character Set
IL	Interactional Linguistics
minCHAT	minCHAT Annotation Format
MYCanCor	Malaysia Cantonese Corpus
PDTB	Penn Discourse Tree Bank
PDTB2	Penn Discourse Tree Bank 2.0
QWI	Question Word Interrogative
RST	Rhetorical Structure Theory
SAT	Speech Act Theory
SPP	Second Pair-part
TCU	Turn-Constructional Unit
TRP	Transition Relevance Place
UTF8	8-bit Unicode Transformation Format
WTI	Why Type Interrogative

Symbols and transcription conventions

Transcription:

Symbol	Interpretation
(.)	Short, untimed pause
(0.0)	Timed pause
=	Latching, speaker change without beat of silence
[	Brackets indicate onset of overlap
:::	Sound stretch
.	Falling intonation
,	Continuing intonation
?	Rising intonation
!	Animated or emphatic tone
	Onset of non-verbal behaviour
> <	Accelerated speech
-	Hyphen indicates an abandoned interactional unit
◦	Relatively quiet or fading speech
↑↓	Falling and rising intonation of lexical unit
<u>janwai</u>	Speaker emphasis
.hhh	In-breath
hhh.	Out-breath
jan(h)wai	Breathiness as in laughter, crying
hehe haha	Laughter
xxx	Incomprehensible stretch of speech
⇒	Indicates occurrence of <i>janwai</i>
(())	Transcribers comments or addition
(?)	Dubious hearing
(cont)	Continuation of previous line
(國) (/國)	Speech in Mandarin Chinese

Continuers

嗯 (<i>ng2</i>)	Enthusiastic tone, element of agreement
啊 (<i>aa1</i>)	Toneless, no element of agreement
哦 (<i>ngo4</i>)	Dull tone, element of reluctance

Other minimal units

喂 (<i>wai3</i>)	Attention getter
咦 (<i>ji2</i>)	Change-of-state token, topic change
↑哦:(<i>ngo2</i>)	Change-of-state token, epistemic

Part of speech (POS) tagset:

Part of Speech Tag	in Chinese	in English
Ag	形容词	Adjective Morpheme
a	形容词	Adjective
ad	副形容词	Adjective as Adverbial
an	名形容词	Adjective with Nominal Function
Bg	区别语素	Non-predicate Adjective Morpheme
b	区别词	Non-predicate Adjective
c	连词	Conjunction
Dg	副语素	Adverb Morpheme
d	副词	Adverb
e	叹词	Interjection
f	方位词	Directional Locality
g	语素	Morpheme
h	前接成分	Prefix
i	成语	Idiom
j	简略语	Abbreviation
k	后接成分	Suffix
l	习用语	Fixed Expression
Mg	数语素	Numeric Morpheme
m	数词	Numeral
Ng	名语素	Noun Morpheme
n	名词	Common Noun
nr	人名	Personal Name
ns	地名	Place Name
nt	机构团体	Organisation Name
nx	外文字符	Nominal Character String
nz	其它专名	Other Proper Noun
o	拟声词	Onomatopoeia
p	介词	Preposition
Qg	量语素	Classifier Morpheme
q	量词	Classifier
Rg	代语素	Pronoun Morpheme
r	代词	Pronoun
s	处所词	Space Word
Tg	时间语素	Time Word Morpheme
t	时间词	Time Word
Ug	助语素	Auxiliary Morpheme
u	助词	Auxiliary
Vg	动语素	Verb Morpheme
v	动词	Verb
vd	副动词	Verb as Adverbial
vn	名动词	Verb with Nominal Function
w	标点符号	Punctuation
x	非语素字	Unclassified Item
Yg	语气语素	Modal Particle Morpheme
y	语气词	Modal Particle
z	状态词	Descriptive

List of Figures

2.1	Example of RST-style annotation of causal connectives (e.g. Penn Discourse Tree Bank)	16
3.1	MYCanCor transcription example in minCHAT format	26
3.2	Typological roadmap of sequential structures featuring <i>janwai</i> in MYCanCor	31
4.1	Instances of initiating actions followed by <i>janwai</i> -prefaced responsive actions	33
4.2	<i>janwai</i> -initial responsive action	33
4.3	Formation of Telling-questions without Question-Word Interrogatives	38
4.4	Overview of findings in Chapter 4	46
5.1	Responsive action with turn-initial <i>janwai</i>	47
5.2	Responsive action with response token followed by <i>janwai</i> TCU	47
5.3	Formation of two-part responsive actions involving <i>janwai</i>	48
5.4	Overview of instances of initiating actions followed by <i>janwai</i> -prefaced responsive action	48
5.5	Cline of initiating actions that constitute Specifying and Telling-Questions	49
5.6	Responsive action featuring <i>janwai</i> following Telling questions	50
5.7	Responsive action featuring <i>janwai</i> following Specifying questions	55
5.8	Responsive action featuring <i>janwai me1 aal</i> or <i>janwai zou6 me1</i>	63
5.9	Accounts as relevant responses and accounts that follow relevant responses	72
5.10	Overview of findings in Chapter 5	73
6.1	Formation of an initiating action followed by <i>janwai</i> unit	74
6.2	<i>Step-by-step</i> formation of the pattern (featuring disfluencies)	75
6.3	<i>In-one-go</i> formation of the pattern (without disfluency)	83
6.4	Production of <i>m4 hai6</i> followed by <i>janwai</i>	95
6.5	Production of final particle <i>me1</i> followed by <i>janwai</i>	101
6.6	Overview of findings in Chapter 6	107
7.1	Production of <i>janwai</i> -initial turns in three speaker settings	109
7.2	Production of <i>janwai</i> followed by <i>so ji</i> (“so; therefore”)	114
7.3	Production of <i>janwai</i> that does not preface a turn, TCU or clause	121
7.4	Overview of findings in Chapter 7	126
8.1	Overview of four sequential environments of <i>janwai</i> in MYCanCor	128
8.2	Telling-question followed by Telling-response action pair; from data excerpt (1) “All the desks”	128
8.3	Usage of <i>janwai</i> to present a preceding turn as in need of an account; from data excerpt (8) “Oily not black”	129
8.4	Sequential pattern of question-response action pair featuring <i>janwai</i>	131
8.5	Sequential pattern of presenting a preceding turn as in need of an account using <i>janwai</i>	132

List of Tables

3.1	Gender and age group distribution in MYCanCor (rounded)	24
3.2	Total number of instances of <i>janwai</i> in MYCanCor (approximate)	27
3.3	Definition of <i>janwai</i> -initial structures in MYCanCor	28
3.4	Total number of <i>janwai</i> -initial structures and other sequential environments in MYCanCor	28
3.5	Representations and transcription formats used in the study	28

Summary

This thesis describes action formation and ascription featuring the Cantonese Chinese discourse marker *janwai* (“because”) in naturally-occurring Cantonese talk-in-interaction. Conceived as a conversation analytic exploratory data analysis, the study examines the use of this utterance as part of the formation of turns and turn construction units in a naturalistic setting. The study is grounded in MYCanCor, a video corpus of around 20 hours of spontaneous everyday conversation that was collected as part of the study in the Malaysian Cantonese speech community. The thesis describes the use of *janwai* in four sequential environments, (1) the production of responses that begin with *janwai*, (2) the production of responses that feature *janwai*, (3) the production of turns and TCUs that feature *janwai* but that do not ostensibly constitute responses, and (4) the production of *janwai* in various other sequential environments, such as to format repairs and noun phrases of cause or reason in clauses. Based on the analysis of the sequential unfolding of stretches of talk-in-interaction, the thesis identifies and explicates different sets of relevance rules that appear to underpin these usage environments. This analysis presents evidence that, as part of question-response sequences, *janwai* can constitute an affirmative response in turn-initial position and project the forthcoming of a telling or an account either in turn-initial position or after a response token. As part of action formation, *janwai* appears to be related to conversational accounting and may be deployed either after a displayed intelligibility problem to preface an account or as a device to retrospectively change action formation of the preceding turn as seeking or requiring an account. These findings show that the study of grammar as an emergent, real-world phenomenon can lead to new and unexpected insights in interactional properties of causal discourse markers and thereby contribute to a better understanding of how these utterances serve as a resource that participants deploy to form turns-at-talk, negotiate social action and accomplish interactional tasks. Based on these findings, I conclude with outlining how discourse-interactional functions of *janwai* may be captured as part of dialogic construction grammars.

Keywords: grammar in interaction, interactional linguistics, causal discourse markers, construction grammars

Introduction

This study sets out to examine what members of the Malaysian Cantonese speech community are doing when they use *janwai* (因為) in naturally-occurring everyday conversation. The puzzle that lies at the heart of this enterprise is to describe how the utterance serves as a resource for building turns-at-talk and the formation of action in talk-in-interaction. The study, aligned in the empirical tradition, approaches this through context-sensitive micro-analysis of video recordings of talk-in-interaction as a way to appreciate social behavior in its natural setting, that of real-world interaction.

There has been no dearth of studies on *janwai* as a ‘coherence marker’ or ‘causal connector’ and previous studies have examined the use of *janwai* and *yinwei* in corpora of text or speech. Yet few have examined how participants *in-situ*, in the real-time unfolding of talk, deploy this utterance to implement actions. The advantage of viewing utterances as resources for building turns that format actions is that it permits a process-oriented approach to linguistic structure as it unfolds in interlock with other action complexes. As this study will show, this approach can enable results that lead to novel and unexpected insights into a ‘well-understood’ and supposedly simple task such as describing the use of *janwai*.

1.1 Motivation

Like many conversation analytic studies, this project started with what analysts sometimes call ‘unmotivated looking’. A couple of years ago, after moving from Hong Kong to Singapore, I made the decision to study the language of a community that had long fascinated me since my first visit to the area while working on a documentary film in 2011: Perak, Malaysia. Coming from Hong Kong, I was surprised to find out that in the province of Perak and especially in the capital city Ipoh, Cantonese was the *lingua franca* of the Chinese community and that, as I found out later, this area is home to possibly the largest Cantonese speech community outside of China. Unfortunately, no linguistic resources seemed to be available that document this community and so the idea was born to build a corpus that captures a little bit of the language that people use in Perak and Ipoh. The outcome is the ‘Malaysia Cantonese Corpus’ that was collected in two rounds of fieldwork stretching over one year in total and that hopefully constitutes a small contribution to the documentation of Perak’s fast-changing linguistic landscape in its own rights.

This corpus was not conceived as a corpus of *janwai* nor was the use of *janwai* elicited in any way. In fact, the decision to explore the use of this particular utterance was made after the corpus was collected. As part of a research stay at the department of Computational Linguistics at the University of Düsseldorf, I began working on discourse parsing and published a small paper on causal coherence parsing in spoken Chinese (Liesenfeld, 2017b). As part of this paper, I reviewed existing work on utterances such as *janwai*, much of it focusing on their use as ‘causal coherence markers’. In the process of this review I began wondering why such a large number of studies that examined this utterance focus on causal relations. Consulting my corpus, it appeared to me that interactionally this items seemed to be involved in much more than signaling cause-effect relations. The question of what else there might be uncovered has stuck with me ever since and so I decided to embark on this exploratory study to find out and describe

what it is that participants are doing when they use *janwai*.

1.2 Objectives and Specifications

Conceived as a bottom-up exploratory data analysis, this study set out without a strong analytical focus or predefined goal. The study is grounded in a corpus that was not designed to study the use of *janwai* in particular. Rather, *janwai* and the grammatical and interactional structures it is part of emerged as topics of interest after the corpus was collected. The project gradually became centrally concerned with the examination of usage instances of *janwai* by members of the Malaysian Cantonese Chinese speech community and, departing from here, an analysis of what the participants are doing when this item appears in naturally- occurring conversation.

The study is based on a corpus of around 20 hours of video recordings of naturally-occurring everyday conversation uttered by around 200 participants. This corpus, called the Malaysia Cantonese Corpus (MYCanCor) features about 500 instances of *janwai*. These instances were examined to identify sequential patterns and a selected number was subsequently subject to a more detailed conversation analytic examination of talk-in-interaction.

1.3 Major contribution

An important findings of this exploratory data analysis is that *janwai* seems to commonly appear in four distinct but intertwined sequential environments:

- *janwai* and the formation of questions and responses
- *janwai* and the formation of accounts
- *janwai* and the formation of cause-effect relations between interactional units
- sequential positioning of *janwai* as a conjunction and preposition

These findings are based on the analysis of approximately 489 instances of *janwai* in the present corpus. In a second step, these four environments were further investigated through examining properties of their sequential organization. Grounded in the in-depth analysis of selected corpus excerpts, the thesis reports sequential patterns that appear to be related to the use of *janwai* in these four environments. Through describing and explicating the relevance rules that appear to underpin the occurrence of these patterns, this thesis hopefully breaks a little new conceptional ground of how *janwai* and the interactional units it is part of are employed in everyday speech and involved in solving a wide range of interactional tasks.

1.4 Organisation of the Dissertation

The thesis consists of **four analytic chapters (4, 5, 6 and 7)** that discuss a range of different sequential environments featuring the utterance of *janwai*. In these chapters, a total of 29 data excerpts from the Malaysia Cantonese Corpus (MYCanCor) are examined. **Chapter 4** examined the use of *janwai* to begin responses. **Chapter 5** also examined the use of *janwai* as part of responses, but sequentially following other ‘response tokens’. **Chapter 6** examined the use of *janwai* as part of action formation in settings other than question-response sequences, particularly focusing on the relation between the utterance of *janwai* and the occurrence of ‘disfluencies’. And **Chapter 7** describes several residual cases that were identified in the data set.

Preceding these analytic chapters, the thesis also features a literature review (**Chapter 2**) that revisits a number of relevant theoretical issues and that summarizes previous work on *janwai* and approximates in other languages. **Chapter 3** introduces the data set that was collected as part of this study - the

Malaysia Cantonese Corpus (MYCanCor). All discussed data excerpts are from this corpus of naturally-occurring everyday Cantonese speech. Lastly, **Chapter 8** concludes the thesis with a summary of all findings, relates these findings to previous work and outlines the contribution of this work to the field of conversation analysis, interactional linguistics and the study of grammar in interaction.

To enhance readability, the parts of the data excerpts under study are presented directly alongside the analysis in a four-line transcription format mainly based on Chinese characters using the Hong Kong Supplementary Character Set (HKSCS) to display Cantonese-specific characters. Additionally, should the need arise, longer transcripts can be found in the appendix.

2

Literature review

This chapter aims to situate the present study in the discipline of conversation analysis (CA) and provides an overview of previous work on ‘causal discourse markers’ and the social conduct these objects are part of. The chapter reviews related work coming out of CA, interactional linguistics and other strands of social-scientific inquiry and defines key concepts that are relevant for this study. Instead of a comprehensive review of the available literature, selected key publications in several areas are reviewed.

2.1 Defining concepts

The present study is aligned with the empirical tradition in that it provides transcripts of real-world talk-in-interaction alongside analytic writing and, whenever possible, the reader is advised to directly consult the video corpus that this study is grounded in. This data-driven analysis ideally enables results that can be grounded in the emic social conduct of the participants themselves through empirical examination of their use and in interlock with their actions.

2.1.1 Units of analysis

Following common conventions in conversation analysis, the basic unit of analysis that this study is based on are turns-at-talk and turn-constructual units (TCUs). The clause as a descriptor of a somewhat different unit also appears to be relevant at times and makes occasional appearances as an analytic unit.¹

Turns

The local management and negotiation of turn exchange is crucial for the organization of talk-in-interaction. In contrast to modes of regulated interaction, turn-taking in naturally-occurring conversation is locally organized and interaction takes place within the framework of a turn-taking system as described in the seminal paper by Sacks et al. (1974). According to Sacks et al.’s discoveries, smooth turn transition and speaker changes are possible because turns are ‘projectable’. This means that the participants are commonly able to predict a first possible end of a turn before it occurs. When such a point of possible completion or ‘transition-relevance place’ (TRP) is reached, the participants rely on the systematics of the ‘turn-allocation component’ to jointly negotiate whether a speaker change occurs or the same speaker continues to speak (Sacks et al., 1974, p.703).² Turn-allocation systematics can be grouped in allocation through other-selection (a speaker selects another speaker to go next) and self-selection (a speaker selects him/herself to go next). These turn-allocation processes become relevant at each TRP in the conversation when the decision of who goes next has to be made again.

¹See Thompson and Couper-Kuhlen (2005) for the argument that clauses are “interactionally-warranted units”.

²This makes it a locally-produced, joint interactional achievement if the same speaker continues to speak and utters a second TCU. In this view, TCUs are always joint-achievements that endogenously emerge from a negotiation process features at least two participants.

Sacks et al.'s description of the turn-taking system focuses on sequential organization and can explain some fundamental aspects of turn-taking in (non-regulated) conversation as well as the occurrence of various forms of overlapping speech, pauses and stretches of silence between turns (Levinson, 1983, p.298ff). Grounded in the turn as the fundamental unit of talk-in-interaction, the 'turn-constructive unit' (TCU) emerges as another unit of analysis. It describes a stretch of social conduct bounded by either speaker change or a transition-relevance place (TRP).

Turn-constructive Units (TCUs)

Turns-at-talk are commonly rather clearly identifiable units in conversation, they are bounded by speaker change or silence. TCUs and their boundaries in form of TRPs, on the other hand, can be much harder to identify (for both the analyst and the conversationalist). In fact, a rather large body of literature has been dealing with this issue, which will briefly be reviewed here.

There is no dearth of studies on the interplay of linguistic structure and the projectability and recognizability of TCUs and TRPs. In fact, even the notion of the TCU as a 'unit' remains contentious. Ford (2004), for instance, points out that what can *in-situ* be identified and described as a TCU in talk-in-interaction does not possess a precise shape and is necessarily subject to local contingencies. In naturally-occurring interaction, TCUs can often not be identified with a fixed set of parameters, but rather remain 'fuzzy' units that conversationalists identify by drawing on different locally-relevant dimensions of human social conduct (for an overview see Clayman 2013; for a more detailed discussion on turn versus TCU design and their 'identifiability', see also Drew 2013; Deppermann 2013).

Sacks et al. (1974) cautioned that turns and TCUs are not products of a single speaker that merely need to be recognized by a single party, rather they maintain that "the turn as a unit is interactively determined" (Sacks et al., 1974, p.726). Previous studies have, however, identified a range of cues that conversationalists commonly rely on to determine what constitutes (or jointly produces) TRPs and TCUs. Moreover, several bodies of literature discuss sets of cues that are relevant in the formation of TCUs, such as: syntactic cues (also implied by Sacks et al. (1974) themselves, according to Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (2018, p.34)), phonetic cues (e.g. Auer 2010, Barth-Weingarten 2013), intonational cues (e.g. Couper-Kuhlen 1996) and various aspects of multimodality (e.g. Goodwin and Goodwin 1987; Goodwin 1996; Hayashi 2005; Iwasaki 2007; Mondada 2006, 2016). In summary, what many of these studies on the interplay between different sets of cues show is that a highly multimodal conception of turns and TCUs is needed. As bounded units, turns and TCUs are "multimodal packages for the production of action" (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, 2018, p.35). Or, as Makoto Hayashi put it:

"[...] while turns-at-talk are often treated as if they were a bounded slot for speaking given to one participant at a time, they may be more adequately conceptualized as a temporally unfolding, interactively sustained domain of multimodal conduct through which both the speaker and recipients build in concert with one another relevant actions that contribute to the further progression of the activity in progress." (Hayashi, 2005, p.21)

Furthermore, it has been argued that participants may also orient to units other than turns and TCUs altogether, such as 'interactional units' (Ford and Thompson, 1996), 'action-units' (Steensig and Heine-mann, 2013), 'response slots' (Raymond, 2013) as well as to larger units such as storytelling (Li, 2010) and (Barsalou) frames (Loebner, 2018). In the light of such conceptions of turns as highly complex multimodal packages and taking into account that TRPs become locally relevant based on an interplay of a multitude of possible different cues, a widely-accepted definition of TCUs as units in interaction has not been achieved.

On the other hand, it has also been shown that TCUs are nonetheless important units in talk-in-interaction that participants commonly orient to, which makes TCUs an organizing dimension too important to be overlooked despite the fact that they have remained somewhat enigmatic. Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (2018), for instance, maintain that participants orient to the completion of TCUs, which is evident in cases of 'disturbance', where speakers stop midway, leave pauses or initiate self-repair in the course of uttering a TCU, in that the speaker may come back and continue the TCU as well as in that other

participants commonly wait for the speaker to do so (see also [Schegloff 1979](#)). [Lerner \(1991, 1996, 2004\)](#) has shown that syntactic structure is commonly interactionally shared, based on the observation that participants may collaboratively complete TCUs, which is evidence that participants commonly orient to and project (at least syntactic) dimensions of TCU construction (see also [Sidnell 2011](#)). Based on these findings, according to ([Selting, 2000](#)), the following definition of a TCU as the “smallest interactionally relevant complete linguistic unit” can be achieved:

“TCUs are interactionally achieved, flexible, and adaptable units in turns at talk that are oriented to as relevant by the participants. Yet they are not ends in themselves. They are the epiphenomena of turn construction, which itself delivers actions.” ([Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, 2018](#), p.39)

Another strand of research on TCUs has investigated the relationship between context-free and context-sensitive aspects of the turn-taking system, focusing on cultural variation in human social conduct. A large-scale quantitative study by [Stivers et al. \(2009\)](#), for instance, shows that the fundamental aspects of the turn-taking system seem to apply across a large number of different languages but that it is subject to local differences in ‘interactional pace’. Thus, the turn-taking system described by [Sacks et al. \(1974\)](#) seems to describe a more or less universal mechanism of human social conduct for the organization of talk-in-interaction in naturally-occurring everyday (unregulated) settings.

Projection and TCUs

As sequential structures, TCUs are ascribed a host of properties that participants commonly rely on to structure and enable talk-in-interaction, many of which have been described in the literature under the umbrella of ‘projection’ or ‘projectability’. Projection refers to the phenomenon that a (sequentially) earlier part of a structure makes a later part of the structure predicable through foreshadowing a possible trajectory based on shared knowledge of *gestalts* or percepts (holistic structures that emerge as the result of complex interactions among various stimuli ([Koffka, 1935](#))).

Projection resources are spread across different structural domains and may differ between languages and speech communities. Various typologies have been proposed to describe these resources. [Schegloff \(2013\)](#), for instance, proposes a distinction between macro-projection and micro-projection. The former refers to the more over-arching structural organization of turns and TCUs, and the latter refers to a more fine-grained structural organization of linguistic resources within TCUs ([Schegloff, 2013](#), p.40ff). [Auer \(2005\)](#) proposes to distinguish different domains of projection resources: action, sequential, content-based, syntactic, and phonological ([Auer, 2005](#), p.10) as well as a set of parameters to classify projection resources across different language (for an overview see [Auer 2015](#)). Several bodies of literature have been developed that describe differences in projection resources from a cross-linguistic perspective, looking at, for instance, grammatical differences between ‘early projection languages’ and ‘delayed projection languages’. The former describes languages such as English and German (as SVO languages) where the grammatical subject and a verb or verb complex commonly appear relatively early in a TCU which gives rise to a (sequentially) early recognition of the action that is being formatted ([Schegloff, 1987](#); [Thompson and Couper-Kuhlen, 2005](#)). The latter describes languages such as Japanese, where the verb or verb complex commonly occurs later in the TCU (SOV languages), which gives rise to different trajectories of action recognition (see [Tanaka 1999, 2000, 2004](#), [Hayashi 2004](#); see also [Iwasaki 2009](#)). There is also a growing number of studies that examine the roles of resources other than grammar and lexical choices in TCU construction (for an overview see [Fox et al. 2013](#)), such as the relationship between prosodic and grammatical resources in TCU construction ([Tanaka 2000](#); [Selting 2000](#); [Auer 2005](#)), pauses in TCU construction ([Local and Kelly 1986](#); [Iwasaki 2009](#)), inserts in TCU construction ([Mazeland, 2007](#)) and compound TCUs ([Lerner 1991, 1996](#)).

Another related body of literature describes practices related to the construction of multi-unit turns and the delivery of ‘big packages’ such as stories or accounts. [Sacks \(1992\)](#), for instance, describes the use of ‘first verbs’ as a means for the projection of multi-unit TCUs ([Sacks, 1992](#), p.180ff). Along similar lines, [Ford \(2001\)](#) describes the practice that negative turn-initial tokens (such as the English negative

response token “no”) and other markers of disaffiliation or disagreement are commonly followed by more talk that constitutes some form of elaboration. In terms of projection, this can be described as making an elaboration projectable through the utterance of a negation (Ford, 2001, p.51). Other practice for the delivery of multi-unit TCUs that have been described in the literature are the formation of pre-sequences (Schegloff (2007); Sidnell (2011)) and evidence for an orientation to various (rhetoric) schemata in talk-in-interaction that project more talk to come, such as [contrast+elaboration] or [contrast+solution] as described by Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson (2000) and Ford (2000).

Projection also plays a role in the organization of turn allocation and turn taking. When TCUs reach their projected ends, participants commonly engage in managing whether or not a speaker-change may occur. Projection plays a crucial role in this process as participants rely on linguistic and multimodal cues to determine their actions as talk approaches TRPs (Sacks et al., 1974; Sidnell, 2011). Previous studies have describes various practices of how participants achieve allocation of next TCUs. From a cross-linguistic perspective, Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (2018) propose a distinction between ‘accent-timed languages’ (such as in English as described by Schegloff 1987), ‘syllable-timed languages’ (such as Finnish, see Ogden 2001) and ‘mora-timed languages’ (such as Japanese, see Tanaka 1999). Generally, the literature in this field stresses that different languages and speech communities mobilize rather different resources for the organization of turn transition and the achievement of turn allocation, turn yielding, turn holding and turn expansion (for a general overview, see Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 2018, p.69ff; for an overview of turn expansion in particular, see Luke et al. 2012). In summary, what virtually all literature on projection and turn/TCU construction has in common is the view that turns and TCUs are interactional accomplishments that format social action in interdependence with specific linguistic resources. In this sense, turns and TCUs are epiphenomena of the processes of social action formation and ascription reviewed in the next section.

2.1.2 Action formation and ascription

At the core of talk-in-interaction lies the system of organization for human social conduct itself, a system that encompasses far more than only linguistic resources. This system that enables the formation and ascription of social actions through turns at talk is fundamentally other-oriented, or as Max Weber describes it:

“Action is ‘social’ insofar as its subjective meaning takes account of the behaviour of others and is thereby oriented in its course”³ (Weber 1922 in Swedberg 1999)

This conceptualization of social action (*soziales Handeln*) gives rise to a crucial problem in the study and description of social conduct. When the analyst (as well as the conversationalist) is confronted with the task to figure out “What is the speaker doing by that?” (Schegloff, 1997, p.506), *that* referring to the some form of observed (verbal) behavior, an answer can only be reached through induction and never in terms of absolute truth values. In Weber’s (translated) words:

“[Sociology is] [...] the science whose object is to interpret the meaning of social action and thereby give a causal explanation of the way in which the action proceeds and the effects which it produces. By ‘action’ in this definition is meant the human behavior when and to the extent that the agent or agents see it as subjectively meaningful [...] the meaning to which we refer may be either (a) the meaning actually intended either by an individual agent on a particular historical occasion or by a number of agents on an approximate average in a given set of cases, or (b) the meaning attributed to the agent or agents, as types, in a pure type constructed in the abstract. In neither case is the ‘meaning’ to be thought of as somehow objectively ‘correct’ or ‘true’ by some metaphysical criterion. This is the difference between the empirical sciences of action, such as sociology and history, and any kind of a priori

³Translation from the German in Swedberg (1999): “Soziales Handeln [...] soll ein solches Handeln heissen, welches seinem von dem oder den Handelnden gemeinten Sinn nach auf das Verhalten anderer bezogen wird und daran in seinem Ablauf orientiert ist.” (Weber, 1922)

discipline, such as jurisprudence, logic, ethics, or aesthetics whose aim is to extract from their subject-matter ‘correct’ or ‘valid’ meaning.” (Weber 1922 in Weber 1991)

This view of social action as a fundamentally reflexive process that is at all times oriented towards the recipient has been adopted by early students of talk-in-interaction such as Garfinkel and Sacks and become known as in these fields as “recipient design”.

“By ‘recipient design’ we refer to a multitude of respects in which the talk by a party in a conversation is constructed or designed in ways which display an orientation and sensitivity to the particular other(s) who are the co-participants. In our work we have found recipient design to operate with regards to word selection, topic selection, admissibility and ordering of sequences options and obligations for starting and terminating conversations etc., as will be reported in future publications.” (Sacks et al., 1974, p.727)

An important implication of the reflexive nature of social action is that human social conduct is commonly taking place in an environment of inter-subjective management of ‘recognitionals’ between the participants (or as Tomasello (2010) puts it, ‘shared intentionality’). In Sacks’ words (on person references):

“The specification of the general preference for recipient design in the domain of reference to persons is: If they are possible, prefer recognitionals. By ‘recognitionals’ we intend, such reference forms as invite and allow a recipient to find, from some ‘this-referrer’s-use-of-a-reference-form’ on some ‘this-occasion-of-use,’ who, that recipient knows, is being referred to. By ‘if they are possible’ we mean: If the recipient may be supposed by the speaker to know the one being referred to, and if the recipient may be supposed by the speaker to have so supposed.” (Sacks and Schegloff, 1979, p.17)

To reflect this inter-subjective view of interaction as an achievement of more than one party, the terms action formation and action ascription have been popularized in the interactionalist literature. Levinson (2013, p.104) defines action formation as the mobilization of linguistic and non-linguistic resources to format an action and action ascription (in contrast to e.g. action recognition) as how these forms are actually understood by the participants to be carrying out a particular action *in-situ* (normally based on some form of contextualized analysis such as the next-turn-proof procedure).⁴

Action granularity, practices, sequences and activities

What counts as an action in talk-in-interaction and how actions are to be identified and described is a central concern of conversation analysis (CA) and interactional linguistics (IL), but much remains to be discovered. What is known about social action mostly dates back to the early days of the development of the social sciences (with Max Weber’s descriptions of the reflexive character of social actions almost a century ago) and there have been surprisingly few discoveries since then. For instance, the question of what level of detail is appropriate to describe social action may vary drastically in the analysis of talk-in-interaction. Even the smallest snippet of observed (verbal) behavior may be described with varying degrees of granularity. The utterance of a single turn at talk can accurately be described as involving a multitude of actions in one sense of the word: participants stimulate muscles to raise their larynx, arrange muscles to round their lips and control air flow in order to produce pressure waves of a specific length that eventually become recognizable as an ‘utterance’ - what is described as an ‘action’ in talk-in-interaction in fact refers to a multitude of more granular actions that are orchestrated by the participants in a manner that they become recognizable as some form of larger package or an ‘action complex’. The appropriate level of granularity to address the questions that this study is asking is:

⁴A number of views have been proposed that describe in more detail the process of how participants come to understand a certain linguistic format as a particular action. Several contesting positions, the top-down (Schegloff, 1978), bottom-up (Drew, 2013) and the both-and view (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, 2018) have been proposed. The top-down view focuses on sequential position, the bottom-up view focuses on turn design as the main resource of the process of action ascription. The both-and view holds that both are resources that are used in combination.

“a level of action description that will allow them to appreciate how the structure and organization of talk-in-interaction impinge upon the choice of linguistic constructions and formats.” (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, 2018, p.212)

Thus, a view is needed that focuses on the reflexive (inter-subjective) dimensions of action complexes. A pragmatic solution for this problem is to adopt a contextualized and reflexive definition of ascribing ‘intention’ and identifying social action in the data, as put forward by Stephen Levinson, the proponent of a family resemblance-based definition that is geared towards possibilities that utterances are neither planned nor recognized as unidimensional social actions:

“The particular sense of action being put central here is the ascription or assignment of a ‘main job’ that the turn is performing. The sense of ‘main job’ or primary action intended here is what the response must deal with in order to count as an adequate next turn. [...] A turn may perform two, perhaps three, ‘main jobs’ at once, but perhaps not often more [...]” (Levinson, 2013, p.107f)

This definition leaves enough leeway to account for ‘non-prototypical’ responses and brings in the notion of multi-layered or stacked action that seems more suitable to take more reflexive and egalitarian connotations into account that have been sidelined in other (‘semantics first’) frameworks of social action such as Austin’s illocutionary and perlocutionary levels in speech-act theory (Austin, 1975), Goffman’s ‘main business’ and ‘ritual business’ (Goffman, 1976) or Clark’s ‘track 1’ and ‘track 2’ (Clark, 1996) (for an overview see Levinson 2013, p.107f). In fact, descriptions of conversational actions coming out of CA and IL have been established as complementing (or even contrasting) those coming out of pragmatics and Speech Act Theory (SAT) in a number of ways (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1976; Searle and Searle, 1969). Significant methodological and theoretical differences between the two approaches have led to the development of two rather independent fields of inquiry. For one, the data-driven, naturalistic conversation-based methodology behind CA/IL has led to a rather different set of descriptions that is narrower in most regards than that of SAT, but wider in terms of taking sequential properties into account, including actions such as prefaces, pre-requests, pre-closings etc. In contrast to SAT, CA/IL has emphasized the significance that ‘larger’ dimensions of the structural organization can play in talk-in-interaction, especially those that go beyond the turn or ‘sentence’ (for a more detailed overview of similarities and differences, see Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 2018, p.213f). These dimensions are:

- A **sequence** is “a course of action implemented through turns at talk” (Schegloff, 2007, p.7). They commonly feature at least one adjacency pair (the base pair), that determines the sequence type.
- A **project**, or plan of action, is a “course of action that at least one participant is pursuing” (Levinson, 2013, p.122). Projects differ from sequences in that they constitute a plan of action of one (or more) participants that is evident in some utterances but may not be sequentially evident as a whole (e.g. a pre-request is indicative of a forthcoming request and if the project of ‘requesting’ is eventually aborted, it is evident as a project but not as a sequence) (see Schegloff 2007, p.244 and Levinson 2013, p.122).
- **Practices** are certain forms of turn designs that are recognizable as an action. The terms covers both content-based and form-based uses of language that implement a certain action (Levinson, 2013, p.117). Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (2018, p.216) describe practices as “ways of formatting turns and of doing things in turns that make these turns recognizable as performing particular actions and that serve as the basis for ascribing particular actions to them. The relation between practices and actions is many-many: practices can implement different actions, and actions can be accomplished through different practices” (see also Schegloff 1997, p.505).

In summary, the nuts and bolts of how to systematically examine and describe social action remain somewhat contested as different approaches have evolved into different directions throughout the last decades. The state of the art in different fields of inquiry as well as some of the ongoing debates that surround it will briefly be reviewed in the next section.

2.1.3 The problem of action coding and typologies

An issue that has repeatedly been problematized in the literature is the question of what level of granularity is adequate for the description of action (as part of the process of action ascription). Related to this, the broader issue of how to conceptualize ‘intentionality’ in talk-in-interaction has been widely discussed. [Duranti \(2006\)](#), for instance, describes one of the core issues as the problem of:

“how to develop a theory of interpretation of social action (discourse included) that takes into consideration culture-specific claims about intentions while simultaneously allowing for a pan-human, universal dimension of intentionality” ([Duranti, 2006](#), p.31)

And, in fact, numerous typologies of (linguistic) social action of varying scope and design have been proposed to tackle the difficult topic of pinning down a (universal) definition of intentionality. Some of the most well known are those by [Bühler \(1934\)](#), [Jakobson \(1960\)](#) and [Searle \(1976\)](#), roughly distinguishing between three grand categories: (1) epistemicity (representation), (2) deonticity (steering or appeal) and (3) evaluation (expression). More recently, [Tomasello \(2010\)](#) proposes ‘three elementary motivations’ for human communication: informing, sharing and requesting. However, none of these typologies has gained wide-spread recognition in CA/IL, instead, many students of conversation associated with these fields seem to have come to call into question some of the fundamental assumptions that most of these typologies are based on. Capturing the thrust of a popular critique of such typologies, Levinson asks:

“Are we dealing with the mapping of action-to-utterance, or actually something more complex like a reconstruction of the other’s motives, with inevitable ineffability?” ([Levinson, 2013](#), p.106)

This harks back to be previously discussed issue surrounding the question to what extend action are coded in linguistic form and to what extend action ascription is depending on complex sequential context (such as sequences or projects). How much linguistic (and contextual) form is necessary to make an action recognizable? Harvey Sacks, in the context of his analysis of the minimal story “The baby cried. The mommy picked it up”, wrote “a culture is an apparatus for generating recognizable actions” ([Sacks and Schegloff, 1995](#), p.226). This view that ‘culture’ (local ways of doing things) as something that gives rise to constraints that enable projection and makes action recognition possible has also been advocated by proponents of Vygotskyian theories of sociocultural development in linguistics (e.g. [Lantolf and Pavlenko 1995](#); [Mondada and Doehler 2005](#)). A key point of this approach is that it is mainly ‘sociocultural’ constraints in conjunction with epiphenomena thereof (such as linguistic constraints) that ultimately enable action ascription for members of a certain speech community. In conversation, these constraints need to be managed by the participants to the extend that they provide the basis for a sufficient level of projection that is high enough to accomplish the interactional task at hand (in Vygotsky’s terms, enough constraints need to be provided that the participants jointly engage in verbal behaviour within their inter-subjective ‘zone of proximal development’). This view suggests that what lies at the core of conceptualizing action recognition, is the remarkable human capacity for attuning their communicative behaviors to different addressees, a phenomenon that becomes observable as ‘recipient design’ in CA/IL (and reflexive social action in sociology).

Students of conversation point to ‘adjacency pairs’ as a prime example of such projective power. In question-response sequences, the choice of what constitutes an ‘adequate next turn’ after a question is often highly constrained as it has to ‘fit into a slot’ of relevant ‘second-pair part’ responses. However, what is happening in terms of action formation and recognition may not be as mechanical as the terminology of ‘slotting’ may suggest. For instance, it has been shown that questions are often a vehicle for other actions ([Schegloff, 2007](#), p.9). Questions may constitute a ‘double’, for example, a pre-invitation can serve as a request for information while, at the same time, also constitute a broaching of an upcoming action ([Levinson, 2013](#), p.110). Actions may be ‘stacked’ and may come in sequences, such as complaint sequences or requests that are followed by counter-requests. ([Levinson, 2013](#), p109). In summary, the literature on action coding and typologies appears to display a trend on moving away from looking for action in turn design alone and towards larger units such as action plans behind specific turns and projects

(as proposed by e.g. [Schegloff 1978](#), [Levinson 2006](#); [2013](#)). [Levinson \(2013, p. 125\)](#), for instance, holds that:

“Indeed, thinking about nonverbal action sequences may help us understand the verbal ones. In general, we seem to understand others’ actions in terms of a grammar of motives (cf. Sacks’ grammar of recognizable actions): if you are fiddling in your pockets in front of a door, I assume you are searching for your keys and will go on and open the door. If I have the same keys, you might put out your hand for them, or I might offer them. Actions come tiered: this one (finding keys) is a step toward that one (opening the door), which is jointly achieved by a sequence of others (putting the key in the lock, turning it, and so forth). We can insert our actions into others’ action streams (offering the keys) because we recognize the whole from one subpart (the fiddling in the pocket by the door) and thus can predict all the rest of the subparts.” ([Levinson, 2013, p. 125](#))

As difficult as it may be, a systematic description of action formation and ascription is crucial to any descriptive study of talk-in-interaction. As of this study, this chapter briefly outlined the highly complex and multi-layered nature of social action in turns-at-talk - the accurate description of which lies very much at the heart of the analytical parts of the thesis.

2.2 Engines of sequence organization

This section reviews literature that is concerned with describing specific mechanisms and resources that participants utilize and rely on when engaging in talk-in-interaction. Instead of a comprehensive review, this section will briefly summarize only those resources that have been observed to bear immediate relevance to the topic under study - the use of *janwai* (因為), i.e. those resources that have been found to be potentially related to turns at talk that feature *janwai* and that seem to ‘drive’ these stretches of talk in some regards. Adopting [Heritage \(2012a\)](#)’s and [Thompson et al. \(2015\)](#)’s terminology, these ‘engines’ of talk-in-interaction are **epistemic status and stance**, two relatively well-described (but not undisputed) resources first described by [Heritage \(1984, 1998, 2005\)](#). **Deontic status** and (deontic) **agency**, two more recently described engines that are related to epistemics but have been established as somewhat distinct resources. In addition to these engines that are conceptualized as ‘resources’, two more sequentially-oriented ‘driving forces’ that operate at the level of turn construction are also potentially relevant and are thus reviewed: **type-conformity** and **front-loading**.

2.2.1 Epistemic status

A question is a type of social action by which a participant asks another participant (the recipient) to provide some kind of information that the recipient is imputed to have knowledge about. Or to put it differently, a questions ‘main job’ is to request information.⁵ In conversation, the participant who utters a question commonly puts herself/himself in a relative position of ‘unknowing’ or in a [K-] position (with regards to the question). In a similar fashion, this puts the other party in a position of knowing or [K+] (for more detail, see [Heritage 2012b](#); [Heritage and Raymond 2012](#)). The terms [K-] (or ‘unknowing party’) and [K+] (or ‘knowing party’) here describe a specific part of a speaker’s ontology that is concerned with the management of information as either ‘new’ or ‘given’ (known or unknown) in relation to the interlocutor(s). Similar distinctions have also been described extensively by a wide variety of communication and linguistic theory (e.g. [Shannon and Weaver 1949](#), [Halliday and Hasan 1976](#), [Clark and Haviland 1977](#), [Prince 1981](#), [Chafe 1994](#)). More specifically, this process of reflexive and ongoing assessment of the ‘level of informedness’ during talk-in-interaction has been described in terms of ‘epistemic status’, ‘background knowledge’ or ‘common ground’ by various strands of functional linguistic theory (i.e. [Garfinkel 1967](#), [Clark 1996](#), [Stalnaker 1978](#), [Enfield 2006](#), [Tomasello 2010](#), [Heritage 2013a](#)).

⁵As described earlier, question may also be used as vehicles for other action. Some analysts have put forward a distinction between ‘requests for confirming’ and ‘requests for information’[p.218]([Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, 2018](#)). Without denying the validity of these observation, this basic description does not take these observations into account.

Drawing on these traditions, this study adopts the terminology [K+] (‘more knowledgeable position’) and [K-] (‘less knowledgeable position’) to describe the participant’s treatment of relevant knowledge at stake at a certain time in a conversation (see [Heritage 2010](#), [Heritage and Raymond 2012](#), [Heritage 2012b](#), [Heritage 2013a](#)). In more detail, drawing on Heritage’s concept of ‘relative epistemic status’, these terms describe:

“the relative epistemic access to a domain or territory of information as stratified between interactants such that they occupy different positions on an epistemic gradient (more knowledgeable [K+] or less knowledgeable [K-]), which itself may vary in slope from shallow to deep.”⁶ ([Heritage, 2012b](#), p.4)

In addition to these descriptions of ‘epistemic status’, this study also adopts descriptions of another, related dimension of epistemics in talk-in-interaction: ‘epistemic stance’. The term describes the more momentary management of epistemic resources in the sequential unfolding of talk, or, in Heritage’s words:

“If epistemic status vis-a-vis an epistemic domain is conceived as a somewhat enduring feature of social relationship, epistemic stance by contrast concerns the moment-by-moment expression of these relationships, as managed through the design of turns at talk.” ([Heritage, 2012b](#), p.6)

In summary, Heritage puts forward the view that epistemic status is a commonly used resource in determining what constitutes a request for information ([Heritage, 2012b](#), p.7ff). Alongside other cues, epistemic status is described as a resource that participants evidently rely on to determine what class of actions an utterance constitutes. Even though the extent to which this resource can be traced in form of empirically evident form has been questioned and remains somewhat contentious, epistemics as a resource and associated processes related to the continuous tracking of what others know seems without doubt something that fundamentally shapes the way actions are formed and recognized (see also [Sperber et al. \(2010\)](#)’s description of “a suite of cognitive mechanisms for epistemic vigilance” that humans rely on to determine whether and how to act on what is being uttered ([Sperber et al., 2010](#), p.33).) In short, epistemic status and epistemic stance constitute resources that, despite the fact that they are sometimes hard to trace empirically, do without doubt constitute resources that are simply too pervasive to be dismissed, or as Heritage puts it:

“Since any and all aspects of clausal morphosyntax are overwhelmed in their significance for action formation by epistemic status, interactants must at all times be cognizant of what they take to be the real-world distribution of knowledge and of rights to knowledge between them as a condition of correctly understanding how clausal utterances are to be interpreted as social actions.” ([Heritage, 2012b](#), p.24)

2.2.2 Deontic status

Interrelated with other dimensions of ‘authority’ in conversation (such as epistemic status), deontic status (also known as deontic authority or deontic rights) refers to a participant’s management of rights and responsibilities and their “rights to determine other’s future actions” ([Stevanovic and Peräkylä, 2012](#), p.297). Deontic status has been described as another resource that conversationalists evidently use in talk-in-interaction to accomplish interactional tasks. Like epistemic status, this resource has been identified in interaction and was then described as an interactional resource within the framework of a ‘practice-based theory of knowledge and action’ (for an early proponent for this paradigm, see [Goodwin 1994, 1997, 2010](#)). This modality is based on the observation that:

⁶Heritage emphasizes that this is not to be misunderstood as a unidimensional variable but rather as a process of navigating an ‘epistemic landscape’ (see also [Sidnell 2012](#)).

“alongside the *epistemic* dimension of authority (concerning knowledge) [...], participants orient also to the *deontic* dimension of authority (concerning rights and obligations)—something that must be regarded as separate from the epistemic dimension but yet as interrelated to it.” (Stevanovic and Peräkylä, 2012, p.298)

Although the description of deontic status as an interactional resource is a rather recent development, this view builds on existing studies that have described ‘rights and responsibilities’ in interaction more generally (see Sterponi 2003; Raymond and Zimmerman 2007; Zinken and Ogiermann 2011). To date, numerous studies on deontic status are available, many coming out of the study of interaction in institutional settings (such as doctor-patient consultations, e.g. Toerien et al. 2013; Landmark et al. 2015). This is indicative of the possibility that orientation to deontic status may be especially relevant in institutional settings where a rather steep gradient of deontic authority is evident (such as between doctors and patients or judges and defendants). However, it has also been shown that orientations to deontic resources are a pervasive feature of everyday talk-in-interaction, evidently encoded in linguistic form more generally (for a discussion on the ‘deontic modality’, see Givón 2005, p.149ff, see also Palmer 2001; Couper-Kuhlen and Etelämäki 2015). In summary, deontic status (and deontic modality) are evidently possible ‘driving forces’ of talk-in-interaction, that, similar to epistemic status, have proven to be somewhat challenging to trace empirically, but that are nonetheless ‘engines’ of conversation that are too pervasive to be neglected.

2.2.3 Agency

Related to the concept of deonticity, agency (or deontic agency) here refers to conversational practices of “nominating future actions” and the question of “how the agents (performers) of future actions are targeted” (Couper-Kuhlen and Etelämäki, 2015, p.7). In this sense, agency is explored empirically within the (Goodwinian) framework of a ‘practice-based theory of knowledge and action’, with much of the work in this tradition focusing on (personal) references and directive sequences in talk-in-interaction (see Couper-Kuhlen and Etelämäki 2015; Stevanovic and Peräkylä 2012). This more data-driven line of inquiry has emerged from and is informed by more theoretical work on agency (for an overview see Duranti 2004), in particular the more abstract semiotic models proposed under the umbrella of ‘distributed agency’ (Enfield 2011; 2013; 2014; Kockelman 2013; Kockelman et al. 2007). In CA/IL, (deontic) agency refers to the description of resources (such as ‘zero-person forms’ and ‘modal constructions’) that participants use to manage the distribution of agency as part of actions such as requests or proposals (Couper-Kuhlen and Etelämäki, 2015, p.7). In Couper-Kuhlen and Etelämäki (2015)’s words, this resource is especially worth exploring in languages where ‘zero-person forms’ are common (such as Finnish and, to some extent, Cantonese) “where subjects need not always be expressed and where special constructions [...] exist for leaving personal reference open.” (Couper-Kuhlen and Etelämäki, 2015, p.7) (for more detail on ‘zero person forms’, see Laitinen 2006). In this study, agency and (person) reference are especially relevant in relation to accounting practices, which, as will be shown, may be formatted with *janwai*.

2.2.4 Type-conformity

In contrast to the previously discussed resource-based ‘engines’, type-conformity is a more sequence-oriented driving force of turn organization. In talk-in-interaction, this mechanism is related to ‘adjacency pairs’ and ‘response obligations’, two topics that have long been of concern of CA/IL (for an overview see Schegloff 2007). These ‘obligations’ describe the strong expectation that a certain type of ‘initiating action’ (or first-pair part) is to be met by a certain matching ‘responsive action’ (or second-pair part), which becomes ‘conditionally-relevant’ after the utterance of the first part. A ‘conditionally-relevant response’ is an responsive action that locally accounts for “what the response must deal with in order to count as an adequate next turn” (Levinson, 2013, p.107). In other words, questions make a certain set of responsive turn designs conditionally-relevant, i.e. those that are locally and jointly expected to

be used as part of the response (Sacks, 1987). As initiating actions, questions may be formed using ‘interrogatives’ (such as question tokens), which then may make certain type of response tokens relevant (Enfield et al., 2010). Within the range of possible relevant responses, some are commonly ‘preferred responses’ in that they do not threaten intersubjectivity or sociality (see Pomerantz 1984; Heritage 1984) or sequence progression (Schegloff 2007).

Generally, the term ‘question’ refers to an action that may or may not be formatted using an ‘interrogative’. From a typological perspective, Sadock and Zwicky (1985) propose three groups of question-response design: ‘agree-disagree languages’, ‘echo-languages’ and ‘yes/no languages’. However, as an uneasy fit into this trifold categorization, Cantonese Chinese features elements of both ‘agree-disagree languages’ (such as Japanese) and ‘echo-languages’ (such as Welsh). In Cantonese, question formation may or may not feature an interrogative token. Interrogatives may be used to format requests for information, requests for confirmation or checks of understanding and to initiate ‘repair’ of the previous utterance (also see Enfield et al. 2010).

Several types of question design have been distinguished in the literature. According to Raymond (2003), questions may be ‘polar’ in that they make a polar response relevant. In many languages, these polar responses are commonly formatted using ‘polar response tokens’ (such as yes or no response tokens in yes/no languages or echo token and negation token + echo token in echo languages). In the case of Yes/No languages, Raymond (2003) proposes the term ‘Yes/No interrogative’ (or YNI) to describe those designs that make a polar response relevant. Raymond (2003) also distinguishes between responses to questions that are ‘type-conforming’ (confirming a treatment of the question as such and formatted using a relevant response token) and those that are ‘nonconforming responses’. Thompson et al. (2015) propose to refer to interrogatives that are commonly used to format questions as ‘question-word Interrogatives’ or QWIs and distinguish between those QWIs that format Specifying-questions and those that format Telling-question (on the design level).

“Our data reveal two types of QWIs (question word interrogatives) in English, which we argue have strikingly different interactional consequences: [...] Specifying Questions seek single, specific pieces of information. Telling Questions, on the other hand, seek extended responses - reports, stories, accounts, explanations, and so on. Both Specifying Questions and Telling Questions may seek information as their main action, or they may seek that information in the service of other actions.” (Thompson et al., 2015, p.20)

This distinction between ‘Specifying-questions’ and ‘Telling-questions’ is relevant to this study based on the observation that *janwai*, as part of responsive action, seems to commonly occur (as a relevant response) following a Telling-question, for instance formatted using the interrogatives *dim2 gaai2* (“why; how come”) or *zuo6 me1* (“why; do what”). This suggests that *janwai* can be part of a type-conforming responsive actions after Telling-questions (or ‘why-type questions’).⁷ Furthermore, as will be discussed in more detail, it seems that why-type questions are a question type that can be followed by a response that begins with *janwai*.

2.2.5 Front-loading

Front-loading describes a pattern in turn design whereby functional cues occur sequentially relatively early in a turn. The interactional literature describes a ‘bias of general preference of front-loading’ (as opposed to back-loading) with regards to action formation and ascription that appears to be consistent cross-linguistically (Levinson, 2013, p.111ff):

“Overall, then, despite the existence of sentence-final particles, there is some evidence for ‘front-loading’, or at least omission of ‘back-loading’, in these languages too. We treat it here as a likely universal bias given the nature of the turn-taking system and vulnerability of final items to overlap”(Levinson, 2013, p.112)

⁷This leads to the question of what type-conformity structure *janwai* is commonly part of - something that will be explored in the analytical part of this study.

This phenomenon is relevant to this study based on the observation that *janwai* commonly occurs early in turns or TCUs. In fact, as of this data set, *janwai* commonly occurs in ‘turn-initial position’ or ‘TCU-initial position’ (Drummond and Hopper, 1993; Heritage, 2013c). This means that *janwai* is the first utterance that participants produce when beginning a turn or TCU. Such ‘turn-initial objects’ have been described in the literature as an important position that can provide “cues to action type early in the turn” (Levinson, 2013, p.112).

As part of response sequences, turn-initial positions have also been described as important places with regards to action formation and ascription. Turn-initial objects may here serve as a cue for a certain action ascription with regards to the preceding question (which often serve as ‘vehicles’ for other action according to Schegloff and may therefore make a specification by the respondee necessary of which ‘main jobs’ s/he will address in the response). Specifically, turn-initial objects may serve as ‘early cues’ for the forthcoming of a certain response type with regards to action formation (which, in turn, enables an early action ascription by the other participants) (see also the discussion on ‘modular pivots’ or ‘turn-constructional pivots’, Clayman 2013, p.162ff). In this sense, turn-initial objects seem to play a unique role in both ascribing actions to the preceding turn and enabling early action ascription of the turn of which they are part.

2.3 Prior work on *janwai* (因為) and approximates in other languages

This section briefly summarizes previous studies on *janwai* (因為) and approximate tokens in other languages. The first subsection provides an overview of previous studies on ‘causal connectors’ and ‘causal coherence markers’ in different languages, briefly outlining different viewpoints and contrasting different approaches to the study of this object class in text and speech. The second subsection focuses particularly on interactionally-oriented studies of these objects across different languages, which will be discussed in more detail.

2.3.1 Causal connectors and causal coherence markers

Early studies of *because*, *yinwei*, *janwai* and similar tokens in other languages have yielded important insights in the work that such objects do. The main strand of research on these objects in English-speaking academia is largely associated with Chomskyian linguistics (and generative semantics) and has long been concerned with ‘causal connectives’ or ‘causal coherence markers’, describing the use of such tokens as (1) conjunctions that introduce clauses to express a cause or reason for an event, state or affair or (2) prepositions followed by an NP of cause or reason (for an historic overview see Newmeyer 2014; for Mandarin Chinese, see Chao 1965; Lü 1982; Xing 2001; Song and Tao 2008; Zhang 2012; Li and Wang 2013; Zhang 2015). This line of work, that is primarily based on text data, has focused mainly on clause combining and generally examines *because* as part of adverbial clauses that follow or precede a main clause.

In this view, *because* is examined as part of a hierarchical structure that relies on the clause as a unit of organization, describing the ‘causal marker’ as part of a ‘subordinate’ (or ‘hypotactic’) unit. Schiffrin (1987), for instance, describes *because* as a marker of cause and proposes that:

“*because* is a marker of subordinate idea units [...] From a functional perspective, subordinate material is that which has a secondary role in relation to a more encompassing focus of joint attention and activity.” (Schiffrin, 1987, p.191)

Related to this view of *because* as a token that connects objects, ‘causal connectors’ are an important part of frameworks that examine ‘discourse relations’. Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST) (Mann and Thompson 1987, 1988), a framework that describes discourse relations in text, for instance, features ‘*because*’ as a tool to describe a subset of discourse coherence relations, namely ‘causal coherence relations’. In RST, causal connectors generally ‘link’ two arguments (Arg1 and Arg2), normally in the form of clauses, and signal a cause - effect relationship between the two units (see Figure 2.1).

Figure 2.1: Example of RST-style annotation of causal connectives (e.g. Penn Discourse Tree Bank)

- (1) 我不參加^{Arg1} 因為^{connective} 我不會游泳^{Arg2}
 (1) *I don't join*^{Arg1} 'because'^{connective} **'I can't swim.'**^{Arg2}

(Arg1=italics, connectives=underlined and Arg2=bold)

Based on RST, a number of large-scale annotated data bases of discourse structure were produced, such as the Penn Discourse Tree Bank (PDTB) and the Penn Discourse Tree Bank 2.0 (PDTB2) (Mitsakaki et al., 2004; Prasad et al., 2007), which have been well received in the study of discourse relations and have come to be widely applied in annotation, tagging and learning of discourse relations of English text (i.e. Carlson et al. 2003; Marcu and Eshihabi 2002). Numerous similar resources have been created for other languages, all based on RST. For Mandarin Chinese text, see (Xue et al., 2005) (here *yinwei* is threatened similar to the English 'because').

Explicit and implicit coherence

In the case of 'causal markers', such as *because* or *yinwei*, these frameworks usually distinguish between explicit (stated) and implicit causal relations. Causal markers are treated as 'signaling causal relationship', marking a possible (or implicit) relationship between units (arguments) as explicit (Duque, 2014). Based on this distinction, studies in the field of natural language processing have mainly focuses on the 'easy' task of identifying and tagging explicit relations (e.g. Pitler et al. 2008) and the relatively difficult task of identifying and tagging implicit relations in text (e.g. Lin et al. 2009, Louis et al. 2010, Zhou et al. 2010).

From text to speech

Several efforts to produce a RST-style annotation taxonomy for speech data instead of text data were undertaken. These frameworks draw on Speech Act Theory (SAT) and define semantically-oriented taxonomies centrally concerned with the inference of a predefined set of dialog acts (DAs) (Bunt and Black, 2000). In recent decades several of such 'Dialog Act taxonomies' of different scope and design were created. Allen and Core (1997), for instance, introduced the 'Dialog Act Markup in Several Layers' (DAMSL) framework, a taxonomy for annotating utterances in dialog using Dialog Acts. The DAMSL framework has since been applied to a wide range of (mostly task-oriented) dialog corpora, such as the switchboard corpora (Jurafsky et al., 1997). More recently, Bunt et al. (2010) introduced a dialog act taxonomy of somewhat similar design based on 'Dynamic Interpretation Theory' (DIT and DIT++) (Bunt, 2009). This taxonomy is published under the umbrella of the 'ISO 24617' standard for the annotation of Dialog Acts (DAs) (see also Bunt 2010, Bunt et al. 2012). Reflecting the semantically-oriented nature of these taxonomies, tokens such as *because* and *janwai* are, like in Rhetorical Structure Theory and in the Penn Discourse Treebank, threatened as signaling an (explicit) cause-effect relationship between preceding and following units of talk (see Bunt et al. 2012 for English and Liesenfeld 2017a; 2017b for Chinese).⁸

These (semantic) dialog act taxonomies as well as most previous studies have come out of the fields of coherence marking and discourse relations, do not deal with properties of 'causal markers' particular to spoken conversation. When it comes to describing properties of objects such as causal markers, this strand of research usually does not distinguish between text and speech as different modes of discourse. Sanders et al. (1992), for instance, in the context of proposing a taxonomy of coherence relations, remark that:

⁸There have been various attempts to apply these RST-style annotation taxonomies to conversational data with the aim to identify and learn discourse relations in speech, but these studies have generally achieved a relatively low accuracy (i.e. Mladová et al. 2008, Sara et al. 2010).

“In our view there are no principled differences between spoken and written discourse with respect to the phenomena we address in this article. Therefore, whenever we use the terms reader and writer, we also intend the speaker and the listener.” (Sanders et al., 1992, p.1)

Another strand of research, however, has been particularly concerned with describing properties of objects in conversational data and discovered properties that go beyond the ‘canonical’ function of these tokens as markers of cause or reason. This work mainly coming out of the fields of conversation analysis and interactional linguistics will briefly be reviewed in the next section.

2.3.2 Interactional studies of causal markers

Interactionally-oriented studies of discourse markers are generally grounded in naturally-occurring audio or video data, which opens up possibilities to investigate the unfolding of larger stretches of talk and relate discourse makers to other structures of organization such as actions, sequences and projects. The bulk of these studies is centrally concerned with the relationship between (social) actions and their linguistic form, and, to this end, describe ‘interactional uses’ of these objects in talk-in-interaction. These studies usually build on and complement other more semantically-oriented studies by describing how these objects ‘come alive’ in real-world social interaction. In the case of ‘causal connectors’ or ‘causal coherence markers’ such as *janwai*, *yinwei* or *because*, interactionally-oriented studies have made important contributions to a more comprehensive understanding of their in-situ use. Many of these studies, especially work on English data, are based on the clause as a ‘locus of grammar and interaction’ (adopting the view that clauses are ‘interactionally warranted units’; see Thompson and Couper-Kuhlen 2005).

Hypotaxis and Parataxis

Early interactional studies of discourse markers describes a range of uses of *because* in spoken discourse that complement the canonical view of *because* as a ‘subordinating conjunction’.⁹ These ‘mainstream’ descriptions are based on e.g. English expository writing, where subordinate because-clauses may occur both before or after a main-clause (Altenberg 1984; Biber 2010; Diessel 2005). This also applies to written Cantonese (Killingley 1993; Matthews and Yip 2013) and written Mandarin (Chao 1965; Xing 2001; Lü 1982). In spoken discourse, on the other hand, post-posed because-clauses seem to be much more common than their pre-posed counterparts (for English see Ford 1993; Couper-Kuhlen 2011 and for Mandarin Biq 1995; Tsai 1996; Wang 1996, 2001; Su 2002; Song and Tao 2008, 2009). As of spoken Cantonese, no previous studies seem to have examined this, however, the present data set suggests that pre-posed *janwai*-clauses are also less common in spoken Cantonese.

Another body of literature on clause-combining complements these findings. Schleppegrell (1991) points out that ‘because’ may be used to “indicating elaboration and continuation in non-subordinating and non-causal contexts” (Schleppegrell, 1991, p.323), a range of uses that she refers to as ‘paratactic’ or ‘coordinating’ - in contrast to ‘hypotactic’ or ‘subordinating’ uses. This distinction has since been adopted and fleshed out by other studies in the field. Ford (1993), for instance, approaches clause combination with a focus on intonational and interactional aspects. Drawing on the work of Chafe (1984, 1988), she examines intonational features of how speakers link temporal, causal and conditional clauses with their preposed or postposed utterances. Ford distinguished between a range of intonational contours such as “falling” and “continuous” and, based on these features, presents a range of taxonomies for the different types of clauses under consideration. In addition, she describes that clauses beginning with a causal marker which are linked with a “continuous” intonation (with regards to the preposed utterances) function to introduce new information (Ford, 1993, p.93ff). Similar causal clauses that feature a falling

⁹Interactional studies seem to have generally focused on causal discourse markers used as conjunctions that introduce clauses and not on the use of these objects as prepositions followed by NPs. To the author’s knowledge, no interactional studies have described significant differences of the use of causal discourse makers as prepositions in ‘real-world’ interaction versus text-based studies (see also Chapter 7.3).

intonation, however, operate as ‘post-completion extensions’ that serve a number of interactional functions such as adding information when a preferred response is not forthcoming or accounting for a second pair-part (SPP) in environments of ‘interactional trouble’ (Ford, 1993, p.116).

Complementing this work on English data, Ford and Mori (1994), examines the use of discourse markers in clause-combining cross-linguistically, looking at English and Japanese. They conclude that universal and language-specific resources jointly shape the use of discourse makers:

“[...] there are needs and constraints in human interaction that affect the shape of turns and the use of grammar in typologically distinct language. [...] While “universal” forces in human interaction clearly influence the use of grammar, typological differences also create advantages and disadvantages in the achievement of certain interactional functions.” Ford and Mori (1994, p.58)

Another line of work by Couper-Kuhlen draws on construction grammar and frame semantics (Fillmore 1988; Fillmore et al. 1988; Goldberg 1995) to complement Ford’s work on the interplay of clause combining and intonational contours. Couper-Kuhlen (1996), for instance, examines the use of discourse markers in clause-combining but maintains that falling or continuous intonation might not be “a relevant parameter for differentiating adverbial use in discourse” (Couper-Kuhlen, 1996, p.390). Instead, she introduces declination reset as a variable that “rather strikingly” corresponds with two distinct readings of *because*-clauses (Couper-Kuhlen, 1996, p.403). The study argues that “direct causal relation” typically correlates with the absence of a declination reset. On the other hand, “indirect cause or reason” or “causal linkage in the epistemic domain” correlates with the appearance of declination reset (Couper-Kuhlen 1996, p.403, see also Sweetser 1990, p.77f). Furthermore, Couper-Kuhlen claims that this is evidence that these patterns “contribute to the constitution of distinct constructional schemas for causal linkage”, termed “CSI” and “CSII” (Couper-Kuhlen, 1996, p.389).

Couper-Kuhlen maintains that functions of *because*-clauses in conversation can be grouped into ‘hypotactic’ (subordinating) and ‘paratactic’ (coordinating) that both come with different pitch properties and interactional uses. In her data, Couper-Kuhlen observes a preference for ‘paratactic’ *because*-clause combination when it comes to providing “reasons following assessments and evaluations” (Couper-Kuhlen, 1996, p.414). She explains this as follows:

“In fact, the majority of reasons following assessments and evaluations in the data at hand are configured [...] with CSII. Now this is rather telling: Not only does it underline once again the unmarked nature of CSII (as opposed to CSI), it also suggests that participants have something to gain from deploying CSII rather than CSI. What they gain must be seen in interactional terms. First, and quite concretely, they gain an additional TCU. Rather than packing two clauses into one TCU with CSI, they distribute them over two TCUs with CSII. In assessment sequences, this strategy has the advantage of allowing the addressee a potential response space and the speaker an opportunity to monitor how the addressee deals with this space - ultimately ensuring closer negotiation in the interactionally sensitive ask of achieving a mutually agreeable evaluation. But also in other (non-assessing) activities, CSII allows for more acknowledgement opportunities for addressees and for more possibilities of emphasis for speakers. That is, it gives speakers the chance to make a (personal, often affect-laden) meta-level comment on their talk. In a very subtle way it allows them to present their turns at talk as reasoned actions - and consequently their interactional selves as rational beings: I know this because, I ask this because, I request this because. Given such gains, the preference for CSII over CSI in conversation should come as no surprise.” (Couper-Kuhlen, 1996, p.414-416)

In summary, the ‘interactional gains’ described by Couper-Kuhlen enable a ‘closer negotiation’ that is evident in a step-by-step utterance of clauses, providing more TRPs that may be used to utter (mis)alignment. In addition to these studies that have focused on the interplay between interactional properties and intonational or phonetic properties, another strand of research has put more emphasis on

the interplay between actions and/or practices and their relation to discourse markers. These studies describe interactional properties or uses.

Interactional uses

A number of studies have focused specifically on interactional (or discourse-interactional) uses of discourse markers that go beyond marking of cause or reason. Couper-Kuhlen (2011), for instance, examines the occurrence of *because* at the beginning of turns, beginning from the insights that these objects mark ‘non-beginnings’ in that they are continuations of prior talk (see Schegloff 1996, p.74f). In more detail, Couper-Kuhlen (2011) describes these objects in relation to the practice of ‘accounting’, pointing out that in her data post-posed *because*-clauses are produced to:

“to account for an immediately prior action by the same speaker, and [...] to account for an immediately prior action by the interlocutor. In other words, because-clauses at the start of turns link up to differently authored turns in prior discourse.” (Couper-Kuhlen, 2011, p.2)

Song and Tao (2008) have made similar observations on Mandarin data and also describe on the use of post-posed causal discourse makers to begin accounts (although without explicit reference to ‘accounting’; see also Fang 2012; Gao 2013). Complementing these studies, Li (2016) shows that, at least in the case of Mandarin *yinwei*, causal discourse markers can also be used to link to units other than the immediately preceding turn:

“We have seen that *yinwei* can be used as a linguistic resource (among other vocal and visual resources) to manage the break in contiguity by linking the subsequent utterances to the talk (and course of action) other than the immediately preceding one.” (Li, 2016, p.74)

The study describes two sequential and interactional environments where this can be the case: “after the possible completion of a recipient-initiated sequence” and “after the possible closure of a storytelling” (Li, 2016, p.51).¹⁰

Generally, it seems that an increasing number of studies have recently looking into the relationship between causal discourse markers and accounts. Luo (2015) examines *yinwei*-clauses in Mandarin conversation and concludes that, in her data, these clauses are mainly used to account for prior actions (89.81% of total n=265) (and may also serve as parentheticals (Houtkoop and Mazeland, 1985) to provide background information as well as constitute the beginning of a story-telling sequence). In this study *yinwei*-clauses are described to commonly account for two types of preceding actions, disagreements and assertions. In summary, causal discourse markers (in English and Mandarin Chinese) have repeatedly been related to accounting practices in the literature. Couper-Kuhlen (2011) even adopts the terms ‘the account’ to describe because-clauses and ‘the accountable’ to describe “that what it provides a reason for” (Couper-Kuhlen 2011, p.2; see also Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 2018). In light of this trend, a brief review of the practice of accounting will be provided in the following section.

2.4 The practice of accounting and the formation of accounts

In her influential study on turn-initial *because*-clauses, Couper-Kuhlen (2011) related these clauses to the practice of accounting and in fact adopts the term ‘the account’ to refer to because-clauses throughout the study. Expanding on these findings, other interactional studies have since examined the relationship between causal markers and accounting in more detail (see also Li 2016; Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 2018). While this relationship seems to be a recent finding, there is no dearth of interactional studies on accounts in general. Dating back to Garfinkel and Sacks, a large amount of literature on accounts that come out of ethnomethodology and conversation analysis alone (see, for instance, Garfinkel 1952, 1963; Goffman 1971; Heritage 2013b; Pollner 2010; Antaki 1988; Sacks and Schegloff 1995; Potter

¹⁰This practice is discussed in this study under the name ‘back-tying’ (see Chapter 6.3).

1996, as well as related literature in other strands of linguistics and sociology [Mills 1940; 1959; Austin 1971; Halliday and Hasan 1976](#)). This review briefly outlines key concepts in the field, especially those relevant to the relationship between accounts and causal discourse markers. The section delineates the interrelated concepts of (1) the account-ability of conduct's action and the (2) practice of accounting for conduct ([Heritage, 2013b](#)). Subsequently, previous research in the field is briefly summarized and relevant core concepts are defined.

Accounts have long been of concern in ethnomethodological and conversation analytic writing. In the early days of ethnomethodology, Garfinkel defined a crucial distinction between two levels of accountability in talk-in-interaction, 'account-able' as intelligibility and 'accountable' (or 'practices of accounting') as overt explanation for what social actors are doing.

What Garfinkel described as accounts and accountability is rooted in the mechanisms of the "joint application of shared methods or reasoning" ([Garfinkel, 1963](#)):

"Garfinkel concluded that shared methods of reasoning generate continuously updated implicit understandings of what is happening in social contexts –a 'running index', as it were, of what is happening in a social event. It is through the creation of this running index that social activity is rendered intelligible or, as Garfinkel puts it, 'account-able'. To make sense, the overt descriptions and explanations (or accounts) which actors provide for their actions must articulate with these already established implicit understandings. Both ethnomethodology and conversation analysis are thus concerned with two levels of 'accountability'. On the one hand, these is the taken-for-granted level of reasoning through which a running index of action and interaction is created and sustained. On the other hand, these is the level of overt explanation in which social actors give accounts of what they are doing in terms of reasons, motives or causes." ([Heritage 1988](#), p.128; see also [Garfinkel 1963; Garfinkel 1967](#)).

It is mainly the latter sense of accounting that is relevant to the use of causal discourse markers, i.e. practices of accounting that are "overt explanation[s] in which social actors give accounts of what they are doing in terms of reasons, motives or causes." ([Heritage, 1988](#), p.128). Harvey Sacks reportedly referred to this sense of accounting as "restoration talk", a normative or moral requirement to account or elaborate that becomes relevant at certain times in talk-in-interaction ([Scott and Lyman, 1968](#)). Accounts may generally sequentially precede or follow that what is accounted for, but, in the case of accounts formatted with causal markers, commonly occur after that what is accounted for. Rooted in mechanisms of 'other-attentiveness', accounting is said to become relevant at certain times in talk-in-interaction, commonly related to the preceding turn or action.¹¹

When do accounts become relevant? [Robinson \(2016, p.7\)](#) further investigates the relation between relevance and accounts and defines 'relevance rules' as:

"[...] understanding processes of action formation and ascription [...] fundamentally relies on identifying, describing, and explicating the relevance rules of both practices and actions [...]. Relevance rules involve both normative structures of reasoning and normative patterns of conduct. Relevance rules not only have 'implications' for interlocutors' understandings of 'what just happened,' but also, and importantly, for interlocutors' immediately subsequent conduct. [Sacks et al. \(1974\)](#) referred to these latter 'implications' in terms of 'sequential implicativeness': "By 'sequential implicativeness' is meant that an utterance projects for the sequentially following turn(s) the relevance of a determinate range of occurrences (be they utterance types, activities, speaker selections, etc.) In thus sequentially organized implications." (footnote 6, p296, emphasis added). ([Robinson, 2016](#), p.7-8)

¹¹In talk-in-interaction "a central assumption of interactional sequencing is that, unless otherwise signaled, each turn is addressed to the matters raised by the turn preceding it. The most powerful expression of this assumption arises in the form of adjacency pairs ([Sacks et al. 1974; Schegloff 1968](#))." ([Heritage, 1988](#), p. 129)

Robinson holds that the mechanisms of ‘relevance rules’ function, in that utterances may project certain ‘occurrences’ for the following turns based on ‘sequential implicativeness’.¹² What makes accounts relevant? Garfinkel (1963) maintains that what leads to the occurrence of accounts is normative or moral in nature. In accordance with this, Heritage (1988) elaborates that accounts are obligations and ignorance of these obligations may be sanctioned:

“Thus, given that accounts are institutionalized, the speaker who fails to provide an account may be sanctioned as willful and self-attentive, as one ‘who would not, or could not, be bothered to provide an account’. One who fails to provide a no-fault account can be construed as hostile or insinuating or, at least, careless of the face of a co-interactant.” (Heritage, 1988, P.138)

This means that accounts emerge in relation to a “web of moral accountability” that social actors are engaged in, within which “the pressures are consistently towards other-attentiveness and towards the maintenance of face, of social relationships and of social solidarity.” (Heritage, 1988, p.138). Rooted in normative and moral obligations, accounting is, according to Scott and Lyman (1968) (and in accordance with Garfinkel 1963,6), defined as:

“[a]n account is a linguistic device employed whenever an action is subjected to valuative inquiry [...] bridging the gap between action and expectation. [...] By account, then we mean a statement made by a social actor to explain unanticipated or untoward behaviour”. (Scott and Lyman, 1968, p.46).

Further elaborating on this definition, Robinson (2016) maintains:

“In sum, an account is an attempt by one interlocutor to modify (e.g. change, explain, justify, clarify, interpret, rationalize, (re)characterize, etc.), either prospectively or retrospectively, other interlocutors’ understandings or assessments of conduct-in-interaction in terms of its ‘possible’ breach of relevance rules [...]. People produce accounts, in large part, in order to forestall the negative conclusions which might otherwise be drawn”. (Robinson, 2016, p.16).

In summary, accounts are used to attend to “gaps between action and expectation” that emerge in relation to “relevance rules” and function as to “repair” action formation/ascription troubles i.e. they function, as Heritage (1988) points out, to “save face” as well as to “save intelligibility” (Garfinkel 1963; Garfinkel 1967 Goffman 2005). Heritage (1988) and Robinson (2016) have even described accounts with reference to the machinery of conversational repair — as a kind of normative repair mechanism. According to Robinson (2016, p.9) “understanding action ascription/formation fundamentally relies on identifying, describing, and explicating relevance rules of both practices and actions.”

Crucial for the analyst interested in accounts then, is not the examination of the accounts per se, but their relationship to places that are in-situ treated as requiring explanation and the description of interactional properties of these places. To this end, Heritage (1988) describes accounts as social actors’ orientation to exceptions or violations of relevance rules, which opens up the possibility for the analyst to describe the rule based on deviant cases of its violation (the expectation proves the rule). This becomes possible based on the observation that social actors themselves commonly engage in behaviour that attends to these rule violations and work to “normalize” it. In Garfinkel (1963) terms:

¹²Robinson on the difference between ‘relevance’ and ‘conditional relevance’:

“Here, akin to the distinction between ‘relevance rules’ and ‘conditional relevance,’ Schegloff and Sacks distinguished between the larger category of ‘sequential implicativeness’ and one subset or type, that being ‘close-order sequential implicativeness.’ In sum, at least one critical difference [...] between ‘relevance rules’ generally (and their ‘sequential implicativeness’ generally) and ones that impose ‘conditional relevance’ (or a ‘close-order sequential implicativeness’) specifically is the ‘degree’ to which whatever is relevant ‘bears upon’ recipients’ conduct”. For example, relative to some relevance rules, those that impose “conditional relevance” appear to have a high(er) degree (e.g. ‘strength’ or ‘force’) of implicativeness, or normative expectation.” (Robinson, 2016, p.9)

“On occasions of discrepancies between expected and actual events, persons engage in assorted perceptual and judgemental work whereby such discrepancies are “normalized.” By “normalized” I mean that perceivedly normal values of typicality, comparability, likelihood, causal texture, instrumental efficacy, and moral requiredness are restored. (Garfinkel, 1963, p.188)”.

What Garfinkel describes here in terms of cognitive processes of “normalization” may become observable in participants’ procedural conduct that reassesses their initially ascribed action in the unfolding of talk (Schegloff 1992; for “normalization” see also Pollner 2010). As previous studies have shown, one of the form that such a reassessment can take are post-posed *because*-clauses (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, 2018). In fact, as mentioned earlier, several studies have adopted accounting terminology to describe interactional uses of discourse markers. Some analysts, such as Couper-Kuhlen (2011), straight up refer to post-posed *because*-clauses in general as “accounts”. Li (2016) also adopts this terminology, although in less pervasive terms, as part of her analysis of discourse-interactional uses of Mandarin *yinwei*, describing a use of this causal marker to format post-posed accounts.¹³ Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (2018) also describe the use of (hypotactic) *because*-clauses in conversational accounting. They distinguish between designed (projected) accounts featuring *because* and accounts that are added (unexpected) by demand:

“When the account is projected, i.e., designed as part of an action complex, the accountable action is construed normatively as in need of an account. [...] If an account is given later, it comes off as having been produced on demand, reflexively rendering the prior action accountable after all.” (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, 2018, p.457)

Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (2018) maintain that “cause or reason clauses” formatted with *because* may deliver accounts and that such (postposed) clauses may serve to point to something “that they have just said or done” as the “accountable”. This description leaves the reader with the impression that the “cause clause” internationally may also, vice versa, serve to attribute such properties to prior talk/action (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, 2018, p.454).

Notably, however, sequences that often feature causal markers to introduce accounts, such as accounts that follow a negative response, may also occur in formats without these markers, but are still commonly identified as such by the participants (Ford 2001, 2002). What, then, is the nature of the ‘marking’ that these markers are involved in?¹⁴ Is there more to be said about the relationship between cause clauses and their relationship to accounting practices?

Building on the above findings, the relationship between accounting practices and their formation using causal markers has emerged as an important topic in the analytical part of this study. This has led to a number of observation that further explore details of the relation between causal markers and accounting practices. Before getting back to this in the analytical part of the study, a short introduction to the corpus this study is grounded in is provided in the next chapter.

¹³“The semantic meaning of *yinwei* may be exploited by the speaker to package the subsequent utterances as related to the earlier talk (as reason, cause, or account), and thereby providing warrants for bringing it up here and now and for its fittedness to the prior course of action.” (Li, 2016, p.74)

¹⁴See Haspelmath (2006) for a constructive critique of the use of the term “marked” in linguistics.

3

The Malaysia Cantonese Corpus (MYCanCor)

The Malaysia Cantonese Corpus, or MYCanCor, is a collection of recordings of Malaysian Cantonese speech mainly collected in Perak, Malaysia. Built as part of this study and based on 7 months of field-work, the corpus consists of around 20 hours of video recordings of spontaneous talk-in-interaction (56 settings) typically involving 2-4 speakers. The corpus was not conceived as a collection that elicits the use of *janwai* in any way. In fact, at the time the corpus was built, *janwai* had not yet emerged as a topic of interest. MYCanCor was conceptualized as a general repository of naturally occurring conversations collected in the Malaysian Cantonese speech community. It consists of video recordings of a variety of everyday settings where spontaneous everyday conversation commonly takes place, such as:

- Family dinner conversations (private homes)
- Conversations over lunch or dinner with friends, relatives or colleagues (Restaurants and street food vendors)
- Car and public transport rides with family members, friends or colleagues (private car or public bus)
- Conversations at work between colleagues as well as between employees and manager (various office spaces)
- Conversations between customers and vendors (shop or factory setting)
- Conversations between local citizens and government representatives (local government office)
- Conversations between students as well as between students and staff (various educational institutions)

The conversations typically involve 2-4 speakers (up to a maximum of 8 speakers) of Malaysian Cantonese and are between 2 and 40 minutes long. Topics include a wide range of commonplace activities related to the setting in which the conversation takes place, frequently including elements of:

- storytelling and narrative sequences
- management of social obligations including greeting and leave segments
- social chat and expressions of emotional states
- task-oriented dialog such as directions while driving or task instructions in workspace environment
- management of authority in dialog, e.g. task assignment and task-oriented dialog in a workspace environment

The recordings were collected mainly in the city of Ipoh and other places in the state of Perak in 2017 and are available as a collection of 56 video recordings (around 20 hours of video content).

Each conversation is transcribed in CHAT format at the minCHAT level. Each video recording also comes with a scene description written in full sentence format that provides the following information:

- brief description of the setting in which the recording took place
- summary of the topics talked about
- specification of the task, in case the recording includes task-oriented sequences
- brief summary of emotional expressions used and brief description of the emotional states talked about, in case the recording features frequent expressions of emotional states
- information about age and gender of each participant

Each recording is available in both high definition video (.mov) and uncompressed audio format (.wav) with a transcription in CHAT format (.cha) [MacWhinney \(2000\)](#) and a scene description (.txt).

3.1 Technical specifications

All 56 conversations were filmed from one angle with one HD video camera (1080p) providing access to facial expression and gesture information of most (but not all) participants. The camera was set up in such a way that in almost all cases all participants appear on the screen.

Audio data was captured with one directional super-cardioid microphone in uncompressed monophonic wave format (96kHz / 24-bit). The recordings took place in a real world environment and feature natural background noise (for example in a restaurant or workspace settings).

3.2 Data collection and sampling

The conversations featured in the corpus aim to present naturally-occurring everyday speech. All recordings took place after informed consent was obtained from each participant and all conversations were recorded after the researcher had left the scene. Several measures were taken to minimize the influence of the researcher on the naturalness of the recording and to mitigate the effects of the observer’s paradox [Labov \(1972\)](#). A basic level of rapport was built up with participants before the recording. Recordings that show an obvious influence of the researcher on the produced utterances have not been included in the corpus. Building on several months of fieldwork in Ipoh and other parts of Perak, a multiple-entry chain sampling method was used in order to recruit participants from a wider variety of socio-economic and educational backgrounds. However, no metrics have been recorded to attest for this. Most interlocutors of a single recorded conversation knew each other prior the recording as friends, family members or colleagues. The corpus is roughly balanced for gender and age group (see Table 3.1).

Table 3.1: Gender and age group distribution in MYCanCor (rounded)

Variable	Distribution
Gender (binary)	Male: 48% Female: 52%
Age group (years)	under 30: 33% 30-60: 45% 60+: 22%

Reflecting common practice in Malaysia, the corpus also features code mixing of Cantonese speech with English, Malay, Mandarin and Southern Min. However, an estimated 95% of the recorded utterances

are in Cantonese and the most frequent code mixing language is English (as well as local varieties of English such as Malaysian English and Singlish).

Data collection and recruitment of participants was in line with the British Association for Applied Linguistics (BAAL) Recommendations on Good Practice in Applied Linguistics (<https://baal.org.uk/resources/>). Participants were recruited under two prerequisites:

- self-proclaimed ability to have a conversation in Cantonese (proficiency in written Chinese not required)
- having spent two-thirds of one's life in Malaysia (self-proclaimed)

Reflecting the speech community, the level of proficiency in Cantonese considerably varies among participants. Participants may be English-, Mandarin- or Malay-educated and many speak Cantonese as a second language, home language or work language alongside with other languages. Recruitment of participants was not tied to ethnic groups, reflecting the ethnically diverse nature of the local speech community.

The data collection mainly took place in the state of Perak (especially the city of Ipoh) since the region has the highest percentage of Cantonese speakers in Malaysia (Tan, 2005). Based on participant observation in 2017, Cantonese is the lingua franca of the ethnic Chinese community in Ipoh as well as in many (but not all) other cities and villages in Perak, such as Taiping, Kuala Kangsar, Teluk Intan and Kampar. Based on these observations, Perak features one of the biggest, if not the biggest, Cantonese speech communities outside of China.

3.3 Transcription

All conversations are transcribed using the minCHAT format, a basic version of the CHAT format (MacWhinney, 2000). The transcripts focus on the word level, aiming to identify words and sentences in the utterances, prioritizing lexis over, for example, phonological aspects. In this sense the transcripts aim to provide a modest starting point for possible further annotation of more aspects of the complexity of naturally-occurring speech. In order to achieve a high level of accuracy and consistency, all transcripts have been proofread by Malaysian Cantonese speakers with relevant experience and backgrounds. The transcripts are presented in Traditional Chinese characters (UTF8) including the Hong Kong Supplementary Character Set (HKSCS). Only identifiable units that can be presented by Chinese characters are transcribed. For example, the utterance ('gw', 'o', 'ng', '2'), ('d', 'u', 'ng', '1'), ('w', 'aa', ' ', '2') (onset, nucleus, coda, tone) would be transcribed as “廣東話”. But the utterance ('gw', 'o', 'ng', '2'), ('d', ' ', ' ', '1') would be transcribed as “廣”xxx since ('d', ' ', ' ', '1') has no defined corresponding character in this format. Completely unintelligible utterances are also transcribed as xxx (see Example 1).

Cantonese-specific characters that are not (yet) supported by HKSCS are presented as romanized strings following the Jyutping Romanization Scheme. Code switching utterances in Mandarin are presented in Traditional Chinese characters (UTF8), for Hokkien and Southern Min the Taiwan Romanization system (Tai-lo) was used. Modal Particles (語氣詞 and Modal Particle Morphemes (語氣語素 are transcribed following UTF8+HKSCS standards. For all utterances that are supported by UTF8+HKSCS no separate romanization in Jyutping or Pinyin is provided.

Following minCHAT requirements, utterances have to end with an utterance terminator (such as period, exclamation mark or question mark). In order to fulfill this requirement, the transcript uses periods to terminate all utterances regardless whether they are questions or exclamations. No question or exclamation marks (標點符號) are annotated, but question and exclamatory particles are transcribed.

A separate CHAT transcription file was created for each of the 56 conversations, but it should be no problem to combine the transcripts into one file using one of the many tools available for CHAT. Each file (.cha) is verified as machine-readable using the CHECK function of the CLAN editor.

3.3.1 Word segmentation and annotation

The transcripts do not include word segmentation or chunking of Chinese characters. Utterances are transcribed as continuous strings of Chinese characters in UTF8 encoding. The minCHAT transcript does, however, separate segments of utterances based on pauses of considerable length (see Figure 3.1). Also, no Part-of-Speech tags or further syntactic annotation is provided as part of the transcript. No additional (systematic) annotation of gestures, facial expression or events is provided. Each file begins with a header. Comments are marked by “%com”. Gestures, actions and scene descriptions by “%act”.

Figure 3.1: MYCanCor transcription example in minCHAT format

```
@Begin
@Languages: zho-yue
@Participants: P1 Wong Older Sister,
P2 Chan Younger Sister
@ID: zho-yue|mycancor|P1|27;1.10|
Target_P2|
@ID: zho-yue|mycancor|P2|39;2.
Target_P1|
*P2: 你食咩啊.
%com: every utterance ends with
      an utterance terminator (period).
*P1: 白果薏米.
*P2: 同怡保嘅好似好唔同 哈哈.
*P1: 唔同啊(0.1)冇得比啦.
%com: Utterances are segmented by
      pauses exceeding 0.1 seconds.
*P2: 依但係.
*P1: 白 但因為 因為佢哋冇煮溶個.
%com: All lexical items
      (onset, nucleus, coda, tone) are
      transcribed as Chinese
      characters.
%act: P2 points at the bowl.
%com: Gestures may be annotated
      as informal descriptions.
*P2: xxx睇下 個腐竹.
%com: Unintelligible or incomplete
      lexical units are
      transcribed as xxx.
*P1: 個腐竹 呢 係咯 同埋唔知點解佢哋
      嘅唔係白色嘅咯.
%com: Modal Participles and Modal
      Particle Morphemes are
      transcribed following
      UTF8+HKSDS conventions.
@End
```


3.4 Use in this study and beyond

Generally, the Malaysia Cantonese Corpus might be of interest to any researcher interested in video corpora or Malaysian Cantonese. To my knowledge, MYCanCor is in fact the first language resource available that is concerned with the Cantonese speech community in Malaysia. Although the corpus is of rather small size, the data that went into its making should be of sufficient quality to make it a useful resource for a wide variety of applications. Considerable effort also went into providing accurate minCHAT transcription for each conversation. One of the advantages of the CHAT format is that the provided minCHAT can be adjusted or expanded with relative ease to encode additional phenomena, should the need arise. The design choices made should allow a combination with other resources with relative ease. The minCHAT transcription, for example, can be expanded to midCHAT or even a full conversation analytical (CA) transcription. Eventual additional layers or syntactic, semantic, phonological or prosodic annotation can also be integrated in CHAT. Facial expressions, gaze or gestures can be added for all conversations given that the video data provides sufficient visual information. MYCanCor is currently hosted at Nanyang Technological University in Singapore and maintained by the author. More information regarding access, licensing and future updates is available under separate cover ([Liesenfeld, 2018](#)).

As part of this study, the corpus serves as the source of all presented empirical evidence. All data excerpts that are discussed in the thesis are from the corpus, mainly as part of longer stretches of conversation. After *janwai* emerged as a topic of interest, approximately 489 usage instances of the token were identified in the corpus (see Table 3.2).¹ The sequential environment of these instances are examined with regards to the analytic structures discussed in the previous chapter.

Table 3.2: Total number of instances of *janwai* in MYCanCor (approximate)

Token	Total number of occurrences in MYCanCor
<i>Janwai</i> (因為)	489

3.4.1 Subject of this study: *janwai*-initial structures

Out of the total 489 instances of *janwai* in the corpus, 474 (96.9%) instances display the production of *janwai* as the first utterance of an interactionally warranted unit or structure, i.e a turn, a TCU or a clause. These cases, are referred to as **janwai-initial structures** and form the pool of usage instances that this study is grounded in. While students of conversation generally seem to agree that turns and TCUs are interactionally warranted structures, the question whether or not clauses are cross-linguistic interactionally warranted structures has been contentious. After some consideration, this study cautiously adopts the view that clauses are “one of the most frequent grammatical formats which speakers orient to in projecting what actions are being done by others’ utterances and in acting on these projections” ([Thompson and Couper-Kuhlen, 2005](#), p.481).² Including the clause as a ‘locus’ of grammar and interaction, the structures that this study is concerned with are defined as follows (Table 3.3):

In total, these structures make up 96.9% of all instances of *janwai* in the corpus (n=474; see Table 3.4. In addition, MYCanCor also features instances of the production of *janwai* followed by the production

¹This figure is an approximate estimate due to the fact that the corpus features stretches of talk that either completely unintelligible or not clearly identifiable due to reasons such as background noise, overlapping talk or low volume.

²Although this is not undisputed, a rather large body of interactional studies is available on clauses in languages other than Chinese (for English, for example, see [Ford and Thompson \(1996\)](#), [Thompson \(1995\)](#) and [Ono and Thompson \(1996\)](#), for Finnish [Helasvuo \(2001\)](#), for Japanese [Fox et al. \(1996\)](#), [Hayashi \(1999\)](#), [Tanaka \(2000\)](#)) that presents evidence that the clause is indeed an “interactionally warranted structure”. Or, as [Thompson and Couper-Kuhlen \(2005, p.481\)](#) put it: “The evidence thus suggests that clauses are interactionally warranted, if variably built, formats for social action.”

Table 3.3: Definition of *janwai*-initial structures in MYCanCor

<i>Janwai</i> -initial structure	An interactional structure or unit (i.e. a turn, TCU or clause) that sequentially begins with the utterance of <i>janwai</i> .
----------------------------------	--

of a noun phrase, constituting a 'prepositional' use of *janwai* that is somewhat similar to the English utterance *because of* (n=7). These instances are also briefly discussed in Chapter 7.3.

Table 3.4: Total number of *janwai*-initial structures and other sequential environments in MYCanCor

Sequential environment	Distribution
<i>janwai</i> -initial clause	474 instances 96.9%
Other sequential environments (use of <i>janwai</i> as a preposition)	15 instances 3.1%

3.4.2 Data representations and transcriptions used in this study

The study is primarily based on the examination of video recordings that are part of the MYCanCor corpus. These videos (enriched by knowledge acquired mainly through participant observation as part of the fieldwork) are the primary source of information that were analyzed with regards to the topic of interest - the utterance of *janwai*. However, in order to enhance the accessibility of the data analysis in the upcoming chapters, additional representations and transcriptions of these recordings have been produced.

Table 3.5: Representations and transcription formats used in the study

Format of representation	Details
Multimedia file (audio/video)	474 <i>janwai</i> -tokens, around 20h of naturally-occurring speech; 56 different settings; 121 participants.
1-line transcription (minCHAT) Line 1: <i>Chinese characters</i>	All 474 <i>janwai</i> -tokens. Available as part of MYCanCor (Liesenfeld, 2018)
2-line transcription (CA-CHAT/Jefferson) Line 1: <i>Chinese characters</i> Line 2: <i>English translation</i>	30 stretches of talk that feature the utterance of <i>janwai</i> . Provided in-text in form of 'Data Excerpts'.
4-line transcription (CA-CHAT/Jefferson) Line 1: <i>Chinese characters</i> Line 2: <i>Jyutping Romanization</i> Line 3: <i>Part of Speech tags</i> Line 4: <i>English translation</i>	30 stretches of talk that feature the utterance of <i>janwai</i> . See Appendix for the full transcripts.

Based on the video recordings, a simple 1-line minCHAT transcripts of were produced (available as part of MYCanCor; [Liesenfeld 2018](#)). Out of this pool of all 498 instances of *janwai* use, around 30 instances were selected for further analysis.³ These 'data excerpts' were transcribed using a more detailed 4-line transcription format that adopts the conventions of the 'Jefferson' transcription guidelines

³These instances were selected to so that at least to instances of each pattern that will be discussed can be presented to the reader

⁴ These 4-line transcripts are provided ‘in text’ alongside the discussion of the excerpt. In addition, longer transcripts of each discussed excerpt can be found in the appendix. In some cases, for example as part of tables, parts of the transcripts have been reduced to two lines to enhance readability, featuring only Chinese characters and an English translation (see Table 3.5).

3.4.3 The sequential environment of *janwai* TCUs in the corpus

Based on the complete dataset of 20 hours of naturally occurring speech, the following basic observations regarding the sequential environment of *janwai*-initial structures were made.

- *Janwai* tokens may be followed by pauses, both micro pauses or longer pauses (n=210). In terms of projectability, this pattern of [*janwai* + (.)] or [*janwai* + (x.x)] is evidence that the utterance of the token *janwai* makes more talk by the same speaker relevant, i.e. turns do not commonly end after the utterance of *janwai*.
- The pattern [*janwai* + pronoun] is a recurring pattern in MYCanCor (n=223). As of MYCanCor, the patterns [*janwai* + *ngo5(dei6)* (“because I; we”)]; [*janwai* + *nei2(dei6)* (“because you; you guys”)] and [*janwai* + *keoi3(dei6)* (“because he/she; they”)] is a frequent sequential structure that speakers opt for.
- *janwai* tokens may occur after a preposed argument of a clause (n=23). These are cases where a lexical item appears before *janwai* that then turns out to be part of a clause. These cases of “pre-positioning” of parts of *janwai*-prefaced clauses are included in the pool of *janwai*-initial clauses, even though the *janwai*-token is not in the TCU-initial position.⁵

In addition to these basic observations evident in the corpus, the analysis is concerned with the interplay between sequential properties on one hand, and the formation and ascription of action on the other. In fact, this relationship has come to be of rather central concern to the analysis of *janwai*-initial structures that lies at the core of this study.

3.4.4 Types of sequential environments: Grouping of similar sequential structures in the corpus

This section provides an overview of the typological treatment of different turn formats that is necessary for the further exploration of the relationship between grammatical form and action formation. To this end, a typology of different sequential environments is laid out. The typology summarizes how issues regarding the relation between action formation and grammatical production format are dealt with in this study and how some of the underlying “independent variables” are laid out based on which the corpus data was separated into instances of a similar sequential environment.

Based on the 474 usage events that involve the utterance of a *janwai*-initial structures, a typology was designed that groups usage events together that display a similar sequential structure. Please refer to Figure 3.2 as a ‘roadmap’ to track how sequential structures are categorized in this study (begin with START in the upper left corner). This typology aims to capture a broad range of structures of different size that appear to be related to the use of *janwai* in MYCanCor (while also taking the problems of intentionality, action coding and action granularity into account that were described in Chapter 2.1.7 and

⁴Please refer to the section “Symbols and transcription conventions” for the details of how the ‘Jefferson’ transcription system is used in this study.

⁵For instance, see Data Excerpt (7) that features the pattern *ngo5 dei6 jan1 wai4 zing3 fu2* + clause (“We, because the government + clause”)

2.1.8). This typology is designed around grouping actions together that are sequentially evident without overly relying on potentially arbitrary action labels such as ‘question’, ‘assertion’ or ‘assessment’. As Figure 3.2 illustrates, at its most basic level, the typology makes a (non-dichotomous) distinction between **(1) responsive action formation**. These are displays of action formation that seem to be (at least partly) produced in response to preceding talk by another participant and that constitute a *relevant* second turn with regards to the preceding turn or action. And, in contrast, **(2) non-responsive action formation**, these are those instances where the action that the *janwai*-structure is part of is not evidently made relevant in previous talk.

Chapter 4 discusses data excerpts that display the formation of a responsive action that begins with *janwai* (i.e. turn-initial *janwai*). **Chapter 5** discusses instances of the formation of responsive action where the response begins with a response token that is then followed by *janwai* (i.e. a multi-part response). These responsive action are grouped into those that follow Telling-questions and those that follow Specifying-questions (see Thompson et al. 2015 for this distinction). The chapter also examines another pattern that has emerged in the data set, response that feature *janwai zou6 me1* or *janwai zou6 me1 aal*. **Chapter 6** examines those instances where *janwai* is part of non-responsive action formation. The first section examines instances that feature a ‘step-by-step’ production of such actions, i.e. an initiating action followed up by a *janwai*-initial structure that features disfluency. The next section examined those instances that feature a ‘in-one-go’ production of this pattern, without disfluencies. Furthermore, the chapter also discusses several other patterns that have emerged: (1) The use of *janwai* to facilitate ‘back-tying’. (2) The ‘misalignment’ utterance *m4 hai6* (“no; that’s not it”) followed by *janwai*. (3) The utterance of *janwai* following an initiating action and the utterance of a *me1* final particle. Last but not least, **Chapter 7** examines ‘residual cases’, other patterns of interest that were observed in the data. These are (1) the utterance of *janwai*-initial turns in environments of more than three speakers. (2) The usage of *janwai* to express cause-effect relationship between utterances and (3) the usage of *janwai* + noun phrase, i.e. ‘prepositional *janwai*’ (“because of”).

Figure 3.2 also provides an overview of how each of these practices distributes over the 489 cases of *janwai*-initial structures in the corpus and provides an approximate number of instances that display the relevant pattern. The provided n-numbers are not intended to represent frequency of the occurrence of the relevant pattern, but are merely a metric that reports which patterns are popular with the participants of MYCanCor and which are not. In the upcoming four analytical chapters, at least two independent (different speakers and settings) cases of each pattern is presented to the reader in form of a two-line transcription alongside with the analysis. Should the need arise, each of these transcripts can also be found in a more detailed four-line format in the appendix.

Figure 3.2 Typological roadmap of sequential structures featuring *janwai* in MYCanCor

Sequential environment 1: *janwai*-prefaced response formats

This is the first of four empirical chapters that employs the method of sequence analysis on a selection of video recordings. Throughout the chapter, four-line transcripts are made available to the reader in form of "Data Excerpts" alongside the data analysis in order to make the analysis of the recorded talk-in-interaction more accessible (Line 1: Chinese characters; Line 2: Jyutping romanization; Line 3: word-by-word translation and parts of speech tags; Line 4: English translation). Should the need arise, longer four-line transcripts of these excerpts can be found in the appendix.

Based on the previously introduced typology (Figure 3.2), this chapter discusses those instances in which *janwai* occurs as part of building responsive action after a preceding utterance is evidently treated as some kind of action that makes a response relevant.¹ **Thus, the sequential patterns that is dealt with in this chapter is the utterance of an initiating action followed by a relevant responsive action that begins with the production of *janwai*, i.e. *janwai*-prefaced responsive action formats.** Initiating actions are actions that make a certain type of responsive action relevant (for instance, a polar question makes an affirmative or negative response relevant). Responsive actions are actions that provide a certain kind of response that has become relevant with regards to the initiating action (for instance, the utterance of an affirmative or negative token after a polar response). See Figure 4.1 for some examples of initiating and responsive actions identified in the corpus that all involve a *janwai* in 'turn-initial position' (Heritage, 2013c). Figure 4.1 shows that this sequential pattern includes various action types, i.e. it includes any action that makes a response relevant and that response begins with *janwai*. In total, MYCanCor features around 43 instances of this pattern (n=43).

The chapter is concerned with those environments in which the participants display an orientation towards the same action type as part of action formation and action ascription. These are commonly two turns-at-talk: A turn by speaker A followed by another turn by speaker B that constitute a 'relevant' second action with regards to the previous turn. For instance, a Yes/No polar question may be followed by either a negative response (such as featuring a negative response token) or an affirmative response (such as featuring a token of affirmation). Both affirmative and negative responses are 'type-conforming' in that both constitute not only relevant responses with regards to an initial polar question, i.e. they constitute responsive actions that are 'conform' second actions after this type of question and that orient to them as such (Raymond, 2003). On the other hand, responsive actions that constitute repair sequences are discussed separately since they do not constitute type-conforming responses.²

¹The instances discussed in this chapter are all categorized as part of the communicative motivation of "requesting" (and not "sharing" or "informing") (see Tomasello 2010), because all instances feature a relevant response (Position 2) that makes evident that Position 1 was treated by the participants as making such a response relevant (as part of processes of action ascription.)

²What constitutes as a type-conforming response depends on the initiating action. See Raymond 2003 and Stivers 2010 for more details on type-conformity in action formation and ascription.

Figure 4.1: Instances of initiating actions followed by *janwai*-prefaced responsive actions

- (1) Telling-question followed by Telling-response formatted with QWI.
MYCANCOR 041 (12:30-12:31)

01 P1 點解呢度咁多車. ← Initiating action: Telling-question
Why are there so many cars here?

02 P2 因為已經好夜. ← Responsive action: Telling-response
Because it's already late.
- (2) Telling/Polar-question followed by Telling-response formatted without QWI.
MYCANCOR 037 (04:30-04:31)

01 P1 你今個禮拜唔教佢啊. ← Initiating action: Telling/Polar-question
You don't go teach him this week?

02 P2 ↑因為:佢冇唔得閒. ← Initiating action: Telling-response
Because he doesn't have time.
- (3) Telling/Polar-question followed by Telling-response.
MYCANCOR 030 (29:10-29:11)

01 P1 佢哋仲未返嚟咩? ← Initiating action: Telling/Polar-question
They are not back yet?

02 P2 因為:(.)佢哋仲係出面咯. ← Responsive action: Telling response
Because they are still outside.

Chapter Outline

Out of a total of 500 instances of *janwai* in MYCanCor, around 349 display the use of *janwai* as part of responsive action in general. Out of these, around 43 instances feature *janwai* in a turn-initial position. The three sections of this chapter examine this pattern in more detail. The first section discusses *janwai*-initial responsive action following initiating actions formatted with Question-Word interrogatives (QWIs). The second section examines *janwai*-initial responsive action following initiating actions formatted without QWIs. Two data excerpts are discussed in the next section. In addition to these ‘type-conforming’ action pairs, the third section discusses a deviant case that features a self-initiated repair featuring turn-initial *janwai*.

The central questions that this chapter engages with include: What action-sequential environments does *janwai* appear in? What kinds of first actions precedes a *janwai*-containing response? What kinds of responsive actions is *janwai* a part of, and how are such actions formatted?

4.1 Initiating actions followed by a response with a turn-initial *janwai*

This section discusses two instances that feature *janwai* in turn-initial position and as part of building responsive actions (Figure 4.2).

Figure 4.2: *janwai*-initial responsive action

P2: An initiating action

P1: *janwai* _____.

Examining why-questions, Thompson et al. (2015) have not only coined the term ‘Question-Word Interrogatives (QWIs)’ to describe this class of questions, but also made the following observations.

First, a ‘main jobs’ of why-questions is to request some form of information and to format actions that, as Thompson et al. (2015, p.16) put it, “centrally involve an epistemic gradient”. Thus, these questions and their responses form an ‘information-seeking sequence’ that consists of at least two parts. The questions are the first-pair part of this sequence and make a second-pair part relevant, a response that commonly contains some element of ‘newsness’.

Second, Thompson et al. note that why-questions commonly format ‘Telling-questions’, i.e. questions that seek “extended responses - reports, stories, accounts, explanations, and so on”, in contrast to, for example, when- or what-questions that can be ‘Specifying-questions’ that “seek single, specific pieces of information” (Thompson et al., 2015, p.16). Thompson et al. also show that a turn-initial *because* may occur after initiating actions that constitute Telling-Questions and that they format ‘relevant responses’ (Thompson et al., 2015, p.20). MYCanCor data confirms these findings and shows that turn-initial *janwai* is also a tool that speakers may use to build responses to Telling-questions. Two excerpts are discussed that make this evident.

4.1.1 Data discussion

As Figure 4.1 has shown, common first actions that are responded to with a *janwai*-initiated response are why-questions. Such questions may be formatted with question tokens such as *dim2* (“why; how”), *dim2 gaai2* (“why; how”), *mat1* (“what; what’s up with”), *mat1 je5* (“what; what’s up with”) and *zou6 me1* (“why; how come”). These questions commonly appear to make some kind of explanatory response relevant.

Turn-initial *janwai* as part of responses to QWI telling-questions

Consider Data Excerpt (1) that shows the utterance of a why-question followed by a relevant response.

(1) Data Excerpt: “All the desks” || MYCANCOR 011 (23:30-22:43)

The participants P2 and P3 are friends. P2 is currently visiting the office where P3 works and both sit in a corner of a large office, having a conversation about the company. Prior to the beginning of this excerpt, P3 has been introducing his company, his work and the office. P2 does not seem to have prior knowledge on these topics.

01 P3 我哋係六個人嚟呢個office.
ngo5 dei2 hai6 luk6 go3 jan4 ze1 ne1 go3 office
We-have-six-q-people-y-this-q-office
We are only six people ((working)) in this office.

02 P2 乜咁多檯嘅.
mat1 gam3 do1 toi4 ge3
What-so-many-desk-y
What’s up with so many desks?

03⇒P3 因為我哋好多volunteer好多volunteer=
jan1 wai4 ngo5 dei2 hou2 do1 volunteer hou2 do1 volunteer
because-we-very-many-volunteer very-many-volunteer
Because we ((have)) so many volunteers, so many volunteers.

04 P2 [| 超過六個seat耶((coughs))
ciu1 gwo3 luk6 go3 seat ye2
exceeding-six-q-seat-y
More than six seats?
| ((points at numerous empty desks in the office behind P3))

- 05 P2 =係啦.
hai6 la3
is-y
Okay.
- 06 P3 輪流入嚟嘅volunte[er].
leon4 lau4 jap6 lai4 ge3 volunteer
rotating-inside-come-y-volunteer
((On a)) rotating ((basis)) volunteers ((are)) coming in.
- 07 P2 [嗯::
ng2
y
Mhm

At line 1, P3 utters the last of a series of TCUs that brings up information related to his job and work duties. Then, in line 2, P2 takes a turn and produces an interrogative using a *mat1* (“what; what’s up with”): “What’s up with so many desks?”. This turn makes a response relevant related to the topic of why there are so many desks in the office. *Mat1 gam3 dol* here approximates to the English translation “What’s up with so many”, in this context the *mat1* (“what”) question marker formats a why-type question that seeks for an explanation. Possibly related to P3’s previous sharing of the information that the company has only six employees (line 1), P2’s question seeks for additional information regarding the perceived mismatch of available seats and employees (see also line 4). After the question has been completed, P3 takes a turn that engages the question using a turn-initial *janwai* (line 3): “Because we ((have)) so many volunteers, so many volunteers”. After the turn-initial *janwai*, P3 follows up with a relevant response (featuring some overlap and repetition) by bringing up the information that the additional desks are for volunteers. However, the sequence that will eventually constitute the complete response does not end here. As the following turns show, this is not the last piece of information he chooses to supply related to the newly introduced reference to “volunteers”. He goes on and does more elaborative work on this topic (line 6). It can be observed that he supplies a telling sequence as a response to the why-type question at line 3.

This excerpt shows that a turn-initial *janwai* as part of a responsive action can be the beginning of a telling sequence, thereby treating the prior question as a Telling-Question. Here, the why-type question followed by a *janwai*-initial response constitutes a (two or more part) “information-seeking sequence” (Thompson et al., 2015, p.16ff). The responsive action formatted as a *janwai*-initial response engages a request for some form of elaborative sequence to make a preceding pieces of information more ‘understandable’.

Two additional observations can be made here. For one, an orientation towards an epistemic gradient is evident. Through uttering the question in line 2, P2 puts himself in a K- position with regards to the information that is requested, and, after a relevant response has been provided, he utters “Mhm” in line 7, a token that in this context signals information receipt and constitutes a possible epistemic change-of-state token (Heritage, 1984). This is evidence of an ‘information-seeking’ component of the question-response action pair in line 2 and 3. However, the orientation towards information-seeking can only explain the first turn of the response because this turn, up to this point, already constitutes a relevant response. But P3 does not stop here, and instead goes on and further elaborates.

Looking at the unfolding of talk up to this point, the following observation can be made. P2 is a first-time visitor to P3’s office and does not seem to know much about P2’s company and the work he does there. Unfolding in this context, P2 engages in ‘explanatory talk’ prior to this excerpt. Line 1 is the last stretch of this ‘introductory talk’ on the topic of his job and company: “We are only six people ((working)) in this office”. As evident in the use of *ze1* (“only”), P3 presents his company as rather small. After this turn, P2 initiates an overt request for elaboration. Is it the information on the size of the company that has lead him to request an explanation? Consider the following observation as evidence that this is the case: In line 4, after his question and in overlap with the response, P2 says: “More

than six seats?”, while he points at empty desks in the office that are located behind P3. Following his question, this action provides a possible reason for questioning the small size of the company and points his interlocutor to his observation that there are more than six desks in the office - so how come there are only six employees? This line makes a reason overt of what it was that P2 has treated as insufficiently explained during the unfolding of line 1 and what has led him to utter a ‘why-request for elaboration’ in line 2. This request is uttered against a backdrop of his orientation to a normative ‘requiredness of an account’ (Heritage, 1988, p.135), i.e. his interlocutors’ ‘obligation’ to properly and coherently introduce his work and the office.

However, at this point, P2 may treat the discrepancy between the number of desks and the number of employees that P3 brings up in line 1 as something in need of additional explanation. P3, on the other hand may not be cognizant of this discrepancy considering that the empty desks are located behind him while he utters line 1, out of his sight. P2 appears to point this out by first uttering the question (line 2) and then following up with pointing his interlocutor to the desks behind him (line 4).

In summary, at this layer of action formation, at line 2, P2 points his interlocutor to a ‘gap between action and expectation’ in the ongoing introductory talk and requests him to ‘reassess’ the previous turn that attends to the trouble he is having with it (Scott and Lyman, 1968, p.46). In this view, P2, in line 2, requests P3 to ‘account for his ignorance’ of the fact that there are more than six desks in the office, which P2 may treat as troublesome, but P3 has not (possibly due to it being out of his sight). At line 3, P3 then attends to the request and accounts for the empty desks behind him. Notably, he begins his account with *janwai*.

Here is another instance of a *janwai*-initial response. This information-seeking sequence features a *janwai*-initial response that is part of a longer multi-TCU telling-sequence (in contrast to shorter one-turn telling-responses).

(2) Data Excerpt: “Tarnished reputation” || MYCANCOR 009 (06:53-7:58)

This example features two colleagues and friends (P1 and P2) having a conversation over dinner. Previously the dating life of another colleague came up as a topic of interest and P1 has expressed a negative sentiment towards this colleague named Ah-Lau, saying that his reputation is not good. After a longer pause, while both are eating, P2 asks a question:

01 P2 跟住做咩你講而家整臭咗?
gan1 zyu6 zou6 mei nei5 gong2 ji4 gaa1 zing2 cau3 zo2
then-do-what-you-say-now-tarnish-Vg
Then what are you doing by saying ((his reputation)) is now tarnished.

02 | (2.0)
| (((P1 chewing)))

03⇒P1 因為(0.3)左近::佢佢:而家on leave.
jan1 wai4 zo2 gan6 keoi5 keoi5 ji4 gaa1 on leave
because-lately-d-d-now-on-leave
Because, lately, he, he is now on leave.

04 P1 應該係而家嘅飛機啊(.)
jing3 goi1 hai6 ji4 gaa1 ge3 fei1 gei1 aa1
should-is-now-u-plane-y
((He)) should be on the plane now.

05 P1 去韓國療養啊嘛.
heoi3 hon4 gwok3 liu4 joeng5 aa1 maa3
go-korea-recover-y
On the way to Korea, recovering.

- 06 P2 恩.
ng2
y
 Mhm.
- 07 P1 我哋問佢你會同邊個(.) (國) 我的朋友(/國) 咯
ngo5 dei2 man6 keoi5 nei5 wui2 tung4 bin1 go3 wo de peng you lo3
d-ask-him-you-will-with which-one-my-friend-y
 We asked him with whom will you ((go)). “Just my friend.”
- 08 P2 恩恩.
ng2 ng2
y-y
 Mhm, mhm.
- 09 P1 咁樣講[啊嘛].
gam3 joeng6 gong2 aa1 maa3
like-this-talk-y
 Like this.
- 10 P2 [啊.
aa1
y
 Yes.
- 11 P1 and then 阿漢咪走去深入調查 哈哈
and then aa3 hon3 mi1 zau2 heoi3 sam1 jap6 diu6 caa4 haa1 haa1
and-then-nr-just-go-to-deep-investigate-laughter
 And then Ah-Hon went on and started to further investigate, haha.
- ((line 12 - 27 omitted; P1 recounts how Ah-Hon ‘investigates’ the relationship between Ah-Lau and the person he is traveling with.))
- 28 P1 跟住阿漢就特登咁講.
gan1 zyu6 aa3 hon3 zau6 dak6 dang1 gam3 gong2
then-nr-just-especially-so-say
 Then Ah-Hon specifically said.
- 29 P1 哦::: (國) 你的對象是嘛: (/國) 呵[呵呵呵].
oo ni de dui xiang shi ma he he he he
y your-partner-is-y laughter
 “Oh, your significant other, right?” hehehehe
- 30 P2 [當然.
dong1 jin4
of-course
 Of course.
- 31 P1 跟住佢就好尷尬咁笑呵呵呵(國) 是咯是咯(/國) 呵呵.
gan1 zyu6 keoi5 zau6 hou2 gaam1 gaai3 gam3 siu3 hehehe shi la shi la hehe
then-he-just-very-awkward-like this smile laughter is-y is-y laughter
 And then he smiled embarrassed. Hehehe “yes, yes,” hehe.

At line 1, P2 utters a why-question using a *zou6 mel* (“what are you doing by”) question token, “Then what are you doing by saying ((his reputation)) is now tarnished”. This turn is hearable as a request for an account. While she utters this turn, her interlocutor, P1, is eating. After a two seconds pause during which P1 is chewing, P1, in line 2, utters a turn-initial *janwai* as she begins to address the question,

“Because, lately, he, he is now on leave”.³ Her turn features a 0.3 second pause and stretched talk, possibly due to P1 still being somewhat busy eating. Two things are noteworthy here.

First, *janwai* is uttered in response to a request for an account. P1 meets this request and provides a relevant account in form of a long telling-sequence that eventually, in line 28 - 31, will become recognizable as a relevant response to the question of why Ah-Lau’s reputation is tarnished (as P1 recounts how the protagonist of her story, Ah-Hon, asks whether the person that Ah-Lau is traveling with in Korea is his significant other). This excerpt shows that a request for an account can be met with a turn-initial *janwai*.

Second, the way P1 engages this request for an account in line 3 is interesting. The initial request is uttered while she is eating and what follows the request is a 2.0 seconds pause during which she is chewing. Even though her sequentially delayed turn-uptake is ‘excused’ because of this, this delay may create an environment of ‘special attention’ as her interlocutor is waiting for the response. She decides to begin her turn with *janwai* that is again followed by a pause. Notably, at this point, her turn already becomes hearable as an affirmative response that commits to meet the request for an account. Similar to a response token (such as a yes/no token that becomes relevant after a polar question), this *janwai* in turn-initial position serves to signal the affirmative nature of the responsive action and foreshadows the forthcoming of the requested account.

This example differs from the previous one in that the first turn of the responsive action (line 3 - 4) does not provide information that directly engages the topic of the colleague’s “tarnished reputation”. Instead the turn is the beginning of a longer telling-sequence that, as a whole, will eventually become recognizable as a relevant response to the question (line 31): “And then he smiled embarrassed ‘hehehe yes, yes, hehe’”. At this point, the story revolving around Ah-Lau’s trip to Korea becomes hearable as a response to the initial question of why Ah-Lau’s reputation is tarnished - because he had an affair. In contrast to the previous example where the relevant response was delivered in one turn, this *janwai*-initial response (as a second-pair part) is delivered in form of a multi-turn telling sequence (Schegloff, 2007, p.37ff). Even though the response only becomes hearable as relevant and affirmative after the telling-sequence has come to an end, the use of turn-initial *janwai* makes this responsive action identifiable as such very early in its sequential unfolding. It appears that *janwai*-prefaced talk will be heard as the beginning of an account, given that what follows *janwai* is here not immediately recognizable as being a relevant account.

Turn-initial *janwai* as part of responses to telling-questions without QWI

Participants may also utter Telling-questions without the use of a Question-word Interrogative (see Figure 4.3). Here are two examples of the utterance of a Telling-question that do not feature QWIs, but that are, similar to the previous section, followed by a turn-initial *janwai* as part of responsive action.

Figure 4.3: Formation of Telling-questions without Question-Word Interrogatives

P2: A Telling-question without Question-Word Interrogative (QWI)

P1: *janwai* _____.

(3) Data Excerpt: “Six or nine months” || MYCANCOR 023 (16:19-16:24)

This excerpt is from a conversation between two participants (P1 and P2) sitting in a park. Prior to the beginning of the excerpt, P1 has brought up that she recently went on a working holiday trip to New Zealand (15:45). P2 then expressed that she would also like to participate in such a programme and begins to ask about more details. What follows is a series of questions and responses. Both participants

³The pause in line 2 does not seem to constitute a delayed response here, due to the fact that P1 is busy eating during the pause and her delayed turn-uptake may therefore be excused.

have never met before and, to the authors' knowledge, do not share knowledge about the programme. The working holiday programme that they talk about grants a six months visa which can be extended once for three months to a total length of nine months.

- 01 P2 你去幾耐(.) 九個月.
nei5 heoi3 gei2 noi6 gau2 go3 jyut6
you-go-how long-nine-q-month
How long did you go ((on exchange to New Zealand)), nine months.
- 02 P1 冇啦:(.) 我去七個月嘅.
mou5 laa1 ngo5 heoi3 cat1 go3 jyut6 syu3
not have-y I-go-seven-month-u
No, I went seven months only.
- 03 P2 你冇extend啊.
nei5 mou5 extend aa1
you-not-have-extend-y
You didn't extend ((from 6 to 9 months)).
- 04⇒P1 >°因為°<(.) 因為六個月嘛.
jan1wai4 yin wei luk6 go3 jyut6 maa3
because-because-six-q-month-y
Because, because ((it is)) six months.
- 05 P2 [嗯
ng2
y
Mhm.
- 06 P1 [跟住你要extend嘛.
gan1 zyu6 nei5 jiu3 extend maa3
then-you-need-extend-y
Then you need to extend.
- 07 P2 係[咯.
hai6 lo3
is-y
Yes.
- 08 P1 [°ex°↑tend 咗(.) 跟住:(.) 淨係得七個月咯.
extend zo2 gan1 zyu6 zing6 hai6 dak1 cat1 go3 jyut6 lo3
extend-y-then-only-Vg-seven-month-y
(I) extended and then it was only seven months.
- 09 P2 ↑哦::::.
ngo4
y
Ohhhh.
- 10 P2 >因為<嗰陣我(.) 我parents: 佢哋要去台灣[旅行
jan1wai4 go2 zan6 ngo5 ngo5 parents-keoi5 dei2 jiu3 heoi3 toi4 waan1 leoi5 hang4
because-that-time-my-my-parents-they-want-go-taiwan-travel
Because ((at)) that time my, my parents they wanted to go travelling to Taiwan.
- 11 P2 [嗯 嗯
ng2 ng2
y-y
Mhm, mhm.

- 12 P2 嚟啦嚟啦 一齊去啦:.
 lai4 laa1 lai4 laa1 jat1 cai4 heoi3 laa1
 come-y-come-y together-go-y
Come, come, ((let' s)) go together.
- 13 P2 >啊<所以你就走咗啦.
 aa1 so2 ji5 nei5 zau6 zau2 zo2 laa1
 y-so-you-just-go-Vg-y
Ohh, so you just went.

At line 1, P2 says “How long did you go ((on exchange to New Zealand)), nine months?”, asking a specifying-question related to the duration of P1’s stay after she has just learned that P1 has previously participated in the programme. After the *gei2 noi6* (“how long”) question comes to a point of possible completion, she goes on and adds a possible duration of stay (9 months) as a candidate answer (here possibly as an increment; Luke 2005; 2012).⁴ At line 2, P1 then responds by first uttering the negative token *mou5 aa1* (“not have; is not”) followed by the information that she stayed only seven months. Against the backdrop of the previously proposed length of 9 months, this is a negative response in that it brings up a different length than the assumed ‘standard length’ that was proposed in line 1. At line 3, P2 then requests an elaboration: “You didn’t extent ((from 6 to 9 months))?”. This turn is hearable as expressing surprise through the use of an *aa1* final particle, which is here a display that she treats the previous turn as containing some unexpected elements. In this context, this final particle token is a display that something unexpected or surprising has happened and thereby may make a response relevant and may serve as a repair initiator (Chor, 2018). Line 3 constitutes an account-seeking action. Note, however, that this question does not feature a QWI.

Following this display of surprise, P1 begins to build responsive action using a turn-initial *janwai* and a longer explanatory sequence (line 4 to 15) ensues that revolves around the topic of why P1 did not stay the full length but ‘only’ 7 months. The sequence begins with (line 4): “Because, because ((it is)) six months”. The *janwai*-initial TCU brings up the information *luk6 go3 jyut6* (“six months”) and ends with a *maa3* final particle, a display that this is a ‘matter of fact’ or even ‘obvious’ (Kwok 1984; 1992). This turn design and the use of this particle presents ‘six months’ as a piece of information that is (or should be) already known - in contrast to presenting it as novel information. Based on what has been established as shared knowledge up to this point, this time frame is hearable as the ‘standard’ length of the working holiday programme. P1 then says in line 6: “Then you need to extend”, in overlap with an information-receipt token (Gardner, 1995). She adds that one needs to extend the visa after the initial six months are over. Then, in overlap with *hai6 lo3* (“yes”) (line 7), P1, in line 8, goes on: “((I)) extended and then it was only seven months”, producing a third TCU related to the topic. This TCU consists of two clauses, the first consists of *extend zo2* (“((I)) extended”) and the second then states that her stay was *zing6 hai6 dak1 cat1 go3 juyt6* (“only seven months”). After that, P2, in line 9, produces a stretched *ngo4* featuring a rising intonation. This token may here be used as an epistemic change-of-state token ‘oh’ (Heritage, 1984) that displays some form of novel understanding has been achieved. In this view, the token relates to the question produced earlier (line 3) and serves to signal that the previous turn in treated as a relevant response. However, the turn may also be a display that the provided explanation was not sufficient. In fact, for two reasons this seems to be a more accurate description of this utterance. First, the rather long stretching and slowly rising intonation of the token make it hearable as a display of ‘doubt’, ‘confusion’ or ‘disbelief’. Second, P1 will later on (beginning in line 10) provide additional

⁴Through proposing a candidate length (a specific length of stay as a possible answer to the question), P2 makes evident that she takes a rather high degree of preexisting knowledge of the programme for granted as shared between them. Possibly based on the fact that P1 told her that she had participated in the programme, she relies on several pieces of information here that have not been explicitly been shared between the two. For instance, in order for the utterance “9 months” to be recognized as a relevant response, both need to know that the standard length of the programme is six months and that it can be extended once for three months. None of this has been mentioned beforehand, but, as P1’s response makes evident, no sign of trouble ensues and it may therefore at this point be successfully established that this knowledge is shared.

explanation related to the length of stay which is further evidence that she is here treating the token like this.

In summary, the sequential unfolding of this sequence up to this point shows the following structure:

- Line 1: Formulation of a question in the format of a *gei2 noi6* (“how long”) QWI that makes an information seeking response relevant, followed by the proposal of a candidate length (9 months) that changes this turn to a yes/no question.
- Line 2: Respondee provides a relevant response that serves as a negative response with regards to the candidate length (by providing an answer that is not either 6 or 9 months).
- Line 3: Utterance of a Telling question in form of a request for elaboration through use of *aal* as a ‘surprise’ token.
- Line 4-8: *Janwai*-initial TCU that marks the beginning of an elaborative sequence that (eventually) attends to the ‘surprise’.
- Line 9: ‘Ohhh’ token that may be a display of ‘doubt’, ‘confusion’ or ‘disbelief’ but may also possibly be an epistemic change of state token.

This sequential order shows that *janwai* may occur at the first utterance of a turn that responds to a display of some kind of ‘problem of understanding’. *Janwai* prefaces the beginning of an explanatory action sequence that attends to P2’s communication of an unexpected duration of stay.

After the discussed *ohhh* in line 9, P1 continues to elaborate. The talk that follows from here constitutes another effort to provide a satisfactory explanation of why the extended stay was only 7 months instead of the full 9 months. Like before, P1 begins with a *janwai*-initial turn (line 10): “Because ((at)) that time my, my parents they wanted to go travelling to Taiwan”. The turn brings up another actor that is relevant to her explanation - the “parents”. The sequence of TCUs that follows from here elaborates on how the parents are related to why her stay was 7 months only (see footnote for details)⁵. After P1 has shared this information, P2 produces *aal* (“ohh”) in line 13, followed by: “so you just went”. This token followed by a *so2 ji5* (“so”)-initial clause brings up information related to the telling-sequence (as it repeats a part of the telling) and thereby displays that the previous sequence has been understood (in a certain way). The *aal* (“ohh”) here is hearable as a change-of-state token that, in this context, displays successful information receipt and that a new understanding has been reached (Heritage, 1984). In contrast to the earlier unelaborated, minimal *ng2* (“hm”) that were receiving the immediately prior chunk of information, P2 with her “so you just went” displays that she now understands the full picture. In this sense, line 10-13 also displays the use of a *janwai*-token at the beginning of a telling-sequence that further elaborates on the topic of ‘why’ P1 did not stay in New Zealand longer (the full 9 months), possibly in response to *ohhh* display of confusion in line 9. The *janwai* TCU brings up the “parents” and the following two TCUs constitute “telling” that explains how they are related to topic in more intricate ways to the larger topic of the duration of stay. The sequence comes to an end with the production of a ‘consequential’ *so2 ji5* (“so”) clause that makes an understanding overt of how the telling-sequence relates to the larger topic (duration of stay) - it provides an account of why P1 had to leave earlier due to unavoidable circumstances.

⁵P1 produces a complex telling-sequence that involves multiple actors and locations that can be summarized as follows: While P1 was in New Zealand, her parents wanted to go traveling to Taiwan (line 10 and 11). Then her parents asked her to come to Taiwan to join them, which she did and which is why she left New Zealand after seven months (instead of staying the full 9 months) (line 12).

In summary, the first *janwai* marks the beginning of the requested account but the account that follows does not immediately provide a reason and is met with a display of confusion. After which P1 continues with another *janwai*-prefaced account which addresses why she applied for an extension that makes a total of 7 months. P2's change-of-state token and *so2 ji5* ("so")-clause in line 13 then brings this telling-sequence to a possible point of completion.

The previously discussed excerpts No. (1), (2) and (3) feature a turn-initial *janwai* in a question-response adjacency pair setting, as part of a second-pair part. These instances display the utterance of turn-initial *janwai* as part of a response obligation, by participants that were selected as the next speakers and assigned a response slot. However, MYCanCor also features instances of turn-initial *janwai* that are uttered in an environment where no response slot is evident. Consider Data Excerpt (4) that displays a case of a more self-initiated turn-uptake with *janwai*.

(4) Data Excerpt: "Why do they feel this way" || MYCANCOR 017 (10:39-11:28)

Here are two friends and colleagues taking about sentiments of their other colleagues towards a coworker called "Ah-Long".

07 P2 其實(.)呢啲人semua啊,
kei4sat6 ne1di1 jan4 semua aa1-
actually-those-people-all-y-
Actually, all those people,

(cont.) 我係唔明白點解(.)會對阿朗咁樣嘅feel咯.
ngo5 hai6 m4 ming4 baak6 dim2 gaai2 wui2 deoi3 aa3long5 gam3 joeng6 ge3 feel lo3
I-is-not-understand-is-not-will-to-nr-like-this-u-feel-y
I don't understand why, right, ((they)) feel about Ah-Long in this way.

08 P2 >我講<=
ngo5 gong2
I-say
I say-

09⇒P1 =因為 佢哋認為自己冇錯 自己啱囉::.
jan1wai4 keoi5 xx zi6 gei2 mou5 co3 zi6 gei2 ngaam1 saai3
because-he-xx-himself-not-have-wrong-self-correct-Vg
Because he xx himself is not wrong ((but)) always right.

At line 7, P1 says: "Actually, all those people, I don't understand why, right, ((they)) feel about Ah-Long in this way", producing a TCU that displays a lack of understanding of why their colleagues treat Ah-Long in a disrespectful way. While the TCU featuring a *dim2 gaai2* ("why") may grammatically constitute a question, it interactionally constitute a display of non-understanding and possibly a stance (Schegloff, 2007). The participant does not select the recipient as the next speaker as evident in line 8 when P1 begins another TCU "I say". Line 7 constitutes an assertion (or a rhetorical question) rather than a 'genuine' question, that does however, in line with the previous examples, make a lack of understanding overt (and puts her in a relative K- position). After uttering "I say" (line 8), P1 abandons the TCU as P2 begins to speak without being assigned a "response slot".

As a latched-on response, P2 then says (line 12): "Because he xx himself is not wrong ((but)) always right)", producing a *janwai*-initial turn that supplies information that addresses the display of lack of understanding that has been made evident earlier by P1. This self-initiated turn-uptake with *janwai* constitutes a telling-sequence that presents an account related to the topic, ostensibly similar to the previously discussed excerpts, this accounting sequence seems to attends to a display of lack of understanding (that has also been evident in the formation of the why-type questions in the previously discussed excerpts).

However, interestingly, a question is not evident as such. In contrast to the previous examples, P2 self-selects through the use of a turn-initial *janwai* and then goes on to deliver an accounting-sequence

that addresses the knowledge gap and possibly presents a counter-stance. Even though P1 articulated her utterance as an assertion (or rhetorical question) to which she herself is proposing an answer), we see that P2 uses the *janwai*-initiated utterance as another kind of rhetorical device to respond to the foregoing turn as if it had been a ‘genuine’ question requesting information. In the process, P2 in effect sets up an ad-hoc epistemic gap between herself and P1 (by ascribing the foregoing turn as a display of non-understanding), regardless of whether or not she deemed P1 to be in an actual K- position. In this way, we see that *janwai* may be a rhetorical device to retroactively subvert the original action formation of a foregoing utterance by designedly treating it as a why-question.

4.1.2 Deviant case analysis: Self-initiated repair of the turn-initial *janwai*

This section presents a data excerpt that, as of MYCanCor, is a deviant case of the two-part sequence “Telling-question followed by a turn-initial *janwai*”. In contrast to the previously discussed instances, Data Excerpt (5) features a question followed by a response that features a repair sequences involving *janwai*.

(5) Data Excerpt: “What to why” || MYCANCOR 011 (1:21-2:09)

The excerpt shows two friends (P1 and P3) who talk about P3’s job in the film industry. P1 has previously been asking several information-seeking questions related to the skills that P3’s job requires.

- 01 P1 咁咁需要 讀讀啲乜嘢?
gam3 gam3 seoi1 jiu3 duk6 duk6 di1 mat1 je5
so-so-need study-study-what
So-so what do ((you)) need to study-study ((for doing this job))?
- 02⇒P3 hhh. 因為(.)而家::,
jan1 wai4 ji4 gaa1
because-now
Because nowadays.
- 03 P3 >okay< 點解我要做呢行呢?
okay dim2 gaa12 ngo5 jiu3 zou6 ne1 hang4 ne1
okay-why-do-this-work-y
Okay, why do I do this ((kind of)) work?
- 04 P1 [嗯
ng2
y
Mhm.
- 05⇒P3 [因為而家:好多人 拍片都要拍digital.
jan1 wai4 ji4 gaa1 hou2 do1 jan4 paak3 pin3 dou1 jiu3 paak3 digital
because-now many-people shoot-movie-all-want-shoot-digital
Because nowadays a lot of people ((that)) shoot movies all want to shoot digital.
- 06 P1 嗯
ng2
y
Mhm.
- 07 P3 so我係讀IT㗎嘛.
so ngo5 hai6 duk6 IT gaa2 maa3
so-I-is-study-IT-y-y
So that’s why I study IT.

08 P1 嗯
ng2
y
Mhm.

In line 1, P1 asks a what question - “so, so what do ((you)) need to study-study ((for doing this job))?”. To this, P3 says *jan1 wai4(.)ji4 gaal::* (“Because now”) beginning with a *janwai*-initiated response (line 2). However, after some disfluency P3 stops short, abandons the turn-beginning, and restarts in line 3 “Okay, why do I do this ((kind of)) work”. After that he says “Okay” (line 3), possibly as a clue for understanding consequentiality (Beach, 1995), followed by “why do I do this ((kind of)) work”, producing a why question that reformulates P1’s question in line 1 as an account-seeking question directed toward P3 (himself). It is only then that he picks up where he left off in line 2 (by repeating it) and continues, “Because now a lot of people ((that)) shoot movies all want to shoot digital.” Finally P3 ends by summing up with “So that’s why I study IT”.

Looking at the sequential unfolding of P3’s responsive action (that becomes relevant after the question in line 1), some interesting observation can be made here. In line 2, P3 begins with a *janwai* account - hearable as the beginning of a telling-response with *ji4 gaal* (“now”) which sets the temporal setting for an upcoming telling-sequence. However, he stops short, and abandons line 2. Then, in line 3, he not only repairs his own talk but retrospectively reformulates P1’s question in line 1 so that he can respond to the new (rhetorical) question which is an account-seeking question. This possibly indicates that this *janwai* uptake is treated as not fitted to the question in line 1 at this point. Moreover, P3 himself then proceeds to answer his rhetorical question with a response which is recognizable as the abandoned *janwai*-initial response (line 5).

This shows participant understanding that *janwai* does not adequately respond to a what-type question, but that it is a why-question that makes a turn-initial *janwai* relevant. In other words, it appears that certain questions that seek for an account (i.e. why-questions) may be followed by a turn-initial *janwai*, but others that make only a specific piece of information relevant (i.e. what-questions) may not. Comparing the pre- and post-repair question formulation, it appears that part of what constitutes such an account-seeking question is a ‘display of non-understanding’ that is commonly (but not necessarily) formatted with question tokens (here it is formatted with *dim2 gaai2* (“why”)). This indicates that a *janwai*-prefaced accounts may become relevant after a display of lack of understanding (but not after a question that seeks for a specific piece of information such as the what-question in line 1).

4.2 Chapter summary

This chapter examined *janwai*-initial responsive action formation. Five excerpts from the MYCanCorpus were discussed. Excerpts (1) and (2) show that *janwai*-initial responses may occur after Telling-questions formatted with why-question tokens. Excerpt (1) “All the desks” shows that *janwai* may preface telling-sequences after they are requested by a Telling-question. As an action pair, this kind of question/response pair may constitute an ‘information seeking sequence’ (Thompson et al., 2015, p.16ff). This is evidence that *janwai*-initial responsive actions can be used to engage a request for elaboration or telling. This commonly involves an orientation to an epistemic gradient with the participant who utters the questions put in a relative K- position and the respondent in a K+ position (as evident in the utterance of change-of-state tokens after such sequences).

Moreover, such information-seeking sequences may be related to accounting practices in that the participants display and orientation to moral or normative ‘requiredness to account’ and the failure to properly ‘do accounting’ may lead to overt requests for information-seeking sequences. Excerpt (2) “Tarnished reputation” shows how account-requests may be met with *janwai*-prefaced accounts and that, in environments of requested accounts, *janwai* may, similar to a response token, serve to signal an affirmative response as well as the forthcoming of an account. This excerpt also shows that such accounts may be expanded into storytelling-sequences.

Excerpts (3) and (4) examined *janwai*-responses following first actions that constitute Telling-questions formatted without question tokens. Here, the first actions differ from those discussed previously in that the why-questions are not formatted as such (with question tokens or as making a response slot relevant), but are also treated as Telling-questions by the participants. Excerpt (3) shows that a Telling-question that is formatted as a polar question featuring a display of surprise may also be engaged with a *janwai*-prefaced explanation/account. This shows that *janwai* may be used to signal a certain action ascription to preceding actions, namely that the ‘main job’ of the previous turn is understood to seek for an explanation/account. Excerpt (4) shows that *janwai*-prefaced responses may also serve as a rhetorical device that ascribes the foregoing turn as seeking an account (even without the occurrence of a response slot). This shows that *janwai* may be used as a device to retroactively subvert the original action formation of the foregoing utterance by designedly treating it as a request for an account.

In addition to these ‘prototypical’ examples, Excerpt (5) shows a self-initiated repair involving *janwai*. The excerpt shows that participants may treat turn-initial *janwai* as beginning an adequate response to an (account-seeking) why-question but not to a what-question. This indicates that *janwai*-initial turn may become relevant after a display of ‘lack of understanding’ but not after questions that seeks a specific piece of information.

A turn-initial *janwai* as a part of responsive action may be used to preface an accounting sequence. The length and structure of this action sequence that *janwai* is part of varies, but a of MYCanCor it consistently goes beyond supplying a specific piece of information. A turn-initial *janwai* introduces a Telling-response. This confirms Thompson et al. (2015)’s findings that “the most frequent question words that initiate Telling Questions, on the other hand, are why and how, with some instances of what”. Speakers may use question tokens (such as *dim2 gaai2* (“why”)) to utter a Telling-question, however, they may also do so without using such tokens.⁶

In summary, the excerpts discussed in this section show that *janwai*-prefaced responsive action seems to be related to a preceding display of ‘lack of understanding’. Furthermore, the chapter shows that such a problem related to intelligibility may involve epistemic asymmetry and it may be delivered in form of a question but may also at times be initiated without a preceding question or a response slot. This means that the display of ‘lack of understanding’ may be formatted as part of action formation (of the first action) but it may also be reflexively ascribes to a first action retrospectively.

⁶MYCanCor data shows that factors other than grammatical form seem to drive action formation and ascription that orients to displays of ‘lack of understanding’ (one of them being epistemic status and perceived epistemic (a)symmetry (Heritage, 2012a)). Aside from WTI’s, no grammatical constraints or patterns could be observed that suggest that a particular question design makes a display of non-understanding evident. This seems to be driven by factors other than grammar. This is also noted by (Thompson et al., 2015) with regards to what constitutes a Telling-question: “What these observations tell us is that, while there is a strong link between the norms for responding and the form of an initiating action, the grammar of a QWI is not always a reliable clue to the type of information being requested. Apart from the ‘specialized’ formats in (2.26), responders must not only pay attention to the question word of a QWI, but must factor in the sequential and activity context with the question format to determine what action the question is performing and what an appropriate response would look like” (Thompson et al., 2015, p.46).

Figure 4.4: Overview of findings in Chapter 4

- *janwai*-initial responsive action can constitute a relevant response to Telling-questions, i.e. *janwai* seems to be part of the ‘projected’ response - designed as part of an question-response action pair
- *janwai* may be part of an information-seeking sequence (consisting of a Telling-question and a Telling-response).
- information-seeking sequences featuring *janwai* seem to include an orientation to epistemic gradients.
- *janwai*-initial responsive action can preface accounts and/or storytelling-sequences.
- as part of responsive action, *janwai* can be used to signal an affirmative response to an account-request (similar to an affirmative response token)
- as part of responsive action, *janwai* can be used as a rhetorical device to subvert original action formation of a preceding turn and ascribes the foregoing turn as seeking an account.
- *janwai*-initial responses can occur after a participants’ display of ‘lack of understanding’ (or after an actual intelligibility problem).

5

Sequential environment 2: *janwai* as part of response formats

Out of a total of around 500 instances of *janwai* in MYCanCor, around 349 instances occur as part of building responsive action. While the previous chapter looked at those instances where *janwai* appear in turn-initial position (Figure 5.1), this chapter looks at other instances of *janwai* as part of responsive action (Figure 5.2). **This chapter examines responsive action formation featuring *janwai* not in turn-initial position, i.e. responses that feature the production of response tokens followed by *janwai* and additional components.**

Figure 5.1: Responsive action with turn-initial *janwai*

P1: Initiating action that makes a response relevant
P2: *janwai* + additional components _____.

Figure 5.2: Responsive action with response token followed by *janwai* TCU

P1: Initiating action that makes a response relevant
P2: A relevant response token (e.g. affirmative or negative token)
P2: *janwai* + additional components _____.

Chapter Outline

Several patterns of turns featuring **response token + *janwai*-prefaced TCU** have emerged in MYCanCor. The first section examines patterns of large range of different question and response designs that featuring *janwai* (n=303). Following previous work on question types, this multitude of question designs that precede responses with *janwai* is divided into two groups: Telling questions + their responses and Specifying questions + their responses (for this distinction, see [Thompson et al. 2015](#), p.20f).

The next section examines a subpattern of this distinction that has emerged in the data set, responsive action that features *janwai* and a *me1* (㗎)-particle (n=23). This includes designs that feature, for instance, *janwai me1* (“because what”), *janwai me1 aal* (“because what” + *aal* final particle) or *janwai zou6 me1* (“because how come; because what happens”). Each section examines two or more data excerpts from MYCanCor that display the pattern under study.

5.1 Responsive action featuring response tokens followed by *janwai*

This section looks at responsive action that involves at least two parts, a response token followed by a *janwai*-initial TCU or clause (see Figure 5.3).

Figure 5.3: Formation of two-part responsive actions involving *janwai*

Part 1: *.Yes/No token; affirmative/negative token; repetition or gesture* _____.

Part 2: *janwai*_____.

More specifically, these are cases where a participant produces an initiating action (a question) that is then engaged by a recipient building responsive action. In contrast to the previous chapter, the responsive action here involves at least two (grammatical) parts, it includes the production of a relevant response token (such as an affirmative or negative token) and subsequently the production of a *janwai*-initial TCU or clause. The particular form of the two-part responsive action varies with regards to the initiating action.

Figure 5.4: Overview of instances of initiating actions followed by *janwai*-prefaced responsive action

- (1) Specifying-question (when-question) followed by response token + *janwai*-TCU.
MYCANCOR 004 (08:20-8:21)

01 P1 幾時到啊佢. ← Initiating action: Specifying-question
When will he arrive?

02 P2 ↑八點::(.)因為佢搭車嚟:. ← Responsive action: two-part response
8 o'clock, because he is taking the car.

- (2) Specifying-question (polar-question) followed by response token + *janwai*-TCU.
MYCANCOR 030 (39:30-39:31)

01 P2 你唔食啲面. ← Initiating action: Polar-question
Don't you want some noodles?

02 P3 唔啦(.)因為我食咗飯啦. ← Responsive action: two-part response
No, because I already had dinner.

- (3) Assertion followed by response token + *janwai*-TCU.
MYCANCOR 052 (02:10-02:11)

01 P1 我唔多食芝士. ← Initiating action: Assertion
I normally don't eat cheese.

02 P2 我都係(.)因為食芝士好肥. ← Responsive action: two-part response
Me too, because it's so fatty.

- (4) Assessment followed by response token + *janwai*-TCU.
MYCANCOR 021 (25:01-25:02)

01 P1 我覺得佢份人好衰啊. ← Initiating action: Assessment
I think he is a terrible person.

02 P4 我都覺(.)因為他把口講唔停.哈哈 ← Responsive action: two-part response
He is, because he never stops talking. haha.

For instance, in the case of polar questions the two part responsive action may take the form of a Yes/No token followed by a *janwai* clause. Other initiating actions may be engaged with some form of repetition, or even a gesture that constitutes part of the responsive action.

The participants in MYCanCor frequently opt for a two-part structure to build responsive action (n=303). As of MYCanCor, this is a common pattern that the participants opt for ($\approx 60\%$) and that is in itself rather diverse, incorporating the formation of both negative responses (denial) followed by elaboration (Ford, 2001) as well as affirmative responses followed by elaboration (Steensig and Heinemann, 2013). Thus, this pattern includes a multitude of initiating actions (see Figure 5.4 for an overview of different sequential patterns that are included in this group). What all instances examined in this chapter have in common is that a turn-initial relevant response token is followed by a *janwai*-initial TCU or clause. Steensig and Heinemann (2013) describe such responsive actions consisting of response tokens followed by elaboration as ‘yes/no+ responses’ (see also Raymond (2003) for ‘yes/no interrogatives’).

This large and diverse range of action pairs is further divided in two sets based on whether the initiating action is a Specifying-question (such as a ‘polar question’) or a Telling question (see Thompson et al. (2015, p.20) for a definition of these question types).¹ Based on responses featuring *janwai* (independent variable), a range of initiating actions can be defined that roughly fall on a cline ranging from prototypical Telling-Questions to prototypical Specifying-Questions (see Figure 5.5). This section examines five corpus excerpts that are positioned differently on this gradient, beginning with ‘prototypical’ Telling-Question.

Figure 5.5 Cline of initiating actions that constitute Specifying and Telling-Questions

5.1.1 Responsive actions featuring *janwai* following Telling-questions

This section discusses examples that display the production of a Telling-question as an initiating action, i.e. an action that makes a Telling-response relevant) (see Figure 5.6). The question is then followed by a relevant response token (Part 1) and a *janwai* TCU or clause (Part 2). What interactionally may constitute a Telling-question may involve different turn designs and critically depends on the sequential context. This is a recurring pattern in MYCanCor (n=46) and two excerpts will be discussed here.

¹Instead of further dividing it, for instance, in action-typological terms and thereby committing to a specific action typology.

Figure 5.6: Responsive action featuring *janwai* following Telling questions

P1: Telling-Question (an initiating action that makes a Telling-response relevant)

P2: Relevant response token

P2: *janwai* _____.

5.1.2 Data discussion

(6) Data Excerpt: “Hiking takes a week” || MYCANCOR 007 (04:48-04:57)

Prior to the beginning of this excerpt from a casual conversation between three friends in a living room, P1, P2 and P3 have been talking about P2 and P3’s recent holiday hiking trip to Nepal. P1 asked several questions related to the trip and now, at line 1, begins a turn with *ee1* (呃) that signals a topic change and here introduces an information-seeking question (Chor, 2018).

- 01 P1 ↑呃 go2 laai2:除咗 尼泊爾::嗰度(.)
 ee1 go2 laai2 ceoi4 zo2 nei4 paak3 ji5 go2 dou6
 y go2-laai2 except Nepal there
Eyy, xx, except over there in Nepal,
- 02 P1 你哋::(.)>仲係嗰度附近行一行啊<?
 nei5 dei2 zung6 hai6 go2 dou6 fu6 gan6 hang4 jat1 hang4 aa1
 you guys also there-near hike-one-hike
did you guys also go somewhere ((else)) nearby?
- 03⇒P2 ↓呃::我哋::(.)其實因為行山都食咗好多時間啊,
 aak1 ngo5 dei2 kei4 sat6 jan1 wai4 hang4 saan1 dou1 sik6 zo2 hou2 do1 si4 gaan1 aa1
 y we actually-because hike already-eat-very-much-time
Mhm, we, actually because hiking ((a mountain)) takes a lot of time.
- 04 P2 |[行山都:(.)][七日十日咁咯(.)] 噃=
 hang4 saan1 dou1 cat1 jat6 sap6 jat6 gam3 lo3 en
 hike-already seven-day-ten-day-y-y y
Hiking ((a)) mountain takes seven to ten days, mhm.
- 05 P1 [↓哦:
 ngo4
 y
Oh ((nods)).
- 06 P3 |((nods)) [一個禮拜.
 jat1 go3 lai5 baai3
 one-week
One week.
- 07 P1 =>一個禮拜行成個山啊<?
 jat1 go3 lai5 baai3 hang4 sing4 go3 saan1 aa1
 one-week hike-whole-mountain
One week to hike one whole mountain?

Considering that the ongoing activity is the recounting/sharing of information related to P2 and P3’s Nepal holiday, line 1 constitutes a Telling-question in that it makes a telling response relevant. The turn design that P1 opts for here constitutes a ‘Did you guys’ question, using *nei5 dei2 zung6 hai6* (“you guys also did”). This ostensibly polar question format here makes a telling response relevant - only a Yes/No token would not constitute an interactionally complete response. At line 2, P2 then begins a

response with the token *aak1* (“Mhm”) featuring a falling intonation that here signals information receipt (Gardner, 1995). Then he goes on: “Mhm, we, actually because hiking ((a mountain)) takes a lot of time. Hiking ((a)) mountain takes seven to ten days, mhm”. This response begins with the pronoun *ngo5 dei2* (“we”), here produced in a stretched fashion followed by a micro pause. After this pause, P2 goes on and utters *kei4 sat4* (“actually”) and *janwai*. At this point, this utterance evidently already constitutes a ‘negative’ response, even before the *janwai* clause is completed. This is achieved through uttering the pronoun followed by *kei4 sat4* (“actually”) in combination with intonational cues such as the micro pause and the stretched pronoun (Clift, 1999, 2001). In this sense, the *janwai* clause here follows a relevant response even though the action of uttering a relevant response and the beginning of the *janwai*-clause ‘accounting’ are not uttered in form of two separate TCUs. In contrast to the examples discussed earlier, the *janwai* token is not in a turn or TCU-initial position but rather part of a *kei4 sat4 janwai* (“actually because”) utterance that is part of both the relevant response and more talk that further elaborates. As part of building the responsive action, the respondee brings up the verb *sik6 si4 gaan1* (“taking time”), thereby providing a reason that elaborates on the circumstances of why they did not go anywhere else. Without having produced an overt negative token such as “no”, P2 has provided an account for the negative response to the effect that they didn’t go anywhere else, that, in this context, is hearable as a dispreferred response (Heritage, 2013b).

After the *janwai* TCU is grammatically and intentionally completed with a *aa1* final particle token (line 3), a sequence of overlapping talk by P2 and P1 ensues, during which P3 produces an interactionally relevant nodding gesture that assists the unfolding of the ongoing ‘telling’ by the speakers (Lerner, 1992). At line 4, P1 produces an epistemic change-of-state *ngo4* (“oh”)-token. In overlap, P3 produces a nodding gesture (line 6) and P2 begins a new TCU (line 4). This TCU brings up more information related to the initiating question.² What ensues after this is another question by P1 related to the topic of hiking and another response sequence that is jointly produced by P2 and P3.

In summary, the following action sequence can be observed here:

- Line 1 and 2: Formulation of a question that makes a Telling-response relevant.
- Line 3: Respondee utters a relevant (negative) response token, in form of an ‘implicit’ negative response through intonational means and the token *kei4sat4* (“actually”) that in this combination serve as a negative response.
- Line 3: *janwai* token precedes an elaborative sequence that brings up a topic that serves as a possible reason and shares information that elaborate on the circumstances that lead to the negative response (P1 did not know this information previously). As a whole, what follows “actually because” in line 3 is hearable as an account for why there is a negative response.
- Line 4: Another TCU that brings up more information that further elaborates on the question.
- Line 5: P1 utters an epistemic change-of-state token *ngo4* (“oh”).

Here is another instance of the pattern.

²She begins with a TCU-initial *hang4 saan1*, a token that was already used in the preceding turn as well as the initiating question. Here P2 opts for an clause with an unmarked verb and the arguments *han4 saan1* (“hiking”) as well as a time period *cat1 jat6 sap6 jat1* (“seven days ten days”). By bringing up a specific period of time, P2 is moving from a more general *sik6 ho2 do1 si4 gaan1* (“take up a lot of time”) to a more specific formulation by bringing up (a range) of days. At line 6, in overlap with the production of the time period, P3 produces the utterance *jat1 go3 lai5 baai3* (“one week”). In this sequential order, P3 here produces a possible completion of part of the clause, at the same time, is uttered by P2 (see line 4 and line 6).

(7) Data Excerpt: “Hire an admin” || MYCANCOR 011 (24:40-25:16)

This excerpt is from a conversation between three friends who sit in an office and talk about work related topics. Around half an hour into the conversation, after a longer stretch of silence, P2 produces a series of TCUs (line 1-2) that are followed by an responsive action (beginning in line 5)

- 01 P2 請admin冇 我個admin又走咗(0.4)
cing2 admin mou5 ngo5go3 admin jau6 zau2 zo2
hire admin not-have my-q admin again-leave-Vg
Did ((you)) hire an admin, my admin left again.
- 02 P2 [千零箍人工嘅嘅好便SPMxx
cin1 ling4 kou1 jan4 gung1 ge3 syu3 hou2 bin6 SPMxx
thousand-zero-q salary-u-y very-cheap SPM xx
A salary of thousand plus dollar only, very cheap, SPM xx
- 03 P3 [哈哈.
haahaa
laughter
Haha.
- 04 (2.0)
- 05 P3 請admin冇啊(.)冇啊::(.)
cing2 admin mou5 aa1 mou5 aa1
hire admin not-have not-have-y
Hire an admin, no ((we)) didn't, didn't.
- 06⇒P3 我哋(.)因為::(.)今年嘅(.)嘅:: economy slow down right?
ngo5 dei2 jan1 wai4 gam1 nin4 ge3 ge3 economy slow down right
we because this-year-u-u economy slow down right
Our, because this year the economy slowed down, right.
- 07 P2 [slow好多::
slow hou2 do1
slow very-much
Slowed down a lot.
- 08 P3 [headcount headcount就freeze咗=
headcount headcount zau6 freeze zo2
headcount headcount just-freeze-u
((Our)) headcount, headcount was frozen.
- 09 P2 =↑哦::
ngo4
y
Ohh.
- 10 P3 舊年我哋就已經聽到咗喇 (.)
gau6 nin4 ngo5 dei2 zau6 ji5 ging1 ting3 dou3 zo2 laa1
last-year-we-just-already-hear about-u-u-y
Last year we already heard about that.
- 11 P3 通常咁樣嘅.
tung1 soeng4 gam3 joeng6 ge3
normally-like that-y
Normally it's like that.

- 12 P3 政府—freeze我哋就知 ok 明年嘅economy冇㗎啦。
 zing3 fu2 jat1 freeze ngo5 dei2 zau6 zi1 ok ming4 nin4 ge3 economy mou5 gaa2 laa1
 government-is-freeze-we-just-know ok next-year-u economy-not have-y
Once the government freezes ((it)), we know, ok next years' economy ain't gonna be good“.
- 13 P2 =↑哦:
 ngo4
 y
Ohh.

At line 1, P2 says: “Did ((you)) hire an admin, my admin left again”, first issues a polar question regarding whether or not his interlocutors' company has hired someone for the position of “admin” (line 1) and then he proceeds to inform P3 about the situation in this own company, bringing up that someone working as an “admin” had recently left. In line 2, he goes on: “A salary of thousand plus dollar only, very cheap, SPM xx”, giving a possible explanation of why the admin left in this own company.³ This sequence of multiple actions performed by P2's lines 1-2 makes a Telling-response interactionally relevant. In line 3, P3 appears to first respond with laughter to the second part of P2's turn in line 1 that his admin left (Sacks, 1987). Thus, when P3 responds to the first part in line 5, in order to signal that he is responding to the first part (i.e. the QWI TCU), P3 rearticulates the gist of the question “Hire and admin”, before going on to answer it with a type-conforming token *mou5* (“no”). After a micropause he then goes on and produces the second part of the Telling-response.⁴ In line 6 he utters a *janwai* TCU that brings up a possible reason behind the response given in line 5 - the topic of ‘economic slow-down’. What ensues from here is a sequence of talk that further elaborates on the rationale.⁵ The response sequence then ends with P2 producing an epistemic ‘oh’-token that features a rising intonation in line 9.

In summary, the following action-sequence can be observed here:

- Line 1 and 2 (Initiating Action):
 1. Formulation of a polar question (in the format of a *mou5* (“not have”) QWI) that makes a polar response relevant (line 1).
 2. Informing (sharing the situation at own company)
 3. Elaboration on the shared information
- Line 5-8 (Responsive Action):
 1. Reiteration of question
 2. Production of relevant polar response token
 3. *Janwai* token that precedes an elaborative sequence that shares an underlying rationale, supporting the production of the response token.
- Line 9: Production of epistemic change-of-state *ngo4* (“oh”) token by the participant who uttered the question.

³In overlap with some laughter by P3 and P2 brings up the salary of that position, describing it as low through the use of *ze1* (“only”) and then adds that this is a *hou2bin6* (“cheap”) position from the employers perspective.

⁴He produces the token *ngo5dei2* (“we; our”) (line 6). Produced after a falling intonation and the pause, this token is intonationally the beginning of a new TCU but what follows is a micro pause and then a *janwai* initial clause. Based on this sequential and intonational design, this token may be a preposed part of the *janwai*-clause or it may be an abandoned TCU followed by a self-repair beginning with the *janwai*-initial clause.

⁵P2 produces a conditionally relevant token that functions as a confirming response and, by adding the token *hou2do1* (“very much”), reiterating a ‘stronger’ version of the previous TCU. In overlap with this turn, P3 produces the token ‘headcount’ which he reiterates after the overlap sequence has come to an end and then goes on and produces a clause with ‘headcount’ as an argument of the verb ‘freeze’.

5.1.3 Section summary

The initiating action discussed in this section all make a Telling-response relevant even though they constitute various typologically different actions such as assessments, questions or informings. Engaging this type of question, both excerpts feature the utterance of a Telling-response in form of a multi-TCU in form of a relevant response token followed by a *janwai* TCU.

Excerpt (6) shows a dispreferred (negative) Telling-response (here formatted using an “mhm”-token, disfluencies and “actually”) followed by a *janwai*-prefaced accounts that brings up novel information and an underlying rationale that points the interlocutor to circumstances that lead to the negative response (the interlocutor did not know this information previously). What follows *janwai* here accounts for why there is a negative response. Notably, such a response may be followed by an epistemic change-of-state token.

Excerpt (7) shows another negative Telling-response (this time formatted a partial reiteration of the question and a polar response token), again followed by *janwai* precedes an elaborative sequence that shares an underlying rationale, supporting and accounting for the production of the response token. Again, the response is followed by an epistemic change-of-state token by the participant who uttered the question.

In both cases the utterances that precede *janwai* does not constitute a relevant response. Thus, the response consists of more than one part and does more than one ‘main jobs’. Two layers of action formation can be identified: The formation of a negative response and the formation of an account. This shows that, as part of action ascription, elements of the preceding question are treated as making a certain type of response token relevant and, at the same time, other elements are treated as ‘accountables’ - as something in need of explanation. Thus, the two excerpts show ‘double-barrel’ responses in that the first part enables the identification (ascription) of the nature of the responsive action as either an affirmative or negative response and the second part, prefaced by *janwai*, serves to engage elements of the initial question that are treated as ‘accountable’. As part of these responses, *janwai* serves to separate these two aspects of the responsive action and presents what comes after *janwai* as novel information and possibly as an account. In this sense, *janwai* serves to point the interlocutor to a locally relevant ‘lack of understanding’ in the preceding turn and signals the forthcoming of a ‘remedy’ (in form of an account).

Furthermore, in both instances, the *janwai*-prefaced TCU involves an orientation towards an epistemic asymmetry in that this TCU presents information that is treated as novel and relevant to some form of knowledge gap. These TCUs elaborate on aspects related to the initiating action by bringing up information that serves as an underlying reason or larger rationale and that is required to solve some kind of intelligibility problem related to the initial question. This attendance to epistemic asymmetry is also evident in the use of change-of-state tokens after the accounting sequence has come to an end (see both Excerpt (6) and (7)).

5.1.4 Responsive actions featuring *janwai* following Specifying-questions

The next section looks at initiating actions that are not formatted as Telling-questions, but that are also met with a Telling-response that features a similar multi-part structure to those discussed previously. The section discusses a series of examples that gradually move away from common formats of Telling-question as initiating actions. This includes a wide range of initiating actions that (increasingly) make some form of specifying response relevant (see Figure 5.7). These initiating action are engaged with a response that features a relevant response token and *janwai*. This is a recurring patterns in MYCanCor (n=46).

5.1.5 Data discussion

Here is an example of the pattern:

(8) Data Excerpt: “Oily not black” || MYCANCOR 016 (06:18-:06:45)

Figure 5.7: Responsive action featuring *janwai* following Specifying questions

P1: Specifying-Question, an initiating action that makes a Specifying-response relevant
P2: Relevant response token
P2: *janwai* _____.

This is from a conversation between two siblings (older sister (P1) and younger brother (P2)) taking place in a living room. Both sit on a couch. Prior to the beginning of this excerpt, P1 picked up P2's photo camera and is now preparing to take a picture of P2. Getting ready for the picture, P2 takes the lower end of his T-shirt and swipes it across his face. At line 5, P1 addresses this action.

- 01 P1 | 哇::: 咁我要搵返嘅靚角度先得㗎嘛. ((sniffles)).
 waa1 gam3 ngo5 jiu3 wan2 faan2 ge3 leng3 gok3 dou6 sin1 dak1 gaa2 maa3
 y so-I-need-look for-back-that-beautiful-angle-first-y-y
Wow, so I need to find a nice angle first, right.
 |((holds camera in front of her face, preparing to take a picture of P2))
- 02 (1.5)
- 03 P2 | °等陣間°
 dang2 zan6 gaan1
 wait-bit-time
Wait a moment.
 |((P2 begins to rub his face with his shirt))
- 04 (3.0)
- 05 P1 | 咁你件衫咪好邋邋咯你咁樣搓.
 gam3 nei5 gin6 saam1 mi1 hou2 laap6 taap3 gaak3 nei5 gam3 joeng6 caai1
 so-your-q-shirt-is-not-very-dirty-y you-like-this-rub
So your shirt, doesn't ((it)) get dirty (when)) your are rubbing ((your face)) like that.
- 06 P2 | 油啫嘛.
 jau4 ze1 maa3
 oil-only-y
((It's)) only oily.
- 07 P1 | 咦呀::.
 ji2 aa1
 y
Eeehh. ((signals disgust))
- 08 P2 | 冇辦法(.) 好邋邋.
 mou5 baan6 faat3 hou2 laap6 taap3
 no way- very-dirty
No way, ((yes)) it's dirty.
- 09 P1 | 黑黑 冇灰塵嘅咩你=
 hak1 hak1 mou5 fui1 can4 ge3 me1 nei5
 black-black not-have-dust-that-what-you
Black and dusty and what not, you.
- 10 P2 | =吓:?
 haak3
 y

What?

- 11 P1 你有灰塵嘅咩?
nei5 mou5 fui1 can4 ge3 me1
you-not-have-dust-Vg-what
Isn't that ((full of)) dust?
- 12 P2 我有黑啊(.)
ngo5 mou5 hak1 aa1
I-not-have-black-y
Nothing black ((on)) me.
- 13⇒P2 >因為我都有出去< 我出=
jan1 wai4 ngo5 dou1 mou5 ceot1 heoi3 ngo5 ceot1
because-I-all-not-have-out-go I-out
Because I didn't go outside, I outside-.
- 14 P1 =你食lunch呢?
nei5 sik6 lunch ne1
you-eat-lunch-y
Didn't you have lunch?
- 15 P2 食lunch 今日係(.)相機腳.
sik6 lunch gam1 jat6 hai6 soeng1 gei1 goek3
eat-lunch today-is-tripod
Have lunch? Today was ((at a restaurant called)) Tripod.

Holding a camera in her hands, P1 says (line 1): “Wow, so I need to find a nice angle first, right.” Then she gets ready to take a picture of P2. At line 3, however, P2 stops the activity and begins to clean his face, possibly as part of getting ready for the shot. While this action is still ongoing, P1, at line 5, begins a turn and comments on this. The four turns that follow from here (line 5 - 8) make an environment of disagreement evident. At line 5, P1 first signals disapproval through describing (a consequence of) the activity as *laap6 taap3* (“dirty”). P2 responds to this display of disapproval by defending himself: *jau4 zel maa3* (“It’s only oily”) (in the sense that something “only oily” may not be “dirty”). At line 7, P1 then goes on and produces *ji2 aa1* (“Eeeeh”), signaling dislike or even disgust. At line 8, P2 then goes on and says “Nothing I can do, so dirty” that in this context signals that rubbing his face like this may indeed have been somewhat “dirty” but that he had no choice but to do so. This is possibly an attempt to mitigate and facilitate a topic change. However, what follows is more talk related to the action as P1 utters a polar (and possibly rhetorical) question in (line 9): “Black and dusty and what not, you”, another display of disapproval. P2 responds with a repair-initiator (line 10): “What?” and P1 produces a similar question in another format: “Isn’t that ((full of)) dust?”⁶

This reiterated polar question (line 11) constitutes the initiating action that subsequently leads to a responsive action with *janwai*. Even though the question is formed as a polar question (as a *me1* (“Isn’t it”) final particle question), it makes a response relevant that goes beyond a polar response token in the light of the preceding environment of disagreement. P2 responds by first engaging the question with a relevant (negative) response: *ngo5 mou2 hak1 aa1* (“It’s not black; I don’t have (anything) black”).⁷

⁶In more detail, the sequence begins with the production of a TCU in line 9 that begins with the token *hak1 hak1* (“black black”) and then features a *mou5 me1* (“Isn’t”)–QWI that constitutes a request for confirmation or agreement by making a polar response relevant (line 9). The question is topically related to this sequence in that it picks up on the topic of “only oily” by bringing up the categories *hak1* (“black”) and *fui1 can4* (“dust”). In this sequential context this TCU is related to the preexisting disagreement in that it constitutes another request for acknowledgment or agreement related to the topic of *laap6 taap3* that was brought up in line 5. Latched-on to this turn, P2 then produces a *haak3* (“what”)–token that here serves as a repair initiator (line 10). In addition to requesting a repair sequence, this token possibly also (again) signals mitigation. Attending to the repair request, P1 then reiterates a similar question in line 11 using a QWI.

⁷In detail, she uses a *mou2* (“not have”) negation or negative token followed by the token *hak1* (“black”) that was also

After a micro pause P2 then goes on and adds a *janwai*-initial TCU: *jan1wai4 ngo5 dou1 mou5 ceot1 heoi3* (“Because I didn’t go outside”). In this context the information that is brought up as part of this TCU is related to the preceding response TCU in that it provides a further elaboration or support of ‘why’ P1’s face (or clothes) is not black. The TCU brings up a larger narrative that provides information on why P1’s shirt is ‘not black’ after rubbing his face. After this TCU comes to a point of grammatical completion, P2 goes on and utters the tokens *ngo5 ceot1* (“I out”) but then stops speaking as P1 takes another turn (that formulates a question related to this TCU) (line14). Shortly after a change of topic occurs.

In summary, the following sequential structure is evident here. In an environment of disagreement, P1 formulates a first action in form of a polar question that makes a polar response relevant and shows disapproval (and makes an implicit complaint) (line 9). After an insertion sequence consisting of a repair request and response (line 10 and 11), P2 produces a ‘negative’ relevant response in line 12. After the relevant response has been produced, he goes on and utters a *janwai*-initial TCU that further elaborates on this response. The *janwai*-initial TCU provides a possible reason that related to the first part of the response. The *janwai*-TCU provides information that elaborates on a larger rationale that P2 has begun to share in the first part of the response. Thus, this is an example of an ostensible Specifying-question, followed by a Telling-response. Similar to the previously discussed examples, *janwai* is the second part of the Telling-response and it elaborates on/supports the first part of the response. In contrast to the previous excerpt, the *janwai*-prefaced explanation is not part of the question-response action pair, i.e. is not part of a relevant response to the preceding question. Rather, it seems to account for why P1 does not show affirmation or act upon P2’s display of disapproval (and implicit complaint).

(9) Data Excerpt: “Work after graduation” || MYCANCOR 054 (10:00-10:14)

The next data excerpt shows two participants sitting in a park. They have just met for the first time but have friends in common and are from the same city in Malaysia. Prior to the beginning of this abstract, the two girls have been talking about past life events, specifically their educational background and employment history. P1 has previously mentioned that she has a degree in psychology.

- 01 P2 咦 你做咩工啊(.)>之後<.
 ee2 nei5 zou6 me1 gung1 aal zi1 hau6
 y you-do-what-work-y after
 Eey, what did you do for work - afterwards ((after graduating from uni))?
- 02 P1 之後:我就嚟::呢::NPU呢,
 zi1 hau6 ngo5 zau6 lai4 aak1 NIE aak1
 after-I-just-come-y nt y
 Afterwards, I just began at, mhm, NPU ((name of university)), mhm.
- 03 P1 NPU係[我讀書嗰邊].
 NPU hai6 [ngo5 duk6 syu1 go2 bin1
 nt-is-I-study-over-there
 NPU is ((that institution)) where I studied.
- 04 P2 [>嗯嗯嗯嗯<
 ng2 ng2 ng2 ng2 ng2
 y-y-y-y-y-y
 Mhh,mhh,mhh,mhh,mhh.
- 05 P1 呃(.)我去嗰度做research assistant咯.
 aak1 ngo5 heoi3 go2 dou6 zou6 research assistant lo3
 y I-go-over-there-do-research assistant-y

produced by P1 in line 9. The TCU ends with a *aal* final particle that here marks the TCU as an exclamation or ‘factual statement’.

Mhm, I went there to work as a research assistant.

06⇒P1 因為我[一直一畢業,
jan1 wai4 ngo5 jat1 zik6 jat1 bat1 jip6
because-I-straight-once-graduate
Because I always, once I graduated,

(cont) 我就做我就想做research嘅:: [°xx°關係=
ngo5 zau6 zou6 ngo5 zau6 soeng2 zou6 research ge3 xx gwaan1 hai6
I-just-do I-just-want-do-research-Vg xx-related to
I did, I just wanted to do research, something related to x.

07 P2 [↑哦:
ngo4
y
Mhm.

08 P2 [哦 係咯
ngo4 hai6 lo3
y is-y
Mhm, yes.

At line 1, P2 formulates a what-type question using the QWI *zou6 me1* (“do what”) that constitutes a question about P1’s occupation after graduating from university.⁸ The question ends with an incremental “afterwards” that links the question to the topic that they have been talking about previously, their university education.⁹

At line 2, P1 engages the question and begins to build a responsive action by first reiterating “afterwards”, which here serves as a response token that signals both understanding and the forthcoming of a response. Then P1 goes on and, as a second part of her response, describes an employer and place reference (line 2) and ends with “mhm”. Up to this point, the turn does not constitute a relevant response to the question. Instead, what follows is a repair sequence as an insertion sequence that begins after P1 has presented a place reference as a piece of information that might need addition explanation (through the use of stretches and turn stalling, see line 2).¹⁰

This second part of the response (the inserted repair sequence in line 2-4 about the locality) does also not yet constitute a full response to P2’s initial question in line 1. Up to this point, P1 has only shared the information of ‘where’ she was working after graduation but not the chosen occupation.¹¹ A third

⁸The question unfolds after an initial *ee2* (“eey”) token that in this context signaled a sudden change of mind or insight and serves to begin a new topic. Then P2 follows with a *nei5* pronoun and the ‘what’-interrogative that constitute the question. After a micropause she then supplies the token *zi1hau6* (“afterwards”) that in the context of their previous talk refers to “after graduation”. Through supplying this token the question becomes a more overt inquiry regarding her job after graduation as opposed to, for example, a side-job during her studies.

⁹In more detail, P1 begins with reiterating part of the question (the token *zi1hau6* (“afterwards”)), then following up with a *ngo5 zau6 lai4* (“I just came to; began at”) and the supply of a place reference (NPU, the acronym of a tertiary education institution).

¹⁰The production of the place reference in line 2 is preceded by the production of a stretched *aak1* (“mhm”) token (line 2). Out of the many functions that this token can have, the one that will sequentially become evident here is that P1 expresses uncertainty about whether her interlocutor is familiar with the place reference “NPU”. This is evident in her production of a ‘clarification’ TCU that follows in line 3. After the use of the *mhm* ‘turn stalling’ token followed by the supply of the name of the place reference, P1 now begins a new TCU with NPU *hai6* (“NPU is”) that supplies additional information related to the place reference. After this turn-initial token, in overlap with the remainder of P1’s TCU, P2 then, in overlap, produces the utterance *ng2 ng2 ng2 ng2 ng2* (“Mhm, mhm, mhm, mhm, mhm or Okay, okay, okay, okay, okay”). Uttered with increased speed, in this context, the token serves to signal that P1 is already familiar with “NPU” that was brought up and that no additional explanation on this topic is needed. In line 5, P1 then begins a new turn with an acknowledgement token *aak1* (“Hm or okay”) that marks the end of the insertion sequence relation to the place reference.

¹¹Considering the initially used interrogative *zou6 me1 gung1* (“do what work”), bringing up a place reference may of course constitute a relevant response (drawing on relevant common ground), but the sequential unfolding and the use of the turn-stalling

part of her response begins in line 5. Beginning a new turn, P1 first produces an *aak1* (“mhm”) token goes on and then says “I went there to work as a research assistant”, producing a (possibly complete) relevant response to the initial question by bringing up the information that she was working as a research assistant.

In line 6, she then goes on and utters a *janwai*-initial TCU: “Because I always, once I graduated, I did, I just wanted to do research, something related to xx”. Notably, just after this TCU has become identifiable as a relevant and possibly complete response, her interlocutor, in overlap, utters a possible epistemic *ngo4* (“Oh”)-token that may signal a change-of-state (possibly signaling the receipt of a complete response). Similar to the previous excerpts, the *janwai*-TCU provides an underlying rationale that explains why she made this choice.¹² Related to the previous question, this TCU gives an account for the described job choice, an elaboration related to the ‘why’ aspects of the topic raises by the question.

In summary, the responsive action unfolds as a four-part structure here. The respondee first utters “afterwards” to engage the question, then elaborates on ‘where’ aspects (line2) by bringing up a place reference. While this action could already serve as a relevant response, it is not treated as such by the interlocutor as evident in line 4 in the utterance *ng2 ng2 ng2 ng2 ng2* (“mhm, mhm, mhm, mhm, mhm”) that here serves as a continuer (similar to a use of the English “yeah”; Gardner 1995; 1993). As a second part of the responsive action, the respondee then moves on to elaborate on the ‘what’ aspects of the question by providing an occupation category in line 5. This part is met with a change-of-state token that signals that a relevant response was given (line 6). However, the response does not stop here. What follows is a third part in form of a *janwai*-initial TCU. Similar to the previous examples, this TCU elaborates on the motivation for (and accounts for) the relevant response just provided in the first part of the response.

The initiating action, the *zou6 me1 gong1* (“do what work”)-question, could in this context constitute both a Telling-question or a Specifying-question - this is not evident at the utterance-level. P1 opts to build a complex responsive action that step-by-step elaborates on different aspects on the question (from ‘where’ to ‘what’ to ‘why’). Sequentially, P1 first builds a response that supplies a specific piece of information, but after this response is met with a continuer, she adds another turn that constitutes a Telling-response featuring a *janwai*-prefaced account. She begins accounting after her previous responsive action was treated as ‘incomplete’ (or even ‘problematic’) by her interlocutor - and expands a Specifying-response to a Telling-response.

Here is another instance of multi-part responsive action formation:

(10) Data Excerpt: “Are you divorced” || MYCANCOR 054 (10:00-10:14)

This data excerpt shows part of a conversation between two participants sitting in an office. P1 is a single mother who has come to visit a local government office to seek help with paperwork related to the schooling of her daughter. A couple of minutes into the conversation, she is now sitting at a desk with an office clerk (P2), explaining her case. Prior to the beginning of the excerpt, P1 has been explaining that she is seeking help in order to solve various bureaucratic issues related to applying for benefits. The office clerk, P2, while listening to P1, has been looking through various forms that P2 has brought with her and asked various clarification questions related to the matter. During this sequence, P1 has repeatedly stressed the urgency of her request for help.

token in line 2 as well as the turn design of P3’s response to the ‘clarification’ question in line 3 make evident that, in this case, no relevant response has been produced up to this point.

¹²In more detail, the clause after the turn-initial *janwai* begins with the pronoun *ngo5* (“I”). As the turn unfolds, P1 utters a self-initiated repair of the pattern *ngo5* (“I”)-token + verb token. First she says *ngo5 zau6 zou6* (“I just did; I just worked”) and then she reiterates the pattern as *ngo5 zau seong2 zou6* (“I just wanted to do/work”). This repair sequence is interesting because it displays a move to a differently marked *janwai* clause. The post-repair clause features a ‘want’ token as part of the central verb of the clause that. By adding one more token to this essential part of the clause, the TCU makes a rather different action evident. Through marking that this job is something that P1 *seong2* (“wants”) to do, the TCU is now more recognizable as an action that provides a motivation or a larger rationale. The repair sequence may be seen as additional evidence that this formation of an action in the realm of ‘sharing why I did this’ is what drives the utterance of the *janwai* clause.

- 01 P2 你你你離開婚未。
nei5 nei5 lei4 hoi1 fan1 mei6
you you-divorce-not
Are you, you, you divorced ((done with the divorce)) or not?
- 02 P1 |我::係(.)暫時俾我|一張紙。
ngo5 hai6 zaam6 si4 bei2 ngo5 jat1 zoeng1 zi2
I-is-at the moment-give-me-one-q-paper
I.. was, for now given a piece of paper.
|((looks around and points at several forms on the table))
|((P2 picks up several forms and looks at them))
- 03⇒P1 因為我老公一直搵唔到(.)失蹤咗。
jan1 wai4 ngo5 lou5 gung1 jat1 zik6 wan2 m4 dou3 sat1 zung1 zo2
because-my-husband-still-find-cannot missing-Vg
Because my husband still can't be found, ((he's)) missing.
- 04 P2 OK xxx 係申請單方面|申請離婚=
OK xxx hai6 san1 cing2 daan1 fong1 min6 san1 cing2 lei4 fan1
OK xxx is-apply-single-party-apply-divorce
OK, xxx is to apply for single party ((divorce)), apply to divorce.
|((starts looking through more forms))
- 05 P1 =唔知走咗 單方面 其實呢,
m4 zi1 zau2 zo2 daan1 fong1 min6 kei4 sat6 nei
not-know-left-Vg single-party actually-y
((I)) don't know, ((he)) left.. single party.. actually.
- 06 P1 我已經盡量去聯絡佢。
ngo5 ji5 ging1 zeon6 loeng6 heoi3 lyun4 lok3 keoi5
I-already-try my best-go-contact-him
I already tried my best to contact him,
- 07 P1 到阿尾 掛蚊(?) 都聯絡唔到佢。
dou3 aa3 mei5 gwaa3 man1 dou1 lyun4 lok3 m4 dou3 keoi5
until-end gwaa(?) man(?) all-contact-not-Vg-him
Until the end, even Gwaa-Man ((name)) can't contact him.
- 08 P2 你都幫佢聯絡。
nei5 dou1 bong1 keoi5 lyun4 lok3
you-help-him-contact
You helped him/her to contact him.
- 09 P1 佢係走開戶 佢欠債。
keoi5 hai6 zau2 hoi1 wu6 keoi5 him3 zaai3
he-is-go-away-household he-indebted
He left the household, he has a debt problem.
- 10 P1 哦 OK。
ngo4 OK
y-ok
Mhm, ok.
- 11 P1 so走咗去邊度 而家都唔知=
so zau2 zo2 heoi3 bin1 dou6 ji4 gaal dou1 m4 zi1
so-go-Vg-go-where now-all-not-know
So he left, where he went, ((I)) don't even know.

- 12 P1 =恩.
ng2
y
Mhm.
- 13 P1 之先走咗澳洲,
zi1 sin1 zau2 zo2 ou3 zau1
before-go-Vg-ns
Before he went to Australia.
- 14 P1 佢係俾阿窿追數 搞到我都滿-
keoi5 hai6 bei2 aa3 lung1 zeoi1 sou3 gaau2 dou3 ngo5 dou1 mun5
he-is-by-loanshark-chase make-until-I-all-fully
He is being chased by loan sharks, all ((this)) makes me really-
- 15 P1 我bear咗好多債務啊.
ngo5 bear zo2 hou2 do1 zaai3 mou6 aa1
I-bear-Vg-very-much-debt-y
I am also deeply indebted
- 16 P1 我俾佢累到.
ngo5 bei2 keoi5 leoi6 dou3
I-by-him-exhausted-to
He caused so much trouble to me.
- 17 P1 |所以係我想[話xxx.
so2 ji5 hai6 ngo5 soeng2 waa6 xxx
so-is-I-want-say-xx
So I would like to say-
|((P2 picks up another pile of papers and reads))
- 18 P2 [佢嘅報生紙你有帶到冇.
keoi5 ge3 bou3 saang1 zi2 nei5 jau5 daai3 dou3 mou5
his-birth certificate-you-bring-to-not
His birth certificate, did you bring ((it))?
- 19 P1 >有有有<.
jau5 jau5 jau5
have-have-have
Yes, yes, yes.

At line 1, P2 takes a turn: “Are you, you divorced ((done with the divorce)) or not”, uttering a polar question using the token *mei6* (as a final position token this token here constitutes a polar ‘or not’ interrogative that makes a yes/no response relevant). Engaging this initiating action, P1 responds to the question by saying “I, was, for now given a piece of paper”. This response begins with a stretched turn-initial *ngo5* (“I”) as she begins to look around the table for a form. Then she utters *hai6* (“is/was”) followed by a micro pause, now pointing at piles of forms that she has brought with her and had previously put on the table. Then she goes on and completes her TCU by uttering a relevant response by saying *zaam6 si4 bei2 ngo5 jat1 zoeng1 zi2* (“for now given a piece of paper”). With regards to the preceding specifying question, this response (line 2) constitutes a response in the form of pointing her interlocutor to a piece of paper that contains information related to the matter, but is hearably not a full response. The response P1 has build up to this point is somewhat ‘non-conforming’ in that she opts to build a response that is different from a (type-conforming) two-pole ‘yes/no’ polar response (Raymond, 2003).

As P1 utters this TCU, P2 picks up the piece of paper pointed at and that contains information related

to the matter.¹³ While P2 looks at the form, P1 goes on and begins another TCU beginning with *janwai*. This next part of her response brings up the novel information that her husband is missing (line 3).¹⁴ That P1 opts to bring this information up here is interesting in a number of ways. Firstly, considering that this TCU directly follows her response to the polar question, this *janwai*-prefaced information seems to provide an account related to her response. The sequential unfolding renders this TCU hearable as a possible account for why P1 has not produced a polar response. Drawing on common knowledge that a divorce requires the consent of both parties, P1's *janwai* TCU provides a possible reason of why she is unable to provide a 'proper' divorce certificate. At line 4, P2 then says: "OK, xxx ((probably name of form)) is to apply for single party ((divorce)), apply to divorce.", telling her interlocutor that she has identified the piece of paper as a relevant response. Latched-on, P1 then says: "((I)) don't know, ((he)) left.. single party.. actually", first continuing her account, then reiterates the function of the form and then prefacing more telling with "actually". What follows in line 6 to 17 is a longer telling sequence (that ends after P2 begins to talk in overlap in line 18).

In summary, P2 first asks a Specifying-question in line 1 (initiating action). P1 begins building responsive action by uttering (and gesturing) a non-conforming response in line 2 (part 1). P1 then employs a *janwai*-TCU in line 3 to provide an explanation of line 2 - i.e. why she was given the paper (part 2). This two-part response provides a reason why she is unable to straightforwardly answer the question by P2 in line 1. By answering in this way, P1 is able to circumvent the imputation that the reason she has not gotten a divorce is not due to a lack of trying but due to unavoidable circumstances (Heritage and Raymond, 2012).

P2's *janwai*-clause is the beginning of a telling-sequence. After having brought up the topic of the missing husband here, P2 later on further elaborates on this topic (line 5 to 17). The information she shares paints her situation as complex and dire that, among other things, may stress the urgency of the general task at stake here (the application for benefits).

The *janwai* TCU is, on one hand, related to the question-response action pair in that introduces a possible account for the provided non-conforming response to the Specifying-question. On the other hand, the *janwai* TCU brings up a piece of information, around which an account in form of a longer telling sequence will eventually revolve that is relevant to the larger ongoing activity - beyond what is projected by the question-response action pair, i.e. the *janwai*-prefaced account first seems to serve as a projected account and is then extended to an account for an activity.

5.1.6 Section summary

This section examined the formation of responses to questions that may or may not constitute Telling-questions (as opposed to Specifying-questions). The section discussed three excerpts have in common that they display a Telling-responses formatted with *janwai* (regardless of whether or not the initiating action may be formatted as a 'prototypical' Telling-question or not). Notably, the excerpts show that even initiating action that are formatted as Specifying-question may be met with Telling-responses through building multi-part responsive action featuring response tokens and a *janwai*-initial TCUs or clauses.

Excerpt (8) shows the utterance of a *janwai*-prefaced account that follows a possibly complete response after a *me1* ("Isn't")-question and a display of disapproval (and complaint). The multi-part responsive action consists of a first part that is projected by the initiating action and a second part, prefaced by *janwai* that goes beyond the question-answer action pair and that brings up novel information that accounts for the participants' rejection to display compliance to a request.

Excerpt (9) displays a four-part response to an initiating action that is formatted as a what-type question using a *zou6 me1* ("do what") interrogative. The respondee seems to first treat this question as a Specifying-question, but after a first response part is not treated as a relevant response, goes on and responds to 'why' aspects of the question and produces a *janwai*-prefaced account. The excerpt shows

¹³It will become evident later on (line 5) that the form is a single-party divorce application.

¹⁴This is the first time this is mentioned in this conversation. P2 has previously introduced herself as a single mother but did not provide any information on her husband.

that, as part of question-response action pairs, *janwai* may be used to ‘extend’ a Specifying-response into a Telling-response in retrospect (after a previous response part was treated as problematic).

Excerpt (10) displays a multi-part response to a Specifying-questions. Sequentially, the responsive action first constitutes a non-conforming action, followed by a *janwai*-TCU that provides a possible account for why a non-conforming response was produced. Then this account is extended into a longer telling-sequence that account for a larger ongoing activity.

All three excerpt have in common that the *janwai*-TCU serves to bring up relevant information, account for the preceding response and shares some form of relevant underlying narrative. This section shows that responsive action to both Specifying and Telling-questions may be formatted featuring response token and *janwai*-prefaced accounts. Certain question formats seem to make certain response tokens relevant that may be uttered as a first part of a response, before *janwai* is then employed to do further accounting work. As of the three excerpts discussed here, the accounting sequence that *janwai* prefaces seems to elaborate on both immediately preceding response token as well as are related to the preceding question (the initiating action) or even a larger ongoing activity.

5.2 Other patterns: Responses featuring *janwai mel aa1* or *janwai zou6 mel*

This section discusses a sub-pattern in MYCanCor related to building multi-part responsive action featuring *janwai*: the usage of *janwai* and *mel* or *zou6 mel* (“because what happens; why is that”) as part of building responses. This is a recurring pattern in MYCanCor (n=23). The pattern that is discussed here is (1) an initiating action that makes a response relevant, (2) the production of a relevant response, and (3) the production of a TCU that features both a *janwai*-token as well as *mel* (“what”) (or *zou6 mel* (“do what”)) (see Figure 5.8).

Figure 5.8: Responsive action featuring *janwai mel aa1* or *janwai zou6 mel*

P1: Initiating action that makes a response relevant
P2: A conditionally-relevant response token (e.g. affirmative or negative token)
P2: *janwai mel aa1/janwai zou6 mel* (因為咩啊 or 因為做咩) _____.

5.2.1 Data discussion

Consider the following excerpt that displays this pattern.

(11) Data Excerpt: “Google Maps” || MYCANCOR 015 (17:31-17:44)

This is from a conversation between two siblings, taking place in their flat. Around 20 minutes into the conversation, both are getting ready to go outside and P2 has just finished looking up a route to their destination on a navigation app on his smart phone (such as Google maps). Prior to the beginning of the excerpt, he has proposed different routes and the two are now in the process of making a decision of which route to take. Just before the beginning of this excerpt, he has proposed the last of several possible routes. This route involves using a local public transport option called the LRT (Light Rail Transit) instead of the MRT (Mass Rapid Transit).

01 P1 |半個鐘就到啦。
 bun3 go3 zung1 zau6 dou3 laa1
 half-q-hour-then-arrive-y
 ((We)) will arrive ((at our destination)) in just half an hour?
 |((P2 keeps looking at his phone))

- 02 P2 嗯 31 minutes.
ng2 31 minutes
y-31 minutes
Yes, 31 minutes.
- 03 P1 仲快過坐MRT↑咯.
zung6 faai3 gwo3 co5 mrt lo3
even-faster-than-nt-y
((That's)) even faster than ((taking the)) MRT.
- 04⇒P2 係呀 因為咩呀|嘛 因為我哋|係落(1.0)
hai6 aa1 jan1wai4 me1 aa1 maa3 jan1wai4 ngo5dei2 hai6 lok6
is-y because-what-y-y-because-we-is-get off
Right, because ((that)) what, because we are getting off at,
 |((P1 starts yawning))
 |((P2 points at window))
- cont 最近呢個(.) 快車站 xx road嘛.
zeoi3gan6 nei3go3 faai3cei1zaam6 xx road maa3
most-close-here-q-nr-ns-y
the xx road railway station close by.
- 05 P1 咁樣去咯 得咯 ((P1 sniffles))
gam3 joeng6 heoi3 gaak3 dak1 lo3
so-that-go-y ok-y
Let's go for this ((route)). That's OK.

brought up earlier.

In summary, the following structure can be observed here:

- Line 3: Formulation of a turn that constitutes a question (without interrogative) that makes a response relevant
- Line 4: Respondee provides a relevant (affirmative) response token.
- Line 4: Respondee produces a *janwai* token followed by a *me1* (“what”)-token. Similar to a single *janwai* token, this *janwai+me1* construction (“Because what happens; why is this”) introduces an elaboration sequence related to the question.
- Line 4: Respondee proceeds to utter an elaborative sequence featuring a *janwai*-initial clause that brings up a related topic that serves as a possible elaboration on ‘why’ aspects of the initiating question.

This excerpt shows that the *janwai+me1* token follows the relevant response but precedes the elaboration sequence that begins with the subsequent *janwai*-initial TCU.

Here is another instance of the above discussed pattern:

(12) Data Excerpt: “Poor government” || MYCANCOR 040 (13:38-14:33)

This is from a conversation between two participants in an office space. It is a local branch of the government that offers counseling services and deals with complaints related to official matters. P1 is an elderly citizen who has come in to seek advice with some paperwork related to government subsidies. P2 is an office clerk. Around 15 minutes into the conversation, the citizen, P1, has already gotten the help she came for and, after their ‘main business’ has been completed, the office clerk now helps her to fill out various forms as a last step before the visit will come to an end. As P2 is filling out the forms and after a longer stretch of silence, P1 takes a turn and utters a TCU in a soft voice.

- 01 P1 ◦啊 政府都係冇錢嘅◦(0.2)
aa1 zing3 fu2 dou1 hai6 mou5 leoi4 ge3
y government-all-is-not have-money-u
Uhh, the government doesn’t have money.
- 02 P2 而你話政府冇錢呢 都係部分啱嘅。
ji4 nei5 waa6 zing3 fu2 mou5 leoi4 nei1 dou1 hai6 bou6 fan1 ngaam1 ge3
u-you-say-government-not have-money-y-also-is-partly-right-u
You say “the government doesn’t have money” ((that’s)) actually partly true.
- 03⇒P2 因為:(.)做咩(.)簡單嚟講一句啊。
jan1 wai4 zou6 me1 gaan2 daan1 lai4 gong2 jat1 geoi3 aa1
because do-what simple-come-say-one-sentence-y
Because, what happens, ((let me)) say something ((to you)) quickly.
- 04 P2 成日咁樣支持你哋呀:。
sing4 jat6 gam3 joeng6 zi1 ci4 nei5 dei2 aa1
whole day-so-kind-support-you guys-y
((the government)) supports you people all the time.
- 05 P2 依依郁郁 依依郁郁啊 真係㗎(0.2)
ji1 ji1 juk1 juk1 ji1 ji1 juk1 juk1 aa1 zan1 hai6 gaa2

- trouble trouble-y really-is-y
Trouble here and there, really is.
- 06 P2 我有嚇你㗎
ngo5 mou5 haak3 nei5 gaa2
I-not have-scare-you-y
I don't ((want to)) scare you.
- 07 P1 咪係咯
mi1 hai6 lo3
not-is-y
You don't.
- 08 P2 你淨係睇醫院就好咯
nei5 zing6 hai6 tai2 ji1 jyun2 zau6 hou2 lo3
you-just-see-hospital-just-good-y
Just look at the hospitals.
- 09 P2 嗰啲上咗六十 [上咗六十歲嘅=
go2 di1 soeng5 zo2 luk6 sap6 soeng5 zo2 luk6 sap6 seoi3 ge3
those-above-Vg-six-ten above-Vg-six-ten-years-u
Those above sixty. Those over sixty years old-
- 10 P1 [不過而家啲
bat1 gwo3 ji4 gaa1 di1
but-now-u
But now-
- 11 P1 =我講啦=
ngo5 gong2 laa1
I-say-y
I tell ((you)).
- 12 P2 =咩都唔使俾錢.
me1 dou1 m4 sai2 bei2 cin2
what-all-not-need-give-money
-don't need to pay money for anything.
- 13 P2 有陣時啊:: 佢哋真係攞到啲要去食啊,
jau5 zan6 si4 aa1 keoi5 dei2 zan1 hai6 lo2 dou3 di1 jiu3 heoi3 sik6 aa1
some-time-y they-really-is-take-Vg-some-need-go-eat-y
Sometimes, they really take the medicine and eat ((it)).
- 14 P2 我都有咁驚啊.
ngo5 dou1 mou5 gam3 ging1 aa1
I-all-not have-so-afraid-y
That's not even that disturbing.
- 15 P2 最驚啊 佢攞到啲藥 佢掉啊.
zeoi3 ging1 aa1 keoi5 lo2 dou3 di1 joek6 keoi5 diu6 aa1
most-afraid-r-take-Vg-some-medicine r-throw away
Most disturbing is ((when)) they get some medicine and throw it away.
- 16 P2 我先至發滾啊.
ngo5 sin1 zi3 faat3 gwan2 aa1
I-only then-start to boil-y
That's when I start to boil.

- 17 P1 所以我哋要食 照顧好自己身體,
so2 ji5 ngo5 dei2 jiu3 sik6 ziu3 gu3 hou2 zi6 gei2 san1 tai2
so-we-need-eat-medicine take care-good-self-body
So we need to take ((medicine)), look after our health.
- 18 P1 唔好成日整自己有病咯,
m4 hou2 sing4 jat6 zing2 zi6 gei2 jau5 beng6 lo3
not-good-whole day-make-self-have-sickness-y
Don't be sick so often.
- 19 P1 因為藥都唔係好嘢嚟㗎,
jan1 wai4 joek6 dou1 m4 hai6 hou2 je5 lai4 gaa2
because-medicine-also-not-is-good-thing-come-y
Because the medicine also isn't good stuff.
- 20 P1 冇辦法咯:: 冇人想去=
mou5 baan6 faat3 lo3 mou5 jan4 soeng2 heoi3
no choice-y no-person-think-go
No choice, nobody likes to.
- 21 P1 =我老公就係,
ngo5 lou5 gung1 zau6 hai6
my-husband-just-is
My husband ((for example)).
- 22 P1 周不時我成日勸佢唔好食咁多啊.
zau1 bat1 si4 ngo5 sing4 jat6 hyun3 keoi5 m4 hou2 sik6 gam3 do1 aa1
often-I-whole day-urge-him-not-good-eat-so-much-y
I often urge him to eat less medicine.

At line 1, P1 says in a soft voice “Uhh, the government doesn’t have money”, beginning with a turn-initial ‘sigh’ particle *aa1* (“Uhh”) that here constitutes some form of negative assessment, complaint or even contempt (as it signals a (negative) emotional state). Such a strong negative assessment commonly makes a response relevant (although this is somewhat unclear here due to the observation that the turn is uttered in a soft voice and may therefore possibly not meant to be intelligible by the interlocutor).¹⁷ Evidently, however, this turn will be treated as an initiating action in form of an assessment that makes a response relevant.

At line 2, P2 begins building responsive action related to the topic that was just brought up by P1. As her response unfolds, an environment of disagreement related to the topic becomes evident (considering the context that P2 is employed by the government). P2 says (line 2): “You say ‘the government doesn’t have money ((that’s)) also partly true”, first engaging the topic by producing a partial reiteration of line 1 in form of a *nei5 waa6*- (“you say”) ‘quote’. Then she says that this stance is *bou6 fan1 ngaam1* (“partly true”), hinting at that it may also be partly wrong - which would make more elaboration or even a story on this topic relevant. Indeed, this is how P2 proceeds after having produces this relevant (and possibly complete) response in line 2. At line 3, P2 says “Because, what happens, ((let me)) say something ((to you)) quickly”, adding another TCU that begins with a *janwai* and now clearly prefaces a forthcoming telling-sequence. In more detail, this *janwai* is, after a micro pause, followed by *zou6 me1* (“do what”). Similar to the previously discussed example, what can be observed here is the production of a rhetorical question that features a *janwai* token first, then a *me1* (“what”) or *zou6 me1* (“do what”) token and subsequently an elaboration. What follows from here is a telling-sequence related to the initiating action in line 1. This telling sequence begins in line 4 and goes on until (at least) line 16.

In summary, the following sequential unfolding can be observed here:

¹⁷In more detail, the turn is a *mou6* (“not have”) clause with two main arguments, *zing3 fu2* (“government”) and *lei4* (“money”).

- Line 1: Formulation of an assertion (without interrogative).
- Line 2: Respondee provides a relevant response.
- Line 3: Respondee produces a *janwai* followed by a *zou6 me1* (“what”) that introduces a Telling-sequence.
- Line 4-16: Respondee proceeds with a telling-sequence that elaborates on the topic that was raised as part of the initiating action.

Here is another instance of the pattern:

(13) Data Excerpt: “Prospering Kampongs” || MYCANCOR 053 (17:50-18:15)

This is from a conversation between two participants (P1 and P2) that takes place in a Cafe. Prior to the beginning of the excerpt, around 20 minutes into the casual talk, P1 brings up the topic of *sing4 si5 kwai1 waak6* (“city planning”) (line 1). Related to this, P2 brings up the topic of Kuala Lumpur’s LRT (Light Rail Transit) (line 3) and formulates an initiating action in line 7-8.

- 01 P1 所以有時係咪(0.5) 城市規劃,
so2 ji5 jau5 si4 hai6 mi1 sing4 si5 kwai1 waak6
so-sometimes-is-not-city-planning
So sometimes, right, city planning,
- 02 P1 個路真 路線真係好重要.
go3 lou6 zan1 lou6 sin3 zan1 hai6 hou2 cung4 jiu3
that-road-really road-really-is-very-important
These road, really, roads are really important.
- 03 P2 根係咯:: 就好似:: KL啲啲(.)輕快鐵啊=
gang2 hai6 lo3 zau6 hou2 ci5 KL go2 di1 hing1 faai3 tit3 aa1
of course-y just-like ns-that-some-nt-y
Of course, just like, those in KL, the Light Railway Transit ((LRT)).
- 04 P1 =係呀.
hai6 aa1
is-y
Yes.
- 05 P2 啲啲LRT啊=
go2 di1 LRT aa1
those-nt-y
That LRT.
- 06 P1 =係呀.
hai6 aa1
is-y
Yes.
- 07 P2 佢哋兜Kampong再兜去城市嘅,
keoi5 dei2 dau1 Kampong zoi3 dau1 heoi3 sing4 si5 ge3
they-run-ns-again-run-to-city-u
They ((the LRT)) run to the kampongs ((villages)) and then to the city again.

- 08 P2 其實有佢嘅原因嘅。
 kei4 sat6 jau5 keoi5 ge3 jyun4 jan1 ge3
 actually-have-their-reason-u
Actually there is a reason for that.
- 09⇒P1 >係呀係<因為做咩要慢慢帶旺佢(0.3)
 hai6 aa1 hai6 jan1 wai4 zou6 me1 jiu3 maan6 maan6 daai3 wong6 keoi5
 is-y is because-do-what need-slow-slow-bring-thrive-them
Yes, yes, because to do what, to slowly make them ((the kampongs)) prosper.
- 10 P1 如果唔係(.)一下子斬斷咗,
 jyu4 gwo2 m4 hai6 jat1 haa6 zi2 zaam2 tyun5 zo2
 if-not-is all of a sudden-break-Vg-Vg
If not, they would suddenly collapse.
- 11 P1 †妖(.)食毛咩>唔係唔係<食粥水咩。
 diu1 sik6 mou4 me1 m4 hai6 m4 hai6 sik6 zuk1 seoi2 me1
 damn eat-hair-what not-is-not-is eat-porridge-water-what
Damn, nothing to eat, I mean, ((only)) porridge water to eat ((idiom)).
- 12 P2 㗎。好似。係咯。
 ng2 hou2 ci5 hai6 lo3
 y like is-y
Mhm, seems like, yes.

At line 7, P2 says that the LRT runs through both the ‘kampongs’ (villages) and the city: “They ((the LRT)) run to the kampongs ((villages)) and then to the city again”. Then he adds that there is a reason for that (line 8): “Actually there is a reason for that”, uttering a turn that asserts that there may or may not be a response relevant.¹⁸ In this context, this turn is hearable as a possible pre-telling. However, a speaker change occurs and P1 begins a turn (line 9): “Yes, yes, because to do what, to slowly make them ((the kampongs)) prosper”. He formats a Telling-response and thereby displays that he is treating the preceding action as making an account relevant. His response consists of three parts. The first part are two affirmative tokens. Then he utters *janwai zou6 me1* (“why is that”), which is ostensibly a rhetorical question, and is in this context hearable as a possible pre-telling (similar to the English “let me tell you why”). The rest of the turn then delivers a why-explanation.

In contrast to the previous examples, the initiating action that precedes this (ostensibly) responsive action is neither grammatically marked as making a responsive action relevant (such as through an interrogative), nor interactionally and topically marked as such (such as in the previous Excerpt “Poor Government”).¹⁹ The sequential structure that is displayed here is:

- Line 7: Formulation of an assertion
- Line 8: Formulation of a TCU (without interrogative) that makes a Telling-sequence relevant (but not a speaker change), possible pre-telling.
- Line 9: Respondee begins a multi-part turn by uttering an (affirmative) response token.

¹⁸In more detail, he begins a TCU with the token *kei4 sat4* (“actually”), followed by a *jau5* (“have”) clause that features *jyun4 jan1* (“reason”) as its main argument.

¹⁹Here, the initiating action in line 8 does not feature any evidence that a response is conditionally relevant here. It can be observed, however, that the topic that the initiating action related to was brought up by P1 in the first place (line 1). This is interesting in that it may be the case here that P1, as the creator of the topic, is (still) in a position of mutually-agreed epistemic authority. In this sense, bringing up the topic “reason” in line 8 may constitute some form of invitation to elaborate. However, this is not sequentially evident.

- Line 9-11: Respondee produces a *janwai* token followed by a *zou6 me1* (“what”)-token that introduces a Telling-sequence that elaborates on a larger rationale related to the topic that was raised by his interlocutor in line 7 - 8.

In summary, this excerpt features a multi-part turn featuring *janwai* after a turn that makes a telling sequence relevant. Interestingly, the initiating action in this excerpt does not make a speaker change relevant and no response slot it evident.²⁰ Instead, a participant produces a self-initiated turn-uptake and produces a *janwai*-prefaced account that attends to the preceding ostensible (but not actual, as it is a possible pre-telling) display of lack of understanding. The responsive action is formatted in as a affirmative token followed by *janwai*-prefaced elaboration.

5.2.2 Section summary

The three excerpts that were discussed as part of this section display multi-part responsive action that is generally similar to the structure that was discussed in the previous section, but seems to differ in markedness. Here, *janwai* is part of *janwai+me1* (or *janwai+zou6 me1*) that formats a (rhetorical) why-type question (similar to the English “why is that” or “how come”).²¹ This constitutes a pseudo cleft-like construction, a rhetorical question along the lines of the English “because of what”, “why is this” or “how come” that makes no speaker change relevant but that instead serves to introduce an accounting sequence. In fact, what follows this utterance seems to be rather similar to the previously discussed excerpt, it prefaces an elaborative sequence. As part of building responsive action, both *janwai* (“because”) as well as *janwai* (“because of what”; “why is this”) signals the forthcoming of an elaboration and prefaces a Telling-sequence. Notably, both utterances seem to be used to fulfill similar interactional functions in that the talk that follows brings up novel information (or a novel angle or stance) and accounts for aspects of “why” something is the way it is in the speakers’ agenda.²²

5.3 Chapter Summary

This is the second chapter that examined responsive action formation featuring *janwai*. While the previous chapter examined responses beginning with *janwai* (turn-initial *janwai*), this chapter examined responses that feature *janwai* in non-initial position (i.e. following response tokens). These instances were further divided into responses to Telling-question and responses to Specifying-questions (see cline of various question designs as initiating actions (Figure 5.5).

Excerpt (6) shows the utterance of a negative response, part of which is a *janwai*-prefaced account of why there is a negative response. The *janwai*-TCU followed by further elaboration on the topic. After the account has come to an end, a change-of-state token is uttered by the interlocutor. Excerpt (7) displays the utterance of another negative response that begins with a response token, a second part of the response is a *janwai*-prefaced TCU that constitutes an account, shares an underlying rationale and thus supports the production of the response token. Again, a change-of-state token is produced by the interlocutor after the response. Excerpt (8) shows the utterance of a response in an environment of disagreement. After a relevant response token (and after an insertion sequence), a *janwai* account supports the negative response and elaborates on why the response is not affirmative. Excerpt (9) shows the utterance of a Specifying-response that is, after a request to do so (using a continuer), extended into a Telling-response formatted as a *janwai*-prefaced account. Excerpt (10) displays the utterance of a non-conforming response

²⁰The excerpt does not feature evidence that the initiating action is a why-type question, (it does not feature a interrogative) and it is not topically or interactionally recognizable as a form of questioning that would make a response relevant.

²¹The use of the interrogative token *me1* or *zou6 me1* token is typically part of forming questions and typically makes an elaborative response relevant.

²²The elaboration may be a ‘single’ elaborative TCU (Excerpt (11)) or a longer elaborative Telling-sequence (Excerpt (12) and (13)).

to a Specifying-question. This response is then followed up by a *janwai*-prefaced account, which both elaborated on why this response has been produced as well as on the ongoing activity in general.

The chapter also discussed a subpattern related to *janwai* responses that has emerged in MYCanCor data, instances of building responses featuring *janwai+meI* (“because what”; “why is that”), a pseudo cleft-like format. Three excerpt were discussed. Excerpt (11), (12) and (13) display the utterance of an affirmative response followed by an account on “why” aspects of the initiating question prefaced by *janwai meI aal* (“because what”; “why is that”). Excerpt (12) shows a similar pattern, but here the *janwai*-prefaced account is extended beyond a relevant response into a longer telling-sequence. Excerpt (13) shows that this pattern may also occur as part of a self-initiated turn-uptake that retrospectively ascribes the previous turn as making an account relevant (instead of a response with assigned speaker and slot).

The previous chapter has shown that turn-initial *janwai* can appear after an initiating action that interactionally (but not necessarily grammatically) constitutes a why-question that makes some form of telling or elaboration relevant. A central driving force of these action pairs seems to be an orientation to ‘why’ aspects of the preceding turn, i.e. to a display of ‘lack of understanding’. It seems that responsive action formatted with a turn-initial *janwai* commonly constitutes Telling-responses, i.e. responses that go beyond the supply of a specific piece of information in that they elaborate on a larger rationale or underlying narrative).

This chapter examined multi-part responses featuring *janwai*. The discussed excerpts show that *janwai* commonly follows some form of relevant response token that constitutes a possibly complete response. After that, the *janwai*-prefaced elaboration is added ‘post-completion’ after the relevant response (and not strictly part of the relevant response per se). Then what action do these *janwai*-TCUs accomplish? The excerpts shows that it seems that the responsive action overall commonly constitutes Telling-responses and, as part of which, the *janwai*-prefaced TCUs or clauses commonly seem to orient to some kind of ‘interactional trouble’ such as supporting a dispreferred response (e.g. Excerpt (7) and (8)) or non-conforming responses (e.g. Excerpt (10)) or attending to problems of intelligibility (e.g. Excerpt (8)). *Janwai* seems to preface accounts for aspects of ‘why I did this’ or ‘this is the case because’. The responses may be uttered in a step-by-step manner and in this course be extended into telling or storytelling sequences (e.g. Excerpt (9)).

Furthermore, the *janwai*-TCUs, similar to the previous chapter, seem to orient to an epistemic gradient in that the information that is brought up is presented (and treated) as novel and sometimes followed up with a change-of-state token (e.g. Excerpt (7), (9) and possibly (5)).

In summary, a difference between environment 1, that was discussed in the last chapter (why-type questions followed by because-responses) (where doing a *janwai*-initial TCU seems to be largely confined to the question-response action pair, i.e. the *janwai*-accounts were delivered ‘on-demand’ as part of a relevant response) and environment 2 that was discussed in this chapter seems to be that here *janwai*-accounts are both part of responsive action but also seem to be related to things that go beyond the question-response pairs (see Figure 5.9).

Comparing the use of *janwai* in Sequential Environment 1 (Chapter 4) and Sequential Environment 2 (this Chapter), a number of similarities and differences can be outlined (see Figure 5.9 for details). In both environments *janwai* prefaced accounts, but in Environment 1 these accounts are produced in response to an overt account-seeking question, whereas in Environment 2, the account are also ‘part of’ a requested (or relevant) response, but that what follows *janwai* also seems to ‘go beyond’ the question-response action pair. In addition to being part of the formulation of relevant responses to an account-seeking question, *janwai* also seems to be related to other interactional uses and/or intelligibility problems. A couple of preliminary observation can be made that cut a little deeper what seems to make *janwai*-prefaced TCUs relevant here. Excerpt (8) “Oily not black”, for instance, displays the utterance of a *janwai*-prefaced account in an environment of disagreement (after a complaint). In response to this, the participants employs a *janwai* account that (1) brings up novel (seemingly unknown to the questioner) information, (2) that points out an intelligibility problem of a normative/moral nature (of what counts as ‘dirty’). By pointing his interlocutor to the reason why his shirt is not black, the participant uses *janwai*

Figure 5.9: Accounts as relevant responses and accounts that follow relevant responses

Sequential Environment 1	Sequential Environment 2
Initiating action: why-type question	Initiating action: any question design
Responsive action: <i>janwai</i> -initial responses	Responsive action: any response design + <i>janwai</i> -TCU
Action formation: <i>janwai</i> accounts are requested <i>janwai</i> -turns are a relevant response part of a question-response action pair questioner puts her/himself in K- position	Action formation: <i>janwai</i> accounts are ‘possibly’ requested <i>janwai</i> -TCUs are part of a relevant response go beyond question-response action pair respondee puts questioner in K- position
Action ascription: <i>janwai</i> signals affirmative response <i>janwai</i> signals forthcoming of account attends to request for novel information questioner ascribes what is the ‘accountable’	Action ascription: <i>janwai</i> signals accounting part of response <i>janwai</i> signals forthcoming of account presents <i>janwai</i> -prefaced information as novel respondee ascribes what is the ‘accountable’

to attend to a (locally and interactionally relevant) ‘lack of understanding’. Doing so, interactionally serves to both - **within the action pair** - support his rejection to acknowledge the complaint (by pointing his interlocutor to missing but relevant information) and - **beyond the action pair** - presents his view as normatively acceptable and reasonable (instead of as despicable). *Janwai* appears to serve to ‘link’ (localize) a relevant piece of information (of the speaker’s general knowledge) to the situation and locally mobilize it in support of interactional goals. In contrast to the previous chapter, this ‘mobilization’ is here initiated by the respondee and not by the questioner (as part of a response obligation), i.e. the respondee and not the questioner ascribes what is the ‘accountable’.

Figure 5.10: Overview of findings in Chapter 5

- *janwai* can be part of a range of different question designs as a part of building responsive action and seems to commonly follow the utterance of relevant response tokens.
- as part of responses, *janwai* prefaced a part of the response that constitutes an elaboration or account.
- the utterance that follows *janwai* seems to orient to epistemic gradients.
- *janwai*- prefaced response parts can account for previously uttered response parts.
- *janwai*- prefaced response parts can also account for things beyond the question-response action pair, such as preference or intelligibility problems.
- as part of responsive action, *janwai* can be used as a rhetorical device to subvert original action formation of a preceding turn and ascribes the foregoing turn as seeking an account.
- *janwai*-prefaced utterances may be used by the speaker to display that a preceding action or utterance is being treated as an ‘accountable’ and ascribe that something is ‘in need’ of an account and treated as displaying a ‘lack of understanding’.

6

Sequential environment 3: *janwai* as part of (non-responsive) action formats

This chapter discusses the use of *janwai* as part of (non-responsive) action formation. These are cases that display a two-part structure where **the same participant** produces a TCU that constitutes an initiating action (i.e. not a responsive action) and then, as the second part, utters a *janwai*-prefaced TCU or clause (see Figure 6.1).

Figure 6.1: Formation of an initiating action followed by *janwai* unit

P1: Formulation of an initiating action

P1: *janwai* _____.

In total, MYCanCor features around 135 instances of (non-responsive) action formation involving *janwai*. This includes both, cases where another participant utters a response after the *janwai*-prefaced TCU (Figure 6.1(a)) and cases where the same speaker continues with further talk (Figure 6.1(b)). In fact, in MYCanCor, 98 instances feature a relevant response and only 37 cases do not feature a response.¹

Figure 6.1(a): Formation featuring speaker change

P1: Formulation of an initiating action

P1: *janwai* _____.

≠P1: Relevant response _____.

Chapter Outline

This chapter examines action formation featuring *janwai* (n=125). Like in the previous chapter, this pool of instances is further divided using variables that are sequentially evident. Two groups could be delineated in MYCanCor. The first group are those excerpts where the utterance of the initiating action displays signs of disfluency (such as stretching or pauses) and is then followed by the production of

¹The reader may ask at this point why MYCanCor features such a low number of instances of participants opting to utter *janwai* in environments other than question and response formation requesting. In fact, only about 7.4% (37 out of around 500) instances are uttered in an environment other than requesting. This may be due to the nature of the corpus as a corpus of everyday interactional settings. MYCanCor only consists of conversational settings, mostly between people with a high level of rapport such as friends and family. Unlike many other corpora of spoken language, it does not contain any mediated settings or public speech settings such as radio or TV programmes or public speeches. Such settings would naturally feature a higher number of *janwai* clauses that are not in the vicinity of responsive action (such as the pattern Figure 6.2).

Figure 6.1(b): Formation without speaker change

P1: Formulation of an initiating action

P1: *janwai* _____.

P1: more talk by same participant

a *janwai*-TCU or clause (Section 6.1) - the turn that features the *janwai* is produced in a *step-by-step* fashion. The second group are those where the production of the action occurs *in-one-go*, without any sequentially-evident signs of disfluency (Section 6.2). Two instances of each group are discussed in detail.

In addition, Section 6.3 discusses another practice involving *janwai* that has recurrently emerged in MYCanCor, the use of *janwai* to facilitate “back-tying” (Couper-Kuhlen 2011; Li 2014; see also (Schegloff, 2007)). These are cases where the initiating action that *janwai* is related to constitutes a longer (multi-TCU) action-sequence (such a question-response sequence), in contrast to an immediately preceding and more “singular” action (such as one TCU). Here, participants use the *janwai*-clause to tie the conversation back to a preceding action (instead of to the immediately preceding turn).

Section 6.4 examines another recurring pattern, the 34 (7.4%) instances in MYCanCor that feature a misalignment token *m4 hai6* (“That’s not it; That’s not what I mean”) followed by a *janwai*-TCU or clause.

Lastly, Section 6.5 discusses another recurring pattern, the three part structure of: (1) the utterance of an initiating action, (2) utterance of a next-turn repair initiator (formatted using a *me1*-final particle) followed by (3) the utterance of a *janwai*-initial turn (n=8).

6.1 ‘Step-by-step’ production of *janwai*-structures as part of the formation of initiating action

This section discusses examples of a ‘step-by-step’ production of *janwai*-TCUs or clauses that follow the formation of an initiating action. The excerpts discussed here feature disfluencies such as a micro-pause, an in-breath or a longer pause before the production of the *janwai*-clause (see Figure 6.2).

Figure 6.2: *Step-by-step* formation of the pattern (featuring disfluencies)

P1: Formulation of an initiating action

P1: Evident disfluency (such as (.) / (x.x) / .hhh / hhh.)

P1: *janwai* _____.

≠P1: Relevant response.

6.1.1 Data discussion

The first excerpt discussed shows the formation of an action that makes a display of compliance relevant.

(14) Data Excerpt: “Verifying the tax” || MYCANCOR 010 (02:44 -02:52)

The excerpt shows a conversation between an elderly citizen (P2) and an employee (P3) of a community center in Malaysia. This center is typically frequented by citizens to seek advice or file complaints regarding a wide range of matters related to citizen-government relations, such as filling out all sorts of paper work, getting documents certified or seeking advice after having trouble with other government

agencies. In this case, the elderly citizen has come in after he previously had some trouble related to his income tax report at another agency.

- 01 P2 我聽我女講佢入電腦度睇話.(0.2)
ngo5 ting3 ngo5 neoi5 gong2 keoi5 jap6 din6 nou5 dou6 tai2 waa6
I-listen my-daughter-say she into computer-s see-say
My daughter told me that, she checked on the computer ((to find the numbers)).
- 02 P2 攞唔到喔.°咁樣樣°=
lo2 m4 dou3 wo3 gam3 joeng1 joeng2
get-no-u y c-r-r
((She)) can't get them.
- 03 P3 |=唔係啊(.)lulus喔?
m4 hai6 aal lulus wo3
no-is lulus y
That's not what I mean, ((you already)) passed ((the tax review)).
|((looking up from her PC screen where she has been checking the client's file))
- 04 P2 係咩?
hai6 mei
is y
Really?
- 05 P3 Lulus(.)只係叫你補返張糧單::?
lulus zi2 hai6 giu3 nei5 bou2 faan2 zoeng1 loeng4 daan1
lulus just is ask-you supplement-u q-salary-list
Yes, ((they)) just ask you to supplement a list of ((your)) salaries.
- 06 P2 哦:::?=
oo:::
y
Ohh.
- 07 P3 =所以我要問清楚,
soji ngo4 jiu3 man6 ceng1 co2
so I need ask-clear
So ((therefore)) I need to be specific here ((about the amount of your income)).
- 08 P3 °你[到底報所得稅報幾[多.°
nei5 dou3 dai2 bao3 so2 dak1 seoi3 bao3 gei2 do1
you after all report income tax report how-much
How much income did you report after all?
- 09 P2 [嗯:: ((nods)) [哦.
ng2 oo2
y y
Ok. Ok.
- 10 P3 你係咪報千五|[-
nei2 hai6 mai4 bao3 cin1 ng4
you v report thousand-five
Did you report 1500-
|((P2 nods))
- 11 P2 [應該就係咯.
jing3 goi1 zau6 hai6 lo1
should d is-y

Should be ((something like that)).

- 12 P3 或者你報千二=
waak6 ze2 nei2 bao3 cin1 ji6
or you report thousand-two-
Or did you report 1200?
- 13 P2 =有啦°(.)[千五到二千咁樣嘛=
mou5 laa1 cin1 ng5 dou3 ji6 cin1 gam3 joeng6 maa3
no-y thousand-five u two-thousand c y
I didn't. ((It was)) around 1500 to 2000.
- 14 P3 [或者你報二千.
waak6 ze2 nei5 bou3 ji6 cin1
or you-report two-thousand
Or did you report 2000?
- 15 P2 =同個佢幫我寫=
tung4 go2 go3 keoi5 bong1 ngo5 se2
with-r he-help-me write
It was with him ((the Malay clerk at the tax office, he)) helped me to write that.
- 16 P3 =咁呢而你係報二千,
gam3 nei1 ji4 nei5 hai6 bou3 ji6 cin1
c-y c-you-is report two-thousand
So you are going to report 2000?
- 17 P3 [咁樣講呢(.)個五百我入落你老婆個度.(.)
gam3 joeng6 gong2 nei1 go2 ng5 baak3 ngo5j ap6 lok6 nei5 lou5 po4 go2 dou6
c say-y r-five-hundred i-put-into your-wife r
In this case, I will input the 500 to your wife's account.
- 18 P2 [哦.
ngo5
e
Oh.
- 19 P3 你保持返千五.
nei5 bou2 ci4 faan2 cin1 ng5
you maintain thousand-five
You maintain 1500 ((on your account)).
- 20 P2 係啊(.)因為個個幫我咁樣寫啊嘛.
hai6 aa1 jan1 wai4 go2 go3 bong1 ngo5 gam3 joeng6 se2 aa1 maa3
is-y because that-help-me like-this-write y-y
Ok. Because that guy ((the Malay guy at the income tax office)) wrote that for me.
- 21 P2 應該係咁上下.
jing3 goi1 hai6 gam3 soeng5 haa6
should is-like around
It should be approximately ((that much)).
- 22 P2 >唔知<千五定二千㗎啦[xx.
m4 zi1 cin1 ng5 ding6 ji6 cin1 gaa2 laa1
not-know 1500 or 2000 y-y
I don' t know ((if)) it was 1500 or 2000. xx-

- 23 P3 [你記得幾多:?
nei5 gei3 dak1 gei2 do1
you remember how-much
How much do you remember?
- 24 P3 [唔好寫錯嘢呀.(.)
m4 hou2 se2 co3 je5 aa1
not-good write-wrong-things y
Can't write something incorrect.
- 25 P2 |[係咁上下㗎啦.(.)
hai6 gam3 soeng5 haa6 gaa2 laa1
is-like around y-y
It's like this, approximately ((this much)).
|((shakes head))
- 26⇒P3 .hhh 因為[我哋對所得稅係咪=
jan1 wai4 [ngo5 dei2 deoi3 so2 dak1 sei3 hai6 mai1
because our verify income tax v
Because we are verifying ((your)) income tax, right.
- 27 P2 [°係咁上下㗎.°
hai6 gam3 soeng5 haa6 gaa2
is-like around y
It's like this, approximately ((this much)).
- 28 P1 |=喂我入去裡面啊入[XX.
wai3 ngo5 jap6 heoi3 leoi5 min6 aa1 jap6
e I inside-go inside y inside xx
Hey, I am going inside.
|((touches P2's shoulder))
- 29 P2 [|嗯嗯嗯.
ng2 ng2 ng2 ng2
e-e-e-e
Ok ok ok.
|((Raises arm))
- 30 (2.0) ((P3 starts typing))
- 31⇒P3 因為我哋對所得稅呀:
jan1 wai4 ngo5 dei2 deoi3 so2 dak1 sei3 aa:1
because we verifying income tax y
Because we are verifying ((your)) income tax.
- 32 P3 有陣時係咪(.)[要清楚交待.
jau5 zan6 si4 hai6 mi1 jiu3 cing1 co2 gaau1 doi6
sometimes v need-clear account
At times, you know, it's important to do this correctly,
- 33 P2 [嗯:.
ng2
e
Yes.
- 34 P3 .hhh 唔係一陣間呀導致到呀,
m4 hai6 jat1 zan6 gaan1 aa2 dou6 zi3 dou3 aa2
not-is later y result u y

Or later this will result in,

- 35 P3 你哋呀(1.0)被調查嘅^{gwo3}結果呀.
nei5 dei2 aa2 bei6 diu6 caa4 ge3 gwo2 git3 gwo2 aa1
you y passiv-investigate u nx result y
You guys getting investigated ((for tax evasion)).
- 36 P2 | 㗎.
ng2
e
Yes.
| ((nods))

Prior to the production of the *janwai*-turn under study, the citizen has been complaining that he (and his daughter who helped him) could not find some documents that the tax office has requested. In line 1 and 2, he says: “My daughter told me that, she checked on the computer ((to find the numbers)) but can’t get them”. During this turn the office clerk (P3) looks up his record on her computer system and then says in line 3: “No, ((you)) passed ((the tax examination))”, pointing out that the client (P2) has successfully passed the tax record check, sharing a piece of information that she has probably found on her computer system. Then, in line 4, P2, in a possible a display of surprise, says: “Really”. P2 then repeats that he has passed by saying (line 5) “lulus” again, the Malay utterance for “to pass” and goes on (line 5): “They just asked you to supplement a list of ((your)) salary.” P3 responds to this with a stretched and rising *ngo5*:: (“Ohh”) token (line 6). Then, in line 7 and 8, P3 says: “So ((therefore)) I need to be specific here ((about the income amount)) how much income did you report after all?”, asked the citizen to supply the exact amount of reported income tax.

It turns out, however, that the citizen is unwilling or unable to provided her an an exact amount. In line 10 - 16, P3 repeatedly requests a specific amount and P2’s responds that he only knows an approximate (*soeng5 haa6*) amount. P2 says that he is only able to provide a range between 1500 and 2000 Malaysian Ringgit. An environment of disagreement becomes evident revolving around the request for a “specific” amount. Possibly in an attempt to move on, P3 then proposed to input an amount of 2000 in the system. In line 17 and 19, P3 says: “In this case, I will input the 500 to your wife’s account you maintain 1500 ((on your account))”. To this, P2 replies: “Ok, because that guy ((the Malay guy at the income tax office)) wrote that for me”, possibly accounting for why he does not know (or wants to share) the requested amount (this use of *janwai* as part of responses was discussed in Chapter 4). Then he continues in line 21 and 22: “It should be approximately ((that much)), I don’t know ((if)) it was 1500 or 2000”. In overlap with an unintelligible last part of this TCU, P3 then begins a turn that begins a new action, she asks (line 23-24): “How much do you remember, don’t write something incorrect”.² This action that unfolds in line 23 and 24 is formatted as a how-much question (line 23) followed by an advice (or even an instruction or warning) in line 24.³ Given that P3 has previously already communicated that he does not want or can provide the amount asked for, this action design is hearable as another attempt to push for an answer.

Responding to the how-much question (line 23) and in overlap with line 24, P2 shakes his head and repeats that he can (or wants) to only provide an approximate amount (line 25). So far, the action that P3 produces here is built up over the course of a sequence of TCUs, first a how-much question and then an advice. Now, in line 26, P3 utters a *janwai*-prefaced TCU to further her agenda, she says: “Because we are verifying ((your)) income tax, right”, beginning an account of why it is important to supply the correct amount.⁴ Looking at the sequential unfolding of this action, a trajectory of increasing specificity

²This turn that constitutes a question using a *gei2 do1* “how much” QWI interrogative, as she, also related to the preexisting disagreement. This shows that the environment of disagreement still persists by not treating the previously provided information as an acceptable response.

³P3 begins a *m4 hou2* (“Don’t”)-prefaced TCU that is the beginning of an action sequence that makes a display of agreement and compliance relevant.

⁴Beginning in line 24, P3 begins a sequence of talk related to the topic of why it is important to not *se2 co3 je5* (“write something incorrect”) that stretches all the way to line 32 - 36. Eventually, at line 35, P3 will bring up the topic of *bei6 diu6 caa4* (“get investigated ((by law enforcement))”) as a rather serious warning of possible legal consequences of providing an

(and escalation) is evident. P3 has been requesting a piece of information (the amount of income tax) several times, and then moves on to utter an advice in line 24 (the *m4 ho2*-("Don't")-initial TCU in line 24). Then, in line 25, she utters a *janwai*-TCU that begins an account of the consequences of not following her advice (line 26).⁵

Sequentially, the *janwai*-clause supplies information that is part of a larger rationale. Step-by-step, P3 brings up increasingly specific and dire consequences. Later on, related to the *m4 ho2* ("Don't") advice (line 24), the talk about possible consequence culminates in a warning of *bei6 diu6 caa4* ("get investigated ((by law enforcement))") as a possible serious consequences of not providing the correct tax amount (see line 32-36).

In summary, the *janwai* clause marks the beginning of a longer explanation which bears upon the consequences of not following the instruction given in the first part, or alternatively, prefacing the beginning of an account for having given the instruction in the first place. The trajectory can be summarized as follows:

- Line 24: "Don't write something incorrect" as an advice (or instruction) that makes a display of compliance relevant.
- Line 26: "Because we are verifying income tax, right" brings up a possible reason and further specifies the ongoing activity
- Line 35: "You might get investigated" as a possible consequence that is to be avoided

This excerpt displays a *janwai*-TCU in an environment of seeking compliance. Over the course of several TCUs, P3 displays a trajectory of incrementally supplying information that interactionally serve to 'increase the pressure' on her interlocutor to comply with her request for a specific piece of information. Looking at the larger picture, it can be observed that *janwai* prefates a multi-unit account of why the first part of the initiating action (i.e. the advice/instruction in line 24), was produced.

Here is another excerpt featuring a step-by-step production of the *janwai*-TCU. In this example an interactionally significant 1.8 second pause precedes the utterance of *janwai*.

(15) Data Excerpt: "Puts on airs" || MYCANCOR 009 (01:53 -02:10)

This is a conversation over dinner between two participant who are colleagues and friends. Both work in the catering industry and, after a working day, now sit in a restaurant, talking about their colleagues. Prior to the beginning of the excerpt they have been talking about a colleague named Ah-Ciu.

- 01 P2 有好多人都唔鍾意佢㗎,
jau5 hou2 do1 jan4 dou1 m4 zung1 ji3 keoi5 gaa2
have-many-people also-not-like-him-y
There are many people who also don't like him (Ah-Ciu),
- 02 P2 xx 有陣時.
xx jau5 zan6 si4
xx-some-time
XX that time.
- 03 P2 |佢冇入嚟CPA仲好啊,
keoi5 mou5 jap6 lai4 CPA zung6 hou2 aa1

incorrect amount of income tax.

⁵The TCU brings up the topic of: *deoi3 so2 dak1 sei1* ("verifying income tax"). The term "*deoi3*" is here used for the first time. Previously, in line 8, P3 used the formulation *bao3 so2 dak1 sei3* ("report so2 dak1 sei3").

- he-not-come-in nt-better-y
It's better that he didn't join CPA ((name of company)),
 |((points at P1))
- 04 P2 如果佢入嚟CPA有好多入好嬲佢㗎.
 jyu4 gwo2 keoi5 jap6 lai4 CPA jau5 hou2 do1 jan4 hou2 nau1 keoi5 gaa2
 if he-come-in-nt have-many-people very-angry-him-y
If he would have joined, a lot of people would have been angry at him.
- 05 (1.8)
- 06⇒P2 因為佢(.)擺起個款咯:好似.
 jan1 wai4 keoi5 baai2 hei2 go3 fun2 lo3 hou2 ci5
 because-he i y likely
Because he puts on airs, it seems.
- 07 P1 佢係把口衰啲嘅:..
 keoi5 hai6 baa2 hau2 seoi1 di1 ze1
 he-is q-mouth-bad-y
He is just a bit foul-mouthed.
- 08 P1 個人其實係(.)[OK
 go3 jan4 kei4 sat6 hai6 OK
 that-person actually-is ok
His personality is actually ...OK.
- 09 P2 [係OK嘅.
 hai6-ok-ge3
 is-ok-y
Is OK.
- 10 P2 but佢(.)但係佢會命令人啲做嘢你你知冇
 but keoi5 daan6 hai6 keoi5 wui2 ming6 ling6 jan4 dei2 zou6 je5 nei5 nei5 zi1 mou5
 but-he but-he-would command-people-do-things you-you-know-not
but he would boss people around to do things, you- you know?
- 11 (7.0)
- 12 P1 所以我都(0.4)好慶幸啊
 so2 ji5 ngo5 dou1 hou2 hing3 hang6 aa1
 so I-also-very-fortunate
So I' m ... fortunate.
- 13 P1 佢一嚟咗我冇響嗰邊做嘢㗎 呵|呵呵
 keoi5 jat1 lai4 zo2 ngo5 mou5 hoeng2 go2 bin1 zou6 je5 zo2 he he he
 he-once-come-in-Vg I-not-have-to-there do-something-laughter
Once he comes, I wouldn' t work there anymore, hehehe.
- 14 P2 |((P2 smiles and thumbs-up gesture))

At line 1, P2 formulates an assessment related to Ah-Ciu by saying that “many people”, probably other colleagues, do not “like him”. This is the beginning of an assessment sequence that stretched from line 1 to line 6 and that makes a type-conforming response relevant (which her interlocutor will eventually produce in line 7).

After the TCU in line 1 is grammatically completed with the final particle *gaa2*, P2 adds another partly unintelligible TCU (line 2). Then she produces another two TCUs (accompanied by a pointing gesture) related to the topic (line 3 and 4). Both TCUs bring up information related to why it is better

that Ah-Ciu did not join CPA, the name of a company or subdivision of a company all three are working for (P1, P2 and Ah-Ciu).⁶ At line 5, a 1.8 second pause ensues during which both participants first look at each other, and P1 then starts eating (around 0.4 seconds into the pause). Up to this point, P2 has produced four TCUs and a pointing gesture that are assessments of actions of their colleague Ah-Ciu. P1, however, has not yet produced a relevant response (despite the occurrence of several TRPs where she could have done so.) Even during the pause in line 5, P1 does not begin a turn. This makes an interactionally significant delay of a relevant response evident. Based on these observations, P1's behaviour up to this point foreshadows is readable as a forthcoming negative response.

It is in such an environment, that P2 now produces a *janwai*-TCU (line 6): "Because he puts on airs, it seems", referring directly to Ah-Ciu, the TCU begins with the pronoun *keoi5* ("he") followed by the attribute *baai2 hei2 go3 fun2* ("putting on airs").⁷ The *janwai*-prefaced TCU is hearable as accounting or giving a basis for the claim that people would be angry with him in line 4. In addition, the TCU is evidence of a move towards increasing specificity, both in terms of agency (by not mentioning another agent), and in terms of bringing up a clearly negative trait directly assigned to Ah-Ciu.⁸ What ensues from here, is the production of a relevant and interactionally dispreferred response by P1 (line 7) and a continuing exchange that features more evidence of a continuous environment of disagreement (line 9-12).

In summary, the following observations can be made about the sequential environment the *janwai*-TCU is embedded in. The TCU is part of an unfolding action that seeks for agreement and/or alignment (line 1 - 6). Through the delayed response by the recipient, she foreshadows some problem producing an agreement. Possible uptake positions are between line 2 and 3, line 3 and 4, and, most clearly observable, during the 1.8 second pause in line 5. P1 displays a trajectory of moving towards an increasingly overt and specific description of negative traits of the under-goer (Ah-Ciu) and produces a concession before going on to produce a more clear disagreement in line 8. The *janwai* clause itself supplies information that, in the light of the preceding TCUs, constitutes a larger rationale (or reason) related to "why Ah-Ciu is not liked". In the face of an upcoming disagreement to the speaker's repeated assessment, the participant uses *janwai* to provide further support or justification for her assessments.

6.1.2 Section Summary

Both excerpts display an initiating action that makes agreement and/or alignment relevant. The initiating actions unfold over the course of several turns or TCUs and is then followed by the utterance of the *janwai*-TCU. While certainly related to the initiating action, the *janwai*-TCUs are sequentially uttered after a display of disfluency, i.e. they are uttered 'post hoc' after places of possible interactional and grammatical completion (they constitute 'post-completion extensions'; Ford 1993).

Excerpt (14) "Verifying the tax" displays the utterance of an initiating action that constitutes an advice (or even instruction). In an environment of disagreement (and repeated resistance to comply with the advice/instruction), the participant then, after a micropause and an in-breath, goes on and utters a *janwai*-TCU that serves to account for the legitimacy of the advice/instruction and possibly serves to enhance the chances of an affirmative response. The participant then goes on and further emphasizes the seriousness of the situation and points the interlocutor to possible consequences of his non-compliance that are to be avoided.

Excerpt (15) "Puts on airs" displays the utterance of a negative assessment as the initiating action. This assessment makes a response relevant but as it unfolds the interlocutor does not immediately utter an

⁶Comparing line 1 and line 4, it can be noted that P2 moves from a *m4 zung1 ji3* ("don't like") to a *hou2 nau1* ("angry at") (both related the same argument *hou2 do1 jan4* ("many people")), making a move from a more moderate to a stronger expression of dispreference evident.

⁷In comparison to P2's previous TCUs, the clause directly assigns this negative attribute to Ah-Ciu, instead of bringing up *hou2 do1 jan4* ("many people") as the agent.

⁸After a slightly stretched final particle, *lo3*, P2 produces a *ho2 ci5* ("it seems or likely"). In this context, this tokens might do some mitigation work after the clause has grammatically been completed, but it could also be seen as a token that highlights P2 as the agent of assigning the negative trait to the under-goer.

affirmative response and the sequential unfolding makes a delayed response evident, which may signal the forthcoming of a dispreferred response. In this (incipient) environment of possible disagreement and after a pause that constitutes another possible delayed response, the participant then utters a *janwai*-TCU that elaborates on the assessment, attend to a possible ‘lack of understanding’ and thereby invites the interlocutor to produce an affirmative response.

In both cases the *janwai*-clause seems to be related to the participant’s prior action. The use of *janwai* is part of an utterance that unfolds in an environment of a possible forthcoming dispreferred response. Interactionally, both instances display the use of a *janwai*-prefaced TCU that serves to account for the preceding action, attend to a ‘lack of understanding’ and thereby possibly increase the likelihood of a forthcoming affirmative response.⁹ The participants seem to use the *janwai*-prefaced TCU to extend (or even ‘repair’) a preceding utterance retrospectively (by attending to some aspect that is considered in need of further explanation), possibly in an attempt to invite a preferred response and pursue their agenda (similar uses of English *because* and Japanese *datte* have been described by Ford and Mori (1994)).

6.2 ‘In-one-go’ production of *janwai* as part of the formation of initiating action

This section shows excerpts of *janwai* TCUs that fulfill the following criteria: the *janwai* TCU is part of the formation of an initiating actions without signs of disfluencies, i.e. these instances feature a ‘in-one-go’ sequential unfolding of these actions. This means that no interactionally-relevant in-breath or longer pause is evident between the TCU that marks the beginning of the initiating action and the following *janwai* TCU (see Figure 6.3). Notably, these examples do however feature a “normal” beat of silence between TCUs, i.e. they are not through-produced.¹⁰

Figure 6.3: *In-one-go* formation of the pattern (without disfluency)

P1: Formulation of an initiating action

P1: *janwai* _____.

≠P1: Relevant response

6.2.1 Data discussion

Here is an excerpt that displays the formation of an initiating action that makes a display of compliance relevant.

(16) Data Excerpt: “You need to wash” || MYCANCOR 016 (02:45 -03:09)

This is a conversation between two siblings (who seem to know each other well) taking place in their living room. P1 is the older sister of P2, her brother. The activity that takes place immediately before the excerpt begins is this: P1 stands next to a laundry rack in the back of the room and, one by one, picks up pieces of clothing that are hanging over the rack. Her interlocutor, P2, is at the other end of the room and not part of this activity. P1 then stops picking up pieces of clothing, turns around and starts walking towards another room, carrying several pieces of clothing on her arm (02:45). As she turns around, she begins a turn that constitutes a request. This action unfolds throughout a sequence of four TCUs and a pointing gesture (line 2-5). P1 asks P2 to do the laundry and, as it will become

⁹Furthermore, in both cases, the information that is brought up is treated as novel and is related to the preceding action in that it presents new aspects related to it. In this sense, an orientation to an epistemic gradient is evident but does not seem to be the ‘main job’ of these utterances.

¹⁰In fact, no instance of a rush-through featuring *janwai* was identified in the corpus.

clear later (line 8 and 9), seems to be concerned about getting enough dirty laundry together to make another round of using a washing machine worthwhile.

- 01 P1 | (3.0)
| ((picks up pieces of clothing from a laundry rack in the living room))
- 02 P1 | 個毛巾應該仲要洗呀.
go3 mou4 gan1 jing3 goi1 zung6 jiu3 sai2 aa1
q-towel-should-also-need-wash-y
That towel needs to be washed.
| ((gaze falls on a towel hanging over a chair))
| ((starts walking across the living room towards another room))
- 03 P1 | 你要洗你嘅個.
nei5 jiu3 sai2 nei5 ge3 go2 go3
you-need-your-that-q
You need to wash your that ((thing)).
| (((gaze on a basket full of laundry on the floor as she walks towards it))
| ((P2 slowly walks around the room with the basket not in view))
- 04 P1 | 你要洗你堆衫哦.
nei5 jiu3 sai2 nei5 deoi1 saam1 ngo4
you-need-wash-your-q-clothes-y
You need to wash your pile of clothes.
| ((points at basket as she walks into another room))
| ((P2 turns toward the basket))
- 05⇒P1 | [因為你有個(.) gym | > 個<長褲 | .
jan1wai4 nei5 jau5 go2 go3 gym go2 go3 coeng4 fu3
because-you-have-that-q gym-that-q-long pants
Because you have these long pants for the Gym.
| ((P1 enters another room))
| ((P2 walks past basket and looks inside))
- 06 P2 | 係呀.(1.0)((sniffles))
hai6 aa1
is-y
Right.
| ((walks away from basket and into the center of the living room))
- 07 P2 | 個唔會臭.
go2 m4 wui2 cau3
that-not-will-smelly
That ((one)) wouldn't smell bad.
- 08 (9.0)
- 09 P1 | 我又可以開一輪(.) 開一輪洗開一輪洗.
ngo5 jau6 ho2ji5 hoi1 jat1 leon4 hoi1 jat1 leon4 sai2 hoi1 hoi1 jat1 leon4 sai2
I-also-can-start-one-round start-one-round-wash start start-one-round-wash
I can start another round. Start a round , start a round of using ((the machine)).
- 10 P1 | 衣機嚟洗.
ji1 gei1 lai4 sai2
washing machine-come-wash
Take the washing machine to wash.

While turning around and facing a green towel that hangs over a chair, P1 says: “That towel needs

to be washed” (line 2).¹¹ Then P1 starts walking across the living room while uttering a second TCU (line 3): “You need to wash your that ((thing))”, now marking P2 as a recipient and making clear that he is the one who does the washing.¹² However, while the TCU is being uttered, P2 still has his back turned towards the scene - the towel that P1 refers to out of his sight. He also does not produce any information receipt or acknowledgment token, possibly making this a case of a delayed response from this point onwards. As this TCU comes to an end with a falling intonation, P2 begins to turn around towards the scene (02:48). Coinciding with this turn towards her (and the basket), P1 utters a third TCU accompanied by a pointing gesture towards the basket on the floor. She says (line 4): “You need to wash your pile of clothes”¹³

P1 then adds a *janwai*-prefaced TCU (line 5): “Because you have these long pants for the Gym”. The TCU overlaps with a minimal receipt token *ngo4* (“uh”) by P2 (line 6) and constitutes the fourth TCU of P1’s unfolding action sequence. Notably, the *janwai*-TCU is being used in an effort to further specify the details of P1’s request for compliance (line 5).¹⁴ The instance shows a speaker requesting compliance, and on finding the recipient’s delay in complying (an incipiently dispreferred response), uses *janwai* to provide support for the request for compliance. As this TCU is being uttered, P1 has just been walking out of the room (line 4 -5) and P2 has been walking towards the basket, looked inside, and now walks away from the basket towards the center of the room. Bringing the sequence to an end, he then responds: *hai6 aa1* (here used as an affirmative token, approximate to “Okay” or “Right”).

In summary, this excerpt shows the formation of an action that makes a display of compliance relevant. However, before a response is uttered by another participant, a *janwai* TCU is supplied as part of the initiating action (as part of the effort to get consent to ‘do the laundry’). More specifically, the sequential unfolding of this action displays (1) a possibly delayed response (that becomes conditionally relevant between line 3-4 as well as line 4-5) and (2) a trajectory of using increasingly specific pronouns, indexicals, classifiers and final particles. Part of this trajectory, the *janwai*-TCU is possibly used to provide support for the request for compliance.

Excerpt No. 17 shows another example of an ‘in-one-go’ production of a *janwai*-TCU and the preceding TCU.

(17) Data Excerpt: “Bought as a kid” || MYCANCOR 013 (22:46-24:02)

This is a family conversation over lunch featuring four participants. P2 is the mother, P1 and P3 are her daughter and son, P4 is the husband of her daughter. The action under study here is related to the topic that the mother (P2) does not know her own birth date (see line 6 - 8). What follows in line 9 to 53 is a longer telling-sequence located in the realm of Chinese mythology (omitted here for brevity).

¹¹In more detail: She utters a turn-initial “that towel” (line 1) and then goes on form a *jiu* (“need”) clause featuring the verb *sai2* “washing” or “doing the laundry”. In this clausal context “washing” is presented as something that “needs” to be done - as a proposed activity. P2 does not display any reaction to the utterance of this TCU, in fact P1 as well as the towel are not in this field of vision during utterance of this TCU. Since her brother, P2, is the only other person in the flat, her TCU is possibly directed at him, but - at this point - he is not marked as either the recipient of the utterance nor the under-goer of the “need to wash” action proposal.

¹²The next tokens of this TCU are a possessive construction (*nei5 ge3* (“your”)) as an argument of the indexical construction “*go2 go3*” (consisting of the indexical token *go2* and a ‘general’ classifier *go3*). In contrast to the first TCU, this TCU marks P2 as both the owner of an item (“that one”) as well as the recipient-marked “you need to wash” action proposal. As will become evident later, the indexical “that one” in this TCU refers to a basket of laundry located on the floor in front of P2 (as she walks across the room).

¹³The pronoun is followed by a *nei5* “your” possessive (this time in a one-token format). She then opts for a *deoi1* pile classifier, the noun *sam1* (“clothes”) and a *ngo4* final particle. In contrast to the previous TCU, she uses a more specific classifier (from *go3* to *deoi1*) and a more specific object (from “*go2*” to “*sam1*”). This trajectory towards more specific tokens is also evident in her production of the pointing gesture as well as the final particle *ngo4* (that here serves to mark the requesting characteristic of the utterance).

¹⁴TCU brings up *ceong4 fu3* (“long pants”) as a new topic, which is possibly of emic relevance to the participant with regards to the proposal of “doing the laundry” (but this remains opaque to the observer). Furthermore, *go2 go3 ceong4 fu3* (“these long pants”) is subject of a self-initiated repair that supplies the argument “Gym” (as a piece of sports clothing that are typically worn when going to the gym) (see line 5).

The telling sequence ends with the punchline that a person cannot be brought back to life if the person doesn't know the exact date and time of birth. As a result of this lack of knowledge, the thread or 'fishing line' with which that person can be pulled out of the underworld cannot be found (line 55).

06 P2 你話佢邊個日子啱.
nei5 waa6 keoi5 bin1 go3 jat6 zi2 ngaam1
you-say-he-which-day-correct
How do you know which ((birth)) day is correct.

07 P4 係咯.
hai6 lo3
is-y
Mhm.

08 P2 都唔知係阿媽啱(.)就政府啱.
dou1 m4 zi1 hai6 aa3 maa1 ngaam1 zau6 zing3 fu2 ngaam1
all-not-know-is-mother-correct or-government-correct
((You)) don't know if mom or the government is right.

((line 9 to 54 omitted, see appendix for full transcript))

55 P3 | 哎(.)搭錯線咗=
aai1 daap3 co3 sin3 zo2
y connect-wrong-line-Vg
Oops, got the wrong line ((to bring a person back to life)).
|((gestures pulling in a fishing line))

56 P1 =| 唔係你唔係你 °哈哈°=
m4 hai6 nei5 m4 hai6 nei5 haa1 haa1
is-not-you-not-is-you laughter
Not you, not you, haha.
|((shaking hands; smiles))
|((P4 smiles))
|((P2 smiles, then opens mouth, possibly in-breath; puts hand on the table))

57 P2 =| 如果我唔知道又係情有可原㗎係咪?
jyu4 gwo2 ngo5 m4 zi1 dou6 jau6 hai6 cing4 jau5 ho2 jyun4 gaa2 hai6 mi1
if-I-not-know-also-is-have excuse-y-is-not
If I don't know ((my birth date)), that can be excused, right.
|((puts both hands on table, palms facing up))

58⇒P2 因為我係買返嚟㗎嘛,
jan1wai4 ngo5 hai6 maa1 faan2 lai4 gaa2 maa3
because-I-is-buy-come-back-y-y
Because I was bought ((as a kid)).

59 P2 又唔係我阿爸生嘅[.]點知?
jau6 m4 hai6 ngo5 aa3 baa1 saang1 ge3 dim2 zi1
also-not-is-my-father-give birth how-know
And it wasn't my father who gave birth to me, how to know?
|((P4 nods))

60 P4 [°>哦<°
ngo4
y
Uh.

61 P4 係咯.

hai6 lo3
is-y
Mhm.

62 P2 佢又係唔知嘅,
keoi5 jau6 hai6 m4 zi1 ge3
he-again-is-not-know-Vg
And he also doesn't know.

63 P2 佢講幾時咪幾時啦(.)
keoi5 gong2 gei2 si4 mi1 gei2 si4 laa1
he-say-what-time-is-not-what-time-y
He says a time and then that's the time.

After P3 has described and gestured an action of bringing a person back to life, the telling sequence comes to an end (line 55 and 56).¹⁵ Laughter ensues and she smiles. P4 also smiles. In overlap with this turn, P2, the mother, first smiles, then opens her mouth, possibly in preparation to start speaking, and puts her hands on the table. Latched-on to P1's laughter, she then begins to speak (line 57): "If I don't know ((my birth date)), that can be excused, right". In the context of the previous talk (line 6 - 8), it is clear that the "not knowing" here refers to her not knowing her exact birth date. Using the idiomatic expression *cing4 jau5 ho2 jyun* ("excusable" or "something can be excused considering the circumstances"), she describes her lack of knowledge as something that is excusable due to dire circumstances - formulating an assertion that in this environment makes a response relevant. Interactionally this TCU may also constitute an assessment in that it asserts the argument of 'being excusable' to the established knowledge that P2 does not know her own birth date. The assertive character of this TCU is also evident in P2's use of a TCU-final *hai6 mi1* ("isn't it; right").¹⁶

The utterance of this TCU is accompanied by an interactionally relevant hand gesture that consists of two parts. P2 first moves both hand from under the table to that they are over the table and visible to her interlocutors. As she utters the turn, she then moves her hands up and down slightly before she turns both hands around simultaneously, palms facing upwards (see video). This gesture actually spans over the production of this TCU and the following *janwai* TCU.

At line 58, she then produces a *janwai*-TCU: "Because I was bought ((as a kid))". Beginning with the token *maai2* ("bought") an increase in volume is noticeable. This part of the TCU coincides with the part of the hand gesture where she turns her palms upwards. Based on this prosodic and gestural evidence, it is evident that this part of the TCU is emphasized. Interactionally, this emphasis may be evidence that P2, at this point, presents this information as something that is of relative importance, possibly even as newsworthy (although it is not known whether the other participants were previously in possession of this piece of information).

Then she goes on and says (line 59): "And it wasn't my father who gave birth to me, how to know", providing additional details related to the circumstances of why she does not know her birthday.¹⁷ This TCU comes to a possible end after *saang1 ge3* ("giving birth") and, after a micropause, she adds *dim2 zi1* ("how to know; who knows") follows. This extension constitutes another piece of information that is also related to the request. The unfolding of the action can be summarized as follows:

- Line 57: Requesting environment becomes evident through use of idiom "*cing4 jau5 ho2 jyun4*" ("can be excused; circumstances make something excusable")
- Line 58: *janwai*-clause brings up *why* it can be excused, providing support or justification for the

¹⁵Elaborating on the scene evoked by P3 of 'pulling a wrong thread', she says (line 56): *m4 hai6 nei5 m4 hai6 nei5* ("Not you, not you"), accompanied by a shaking hand gesture.

¹⁶One of the uses of this token is to seek affirmation or agreement, especially when produced, like in this case, with a rising intonation.

¹⁷Notably, P2 will later come back to the topic of the father, who is brought up here for the first time.

immediately preceding claim made.

- Line 59: Additional information provided related to the rationale as topic of father is brought up.
- Line 59: Post-completion extension brings up another piece of information that makes relationship even clearer *dim2 zi1* (“how to know; who knows”)

In overlap with P2’s turn in line 59, P4 then begins a response that consists of three parts, a nodding gesture (line 59), then a short acknowledgment token *ngo4* (“uh”) in line 60 and finally the production of an affirmative token in line 61. What follows after this excerpt is further elaborative work by P2 related to the topic (line 62-64).

In summary, what is sequentially observable in this example is the unfolding of a sequence that begins with P2’s building of an initiating action that makes a response relevant (line 58). This request is formulated as an assessment of her own situation of not knowing her birth date. The assessment makes an affirmative or agreeing response relevant (that is eventually produced by P4 in line 59-61). As a second part of the action formation sequence, at line 58, P2 then goes on and utters a *janwai*-TCU that brings up a possible reason and a larger rationale related to the request. The supply of this information coincides with the use of prosodic and gestural cues that may constitute an emphasis of this information. The third part of the action sequence is another TCU (line 59) that brings up further (related) information and ends with a post-completion extension that supplies another part of relevant information.

6.2.2 Section summary

This section looked at cases where a *janwai*-clause is produced in an ‘in-one-go’ fashion after a preceding initiating action. Excerpt (16) “You need to wash” features a request for compliance/agreement and Excerpt (17) “Bought as a kid” features a request for understanding/agreement. Both excerpts feature a relevant response to these initiating actions by the participants. Looking at the sequential unfolding of action formation and responsive action, a couple of observations can be made. In both cases, the *janwai*-TCU is produced as part of the unfolding of a larger activity. More specifically, the Excerpt (16) “You need to wash” displays a trajectory towards increasing specificity that follows the formulation of a request for compliance. Sequentially, this incremental supply of information preceded the relevant response, raising the possibility that the producer of the initial action may have opted for a *janwai* clause as part of a strategy to make the action as overt as necessary in order to achieve his/her relevant interactional goals. Data excerpt (17) “Bought as a kid” shows a similar pattern. Here, the initial action of requesting agreement/understanding is first formulated and an incrementally unfolding sequence that elaborates and makes the request ‘more understandable’ follows. The *janwai*-clause is part of this sequence. In both examples the speaker, together with the other participants, collaboratively manages the successful formulation (and ascription) of the initiating action through opting for TCUs in a way that the information provided is reflexively tailored to be understandable as related to the initiating action. *Janwai* is part of this joint effort.

6.3 Other patterns: Formation of ‘back-tying’ involving *janwai*

This section discusses another pattern that has recurrently emerged in MYCanCor data. The use of *janwai* to tie the conversation back to a preceding topic or action. These are examples of the use of *janwai* TCUs or clauses does not seem to be related to the immediately preceding turn but to a preceding action or a topic that was mentioned earlier. This practice is referred to as ‘back-tying’.

6.3.1 Data discussion

The first excerpt is from a conversation between two participants sitting in a park that has already been discussed in the data excerpt “Work after graduation” in Chapter 4, which examined a question-response sequence (line 1-8) that features the use of *janwai* as part of the response. This sequence is reprinted here and extended to include another instance of *janwai* that immediately follows the previously discussed sequence.

(18) Data Excerpt: “Doing research” (partial reprint of “Work after graduation”) || MYCANCOR 023 (04:11-04:31)

To recap, the two female participants (P1 and P2) have just met for the first time but have friends in common and are from the same city in Malaysia. Prior to the beginning of this abstract, they have been talking about past life events, specifically their educational background and employment history.

01 P2 嘅 你做咩工啊(.)>之後<.
ee2 nei5 zou6 me1 gung1 aa1 zi1 hau6
y you-do-what-work-y after
Eey, what did you do for work - afterwards ((after graduating from uni))?

02 P1 之後:我就嚟::呃::NPU呃,
zi1 hau6 ngo5 zau6 lai4 aak1 NIE aak1
after-I-just-come-y nt y
Afterwards, I just began at, mhm, NPU ((name of university)), mhm.

03 P1 NPU係[我讀書個邊.
NPU hai6 [ngo5 duk6 syu1 go2 bin1
nt-is-I-study-over-there
NPU is ((that institution)) where I studied.

04 P2 [> 嗯 嗯 嗯 嗯 嗯 <
ng2 ng2 ng2 ng2 ng2
y-y-y-y-y-y
Mhh,mhh,mhh,mhh,mhh.

05 P1 呃(.)我去個度做research assistant咯.
aak1 ngo5 heoi3 go2 dou6 zou6 research assistant lo3
y I-go-over-there-do-research assistant-y
Mhm, I went there to work as a research assistant.

06⇒P1 因為我[一直一畢業,
jan1 wai4 ngo5 jat1 zik6 jat1 bat1 jip6
because-I-straight-once-graduate
Because I always, once I graduated,

(cont) 我就做我就想做research[嘅::[°xx°關係=
ngo5 zau6 zou6 ngo5 zau6 soeng2 zou6 research ge3 xx gwaan1 hai6
I-just-do I-just-want-do-research-Vg xx-related to
I did, I just wanted to do research, something related to x.

07 P2 [↑哦:
ngo4
y
Mhm.

08 P2 [哦 係咯
ngo4 hai6 lo3

y is-y
Mhm, yes.

- 09 P2 =>因為<我有(.)之前我有friend都係讀psychology,
jan1wai4 ngo5 jau5 zi1 cin4 ngo5 jau5 friend dou1 hai6 duk6 psychology
because-I-have-before-I-have-friend-also-is-study-psychology
Because I have this friend who also studied psychology,
- 10 P2 即係唔知做乜嘢:.
zik1 hai6 m4 zi1 zou6 mat1 je5
exactly-is-not-know-do-what
Who just didn't know what to do.
- 11 P2 >除咗做research之外<哈哈.
ceoi4 zo2 zou6 research zi1 ngoi6 haa1 haa1
beside-do-research-beside laughter
Besides doing research, haha.

P1, who is a couple of years older than P2, asks a question about the details of P1's first job after graduating from university with a degree in psychology (line 1). In line 2-8, P1 then response to this question and supplies a relevant response in line 5 and follows up with a *janwai*-prefaced account related to the response. In line 7, in overlap with P1, P2 then utters an *ngo4* ("Oh") token, possibly signaling information receipt, doubt or a change-of-state (see previous discussion for details). After that, in line 8, P2 says *ngo4 hai6 lo3* ("Mhm, yes"), producing an affirmative response that is a relevant response and possibly brings the question-response sequence to an end (that stretches from line 1 to 8). What follows next is a *janwai*-prefaced TCU.

At line 9 and 10, latched-on to P1's talk in line 6, P2 says: "Because I have this friend who also studied psychology who just didn't know what to do", bringing up the topic of a friend who studied the same major as her interlocutor.¹⁸ Looking at the sequential unfolding of the talk from line 1 - 10, it is evident that P2 here brings up a *janwai*-prefaced account for why she asked the why-question in line 1.¹⁹ This is interesting because, in contrast to the previously discussed examples, the *janwai* clause does topically not relate to the immediately preceding turn or TCU but accounts for a larger action sequence that spans over some time.

In summary, P2 uses a *janwai*-prefaced clause (line 9 -10) to do elaborative work on a whole preceding question-response sequence in contrast to mainly elaborating on the immediately preceding TCU. This shows that *janwai*-prefaced accounting sequences may be used to account for talk that goes beyond the immediately preceding TCU or turn as well. Compared to the previously discussed examples it can be observed that this instance of a *janwai*-prefaced account brings up information that relates to not only the previous TCU but to a larger preceding sequence which interactionally may be used to bring the conversation back to a larger preceding action. This practice may be described as 'back-tying' using *janwai*-prefaced accounts.²⁰

Here is another excerpt featuring a *janwai*-prefaced TCU that ties the conversation back to a previous action.

¹⁸In more detail, she first utters a sped-up *janwai* followed by a *jau* ("have") clause that features a self-initiated repair. The turn consists of two clauses, with the main clause ending after "psychology". This *zik1 hai6* ("precisely, exactly")-prefaced clause related to the topic of the friend supplies additional information related of how the topic of the friend is related to her question.

¹⁹This is evident topically in that both her interlocutor and her friend study the same major (psychology). Interactionally, line 10 brings up a possible reason of *why* P2 asked the question in line 1.

²⁰In this example, this practice also involves the use of membership categories. Prior to the beginning of the excerpt, it has been established that P2 studies "psychology" (04:04), which makes her a member of a membership category of "psychology graduates that P1 knows" (see MYCANCOR 023 04:00-05:00). The 'back-tying' *janwai* clause in line 9 then refers back to this category by bringing up another member of it.

(19) Data Excerpt: “Days off” || MYCANCOR 008 (00:00-00:40)

The excerpt shows a conversation between two participants, older sister (P2) and younger brother (P1), who sit at a table. The conversation has just begun and no prior information related to the topics that come up have previously been shared. At the beginning of the excerpt, the two talk about P1’s job. Specifically, they are talking about the amount of vacation days that P1 has left this year. Up to this point, no additional information related to the topic has been brought up.

- 01 P2 你剩返幾耐假?|(0.5)
nei5 zing6 faan2 gei2 noi6 gaa3
you-have-left-Vg how-many-holidays
How many holidays ((days off work)) do you have left?
|((puts phone near P1))
- 02 P1 |我?(1.8)
ngo5
r
Me?
|((looks at phone then up))
- 03 P1 兩個:拎咗:::(0.8)一日(0.5)兩日(0.5)
loeng5 go3 ling1 zo2 jat1 jat6 loeng5 jat6
two-q take-already one-day two-day
Two have been taken. One, two.
- 04 P1 過年應該兩日=
gwo3 nin4 jing3 goi1 loeng5 jat6
new year should two-day
((Chinese)) New Year should be two days.
- 05 P2 =你一年[有幾多日].
nei5 jat1 nin4 jau5 gei2 doi jat6
you-one-year have-how-many-day
How many days do you have a year?
- 06 P1 [xx =>十五日<=
xx sap6 ng5 jat6
xx five-ten-day
xx Fifteen.
- 07 P2 =十五日:日(0.2)
sap6 ng5 jat6
ten-five-day
Fifteen days.
- 08 P2 之後::(.)過年你攞開幾多日=
zi1 hau6 gwo3 nin4 nei5 lo2 hoi1 gei2 doi jat6
after new year you-take-away-how-many-day
How many days did you take off after ((Chinese)) New Year?
- 09 P1 =我帶開四日過來啊嘛.
ngo5 daai3 hoi1 sei3 jat6 gwo3 loi4 aa1 maa3
I-bring-over four-day-over-come-y-y
I brought four days over ((from last year)).
- 10 P2 你帶咗四日過來::.=
nei5 daai3 zo2 sei3 jat6 gwo3 loi4

- you-bring-already-four-day-over-come
You brought four days over ((from last year)).
- 11 P1 | = 恩
 ng2
 y
Yes.
 | ((nods))
- 12 P2 > 跟住 < (0.3)
 gan1 zyu6
 then
Then.
- 13 P1 四日 (0.2) 加多兩日 > 一日用 XXX < 即係 > 我哋可以一日啫 <.
 sei3 jat6 gaa1 do1 loeng5 jat6 jat1 jat6 jung6 XXX zik1 hai6 ngo5 dei2 ho2 ji5 jat1 jat6 ze1
 four-day add-vg-two-day one-day-use xxx then-we-can-one-day-y
Four days plus two days. One day for XXX. Then we can ((use)) one day.
- 14 P2 你拎開一日 [恩恩
 nei5 ling1 hoi1 jat1 jat6 ng2 ng2
 you-take-away-one-day y-y
You took one day off? Yes.
- 15 P1 [跟住 XXX 啲啲又加返呢
 gan1 zyu6 XXX go2 di1 jau6 gaa1 faan2 nei
 then xxx r c-add-Vg-y
Then XXX we add that back.
- 16 P1 所以我仲有 好多日㗎 (0.2)
 so2 ji5 ngo5 zung6 jau5 hou2 do1 jat6 gaa2
 so-I-still-have very-many-day-y
So I still have a lot of days.
- 17 P1 > 十 [五日 <.
 sap6 ng5 jat6
 five-ten-day
Fifteen days.
- 18 P2 | [其實係幾多日.
 kei4 sat6 hai6 gei2 do1 jat6
 actually-is how-many-day
So how many days do you actually have left?
 | ((raises hand and turns palms upwards; looks at P1))
- 19 | (0.4)
 | ((P2 looks up, then on her phone))
- 20 ⇒ P2 因為: (0.2) 如果媽 | 咪係::: 下個月出嚟嘅話,
 jan1 wai4 jyu4 gwo2 maa1 mi1 hai6 haa6 go3 jyut6 ceot1 lai4 ge3 waa6
 because if-mother-is next-q-month-out-come-if
Because if mother is coming over next month,
 | ((looks at phone))
- 21 P2 你應該冇攞假=
 nei5 jing3 goi1 mou5 lo2 gaa3
 you-should-no-take-holiday
You ((probably)) wouldn't take any leave.

- 22 P1 =冇啊=
 mou5 aa1
 no-y
 No.
- 23⇒P2 =因為你冇假用嘛|. (0.4)
 jan1 wai4 nei5 mou5 gaa3 jung6 maa3
 because-you-no-holiday-use-y
Because you can't take any days off.
 |((P1 looks at P2))

After a longer pause, P2 says (line 1): “How many holidays ((days off work)) do you have left?”, bringing up “holidays” as a new topic in form of a how-many question. P1 responds: “Me? Two have been taken, One, two”. Interestingly, P1 first responds with *ngo5* (“me”) with a rising intonation. Given that no other participant is present at that time, this response design is possibly not, a request for confirmation of him as the addressee of the question, as the utterance level formulation might suggest. Interactionally, this utterance possibly seeks for clarification using a repair-request token serves to delay the actual response to the question, possibly signaling reluctance or some sort of resistance to do so.²¹ Then he responds to the question: “Two have been taken. One, two.” He starts to count and produces several pauses as this TCU unfolds. These pauses possibly signal difficulties to retrieve the required information to produce a relevant response, but, at the same time, signal that P1 has engaged the topic and is now ‘working on’ producing the response. What ensues from here is a sequence stretching from line 3 to line 17 during which both participants jointly ‘calculate’ and exchange pieces of information in order to reach a relevant response (see transcript).

At line 16 and 17, P1 eventually produces a ‘final’ response: “So I still have a lot of days (0.2) fifteen days”. Beginning with a *soji* ((consequential) “so”), he concludes that he has *hou2 do1 jat6* (“a lot of days”) left. Then, after a 0.2 seconds pause, he specifies the amount of days as “fifteen days”. Overlapping this part, P2 asks: “So how many days do you actually have left?”, displaying that she is not satisfied with the first part of the response (“So I still have a lot of days”) and seeking a more specific answer to her question (that is actually being supplies in overlap). The view that she is not satisfied with the response is also evident in a hand gesture of turning her palm of her right hand upwards, that is a form of communicating a request for elaboration or more information. Since this turn and P1’s previous second part of the response (“fifteen days”) almost completely overlap (see line 17 and 18), this turn is possibly a response to line 16 - without taking the relevant response in line 17 into account.²² What follows is a 0.4 second pause.

In the face of an emerging silence, P2 then produces a *janwai*-prefaced TCU: “Because if mother is coming over next month, you ((probably)) wouldn’t take any leave”, bringing up the (novel) information that their mother is planning to come for a visit. Sequentially, this piece of information is directly related to her previous question in that it provides a possible reason of why P2 asked the question in the first place - it provides a possible motive. In this sense it accounts for what has happened previously, possibly relating to both the immediately preceding repeated question and as well as possibly tying back to the preceding question-response sequence as a whole. Later on, P2 will develop this topic further as a larger narrative unfolds that revolves around accommodating for their mother’s visit.

In summary, we are seeing here that P1 may have initially been delaying his response in view of or suspecting the possible motivation for P2’s question in the first place. Sure enough, P2 reveals in lines

²¹This view is also evident in P1’s display of some disfluency in the production of the next TCU.

²²This view is also evident in a series of facial gestures. During the production of line 18, P2 looks directly at P1, but after the TCU ends, her gaze shifts upwards (line 19). This gaze shift sequentially coincides with the TRP between line 18 and 19, where P2 evidently decided to not pursue the topic further. Instead, she then looks down towards her phone and a 0.4 second pause ensues. This is where the two-part sequence of action formation (in form a QWI that makes evokes an environment of requesting) and responsive action formation (in form of the production of a relevant response in line 17) is completed.

20-21 that there may have been an agenda, of getting her brother to use some of his leaves to spend time with the mother when she comes to visit). What can be observed here is the use of a *janwai*-prefaced TCU that is used to tie the conversation back to a preceding larger stretch of action sequences as a whole. The *janwai* TCU provides information that is directly related to the preceding request in that clause provides a possible reason and a larger narrative related to it.²³ It is possible that P2's *ngo5* ("me") (line 2) already makes a 'justification' or elaboration of a rationale or reason relevant and that P2's production of such a motivation in form of a *janwai*-prefaced TCU is in this sense a form of responsive action related to such expectations. In this light, the interactional import of the *janwai* TCU in line 20 is an action along the lines of: [Do you want to know why I asked you this question earlier?] Because if mother is coming over next months you can't take leave.

6.3.2 Section Summary

The two excerpts display the use of *janwai*-prefaced TCUs to do elaborative work on a whole preceding action or activity instead of specifically the preceding TCU. By elaborating on something that has happened previously, the *janwai* TCUs tie the conversation back to a previous action, i.e. they serve to 'link' the preceding action to more elaboration related to the topic.

Excerpt (18) "Doing research" displays the utterance of a question-response action pair. After the response has been completed, the participant uses *janwai* to elaborate on an underlying rationale of why she asked the question in the first place, this ties the talk back to the question.

Excerpt (19) "Days off" displays the utterance of a Specifying-question followed by a relevant response. After the response, the questioner produces a *janwai*-TCU to bring up an underlying rationale that accounts for why the question was asked in the first place.²⁴ Here, the response that precedes the account features a display of resistance or reluctance that may invite the production of the back-tying TCU as (contingent to) a responsive action formation (that makes it recognizable).

In summary, the practice of back-tying involving *janwai*-TCUs is a recurrent pattern in MYCanCor that participants use to retrospectively account or elaborate on previous turns, actions or activities (see also Couper-Kuhlen 2011; Li 2016). It seems that such 'post-hoc' elaborations or accounts may be invited by (and are possible produced in response to) displays of resistance or reluctance, i.e. displays that present an utterance as an 'accountable' through making an intelligibility problem or 'lack of understanding' overt.

6.4 Other patterns: The misalignment utterance *m4 hai6* followed by *janwai*

This section discusses the utterance of *m4 hai6* ("No; That's not it") (with or without final particle such as *aa1* or *a1*) followed by a *janwai* TCU) (n=34). As of MYCanCor, these instances are preceded by an initiating action and the production of a relevant response by a participant other than P1 (see (Figure 6.4)).²⁵

²³Compared to the previous example, no reference to membership categories is used as part of the *janwai* clause to make it recognizable as tying back to line 1. What is also different, is that, in this example, the recipient of the request sequentially delays the production of a relevant response, possibly as a display of reluctance or resistance (line 2-3). Possibly against this background of this resistance, P2's back-tie is recognizable as such.

²⁴This *janwai*-TCU also features the use of (ad-hoc) membership categories to facilitate the back-tying.

²⁵This pattern is discussed under the topic of 'action formation' and not 'response action' even though the pattern under study (*m4 hai6* ("No; That's not it") followed by a *janwai*-prefaced TCU) is produced as a response to a previous turn by another participant. This is because in all cases in MYCanCor this pattern evidently ties back to a preceding initiating action by the same participant who will eventually utter the pattern under study. In this sense, the pattern is part of the unfolding of this initiating action rather than the constitution of a 'separate' responsive action.

Figure 6.4: Production of *m4 hai6* followed by *janwai*

P1: Formulation of an initiating action

≠P1: Formulation of a response

P1: 唔係 (*m4 hai6*) / 唔係呀 (*m4 hai6 aa2*) / 唔係啊 (*m4 hai6 a1*) _____.

P1: *janwai* _____.

6.4.1 Data discussion

Consider the following excerpt that displays this pattern.

(20) Data Excerpt: “Winter clothes” || MYCANCOR 015 (04:34-05:30)

Here are two participants, a younger sister (P1) and her older brother (P2), who have just moved in a new flat and are in the process of unpacking boxes in the living room. As of the beginning of the excerpt, P1 is sitting on the floor and takes a piece of clothing out of a plastic box in front of her. It is a thick sweater.

01 P1 | 喂 呢啲冷衫又唔愛著嘅:,
wai3 ne1 di1 laang5 saam1 jau6 m4 ngoi3 zyu3 ge3
y-q-these-cold-cloth-also-not-like-wear-Vg
Hey, these winter clothes, ((you)) don’t wear ((them)).
|((takes a piece of clothing out of a box))

02 P1 °你冇著°=
nei5 mou5 zyu3
you-not-wear
You don’t wear ((them)).

03 P2 =咩唔愛著啊平時:.
me1 m4 ngoi3 zyu3 aa1 ping4 si4
what-not-like-wear-y normally
What ((do you mean I)) don’t wear them, normally-

04 P1 唔係呀:..
m4 hai6 aa1
not-is-y
No ((that’s not it)).

05⇒P1 因為係咪(.)冬天嘅衫,
jan1 wai4 hai6 mi1 dung1 tin1 ge3 saam1
because-is-not-winter-Vg-clothes
Because, right, ((these are)) winter clothes.

06 P1 我放落一個::大袋嘢.
ngo5 fong3 lok6 jat1 go3 daai6 doi6 je5
I-put-down-one-q big-bag-thing
I put ((them)) in a big bag ((with the big bag things)).

07 P2 放袋度咩你放嗰邊度=
fong3 doi6 dou6 me1 nei5 fong3 go2 bin1 dou6
put-bag-there-what you-put-q-there
Put them in a bag. You ((can)) put them over there.

08 P1 =大袋°嗰°因為嗰啲全部都係冬天嘅衫嚟嘅.
daai6 doi6 go2 jan1 wai4 go2 di1 cyun4 bou6 dou1 hai6 dung1 tin1 ge3 saam1 lai4 ge3

big-bag-q because-q-these-all-is winter-Vg-clothes-come-Vg
 ((In the)) big bag. Because that's for all the winter clothes.

- 09 P1 但係呢個又=
 daan6 hai6 ne1 go3 jau6
 but-is-this-q-also
But isn't this one also-
- 10 P2 =衫房啦衫房都冇位冇嘢放°=
 saam1 fong4 laa1 saam1 fong4 dou1 mou5 wai2 mou5 je5 fong
 wardrobe-y wardrobe-all-not have-c not have-thing-put
 ((The)) wardrobe ((changing room)), the wardrobe is full, can't put ((it)) there.
- 11 P1 =但係呢個又冬夏唔冬夏咁喔
 daan6 hai6 ne1 go3 jau6 dung1 haa6 m4 dung1 haa6 gam3 ak1
 but-is-that-q-also-winter-summer-not-winter-summer-so-y
But this one is also for winter and summer.
- 12 P1 睇吓你有冇掛住呢?
 tai2 haak3 nei5 jau5 mou5 gwaa3 zyu6 ne1
 look-Vg-you-have-not-have-miss-y
Let's see ((if)) you will miss is.
- 13 P2 °放住.°
 fong3 zyu6
 put-Vg
Put ((it away)).
- 14 P1 你發燒咁著呀嘛.
 nei5 faat3 siu1 gam3 zyu3 aa1 maa3
 you-have fever-then-wear-y-y
Wear it when you have a fever.
- 15 P2 發燒(.)發燒唔開冷氣咪得咯.
 faat3 siu1 faat3 siu1 m4 hoi1 laang5 hei3 mi1 dak1 lo3
 have fever-have fever-not-turn on-air con-is ok-y
A fever? ((When I)) have a fever ((I)) just don't turn on the Air-Con.

Looking at the sweater, she begins a turn (line 1): “Hey, these winter clothes, ((you)) don't wear ((them))”. She begins with an attention-getter *wai3* (“hey”) directed at P2, who is currently in another corner of the room and who is the only other person in the flat at the time. Then she adds another TCU: “You don't wear”, but stops as P2 begins to respond.²⁶

Latched-on, P2 responds (line 3): “What ((do you mean I)) don't wear normally”, beginning with a turn-initial *me1* (“what”).²⁷ P2 here seeks to ‘calling into question’ of some aspect of the question, constituting some form of misunderstanding (or possibly even disagreement). Intonationally and sequentially, this is evident in the rather forceful (latched-on) turn-uptake, as well as in P2's turn design choices of

²⁶The turn features a *m4 ngoi3* (“don't like”) clause that brings up the topic of *laang5 saam1* “clothes for cold weather or winter clothes” that P2 does not like to wear. Looking at the utterance level only, it is at this point sequentially not quite overt what kind of action P1's turn in line 1-2 constitutes. Consider the following three options: (1) As P1 is unpacking the boxes, this turn may be a comment on the item she is holding in her hands that makes no response relevant, an instance of an informing sequence. (2) The *m4 ngoi3* (“don't like”) clause may also be seeking for agreement in the sense of an ‘assessment’ (with no further implications). (3) Or, P1 may seek for more than agreement, such as for a permission to do something with this piece of clothing. Based on sequential evidence, at this point, all these possible action ascriptions are equally overt. Considering the sequential evidence up to this point and the larger context of the preceding ongoing activity of unpacking boxes, no clear distinction between the three options seems evident that could aid action ascription.

²⁷This *me1* (“what”) interrogative reiterates the verb of the previous clause (*m4 ngoi3* (“don't like”). The turn is uttered latched-on to P1's (possibly incomplete) TCU in line 2.

beginning the TCU with a turn-initial *me1* (“what”), followed by the reiteration of the verb token *m4 ngoi3* (“don’t like”) that P1 used in the preceding turn, then followed up with a *aa1* particle (here used as a form of exclamative marker; Chor 2018). After the particle, the turn ends with the production of the token *ping4 si4* (“normally”) that may either be a post-grammatical completion extension or it may be the beginning of another TCU, but since P2 then stops to speak as P1 begins a new turn, this is unclear.

At line 4, P1 then says: *m4 hai6* (“no; that’s not it”), uttering a negative response and possibly signaling some form of misfit regarding the previous turn. Then she goes on and utters a *janwai*-prefaced TCU: “Because, right, ((these are)) winter clothes, I put ((them)) in a big bag ((with the big bag things)), put them in a bag, you ((can)) put them over there”.²⁸ What follows the *janwai* further elaborates on what exactly has constituted the ‘misfit’ that P1 has previously pointed out in line 4, it elaborates on *why* there has been a misunderstanding. In this sense it accounts for why she has pointed out a misunderstanding earlier.

Through bringing up this information here, P1 also elaborates on her previous turn in line 1-2. In the light of the information that is available now, the action formation that unfolded in line 1-2 becomes more understandable in retrospect. P1 has now made evident that she indeed would like to distribute the sweater to a specific location (the big bag). Based on this information, her ‘assessment’ now coincides with the activity to decide where the sweater will be put. In this light, the ‘assessment’ turns into a recognizable request for agreement (and permission) of where to put the sweater she is holding in her hands. This could, for instance, be a location where she puts all items that the two not frequently use or a collection of items that are for cold weather etc. In retrospect, it is now evident that she has been seeking to collaboratively make the decision of where to put this piece of clothing - she is seeking for P2’s consent. This view of line 1-2, however, only becomes evident through the information that is supplied as part of the *janwai* clause in line 5-6.

In summary, the unfolding action sequence in the vicinity of the *janwai* clause can be described as follows. P1 formulates an action that is subsequently not recognized as intended by her interlocutor (line 1-3). To signal this misalignment, P1 then utters a *m4 hai6* (“no; that’s not it”)-token that points out the misalignment and makes further attendance to it relevant. As part of a *janwai*-initial TCU, P1 then goes on and supplies further information in service of making her initiating action more overt. Similar to a repair sequence, based on the information produced as part of the *janwai*-prefaced account, another action ascription of the initiating action becomes overt in retrospect.

Here is another excerpt that displays the pattern.

(21) Data Excerpt: “Hot spring” || MYCANCOR 012 (12:20-13:03)

This excerpt is from a conversation between wife (P1) and husband (P2), taking place in a restaurant over a cup of tea. Both have been talking for a while and, immediately preceding the beginning of the excerpt, recount a visit to hot spring spa together with friends. Typically, such hot springs in Malaysia feature a variety of pools that differ in temperature. P1 also mentioned that one of the friends at the spa did not cope well with the hot water (see full transcript). Related to this incident, P1 then goes on and proposes a strategy of how to adapt to the hot water - by entering a less hot pool first for a while before moving on to the hotter ones.

- 09 P1 其實其實應該我哋去浸開個個,
 kei4 sat6 kei4 sat6 jing3 goi1 ngo5 dei2 heoi3 zam3 hoi1 go2 go3
 actually-actually-should-we-go-soak-open-that-one
 Actually, actually ((he)) should ((go to)) that one where we usually go first,
- (cont) 比較冇咁熱嘅先,
 bei2 gaau3 mou5 gam3 jit6 ge3 sin1
 relatively-not-have-that-hot-y-first

²⁸ *Dung1 tin1 ge3 saam1* (“winter clothes”) is similar to P1’s previous formulation of *laang5 saam1* in line 1) and *daai6 doi6* (“big bag”) as a location of where this piece of clothing will be put.

the one that is not so hot.

- 10 P1 =至去浸個好熱嘅唉=
zi3 heoi3 zam3 go2 go3 hou2 jit6 ge3 aa1
until-go-soak-that-one-very-hot-y y
And then go to the really hot one ((sigh)).
- 11 P2 =嗯
ng2
y
Mhm.
- 12 P1 如果唔係呀 哎唷.
jyu4 gwo2 m4 hai6 aa1 aa1 jo1
if-not-is-y y-y
If not, uuuh.
- 13 P1 一下就落熱嘅好咩嘢㗎?
jat1 haa6 zau6 lok6 jit6 ge3 hou2 me1 je5 gaa2 ngo4
suddenly-d-drop-hot-y-like-that-y-y
Suddenly going into ((the)) hot ((water)), really ((what)).
- 14 P2 xx熱就好熱嘅
xx jit6 zau6 hou2 jit6 ge3
xx-hot-just-very-hot-y
xx hot, really hot.
- 15 P2 一陣嚟就唔覺㗎啦,
jat1 jat1 zan6 syu3 zau6 m4 gok3 gaa2 laa1
one-one-time-y just-no-feeling-y-y
For some time you won't feel ((hot)).
- 16 P2 一落 一落開就唔覺㗎囉(.)
jat1 lok6 jat1 lok6 hoi1 zau6 m4 gok3 gaa2 ak1
if-drop if-drop-start-d-no-feeling-y
Once, once you are in ((the water)) for a while you won't feel ((hot)).
- 17 P2 係咯.
hai6 lo3
is-y
Mhm.
- 18 P2 哇咁熱啊點頂啊九十度啊
waa1 gam3 jit6 aa1 dim2 ding2 aa1 gau2 sap6 dou6 aa1
y so-hot-y how-cope-y nine-ten-degree-y
Woah, so hot, how to cope ((with the heat)), 90 degrees.
- 19 P1 九十熱度啊?
gau2 sap6 jit6 dou6 aa1
nine-ten hot-degree-y
90 degrees.
- 20 P2 呢 個度 個地下寫著九十度啊嘛.
aak1 go2 dou6 go3 dei6 haa6 se2 zyu3 gau2 sap6 dou6 aa1 maa3
y-over-there that-place-down-write-Vg nine-ten-degree-y-y
Yes, over there, on the floor it says 90 degrees.
- 21 P1 淥熟你啊. 呵呵呵.

- luk6 suk6 nei5 aa1 hehehe
boil-hot-you-y laughter
You ((are)) boiling, haha.
- 22 (3.0)
- 23 P2 浸開嚟(.) >係<松啲啊.
zam3 hoi1 lai4 hai6 song1 di1 aa1
soak-Vg-come is-relaxed-little bit-y
After soaking ((in the water)) for a while it ((gets)) more comfortable.
- 24 P1 唔係呀 (.)
m4 hai6 aa1
not-is-y
No.
- 25⇒P1 因為你你浸開冇咁熱嘅先
jan1wai4 nei5 nei5 zam3 hoi1 mou5 gam3 jit6 ge3 sin1
because-you you-soak-start-not-have-so-hot-y-first
Because you you soak in the less hot one for a while first.
- 26 P1 你俾你個|啲
nei5 bei2 nei5 go2 di1
you-give-you-that
You let your-
|((points at her arm))
- 27 P2 皮膚啊=
pei4 fu1 aa1
skin-y
Skin.
- 28 P1 =皮膚啊適應咗[啲啲。而唔係。
pei4 fu1 aa1 sik1 jing3 zo2 go2 di1 ji4 m4 hai6
skin-y adapt-Vg-that-so-is-not
Skin adapt ((to the heat)), rather than.
- 29 P2 [一膨脹收縮啊咁樣
jat1 paang4 zoeng3 sau1 suk1 aa1 gam3 joeng6
if-expand-contract-y-like that
((The skin)) expands and contracts.
- 30 P1 你一下咁熱喂噃.
nei5 jat1 haa6 gam3 jit6 wai3 jo1
you-suddenly-so-hot y-y
((If)) you suddenly go ((into the hot water)), uhhh.

In line 9 - 10, P1 says: “Actually, actually we should go to and soak in that one first, that is not so hot, and then go soak ((in)) the really hot one”. This proposal unfolds in two TCUs and ends with an *aai*-token (line 10) that expresses an emotional state related to regret or sadness (approximate to what would be expressed with a “sigh” in English). Her husband, P2, then produces a latched-on acknowledgement or information receipt token *ng2* (“mhm”). What ensues from here is a series of turns during which both participants further elaborate on various aspects of the incident.²⁹

In line 23, P2 picks up on the topic of the friend who felt uncomfortable and says: “After soaking ((in the water)) for a while it is more comfortable”, proposing a strategy of how to cope with the water

²⁹Relevant to the remainder of the excerpt: P2, in line 16, brings up that after soaking in such hot water for a while, one wouldn’t feel anything anymore.

temperature.³⁰ In response to this proposed strategy, (or to reiterate her earlier view), P1 says: “No, that’s not it”, signaling disagreement or a misunderstanding. Then she adds a *janwai*-prefaced clause: “Because you, you soak in the less hot ((one)) for a while first”, proposing an alternative strategy. This TCU proposes a different view - namely to just stay in the water until one doesn’t feel anything anymore, which makes it ‘more comfortable’, thereby accounting for *why* P2’s previous utterance is deemed as problematic and a different line of reasoning is provided. What ensues from here is more talk by P1 that constitutes further elaboration on this strategy.

In summary, this excerpt displays the following action-sequential properties:

- Position 1: Formulation of an activity as a solution to a perceived problem (proposal of a strategy) (line 9-10).
- Position 2: Formulation of another proposed activity related to the same problem (alternative strategy) (line 15-16 and line 23).
- Position 3: *m4 hai6* (“no; that’s not it”) display of disagreement or misunderstanding (possibly rejection) that makes an accounting sequence relevant of ‘why’ this is the case (line 24).
- Position 4: *Janwai*-prefaced TCU as the first TCU of this elaborative sequence. Restatement of the initially proposed strategy followed by further elaboration and pointing the recipient to a different line of reasoning. (line 25-30).

6.4.2 Section Summary

Based on the discussion of these two excerpts, the following observations can be summarized. Both excerpts feature a relevant initiating action by the same participant who also utters the *m4 hai6* (“no; that’s not it”)-token and the *janwai*-prefaced TCU. In both cases the *m4 hai6* (“no; that’s not it”) is interactionally related to this initiating action. In the “Winter clothes” excerpt this initiating action is (as it will become clear later) a request for permission related to the larger ongoing activity of unpacking boxes.

In response to this initiating action, *m4 hai6* (“no; that’s not it”) is used as a negative response token that seems to do more than, for instance, saying “No” in English. In addition to a negative token, this token points a misalignment out that ‘misses the point’ and displays a diverging action ascription is produced. This use of *m4 hai6* (“no; that’s not it”) seems to be somewhat similar to, for instance, uses of the Korean response token *ani* (“No”) in that it can point out a misalignment or misunderstanding (Yang 2002; Yoon 2010; Kim 2016). This use may then be followed up with a *janwai* clause that accounts for this and that, with regards to the initiating action, may serve as a way to ‘adjust’ the interaction back to other aspects related to the initial action.

In comparison, the “Hot spring” example also features a relevant initiating action in form of the proposal of a ‘coping strategy’ for soaking in hot water. The misalignment in this example becomes evident through the formulation of a different or alternative ‘coping-strategy’. The *m4 hai6* (“no; that’s not it”)-token points this misalignment out as part of a subsequent rejection and reiteration of the initial strategy (beginning with the *janwai* clause).

Generally, *m4 hai6*, used as a token of signaling misalignment, seems to have a relatively high (socially) disruptive potential. This is evident in the high level of rapport between both participants in both examples. The presented excerpts are from ‘causal’ conversations between husband and wife as well as boy- and girlfriend. In fact, as of MYCanCor, all examples that feature this pattern are from

³⁰He utters a turn-initial *zam3 hoi1 lai4* (“soaking for a while”) and then this turn unfolds as a *hai6* (“to be”)-clause with the other argument being *song1 di1* (“more comfortable”).

conversations between participants where a high level of rapport is expected. However, even in such environments of high rapport, this token makes work of accounting for the caused disruption conditionally relevant. Through pointing out a perceived misalignment with *m4 hai6* (“no; that’s not it”), the collaborative nature of the ongoing interaction comes under scrutiny along the lines of: “Why did you do this?” “How is this display of misalignment warranted?” Related to addressing such potential ‘ruptures’, a *janwai*-prefaced clause seems to be a tool that MYCanCor participants recurrently opt for in order to retrospectively account for this ‘rupture’ and present it as more reasonable or understandable.

6.5 Other patterns: *Janwai* following an initiating action and a *me1* final particle

This section looks at cases where the following three-part structure is evident. The formulation of (1) an initiating action that is followed up by another participant with (2) a turn that ends with a final-particle *me1* (咩), which is then followed by (3) a *janwai*-prefaced turn (see Figure 6.5). This is a recurring pattern in MYCanCor (n=8).

Figure 6.5: Production of final particle *me1* followed by *janwai*

P1: Formulation of an initiating action

≠P1: _____ **final particle *me1* (咩).**

P1: *janwai* _____.

The pattern is discussed as part of action formation and not responsive action, because, as of MYCanCor, the sequence involves an initiating action to which both the *me1*-clause and the *janwai*-clause seem to be related - similar to a repair. On a more micro level, the *me1* clause and the *janwai*-clause may of course also constitute a question-response sequence in itself.

6.5.1 Data discussion

Here is the first excerpt that displays this pattern.

(22) Data Excerpt: “Paid survey” || MYCANCOR 026 (02:15-02:21)

This is from a conversation between two university students (P1 and P2). Both sit on a couch on a university campus and have been talking for some time. After a longer pause, P1 brings up a new topic.

- 01 P1 你唔覺得以後做研究愛俾錢好多嘅咩?
 nei5 m4 gok3 dak1 ji5 hau6 zou6 jin4 gau3 ngoi3 bei2 cin2 hou2 do1 ge3 me1
 you-not-think-later-do-research will-give-money-very-much-u-y
Don’t you think when doing research later, ((you’ll)) be given lots of money?
- 02 P2 係咩?
 hai6 me1
 is-y
Is it?
- 03⇒P1 因為有係咪你成日睇到成日(.)睇啲survey啊,
 jan1wai4 jau5 hai6 mi1 nei5 sing4 jat6 tai2 dou3 sing4 jat6 tai2 go2 di1 survey aa1
 because-have-is-not you-whole day-see-Vg all-day-see-q-u-survey-y
Because aren’t there, you always see, always see these survey ((ads)),
- (cont) paid survey啊有睇過冇?

paid survey aa1 jau5 jau5 tai2 gwo3 mou5
 paid survey-y have have-see-Vg-not-have
paid surveys, didn't you see?

04 P2 我有我去嗰啲assessment咪xxx=
 ngo5 jau5 ngo5 heoi3 go2 di1 accessment mi1 xxx
 I-have I-go-that-q-accessment-is-not-xxx
I have. I went to that assessment, right xxx.

05 P1 =啊 你去 你去嗰個xx睇入低有好多paid survey,
 aa1 nei5 heoi3 nei5 heoi3 go2 go3 xx tai2 jap6 dai1 jau5 hou2 do1 paid survey
 y-you-go you-go-that-q-xx-see-Vg-Vg-have-very-many-paid-survey
Yes, you went, you went to that xxx, did you see there are many paid survey ((ads)),

(cont) 咩咩咩survey(.)然後全部都係俾人哋錢幫人做survey.
 me1 me1 me1 survey jin4 zi1 hau6 cyun4 bou6 dou1 hai6 bei2 jan4 dei2 cin2 bong1 jan4 zou6 survey
 what-what-what-survey afterwards-all-is-give-people-u-money help-people-do-survey
this and that survey, afterwards they all give money to the people to help them with the surveys

06 P2 係咯 你個publish個嗰paper(.)you will(.)佢有鑄賺㗎啦:.
 hai6 lo3 nei5 go3 publish go3 go2 paper you will keoi5 jau5 leoi4 zaan6 gaa2 laa1
 is-y you-q-publish-that-q-paper you will he-have-money-earn-y-y
Yes, ((when)) you publish your paper, you will, they get paid for it.

At line 1, P1 says: “Don’t you think when doing research later, ((you’ll)) be given lots of money?”, asking for an opinion and/or agreement. In response, at line 2, P2 says: *hai6 me1* (“is it?”), uttering a next-turn repair initiator that seeks for elaboration. At line 3, P1 engages the repair request and says: “Because aren’t there, you always see, always see these survey ((ads)), paid surveys, didn’t you see”, supplying more information that is related to the initiating action. P1 produces a *janwai*-prefaced account that illuminated a rationale of why she thinks that doing research brings a lot of money. Interactionally, this accounting sequence constitutes a relevant response to the preceding repair initiator and, at the same time, is topically relation to her earlier turn in line 1. In line 4, P2 then says: “I have, I went to that assessment, right xxx”, producing an affirmative response to the last part of P1’s preceding turn (“Didn’t you see”). Then he goes on and talks in more detail about a location (“the location of the assessment”) where he has seen posters looking for research participants (line 6-9).

In summary, this excerpt displays the use of a turn-initial *janwai* somewhat similar to those discussed in Chapter 4. However, in this excerpt, the *janwai*-turn is uttered in response related to a preceding repair initiator and related to a preceding action. This excerpt differs from the previously discussed uses of the turn-initial *janwai* in that the participants elaborate on their own previous talk (following the repair request). The *me1* (咩) repair initiator constitutes an action that seeks for elaboration on some aspect of the preceding talk. In this sense it interactionally serves a similar function to a why-type question - it seeks a telling response or an account for something. This repair initiator is treated similar to a why-type question by the participant, it is followed by a turn-initial *janwai* that elaborates on an underlying rationale (related to the initiating action).

Here is another example that displays the pattern.

(23) Data Excerpt: “Pioneer” || MYCANCOR 011 (03:28-03:43)

This is from a conversation between three friends (P1, P2 and P3). Sitting in an office in Singapore, P1 and P3 talk about who moved from Malaysia to Singapore first. Prior to the beginning of the excerpt, P3 has been asking several question in order to find out when P1 moved to Singapore.

01 P3 你::: form five之後過咗嚟啊.
 nei5 form five zi1 hau6 gwo3 zo2 lai4 aa1
 you form five after-over-Vg-come-y

You came over after form five ((school grade)).

- 02 P1 form five之後:冇,
form five zihau6 mou5
form five after-not
After form five, no.
- 03 P1 form five之後仲有讀(0.2)讀college咯diploma咯.
form five zi1 hau6 zung6 au5 duk6 duk6 college lo3 diploma lo3
form five-after-still-have-study study-college-y diploma-y
After form five I also studied studied in college, for a diploma.
- 04 P3 哦:::
ngo4
y
I see.
- 05 P1 之後咪過咗嚟咯.
zi1 hau6 mi1 gwo3 zo2 lai4 lo3
after-u-over-Vg-come-y
After that you came over.
- 06 P3 so你係pioneer嚟㗎你 哈哈 先鋒 哈哈,
so nei5 hai6 pioneer lai4 gaa2 nei5 haa1 sin1 fung1 haa1 haa1
so-you-is pioneer-come-y you laughter pioneer laughter
So you are the pioneer haha pioneer haha.
- 07 P3 你仲早過我哋.
nei5 zung6 zou2 gwo3 ngo5 dei2
you-still-early-over-us
You are still earlier than us.
- 08 P1 即係係咯我哋呢班=
zik1 hai6 hai6 lo3 ngo5 dei2 ne1 baan1
still is-y we-this-class
Should be, yes, our class.
- 09 P3 =恩=
ng2
y
Yes.
- 10 P1 =小學嚟講應該[係。呢度]。
siu2 hok6 lai4 gong2 jing3 goi1 hai6 ne1 dou6
elementary school-come-study-should-is-there
((You went to)) elementary school over there, right.
- 11 P3 [應該係你 你先嚟 我:2006年先到。
jing3 goi1 hai6 nei5 nei5 sin1 lai4 ngo5 2006 nin4 sin1 dou3
should-is-you you first-come me-2006-year-first-arrive
That should be you, you came before me, ((you)) arrived in 2006.
- 12 (1.0)
- 13 P1 06咩=
06 me1
06-y
06, really?

- 14⇒P3 =°06° 因為啊 2006我讀完::STBM啊. (1.0)
 06 jan1 wai4 aa1 2006 ngo5 duk6 jyun4 STBM aa1
 06 because-y 2006-me-study-finish STBM-y
06, because in 2006 I finished STBM ((school)).
- 15 P3 | 嗯 2[005.
 ng2 2005
 y 2005
Mhm, 2005.
 |((P1 nods))
- 16 P1 [咁你嚟幾年啊而家 06.
 gam3 nei5 lai4 gei2 nin4 aa1 ji4 gaa1
 so-you-come-which-year-y now 06
So how many years have you been here, 06?
- 17 P3 11年咯計埋[今年.
 11 nin4 lo3 gai3 maa14 gam1 nin4
 11-year-y total-this-year
This year it's 11 years in total.
- 18 P1 [咁咁你咪仲早過我.
 gam3 gam3 nei5 mi1 zung6 zou2 gwo3 ngo5
 so-so you-u-still-early-over-me
So you came earlier than me.
- 19 P3 係咩?
 hai6 me1
 is-y
Really?
- 20 P1 係咪啊.
 hai6 mi1 aa1
 is-u-y
Isn't it.

At line 6 and 7, P3 then says: “So you are the pioneer haha pioneer ((repeated in Cantonese)) haha, you are still earlier than us”, referring to P1 as a “pioneer” - saying that, out of the three participants, P1 has been the first to settle in Singapore. In this context, line 6 and 7 constitute an assertion that makes a response relevant.

At line 8, P1 then responds: “Should be, yes, our class”, producing a somewhat tentative affirmative response that expresses some degree of doubt. The response is formatted as a turn-initial *zik1 hai6* (“exactly”), a token that may be used to foreshadow doubt, conditional agreement or even a negative response (Zhang and Gao, 2012).³¹ From this point on, an environment of possible disagreement is may be emerging related to the question of whether or not P1 is a “pioneer”. In line 9, P3 says, latched-on, *ng2* (“yes”), and then P1 says (line10): “((You went to)) elementary school over there, right”, possibly beginning to probe whether he really is the “pioneer”. In line 11, P3 then says: “Should be you, you came before me, ((you)) arrived in 2006”, reiterating the assertion that P1 was the first to move to Singapore, in 2006. Then, after a 2 seconds pause, P1 says (line 13): “06, really”, now more directly uttering doubt by reiterating part of the previous turn “06”, followed by a *me1* final particle used as a repair initiator. Latched on to this turn, P3 says (line 14): “06, because in 2006 I finished STBM ((school))”,

³¹In this sequential context, *zik1 hai6* is hearable as a token that raises doubt and may signal the forthcoming of a negative response. The next token *hai6 lo3* (“yes; ok”) constitutes a relevant response, but is in this context hearable as a conditional affirmative response - an affirmative response that also expresses a degree of skepticism.

first reiterating “06” in a soft voice and then adding a *janwai*-prefaced clause that brings up additional (and novel) information that elaborates on what happened in that year (and possibly why he knows that it was that year - it was the year he graduated). And, after one second of silence, he then adds *ng2* (“Mhm”) 2005, repairing the date he mentioned earlier (which possibly does not change his argument of who came first). In overlap, P1 nods and then goes on and goes on to probe who ‘really’ came first (see full transcript).

In summary, the *janwai*-prefaced turn is uttered in an environment of (incipient) disagreement and sequentially follows a repair initiator. The turn elaborates on a rationale behind the utterance that immediately precedes the repair initiator and, at the same time, it elaborates on a larger issue that is at stake (the question who came first). In more detail, it accounts for why 2006 is the correct date of P3’s arrival (which later turns out to be wrong, see line 15) by providing additional evidence of why P3 still remembers the date so well (because it is the year of his graduation).

6.5.2 Section Summary

Both excerpts discussed in this section show that *janwai*-prefaced turns may be produced following a *mel* repair initiator. Both excerpts display the following three-part structure. After (1) an initiating action by a participant, (2) a repair is invited by another participant and, in response, (3) a *janwai*-prefaced TCU or clause is produced. In both examined instances the *janwai*-TCU or clause elaborates on certain aspects of the initiating action and constitutes an account related to aspects of the initiating action by shedding light on a related and novel narrative, piece of evidence or motivation. Sequentially, these cases are somewhat similar to turn-initial *janwai* as part of responsive actions that are initiated by why-type question (see Chapter 4), except that here the speakers elaborate on their own previously formulated initiating actions. Similar to a why-type question, the *mel* repair initiator, as of the examples discussed here, seems to be a way to seek for an account (possibly by displaying a lack of understanding that makes an elaboration on specific aspects of the preceding talk relevant). As discussed in Chapter 4, *janwai*-prefaced turns seems to be a way to engage this kind of request/display.

6.6 Chapter summary

The previous two chapters on responsive action have presented evidence that, through the use of *janwai*, participants seem to display that they have ascribed a certain actions to the previous turn and that, in terms of projectability, *janwai* seems to signal the forthcoming of elaboration that attends to a ‘lack of understanding’ or an account that makes the initiating action more ‘understandable’ (see Chapter 4 and 5).

This chapter shows that participants may also follow up on their own talk by uttering a *janwai* TCU or clause. This *janwai*-prefaced talk may be produced after a pause, in-breath or other signs of disfluency. Section 6.1 shows that such step-by-step or ‘post-hoc’ produced *janwai*-TCUs or clauses seem to be part of interactional functions such as inviting an affirmative response or display of compliance, particularly in an environment of disagreement or a delayed response (see Excerpt (15)). Here, the *janwai* prefaced talk may be part of a trajectory of increasing specificity or overtness in the face of actual or incipient disagreement or ‘resistance’ with regards to a prior action such as a request, instruction or assessment (this is in line with similar observations made for English *because* and Japanese *datte* (Ford 1993; Ford and Mori 1994)). The participants seem to use the *janwai*-prefaced TCU to account for (or even ‘repair’) a prior action retrospectively (by attending to some aspect that is considered in need of further explanation), possibly to invite affirmative responses or in service of achieving other interactional goals (see both Excerpt (14) and (Excerpt (15))).

Section 6.2 examined instances that display an utterance of *janwai*-TCUs or clauses ‘in-one-go’, without any signs of disfluency. These instances seem to unfold in a similar fashion with *janwai* prefacing an elaboration or account related to a prior action, even though these instances do not feature disfluencies that may be treated as a display of ‘seeking elaboration’. Excerpt (16) and (17) shows the use of a *janwai*-

prefaced accounts to make a request for agreement/compliance more ‘understandable’ (and possibly invite agreement).

Furthermore, three related subpatterns were identified in the data set and each discussed in a separate section. The first pattern that has emerged in MYCanCor is the practice of ‘back-tying’ with *janwai* (Section 6.3) - the use of a *janwai*-prefaced TCU or turn to tie the conversation back to an earlier topic or action. Excerpt (18) and (19) display the use of *janwai* to preface an account for a previous action or activity (instead of only the previous turn) (see also Couper-Kuhlen 2011; Li 2016). The section also provides evidence that such account may be encouraged and become relevant after certain turn designs that display reluctance or a ‘lack of understanding’ (see particularly Excerpt (19)).

Section 6.4 examines the use of the misalignment token *m4 hai6* (“no”; “that’s not it”) followed by *janwai*. Excerpt (20) and (21) show that, besides the use of *m4 hai6* (“no”) to utter negative responses, this response token may also be used in the sense of “that’s not what I mean” or “that’s not it” to signal misalignment or misunderstanding (similar uses have been documented for Korean *ani*, see Yang 2002; Yoon 2010; Kim 2016). Following up on such a display of misalignment/misunderstanding, *janwai*-prefaced TCUs may be used to both account for its utterance and present information that elaborates on why its use was warranted. In this environment, *janwai* seems to be a way to present additional elaboration of ‘why’ it was used, thus attending to both face-saving as well as furthering their agenda (‘justifying the use’) (see in particular Excerpt (21)).

Section 6.5 discusses those cases that feature a *me1* next-turn repair initiator followed by a *janwai*-prefaced turn. Excerpt (22) and (23) show that *me1* may be used as a repair initiator that requests elaboration on specific aspects of the preceding turn, similar to a why-type question. The next turn repair sequence that follows may feature a *janwai*-prefaced TCU that, similar to a response after a why-type question, prefacing an account or elaborative sequence.

All excerpts discussed in this chapter seem to have in common that some form of actual or ascribed ‘lack of understanding’ (or retrospective treatment as something in need of elaboration) seems to precede the utterance of a *janwai*-TCU or clause. In some cases, such as those where *janwai* is uttered after a display of disfluency, this ‘lack of understanding’ may be evident sequentially, while in other cases, such as the utterance in-one-go, this may not be evident sequentially. Notably, *janwai* seems to be a tool related to the collaborative management and local evaluation of what constitutes a ‘lack of understanding’ and what is treated as ‘in need of explanation’. Comparing the previously discussed environments of building responsive action and those discussed in this chapter, the information that *janwai* prefaced differs in that here the *janwai*-prefaced elaborations accounts seem less projected (or requested) by another participant but rather produced to ‘actively’ ascribe and propose what is to be treated as an ‘accountable’ in the preceding talk, i.e. to reflexively ascribe and propose what it is in the preceding turns or actions that is in need of an account.³²

³²In this sense, *janwai* serves to retrospectively present something as an ‘accountable’ based on a use of the it as a collapsed form of a why-question/*janwai*-response action pair in fashion of what Levinson (1983) called a “conventionalized collapse”. For instance, a *janwai* TCU or clause after an assertion can become a response to an (anticipated) ‘lack of understanding’ and the incipient information request that becomes relevant after the assertion has been uttered.

Figure 6.6: Overview of findings in Chapter 6

- *janwai*-TCUs or clauses can both be added ‘post-hoc’ as part of a step-by-step unfolding of an action or be part of the unfolding of actions in-one-go. These TCUs/clauses seem to preface elaborations or accounts related to the preceding turn.
- *janwai*-TCUs or clauses may also preface elaborations or account for preceding actions that go beyond the immediately preceding turn.
- *janwai*-TCUs or clauses may be uttered after a display of misalignment/misunderstanding formatted with *m4 hai6* (“no”; “that’s not it”) and seem to preface accounts for such a display as well as attend to a possible reason or cause of the display.
- If an initiating action is followed by a *me1* repair initiator, *janwai*-prefaced turns, TCUs or clauses may constitute a relevant next turn and provide accounts related to the repair request.
- as part of action formation action, *janwai* can be used to preface turns, TCUs or clauses that attend to actual or incipient displays of a ‘lack of understanding’ by treating something as an ‘accountable’, i.e. as something ‘in need of explanation’ even though such an elaboration may have not been requested.

7

Other sequential environments

The last of the four empirical chapters, this chapter discusses the use of *janwai* in environments that sequentially differ from those discussed earlier but recurrently appear (at least twice) in MYCanCor (residual cases). Three such sequential environments were identified and each is discussed in a separate section of this chapter.

Section 7.1 discusses the use of the turn-initial *janwai* in settings with three or more speakers. These settings differ in some aspects from those discussed in Chapter 4: (1) Here, the participant uttering *janwai* was not selected as the next speaker. (2) At the time of the utterance of *janwai* three or more speakers are all engaging in the talk, *janwai* is part of a ‘triangular’ turn management. Sequentially these instances feature a similar action-sequential pattern to those previously discussed in Chapter 4.2, *janwai* appears in turn-initial position (see Figure 7.1; n=14).

Figure 7.1: Production of *janwai*-initial turns in three speaker settings

≠P1: Talk by any participant (excerpt P1) in three or more speaker setting
 P1: *janwai* _____.

Section 7.2 examines the use of *janwai* to share a two-part cause-effect relationship. The two-part structure consists of a *janwai*-prefaced TCU and a *soji* (所以) (“so; therefore”)-prefaced TCU that in combination communicate a cause and effect relationship between two utterances (see Figure 7.2; n=12).

Figure 7.2: Production of *janwai* followed by *soji* (“so; therefore”)

P1: *janwai* _____
 P1: *.soji* (“so; therefore”) _____.

Section 7.3 examines the use of *janwai* as part of phrases, i.e. prepositional *janwai* followed by an NP of cause or reason. This use of *janwai* differs in sequential placement and *janwai* does not form part of a *janwai*-initial structure (see Figure 7.3; n=7). *Janwai* does not preface a turn, TCU or clause, somewhat similar to the English prepositional “because of”, “is because” or “this is because”.

Figure 7.3: Production of *janwai* that does not preface a turn, TCU or clause

P1: _____ *janwai* (“because of; this is because”) _____.

Each section examines two excerpts that display the pattern under study followed by a section summary and conclude with a chapter summary.

7.1 Turn-initial *janwai* in environments with three or more speakers

The two excerpts examined in this section show a conversation between more than two speakers (three and four). The *janwai*-initial turn is uttered by a participant who has not been talking in the immediately preceding stretch of the conversation (see Figure 7.1). In both cases the speaker who begins a turn with *janwai* has not been selected as the next speaker (such as, for example, through being asked a question).

Figure 7.1: Production of *janwai*-initial turns in three speaker settings

≠P1: Talk by any participant (excerpt P1) in three or more speaker setting
P1: *janwai* _____.

7.1.1 Data discussion

Here is the first instance of the pattern. The excerpt is from a conversation between three participants that all take turns in rapid succession and partial overlap.

(24) Data Excerpt: “Football shoes” || MYCANCOR 039 (14:37-15:07)

The excerpt is from a conversation between three participants (P1, P2 and P3) taking place in a park. The three male participants talk about the sport “Ultimate Frisbee”, a team sport using a Frisbee somewhat similar to football or rugby. P3 is the only participant who is familiar with the game and has been trying to convince the other two (who seem to be only vaguely familiar with the rules of the game) to give the game a go and try it out. At line 1, P1 agrees to try the game and proposes to have a game together.

- 01 P1 搵日試吓過嚟搞啊
wan2 jat6 si3 haak3 gwo3 lai4 gaau2 aa1
look for-day-try-a little-come-over-play-y
Let’s find a day and come have a try ((playing the Ultimate Frisbee game)).
- 02 P3 [得一場啊
dak1 jat1 coeng4 aa1
yes-one-game-ys
Only a game.
- 03 P2 [又好似又好似好爽咁喔=
jau6 hou2 ci5 jau6 hou2 ci5 hou2 song2 gam3 ak1
again-seems like again-seems like-very-cool-like this-y
Also it seems like, it seems like it’s ((a)) really cool ((game)).
- 04 P3 =好爽嘅=
hou2 song2 ge3
very-cool-y
Very cool.
- 05 P2 [=咁樣
gam3 joeng6
like-this
Like this.

- 06 P3 [你著釘鞋你唔著釘鞋或者冇著鞋。
nei5 zyu3 deng1 haai4 nei5 m4 zyu3 deng1 haai4 waak6 ze2 mou5 zyu3 haai4
you-wear-football shoes you-not-wear-football shoes or-you-wear-no-shoes
You wear football shoes, you don't wear football shoes or you wear no shoes.
- 07 P2 唔著鞋啊。
m4 zyu3 haai4 aa1
not-wear-shoes-y
Not wearing shoes.
- 08 P1 哇::[唔著鞋啊,
waa1 m4 zyu3 haai4 aa1
y not-wear-shoes-y
Wow, not wearing shoes.
- 09 P2 [又得啊:
jau6 dak1 aa1
also-ok-y
((That's)) also OK.
- 10 P1 俾人踩你冚家劇[咯。
bei2 jan4 caai2 nei5 kam2 gaa1 caan2 lo3
by-people-trample-you-fudged up-y
((If)) people step on you((r foot)), you are fudged up.
- 11 P2 [釘釘鞋。
deng1 deng1 haai4
football football shoes
Football shoes.
- 12 P3 冇其它嘢你冇>冇protect啊嘛<=
mou5 kei4 taa1 je5 nei5 mou5 mou5 protect aa1 maa3
not have-other-thing you-not have not-have-protect-y-y
Nothing else, you don't, don't have protection.
- 13⇒P2 =因為佢而家冇=
jan1 wai4 keoi5 ji4 gaa1 mou5
because-he-now-not-have
Because now it doesn't-
- 14 P1 =腳趾好短啊[呢啲
goek3 zi2 hou2 dyun2 aa1 nei di1
toe-very-short-y-you guys
You guys have short toes.
- 15 P2 [唔係因為佢而家冇身體接觸你可以,
m4 hai6 jan1wai4 keoi5 ji4 gaa1 mou5 san1 tai2 zip3 zuk1 nei5 ho2 ji5
not-is because-he-now-not-have-body-contact-you-can
No, because it doesn't have body contact, ((so)) you can.
- 16 P2 如果你有身體接觸唔得,
jyu4 gwo2 nei5 jau5 san1 tai2 zip3 zuk1 m4 dak1
if-you-have-body-contact-not-can
If you have body contact, ((then)) it's not possible.
- 17 P1 大家一齊走[梗,
daai6 gaa1 jat1 cai4 zau2 gang2

everybody-together-go-certainly
While everybody ((is)) running together.

- 18 P3 [著料
zyu3 liu2
wear-xx
Wear xx
- 19 P1 [佢踩到你你卵知啊.
keoi5 caai2 dou3 nei5 nei5 leon2 zi1 aa1
he-trample-Vg-you you-how-know-y
S/he steps on you, how do you know.
- 20 P3 [著梗鞋.
zyu3 liu2 zyu3 gang2 haai4
wear-what wear-Vg-shoes
Wear something, wear shoes.
- 21 P2 咁啊係啦=
gam3 aa1 hai6 lo3
so-y is-y
So, yes.
- 22 P1 =咁啊麻煩啲.
gam3 aa1 maa4 faan4 di1
so-y trouble-some
So, you are in trouble.

After P3 has been explaining the rules of the sport “Ultimate Frisbee”, P1 says in line 1: “Let’s find a day and come have a try ((playing the Ultimate Frisbee game))”, agreeing to set up a meeting to try the game together. The third participant, P2, then also agrees to play the game and that P3 has successfully convinced his interlocutors as everybody agrees to go ahead with the plan (line 2-5). Then P3 moves on to talk about details related to the planning of this event. In line 6 he says: “You wear football shoes, you don’t wear football shoes or you wear no shoes”, proposing three options of what footwear to bring to play the game.

To this, P2 responds (line 7): “Not wearing shoes”, and then, after a short pause (and in overlap with P1) adds (line 9) “That’s also OK”. He begins his turn by repeating one of the proposed candidate options. This repetition may constitute both a possible display of agreement or a marking of this option as something unexpected or in need of further explanation. After a short pause however, he adds *jau6 tak1 aa1* (“((That’s)) also OK”), now formatting an affirmative response specifically targeting the proposed option to play the game barefoot. In overlap with this second part of this response, P1 begins to utter a turn. In line 8, he says: “Wow, not wearing shoes”, beginning with *waa1* (“wow”) that here formats unexpectedness or possibly even surprise, using *waa1* as an exclamation (Rett 2011, 2016; Charlow and Chrisman 2016, chap. 2; for uses that format surprise see also Bybee and Fleischman 1995). At line 10, he goes on and adds: “((If)) people step on you((r foot)), you are fudged up”, bringing up a possible negative consequence of playing barefoot in an exaggerated and humorous fashion. Up to this point, the possibility of playing barefoot has been singled out as something “also OK” by P2 and as something potentially harmful (and funny) by P1. It can be observed that both participants seem to have taken different stances towards the candidate option (playing barefoot), which makes an incipient environment of disagreement evident (Kärkkäinen 2006; for stance-taking in Chinese see also Lim 2011, Lim and Hong 2012).

In overlap with P1, P2 says in line 11: “Football shoes”, possibly beginning a new turn that may pick up on another candidate option that was proposed earlier (line 6), however, he abandons this turn, leaving it unclear what kind of action this utterance constitutes. Then P3 says (line 13): “Nothing else, you don’t, don’t have protection”. This turn seems to be related to the option of playing barefoot, elaborating

that this way the feet “don’t have protection”. Latched-on to this, P2 then utters a *janwai*-initial turn: “Because now it doesn’t”, but stops speaking when P1 begins to speak again (line 14): “You guys have short toes”. In relation to his earlier turn that “made fun” of the option to play barefoot, this turn is also a somewhat humorous utterance that further elaborates on how unreasonable it would be to play barefoot. In slight overlap, P2 begins to speak again (line 15): “No, because it doesn’t have a body contact, ((so)) you can”. He begins the turn with *m4 hai6* (“no; that’s not it”), that not only constitutes a negative response token with regards to the preceding turn but also possibly signals that this is not what he wants to talk about or that there has been a misunderstanding (see Chapter 6.4 for this use of *m4 hai6*). Then he goes on and partly repeats his previous turn and adds that playing barefoot is actually a viable option because the game is played without body contact (which means that the danger of getting hurt is not high). Then he adds another TCU: “If you have body contact, ((then)) it’s not possible”, that contrasts his previous TCU by describing the opposite case of a game with body contact which would then required wearing shoes. After this account on why playing barefoot is a viable option, P1 says (line 17 and 19): “While everybody ((is)) running together, s/he steps on you, how do you know”, also calling this option into question.

In summary, this excerpt displays the use of a turn-initial *janwai* to preface an account. This account is produced in an environment of disagreement that becomes evident after two participant have uttered different views related to a question (or proposal) in line 6. In contrast to the previously discussed excerpts, the *janwai*-initial account is sequentially neither produced directly after a response token (as part of a responsive action sequence), nor occurring directly after a preceding turn by the same speaker (as a second part of an action formation sequence). Instead, it is added after a turn by a third participant, sequentially somewhat separated from the talk that it elaborates on. In this sense, the account constitutes a ‘post-hoc’ action, produced *on-demand* (instead of projected) at a certain point in the sequential unfolding of the talk (Couper-Kuhlen, 2011). This sequential position indicates that the account may be produced after P2 finds himself in a position that is construed normatively as in need of an account, i.e. after he has been ‘made fun of’ for taking a certain stance. Prefacing his account with *janwai*, he then displays that an account has become normatively relevant at this place and that what comes after *janwai* will constitute an account. Notably, in terms of turn design, *janwai* may serve as an early cue in service of enabling the ascription of this type of action.

Here is another instance of a ‘post-hoc’ *janwai*-initial turn.

(25) Data Excerpt: “You are Lala” || MYCANCOR 003 (22:24-22:32)

This is a conversation between four female friends, taking place on a university campus. Prior to the beginning of this excerpt, the girls have been chatting about a Japanese restaurant and P3 recounts a visit to this restaurant and describes the dishes she tried there.

- 01 P3 係有少少海鮮嘅。
hai6 jau5 siu2 siu2 hoi2 sin1 ge3
is have little-little seafood y
They have a little bit of seafood ((at the restaurant)).
- 02 P3 佢有喇喇，
keoi5 jau5 laa4 laa5
r have Lala
They have Lala ((a kind of shellfish popular in Malaysia)),
- 03 P3 =佢有Scallo[p啊:::
keoi5 jau5 Scallop aa1
r have scallop y
They have Scallop.
- 04 P2 [呃:::|XX[XX喇喇好好食。
eeh xx xx laa4 laa5 hou2 hou2 sik6

- y xx xx Lala very-delicious
Ummm xx Lala are very delicious.
 |((turns head to P1))
- 05 P1 [上一拜佢嘅喇喇好食=
 soeng5 jat1 baai3 keoi5 ge3 laa4 laa5 hou2 sik6
 last-time their Lala delicious
Last time their Lala were delicious.
- 06 P2 |=喇喇好食=
 laa4 laa5 hou2 sik6
 Lala very-delicious
The Lala are delicious.
 |((nodding))
- 07 P1 =上一拜佢嘅|喇喇好[大隻.
 soeng5 jat1 baai3 keoi5 ge3 laa4 laa5 hou2 daai6 zek3
 last-time r Lala very-big-q
Last time their Lala were really big.
 |((gestures scallop with both hands))
- 08⇒P4 [因為|你係喇喇咯.
 jan1 wai4 nei5 hai6 laa4 laa5 lo1
 because you are Lala y
Because you are Lala ((lesbian, another sense of this utterance)).
- 09 (0.5)|(1.0)
 |((P3 starts smiling))
- 10 P3 |<唔好理佢>=
 m4 hou2 lei5 keoi5
 do-not-pay-attention-her
Ignore her.
 |((dismissive hand gesture to P4))
- 11 P4 =哈哈[哈哈
 haha haha
 laughter
Haha haha
- 12 P1 [哦
 oo1
 y
Ok.

At line 1, P3 says: “They have a little bit of seafood ((at the restaurant)). They have Lala ((shellfish)), they have Scallop”. ‘Lala’ is the name of a specific kind of shellfish popular in Malaysia. In slight overlap with this turn, two participants (P2 and P1) simultaneously begin a turn (P2 utters *Eeh* (“Ey”) and P1 raises her hand).

Then both utter partially overlapping turns that assess the “Lala” shellfish dish at the restaurant a being *hou2 sik6* (“delicious”). In line 3 and 5, P2 says: “Ey, xx Lala are very delicious, Lala are delicious”. And P1 says (line 4 and 6): “Last time their Lala were delicious”, “Last time their Lala were really big”. While P1 utters this turn in line 6, she also gestures a scallop with both hands. Then, in slight overlap with this turn, P4 begins to speak for the first time in a while. Pointing at P1, she says: “Because you are Lala ((lesbian))”. In Malaysia ‘Lala’ can refer to both the name of a kind of shellfish as well as describe a female homosexual person. While ‘Lala’ has in the previous talk been used in the sense of ‘shellfish’, P4 now uses it to call P1 ‘lesbian’, possibly uttering a joke drawing on this wordplay. What follows is a

1.5 seconds pause during which P3 begins to smile and then says (line 9): “Ignore her”, while making a dismissive hand gesture towards P4. P3 treats P4’s previous utterance as a joke (instead of, for instance, taking offense) and, by going ahead and responding first, possibly proposes that the other participants shall do the same (Glenn, 1989). Then P4 starts laughing in line 10 and P1, the recipient of the ‘tease’, shifts her gaze downward (Drew, 1987).

A couple of things make this a remarkable use of *janwai*. Similar to the previous excerpt, P4 uses *janwai* without having previously uttered any related response token or as part of a response to an account-seeking question. Instead, she begins a ‘freestanding’ action to deliver her humorous assertion that begins with a turn-initial *janwai* and constitutes a rather forceful turn-uptake through the utterance of a stressed *janwai*, a slight overlap with previous talk and through accompanying the turn-uptake with a pointing gesture (see line 7). The turn constitutes a self-initiated *janwai*-prefaced account for ‘why P1 likes the shellfish called Lala’ in the sense that one who is ‘Lala’ (in the sense of ‘lesbian’) may also eat ‘Lala’ (in the sense of ‘shellfish’). The turn appears to constitute an assertion or assessment and is then being treated as a possible joke (or tease) by another participant (P3), but not by the recipient of the utterance (P1).

Similar to the previous excerpt, the *janwai*-turn, in retrospect, presents the preceding turn as normatively or morally in need of an account and, related to this, appears to format more than one ‘main jobs’, i.e. the delivery of the *janwai*-initial account also constitutes a (humorous) assessment of the preceding action. What can be observed here is the formation of an account that ‘doubles’ as an assessment.

7.1.2 Section summary

Excerpt (24) and (25) display the utterance of a *janwai*-initial turn that delivers an account for a preceding action by another participant. In both instances the *janwai*-turn seems to follow an action that is normatively or morally construed as in need of an account. Excerpt (24) shows the utterance of a *janwai*-account after an interlocutor produced a humorous assessment of the speakers’ (the participant that utters the account) previous action. The *janwai*-account seems to become relevant after a tease.

Excerpt (25) shows the utterance of a *janwai*-account after an interlocutor uttered an assessment and the speaker then utters a *janwai*-account that ‘doubles’ as a (humorous) counter-assessment. The *janwai*-account seems to become relevant after the interlocutor has produced a positive assessment using a specific term (that the (humorous) second assessment picks up on). The two excerpts show that *janwai*-accounts may be produced after initiating actions that are normatively or morally deemed accountables (such as being teased or being assessed to have a certain sexual orientation).

7.2 Usage of *janwai* to express cause-effect relations between utterances

This section examines the use of *janwai* to express a cause and effect relationship between two utterances. The pattern under study here is a sequence of a *janwai*-prefaced turn or TCU followed by another turn or TCU that is prefaced by *soji* (“so; therefore”) or English *so* (Figure 7.2). Two excerpts are discussed.

Figure 7.2: Production of *janwai* followed by *so ji* (“so; therefore”)

<p>P1: <i>janwai</i> _____.</p> <p>P1: <i>.soji</i> (“so; therefore”) / <i>so</i> _____.</p>
--

7.2.1 Data discussion

Consider the following data excerpt that displays the pattern.

(26) Data Excerpt: “Penang Hokkien” || MYCANCOR 022 (03:14-03:33)

This is from a conversation between two participants (P1 and P2) that have a casual chat about different varieties of Hokkien (Southern Min) spoken in different cities in Malaysia. Prior to the beginning of the excerpt, P1 has mentioned that she is from the city of Taiping and that the variety of Hokkien spoken there differs from that spoken in other parts of the country.

- 01 P1 好似Penang嘅:佢哋係(.)好Penang嘅福建話.
hou2 ci5 Penang ge3 keoi5 dei2 hai6 hou2 Penang ge3 fuk1 gin3 waa6
seemingly-ns-u-they-is-very-ns-u-hokkien
It seems like Penang’s, they have a very Penang Hokkien ((over there)).
- 02 P1 其它嘅地方係冇嘅.
kei4 taa1 ge3 dei6 fong1 hai6 mou5 ge3
other-u-place-is-not-have-u
Other places don’t have ((it)).
- 03⇒P1 之後:(.)因為(.)我哋太平[係參少少=
zilhou6 jan1wai4 ngo5 dei2 taai3 ping4 hai6 sam1 siu2 siu2
after-because-we-ns-is-add-little-little
And then, because, we ((in)) Taiping are adding a little bit of.
- 04 P2 [| ° 即 ° -
zik1
zik
Zik((but))-
|((points at P1))
- 05 P2 =係咯 你哋比較近Penang嘛.
hai6 lo3 nei5 dei2 bei2 gaau3 gan6 Penang maa3
is-y you guys-relatively-close-ns-y
Yes, you guys ((in Taiping)) are relatively close to Penang.
- 06 P2 [so你哋講嘅福建話[都應該比較近.
so nei5 dei2 gong2 ge3 fuk1 gin3 waa6 dou1 jing3 goi1 bei2 gaau3 gan6
so-you guys-u-hokkien-also-should-relatively-close
So the Hokkien that you guys speak is also relatively close.
- 07 P1 [係 [但係
hai6 daan6 hai6
is but
Yes- But-
- 08 P1 | ° > 唔係呀 < ° (.) 唔一樣(.)
m4 hai6 aal m4 jat1 joeng6
not-is-y not-same
No, it’s different.
|((P1 shakes head))
- 09⇒P1 因為參參到啲咁廣東話 同埋(.)客家.
jan1 wai4 sam1 sam1 dou3 go2 di1 gwong2 dung1 waa6 tung4 maa14 haak3 gaa1
because-add-add-Vg-q-some-cantonese-and-hakka
Because ((we in Taiping)) add some Cantonese and Hakka.
- 10 P2 噃.
ng2
y
Mhm.

- 11 P1 所以(.)係好似有|少少::>dist[ance< already
so2 ji5 hai6 hou2 ci5 jau5 siu2 siu2 distance already
so-is-like-have-little-little-distance-already
So there seems to be a little distance ((difference)) already.
|((gestures distance using one hand))
- 12 P2 [好似有啲rojak=
hou2 ci5 jau5 di1 rojak
like-have-some-rojak
Like a little rojak ((mixed)).
- 13 P1 |=恩.
ng2
y
Yes.
|((P1 nods)) ((P2 smiles and laughs))

At line 1, she says: “It seems like Penang’s ((Hokkien)), they have a very Penang Hokkien ((over there))”, explaining that people in Penang speak Hokkien Chinese in a unique way. She adds (Line 2): “Other places don’t have ((it))” and (line 3): “And then, because, we ((in)) Taiping are adding a little bit of”. Then she stops and leaves this TCU grammatically incomplete as P2 points at her and begins to speak in overlap.

What can be observed up to this point is the utterance of an assertion in line 1-2 that claims that Penang Hokkien is different from that spoken in other places. Following up on this, in line 3, P1 then goes on and adds a *janwai*-prefaced account for why this is the case by bringing up more information on why the Hokkien in Taiping, another city close to Penang, is different.¹ See Chapter 6 for a discussion of this use of *janwai* that prefaces an account related to a preceding utterance. What happens here, however, has not previously been examined. P2 abandons the turn as P2 begins to speak.

In overlap, P2 first utters (line 4): “*Zik1*” (probably the first part of *zik1 hai6* (“actually”)) and then, latched-on to P1’s turn, P2 says (line 5): “Yes, you guys ((in Taiping)) are relatively close to Penang”. Despite the fact that P1 stopped talking before actually saying in what regard Taiping Hokkien differs, P2 begins with an affirmative token “yes” (“*hai6 lo3*”) and then talks about the geographically close distance between the cities of Taiping and Penang. Then P1 goes on (line 6): “So the Hokkien that you guys speak is also relatively close”. P2 utters a possible completion of P1’s previous incomplete clause. To this, P1, in overlap, first uttered an affirmative token (“Yes”) after the first TCU, and, in overlap with the second TCU, says: “but”, signaling the forthcoming of a contrastive utterance using a discourse marker (Schiffrin, 1987). After P2’s TCU has come to an end, she says (line 8): “No, it’s different”, while shaking her head, now uttering a negative response (possibly with regards to P2’s proposed completion of her clause). Then she goes on and partially reiterates her earlier turn, saying (line 9): “Because ((we in Taiping)) add some Cantonese and Hakka”. This *janwai*-initial TCU follows her negative response, but interactionally here seems to be less of an account for the negative response given and more of the beginning of a repair sequence that picks up on her earlier talk that was left unfinished. After an *ng2* information-receipt token, she then goes on and adds another turn: “So there seems to be a little distance ((difference)) already”. Beginning with a consequential *so2 ji5* (“so; therefore”), she says that because of the unique codeswitching with Hakka and Cantonese in Taiping, the Hokkien spoken in this city is different from that in Penang. By bringing up the code switching as the cause of the difference, she points her interlocutor to a different cause and effect relationship that does not involve the geographical difference between the cities. In line 9 and 11, P1 first utters a *janwai*-initial turn that is a partial repetition (of her previous *janwai*-prefaced account) and then adds another *so2 ji5* (“so”)-initial turn that brings up a consequence. The actions unfold as follows:

¹Eventually, in line 9, she will partially repeat this turn and complete it by saying that the people in Taiping “add come Cantonese and Hakka”, which makes the language spoken in Taiping different from that in other places.

- Line 1-2: Formulation of an assertion.
- Line 3: *janwai*-TCU that accounts for the assertion and brings up an underlying rationale - but is abandoned incomplete.
- Line 4-5: Interlocutor proposes a possible completion of the previous line.
- Line 6: Interlocutor uses a consequential *soji* (“so; therefore”) to preface the second part of his proposed completion.
- Line 7-8: Negative response and rejection of the proposed completion by the speaker.
- Line 9-11: Utterance of a two-part cause-effect relationship in two turns, part one prefaced by *janwai* and part two prefaced by *soji* (“so; therefore”).

In summary, this is a remarkable use of two *janwai* TCUs because the first TCU seems to constitute a post-hoc *janwai*-prefaced account similar to the pattern described in Chapter 6 (particularly the step-by-step utterance of a post-hoc account in Chapter 6.1). The main job of the second *janwai*-TCU, however, seems to be the marking of a two-part cause-effect relationship and it does not constitute an account. This move towards expressing a cause-effect relationship using *janwai* takes place in an environment of ‘interactional trouble’, i.e. after a negative response and the rejections of a proposed joint completion.

Here is another instance displaying this pattern:

(27) Data Excerpt: “Volleyball championship” || MYCANCOR 005 (08:44-09:30)

This is from a conversation between two male participants in a domestic setting (P1 and P2). The two have been talking about sports and hobbies for a while. P1, an avid volleyball player, has just told P2 that he would like to participate in an annual competition that is hosted in different countries across Asia every year.

- 01 P1 | 呢都唔知幾時(.)打返波哦
 ee dou1 m4 zi1 gei1 si4 da1 fan1 bo1 ngo4
 y really-not-know what-time play-again-ball y
Eey, I really don’t know when I can play ((Volleyball) again.
 |((points at P1))
- 02 (0.5)
- 03 P1 °好耐冇打咯°
 hou2 noi6 mou5 da1 lo3
 very-long not-play y
I didn’t play for a long time.
- 04 (0.5)
- 05 P2 你講嘅係(.)咩波啊
 nei5 gong2 ge3 hai6 me1 bo1 aa1
 you-talk is what-ball y

Play what again?

- 06 P2 即係(.)[排球
zik1 hai6 paai4 kau4
is volleyball
(I mean) Volleyball.
- 07 P1 [排球(.)哦(0.2)
paai4 kau4 ngo4
volleyball y
Volleyball, mhm.
- 08 P1 哦咩event.
ngo4 me1 event
y what-event
Oh, ((there is)) that ((volleyball)) event.
- 09 (0.8)
- 10 P1 |XXX
|((opens hands))
- 11 P2 唔知|唔知唔知可以唔可以去嗰個咩,
m4 zi1 m4 zi1 m4 zi1 ho2 ji5 m4 ho2 ji5 heoi2 go2 go3 me1
not-know not-know not-know can-not-can go-this-one
I d.. don't don't know if I can go attend that ((event)).
|((points at P1))
- 12 P1 Mak Su=
Mak Su
event name
Mak Su ((the name of the event or locality)).
- 13 P2 =Macau
Macau
place name
Macau.
- 14 P1 Maca ((turns head away))
Maca
Macau
Maca((u)).
- 15 P1 諗(.)今年唔係:嚟::馬來西亞咩?(0.2)
Aai2 gam1 nin4 m4 hai6 lai2 maa5 lai4 sai1 aa3 me1
y this-year not-is-coming Malaysia y
Ey, this year, is ((the event)) not coming to ((taking place in)) Malaysia?
- 16 P2 啊.(.)
aa1
y
Yes.
- 17 P2 |本來係馬來西亞嘅.
bun2 lai4 hai6 maa5 lai4 sai1 aa3 ge3
originally is Malaysia y
Originally it ((would be)) in Malaysia.
|((points at P1))

- 18 P2 >之後<佢哋話(.)
 zi1 hau6 keoi5 dei2 waa2
 after they-say
((But)) then they said.
- 19⇒P2 啊:因為:(.)啊::|before Hong Kong 嗰係唔係=
 aa1 jan1 wai4 aa1 before Hong Kong go2 hai6 m4 hai6
 y because Y before Hong Kong-this is-not-is
Because, mhm, the one before Hong Kong ((in the ranking of hosts)), right.
 |((tapping back of hand))
- 20 P1 =恩.
 ng2
 yes
Yes.
- 21 P2 係Macau (.)
 hai6 Macau
 is Macau
Is Macau.
- 22 P2 之後Macau做唔成就俾Ho[ng Kong做
 zi1 hau6 Macau zou6 m4 cing4 zau6 bei2 Hong Kong zou6
 after Macau-do-not-success just-give Hong Kong-do
But then Macau couldn't do it and just gave ((the event)) to Hong Kong.
- 23 P1 [哦:做先::
 ngo 4 zou6 sin1
 y do-first
Oh, ((Hong Kong)) hosts ((the event)) first.
- 24 P2 啊
 aa1
 yes
Yes.
- 25 P1 到而家|(0.3)之後[咪有可能
 dou3 ji4 gaa1 zi1 hau6 mai1 jau5 ho2 nang4
 to-now after y-just-have-chance
Until now, afterwards, isn't it possible ((that)).
 |((raising hand gesture))
- 26 P2 [by right係Malaysia嘛
 by right hai6 Malaysia maa3
 by right is Malaysia y
According to the order, it ((should be)) Malaysia.
- 27 P2 |所所以個Macau就take over|先
 so2 so2 ji5 go3 Macau zau6 take over sin1
 so this-Macau just take-over first
So Macau is taking over first ((to host the event)).
 |((hand points left)) |((hand points to hand back))
- 28 P1 ↑恩=
 ng2
 y
Yes.

- 29⇒P2 | =因為(.)到佢哋個Turn(0.2)| 啊先至到(.)到Malaysia=
 jan1 wai4 dou3 keoi5 dei2 go3 Turn aa1 sin1 zi3 dou3 dou3 Malaysia
 because to-r that-turn y first-then-to to Malaysia
Because its their ((Macau's)) turn, and after that it's Malaysia's ((turn)).
- 30 P1 =Malaysia.
 Malaysia
 Malaysia
Malaysia.
- 31 P2 | 恩.
 en1
 yes
Yes.
 | ((nods))
- 32 (2.5)
- 33 P1 ((snaps fingers)) 咁(.)去啦::
 gam2 heoi2 laa1
 then-go-y
Then go.

The excerpt begins with P2 bringing up the topic ‘volleyball’, and then, after a repair sequence, he goes on and brings up an “event”, a volleyball championship, that he is considering to attend. Related to this, his interlocutor then asks (line 15): “Ey, is ((the volleyball championship)) not coming to Malaysia this year”. This line constitutes a polar question (a specifying question) about whether or not the event will take place in Malaysia this year. After a 0.2 seconds pause, P2 then responds (line 16, 17 and 18): “Yes, originally it ((would be)) in Malaysia, ((but)) then they said”. After beginning with the affirmative token *aa1*, P2 uses *bun2 lai4* (“originally”) to format a response that points his interlocutor to a forthcoming telling that something has happened and that the event is actually now not going to take place in Malaysia. After this pre-telling, he follows up with an account. First he adds *keoi5 dei2 waa2* (“they said”), presenting the account as a quote. And then, at line 19, he begins: “Because the one before Hong Kong ((in the ranking of places that host the event))”. As P2 begins this TCU he begins to tap different knuckles on the back of one hand with his other hand to evoke an image of a list of items or a ranking.² At this point, the utterance becomes hearable as an elaboration that there has been some change in the ranking order of different places that host the volleyball championship. By tapping different knuckles, he appears to signal such a list and points his interlocutor to some changes. He continues to utter an explanatory telling that unfolds as part of an account related to why the event that should “originally” take place in Malaysia now takes place somewhere else.

Here are the details of this rather complex explanation. After a micropause he goes on (line 22): “But then Macau couldn’t do it and just gave ((the event)) to Hong Kong”, explaining a change of place on the ranking list. In overlap, P1 says (line 23): “Oh, ((Hong Kong)) hosts ((the event)) first”, partially repeating P2’s utterances, possibly to show that he has understood the changes correctly. P2 responds to this with (line 24) “Yes” and then P1 goes on (line 25): “Until now, afterwards, isn’t it possible ((that))”, then abandoning the turn that possibly constitutes a question. Then P2 begins to talk again (lines 26 and 27): “According to the order, it ((should be)) Malaysia, so Macau is taking over first ((to host the event))”. While explaining that Macau ‘overtook’ Malaysia on the ranking list, he moves his hand to the left first and then back to the right afterwards to signal a shift taking place on a scale with two poles. After an information receipt token *ng2* by P1 in line 28, he adds (line 29): “Because it’s their ((Macau’s)) turn, and after that it’s Malaysia’s ((turn))”. This *janwai*-initial turn elaborates on a possible reason of why Macau is ranking before Malaysia, providing an account that possibly also relates back to P1’s earlier

²After a latched-on “Yes” by P1 in line 20, P2 adds (line 21): “is Macau”, grammatically completing the previous turn.

question of whether the event is taking place in Malaysia (line 15) and P2's response that it "originally" should be but is now hosted somewhere else (in Macau) (beginning in line 17). After the *janwai*-initial TCU the response sequence comes to an end as when P1, in line 30, repeats the last part of P2's previous turn: "Malaysia", possibly signaling that he has understood the rather complicated explanation of why Malaysia does not host the event this year. In response P2 nods and says: "Yes". The explanatory response sequence ends after both have signaled understanding.

In summary, the excerpt features two *janwai*-prefaced turns or TCUs as well as a *so*-prefaced TCU that are all part of the explanatory sequence that is uttered in response to a question and delivered after a pre-telling. During the telling sequence the participant utilizes non-verbal behaviour (tapping his knuckles) to aid his interlocutor with the complex explanation. While the first *janwai* prefaced an accounting sequence, the second *janwai* seems to be part of these efforts to deliver the explanation (by 'marking' cause and effect relationships between TCUs) and do not seem to constitute an account for other actions.

7.2.2 Section summary

Two excerpts were discussed that feature a *janwai*-prefaced TCU as well as a *soji*-("so; therefore")-prefaced TCU. Excerpt (26) features a *janwai*-prefaced account of a preceding turn that jointly completed by two participants. However, the jointly completed account is then rejected by the speaker and followed up with a *janwai*-TCU and a *soji* ("so; therefore") that 'mark' a cause and effect relationship between two TCUs. Excerpt (27) also features the use of *janwai*-TCUs to mark cause-effect relationships between TCUs. Here, the *janwai*-TCU is part of a telling sequence which is prefaced by a pre-telling.

Both excerpts display the use of *janwai* to mark cause-effect relationships between TCUs. Notably, this use of *janwai* takes place after a telling or an explanation has previously been made relevant by the speaker. In Excerpt (26) this is done by a negative response that rejects a proposed explanation (and thereby making another explanation relevant). In Excerpt (27) the explanation becomes relevant after a pre-telling (formatted as a *bun2 lai4*-("originally")-prefaced TCU).

7.3 Usage of *janwai* + noun phrase

In addition to *janwai*-initial interactional structures, MYCanCor also features instances where *janwai* does not preface a turn, TCU or clause (n=7). Here, *janwai* occurs as part of a phrase (i.e. followed by a noun phrase). This use of *janwai* is similar to the English prepositional construction "because of" (Figure 7.3). Two such instances are examined here.

Figure 7.3: Production of *janwai* that does not preface a turn, TCU or clause

P1: *janwai* ("because of; this is because")

7.3.1 Data discussion

Here is the first instance of a 'propositional' *janwai*.

(28) Data Excerpt: "Language Problems" || MYCANCOR 005 (08:44-09:30)

This is from a conversation between two participants (P1 and P2) who have a casual chat about their work in the dental care industry. Prior to the beginning of the excerpt, P2 began recounting the visit of an elderly patient and described having difficulties communicating with this patient who spoke Hokkien Chinese.

01 P2 我就完全一粒字我都聽唔明,
ngo5 zau6 jyun4 cyun4 jat1 lap1 zi6 ngo5 dou1 ting3 m4 ming4

I-then-completely-one-q-word-I-all-not understand
I don't even understand a single word,

02 P2 你你你仲要就係個個(.) patient仲係冇牙嘅添喔,
nei5 nei5 nei5 zung6 jiu3 zau6 hai6 go2 go3 patient zung6 hai6 mou5 ngaa4 ge3 tim1 ak1
you-you-you-still-need-then-is-that-q-patient-also-is-not-have-teeth-Vg-y-y
You, you, you still have that patient who also has no teeth,

03 P2 講話仲係漏風,
gong2 waa6 zung6 hai6 lau6 fung1
speak-is-leak-air
and speaks very unclear all the time,

04 P2 我根本就聽唔明佢講梗[啲乜嘢 除非=
ngo5 gan1 bun2 zau6 ting3 m4 ming4 keoi5 gong2 gang2 di1 mat1 je5 ceoi4 fei1
I-basically-just-don' t understand-he-what-things except
I basically can't understand what he says, except-

05 P1 [哦::
ngo4
y
Mhm

06 P1 =家下你聽得到咩?
gaa1 haa6 nei5 ting3 dak1 dou3 me1
now-you-can-hear-y
Now you can listen to it, right?

07 P2 聽到(.)你:如果你識個個語言嘅話,
ting3 dou3 nei5 jyu4 gwo2 nei5 sik1 go2 go3 jyu5 jin4 ge3 waa6
listen-Vg you-if-you-know-that-q-language-if
Yes, if you know the language,

08 P2 你 你識福建話,
nei5 nei5 sik1 fuk1 gin3 waa6
you-you-know-hokkien
You know Hokkien,

09 P2 [你點樣你都知道[佢講梗啲咩嘅嘛.
nei5 dim2 joeng6 nei5 dou1 zi1 dou6 keoi5 gong2 gang2 di1 me1 gaa2 maa3
you-anyhow-you-all-know-he-talk-Vg-what-y-y
You anyhow just know what he is talking about.

10 P1 [大概大概啦 [嗯
daai6 koi3 daai6 koi3 laa1 ng2
roughly-roughly-y y
Roughly. Yes.

11 P2 係啦(.)
hai6 laa1
is-y
Mhm.

12⇒P2 °上次係做得好辛苦咯 就係因為語言問題.°
soeng5 ci3 hai6 zou6 dak1 hou2 san1 fu2 lo3 zau6 hai6 jan1 wai4 jyu5 jin4 man6 tai4
last-time-is-do-Vg-very-tiring-y just-because-language-problem
Last time it was so hard, just because of language problems.

13 P1 恩.
ng2
y
Mhm.

14 P2 如果係廣東話嘅話就簡單咯::.
jyu4 gwo2 hai6 gwong2 dung1 waa6 ge3 waa6 zau6 gaan2 daan1 lo3
if-is-cantonese-is-then-easy-y
If it's Cantonese, then ((it's)) easy.

At line 1, P2 says: “Then I don’t even understand a single word”, recounting difficulties of communicating with this patient. He goes on (line 2 and 3): “You, you, you still have that patient who also has no teeth, ((who)) speaks very unclear all the time”. Then he adds (line 4): “I basically can’t understand what he says, except-”, abandoning the turn as P1 starts talking (line 5): “Now you can listen to it, right”. In response, P1 says (line 7): “Yes, if you know the language”. Then he asserts (line 8 and 9): “You know Hokkien, you anyhow just know what he is talking about”. P1 responds (line 10): “Roughly, roughly, yes”. Then, at line 11, P2 first says “Mhm” and, after a micropause, adds in a soft voice (line 12): “Last time it was so hard just because of language problems” (“*soeng5 ci3 hai6 zou6 dak1 hou2 san1 fu2 lo3 zau6 hai6 jan1wai4 jyu5 jin4 man6 tai4*”). Looking at this turn in more detail, it can be observed that *janwai* does not appear in turn, TCU or clause-initial position. *Janwai* is preceded by *zau6 hai6* (“just” or “just is”) and, in this context, roughly translates to the English prepositional “because of”.

In summary, this use of *janwai* presents the talk that follows as a cause or reason with regards to the preceding utterance, i.e. it presents that the communication with this patient was “so hard” as a result of “language problems”. Here, *janwai* prefaces a phrase but does not preface a clause. The part of the turn that *janwai* presents as a cause or reason is a noun phrase. *Janwai* seems to signal a cause or reason relationship within a clause (instead of signaling a linkage between turns, TCUs or clauses). Interactionally, this turn seems to constitute an ‘afterthought’ in that the turn recounts, summarizes and concludes the participants’ preceding telling. *Janwai* does not seem to preface an account or accounting sequence (beyond the turn or TCU it is part of).

Here is the second instance of this pattern:

(29) Data Excerpt: “Home for Chinese New Year” || MYCANCOR 037 (09:05-09:26)

The excerpt shows another instance of *janwai* as part of a phrase and not in turn/TCU-initial position. This is from a conversation between two female participants, daughter (P1) and mother (P2) taking place in a domestic setting. Prior to the excerpt, P1 has been talking about difficulties she encountered with her employer when trying to apply for holiday leave during Chinese New Year.

01 P1 佢哋啊嗰日同我講話,
keoi5 dei2 aa1 go2 jat6 tung4 ngo5 gong2 waa6
they-y that-day-to-me-say
They said to me that day,

02 P1 你知唔知 xxx 叫我同阿經理傾::.
nei5 zi1 m4 zi1 xxx giu3 ngo5 tung4 aa3 ging1 lei5 king1
you-know-not-know xxx call-me-to-manager-chat
You know xxx told me to speak to the manager.

03 P1 講::睇佢可唔可以俾我過年返.
gong2 tai2 keoi5 ho2 m4 ho2 ji5 bei2 ngo5 gwo3 nin4 faan2
say-look-he-can-not-can-give-me-new year-back
Said ((let's)) see whether he can let me ((go home)) for Chinese New Year.

04 P1 我講冇可能嘅事啊.
ngo5 gong2 mou5 ho2 nang4 ge3 si6 aa1

- I-say-not possible-u-things-y
I said that's not possible.
- 05 P1 放我一個人都有得返,
 fong3 ngo5 jat1 go3 jan4 dou1 mou5 dak1 faan2
 let-me-one person-all-cannot-back
Permit only me, nobody is allowed to go back ((home for CNY)),
- 06 P1 |即係星加坡人都有得返嘅.
 zik1 hai6 sing1 gaa1 bo1 jan4 dou1 mou5 dak1 faan2 ge3
 also-singaporean-also-cannot-back
Even Singaporeans can't go back ((home)).
 |((P2 nods))
- 07⇒P1 咁有可能因為我:.,
 gam3 mou5 ho2 nang4 jan1 wai4 ngo5
 so-not possible-because-me
So it's not possible ((that)) because of me,
- 08⇒P1 如果因為我:而咁樣,
 jyu4 gwo2 jan1 wai4 ngo5 ji4 gam3 joeng6
 if-because-me-so-like-that
If ((it is)) like that because of me,
- 09 P1 即係俾我一個人|返.
 zik1 hai6 bei2 ngo5 jat1 go3 jan4 faan2
 so-give-me-one-person-back
that is to allow only me to go back ((home)).
- 10 P2 過嚟啦:=
 gwo3 lai4 laa1
 come-over-y
Come over.
- 11 P1 =嗯.
 ng2
 y
Mhm.
- 12 P2 係呀個個都吵愛咯.
 hai6 aa1 go3 go3 dou1 caau2 ngoi3 lo3
 is-y that-q-all-quarrel-want-y
Yes, everybody argues that ((they)) also want.
- 13 P1 個個都吵嘅
 go3 go3 dou1 caau2 ge3
 everybody-all-quarrel-u
Everybody argues.

The excerpt begins with P1 recounting talking to a manager about applying for leave. Then, in line 4, she says: “I said that’s not possible”, voicing doubt herself that her request the will be granted. At line 5, she says: “Nobody can go back ((home for CNY))”, beginning to account for why she thinks her request will be rejected. Then she adds another TCU (Line 6): “Even Singaporeans can’t go back ((home))”, elaborating that even employees from Singapore will not be granted such a request. In overlap, P2 nods in a possible display of understanding. Then she adds another two TCUs (line 7, 8 and 9): “So it’s not possible ((that)) because of me, if ((it is)) like that because of me, that is to allow only me to go back ((home))”, and, after a check of understanding by her interlocutor, completes the TCU in line 12: “Yes,

everybody argues that ((they)) also want.”³ As part of this unit, *janwai* is uttered followed by the noun phrase “me” and does not preface a turn, TCU or clause.

In summary, *janwai* here occurs as part of two TCUs and in both instances *janwai* prefaces a noun phrase. Both *janwai* do not preface a turn, TCU or clause and are in both cases followed by “me” (“ngo2”), constituting a unit that is similar to the English prepositional “because of me” that presents “me” as a cause or reason. Here, *janwai* does not seem to preface an account.

7.3.2 Section summary

Excerpt (28) and (29) show a use of *janwai* that seems to differ in both sequential position as well as interactional function from the other instances previously discussed. Sequentially, *janwai* is here followed by a noun phrase and does not preface a turn, TCU or clause. Interactionally, *janwai* in this position seems to present the noun phrase that follows it as a cause or reason in relation to the clause it is part of (instead of constituting a relationship between turns, TCUs or clauses), but does not seem to preface an account related to other actions or turns. In total, MYCanCor features seven instances of this ‘prepositional’ use of *janwai*, making up around 1.4% of all instances in the corpus.

7.3.3 Chapter summary

This chapter examined three sequential environments that have recurrently emerged in the data set, but that each seem to differ from the general patterns discussed in the previous chapters. The first of these residual cases is the utterance of *janwai*-prefaced turns that do not seem to be related to the immediately preceding turn and that are uttered in a three-or-more speaker setting. Excerpt (24) and (25) show that these *janwai*-initial turns constitute accounts that seem to be related to a preceding assessment. Excerpt (24) displays the utterance of a *janwai*-prefaced account after the speaker has been the recipient of a ‘tease’. Excerpt (25) displays the utterance of an assessment by another participant, related to which the speaker then utters a (humorous) *janwai*-prefaced account that ‘doubles’ as an assessment.

Excerpt (26) and (27) display the use of *janwai*-initial and *soji*- (“so; therefore”)-initial TCUs to present a cause-effect relationship between two TCUs. Excerpt (26) shows the utterance of this pattern after a cause-effect relationship proposed by the interlocutor has been rejected. The *janwai*-prefaced TCU is part of an effort to clarify (or even repair) a certain cause-effect relationship. Likewise, Excerpt (27) also shows the use of *janwai*-prefaced TCUs in an environment of an ongoing effort to elaborate a series of causal relationship (after the interlocutor has assumed a K- position). This is evidence that the use of *janwai* to ‘mark’ cause-effect relationships may occur in environments where an explanation has previously been made relevant or is otherwise expected (e.g. after relative epistemic status has been established). In this environment *janwai* does not seem to preface an account.

Last but not least, two excerpts were discussed that examine the utterance of *janwai* to preface noun phrases instead of turns, TCUs or clauses. In contrast to uses of *janwai* as a ‘conjunction’, this ‘prepositional’ use of *janwai* seems to differ in both sequential position as well as interactional use from the previously discussed instances. Excerpt (28) and (29) display the use of *janwai* to present the immediately following noun phrase as a cause or reason within the clause both are part of. Interactionally, *janwai* does not seem to preface an account. This provides evidence that a distinction between *janwai* as a ‘conjunction’ and *janwai* as a ‘preposition followed by an NP of reason or cause’ is also valid in this data set (Lü 1982; Li 2016). Notably, this data set only contains a relatively small number of such ‘prepositional’

³In more detail, P1 first says that it is “not possible” to take days off. Then she adds “because of me” (“*jan1wai4 ngo5*”), saying that it is not possible to get holidays just because she (as a single employee) wants it. After this TCU has come to an end with a stretched me (“*ngo5*”), P1 reiterates part of it in a new TCU (possibly as part of a self-initiated repair) and adds (line 8 and 9: “If ((it is)) like that because of me”, “that is to allow only me to go back ((home))”). She prefaces the first TCU with a “If” and utters the first part of a conditional by saying that “if just she is able to take days off”. Then P2 starts to speak (line 11): “Come over”. P1 responds with *Mhm* (“*ng2*”) and P2 continues: “Yes, everybody argues that ((they)) also want”, beginning her turn with an affirmative token and then adding a possible second part of the conditional by saying that if she gets days off, all other employees would demand the same.

sequential environments. In total, only about 1.4% of all instances display this environment (n=7). See Figure 7.4 for an overview of all findings described in the three sections of this chapter.

Figure 7.4: Overview of findings in Chapter 7

Section 7.1: Turn-initial *janwai* in environments with three or more speakers

- *janwai*-initial turns that preface accounts may be uttered following assessments (or teases).
- such *janwai*-prefaced accounts may account for another participants previous assessment (and constitute a second (humorous) assessment).

Section 7.2: Usage of *janwai* to express cause-effect relations between TCUs

- *janwai*-TCUs can be used in conjunction with *soji* (“so; therefore”) prefaced TCUs to utter a two-part cause-effect relationship between TCUs or clauses.
- in this environment, *janwai* does not seem to preface accounts.
- As of MYCanCor, this use of *janwai* seems to occur in environments where an explanation or clarification of such relationships has previously become relevant.

Section 7.3: Usage of *janwai* + *noun phrase* (“because of”)

- *janwai* + *noun phrase* (or ‘prepositional *janwai*’) seems to differ in sequential position as well as in interactional use from turn, TCU or clause initial *janwai* (*janwai* as a ‘conjunction’).
- In this environment, *janwai* seems to be followed by a noun phrase of cause or reason, but does not seem to preface accounts.
- *janwai* + *noun phrase* makes up for only around 1.4% of all instances of *janwai* use in the corpus (n=7).

8

Conclusion

The preceding four chapters examined how participants deploy *janwai* in everyday conversation. Grounded in real-world data, various ‘sequential environments’ have been identified and discussed. This chapter summarizes the findings of this exploratory analysis and, in doing so, hopefully breaks a little new conceptual ground through showing how *janwai* and the patterns it is part of serve as resources for building turns-at-talk, the formation of actions and the accomplishment of interactional tasks.

8.1 Summary of findings

In the present corpus *janwai* commonly prefaces turns, TCUs or clauses. In fact, it has turned out that this use makes up for around 98% of the total instances of *janwai* in the data set. Only around 1.4% appear in other positions where *janwai* is used as a ‘preposition’ (n=7).¹

These *janwai*-prefaced interactional units are found to occur in two interactional settings, as part of responsive action formats, (i.e. a response to a question) and as part of ostensibly non-responsive action formats (i.e. as part of a speaker’s talk related to their own preceding actions). In both settings, *janwai* commonly prefaces a telling or an account. Chapter 4,5 and 6 present a sequential analysis of why, when and by whom *janwai*-prefaced units are produced and that identified evidence for complex relationships between this utterance and certain actions, activities and interactional tasks. The detailed exploration and explication of these relations and the description of relevance rules that appear to underpin different sequential environments are the main contribution of this thesis.

8.1.1 Overview of sequential environments: *janwai* as part of action formation and ascription

Four more or less distinct sequential environments of *janwai* have been delineated in the corpus, each featuring different sequential properties. In MYCanCor, the participants recurrently use *janwai* as a response token, to preface accounts, to format cause-effect relationships between turns, TCUs or clauses and to present a noun phrase as a cause or reason (see Figure 8.1).

8.1.2 *janwai* as a response token

As part of building a response to a question, *janwai* may be used to signal the forthcoming of a relevant response and as an early display that the preceding initiating action (the question) will be treated as seeking an elaboration, telling or account (see Figure 8.2).

¹For instances of ‘prepositional’ *janwai* and a discussion on differences in sequential positioning and interactional uses between both environments, see Chapter 7.3 and Excerpt (28) “Language Problems” and Excerpt (29) “Home for Chinese New Year”.

Figure 8.1: Overview of four sequential environments of *janwai* in MYCanCor

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>janwai</i> as a response token • <i>janwai</i>-prefaced accounts • <i>janwai</i> to format actions that state cause-effect relation between interactional units • <i>janwai</i> to format noun phrase of cause or reason (propositional use)
--

Figure 8.2: Telling-question followed by Telling-response action pair; from data excerpt (1) "All the desks"

Initiating action:	Responsive action:
乜咁多檯嘅. "What's up with so many desks?"	因為我哋好多 volunteer "Because we ((have)) so many volunteers"
Format: Why-type question Action: Telling-seeking question	Format: Because-prefaced response Action: Telling-response

Relevance rules

Janwai occurs in turn-initial position as part of a question-response adjacency pair. What precedes *janwai* is a turn that constitutes an action that locally makes a telling-response relevant. Following the constitution of a response slot, *janwai* is then produced as the first utterance of formatting a turn-uptake. Notably, I have shown that such *janwai* responses may also be produced after an initiating action that do not not ostensibly format a why-type question or that do not project a response slot and instead are produced as part of a 'self-initiated' turn-uptake that then retrospectively treats the preceding turn as seeking a telling (even though this may not be ostensibly part of the format of the initiating action).

Projectability

In this environment, what follows *janwai* commonly constitutes an elaboration or a telling that is topically related to the preceding question. The utterances that follow *janwai* can display an orientation to an epistemic gradient in that the information that is brought up may to be treated as novel, and that brings up an underlying rationale or larger narrative in relation to the question.² Once owning the floor and having initiated a turn that signalled the forthcoming of a telling, these responses can be expanded at will and may turn into full-blown story-telling sequences. They may also constitute accounts.

²For the relationship between presenting information as 'novel' or previously unknown and orientation to epistemic gradients, see Heritage (2012a): "As noted earlier, the idea that "information" is a key element in communication, motivating and warranting contributions to talk, is not new. But this does not mean that it should be ignored. Conversation analysts, as I have suggested, have repeatedly addressed the conjoined issues of epistemics and "information" in conversation, clearly showing that speakers are sensitive to whether (and how) a turn will be informative for some particular recipient(s), and describing the organization of sequential resources for assuring the informative nature of a turn in advance, and for reassuring that same thing ex post facto." (Heritage, 2012a, p.49)

8.1.3 *janwai*-prefaced accounts

As part of building accounts, *janwai* may be used to preface a turn, TCU or clause that constitutes the beginning of an account or a part of an ongoing accounting sequence. The participants in MYCanCor produce *janwai*-accounts both in service of other actions or to attend to actual or displayed intelligibility problems (see Figure 8.3).

Figure 8.3: Usage of *janwai* to present a preceding turn as in need of an account; from data excerpt (8) "Oily not black"

Action sequence, Part 1:	Action sequence, Part 2:
你要洗你堆衫嘅. "You need to wash your pile of clothes, because you have these long pants for the Gym."	因為你有嗰個 (.)gym> 嗰個 < 長褲.
Format: TCU(1) followed by second because-prefaced TCU(2)	
Action: TCU(1) constitutes an initiating action. TCU(2) constitutes a <i>janwai</i> -prefaced account.	
<i>janwai</i> both presents the first TCU as in need of an account and signals the forthcoming of a relevant account.	

Relevance rules

Janwai-accounts may occur after an initiating action and, in this position, commonly appear after some form of interactional trouble has become locally relevant, sometimes in form of disfluencies, a delayed response or signals of a forthcoming dispreferred response. *Janwai*-accounts also appear to be produced after preceding actions that display divergence from locally relevant shared norms or expectations. Sometimes *janwai*-accounts are elicited after preceding actions have been treated as normatively deviant or 'unreasonable', i.e. they occur as 'responsive accounts' that follow the production of disfluencies, delays or formats that signal resistance. In other cases, however, elicitation may not be sequentially evident.³

Projectability

In MYCanCor, *janwai*-accounts commonly constitute tellings that elaborate on an underlying rationale or larger narrative. The talk that follows *janwai* commonly accounts for why there has been a departure from locally shared norms and expectations. In this sense, accounts commonly attend to an actual or displayed 'lack of understanding', but they may also be produced 'in service' of another action, sometimes produced by the speakers to substantiate this action and to present themselves and their actions as 'reasonable'.

8.1.4 Usage of *janwai* to format cause-effect relations between interactional units

MYCanCor features instances where participants use *janwai* to format actions that state a cause-effect relationship between turns, TCUs or clauses (but that are not accounts). These instances may feature the use of *janwai* TCUs in the vicinity of *soji* ("so; therefore") TCUs, that, as a pair, format sequences that present a two-part cause-effect relationship between utterances. Notably, as of MYCanCor, this use of

³For details see Chapter 6. *Janwai* accounts of similar interaction function may occur after both "step-by-step production" and "in-one-go production", which in fact calls this distinction into question. However, if we abandon this distinction, which accounts are to be viewed as elicited? Based on which sequentially observable formats? This points to an crucial limitation of sequential analysis to investigate what constitutes elicitation and whether it is actually contingent on sequential structure.

janwai occurs in environments where an explanation of such a ‘causal relationship’ has become locally relevant in some form. In fact, the instances of this use in the current data set appear to occur as part of tellings that constitute some kind of repair operation (e.g. Excerpt (26) “Penang Hokkien” and Excerpt (27) “Volleyball championship”).

8.1.5 Usage of *janwai* to format noun phrases of cause or reason

MYCanCor also features instances of *janwai* that preface noun phrases of cause or reason. This use of *janwai* as a ‘proposition’ differs in sequential position from the other sequential environments. Here, *janwai* is followed by the production of a noun phrase, it does not preface a turn, TCU or clause (see excerpt (28) “Language Problems” and excerpt (29) “Home for Chinese New Year”). Generally, this use of *janwai* participates in action formation and ascription in considerably different ways. In fact, no discourse-interactional properties beyond its clause were identified and no relevance rules related to larger interactional units were found. Notably, this use of *janwai* makes up for only 1.4% of all instances of *janwai* in MYCanCor (n=7), thus providing evidence that ‘prepositional’ *janwai* may be less common in everyday conversational settings in comparison to the other described uses.

8.2 Concluding remarks

Out of the around 500 instances of *janwai* in the corpus, around 349 are produced as part of formatting responses to questions, either as response tokens or as part of telling responses. This indicates that, in everyday conversational settings, *janwai* commonly appears to occur as part of response formation. This is remarkable in that it presents a rather different picture of what it is we are dealing with and calls into question whether the study of this item should be conceived of as the study of a ‘causal discourse marker’ at all. In contrast to previous work on such items that largely focused on ‘causal coherence’, i.e. explicit and implicit causal marking, the present data set indicates that the study of *janwai* in fact seems to primarily be intertwined with question-response structures.⁴

As such, the study of discourse-interactional functions of *janwai* has to take its ‘dialogical nature’ into account, examining it as part of the dynamic use of linguistic resources in talk-in-interaction. To this end, this study aimed to provide observations that shed light on the interplay of *janwai* with processes of action formation and ascription. Conceived as a classic conversation-analytic sequential analysis of talk-in-interaction, it took turn formats as proxies for this process and explored the co-construction of turns-at-talk that feature *janwai*. Two broader themes have been found to be related to such turns, formats of question-response pairs and the formation of conversational accounting.

8.2.1 Questions and *janwai* responses

As part of responsive action, *janwai* may appear in different sequential positions. Responses may either begin with *janwai* or a response token may be uttered first and then a *janwai*-prefaced TCU or clause may follow. Responses that begin with *janwai* commonly seem to follow questions that seek some form of elaboration of an underlying reason or larger narrative (see Chapter 4.1). The following observations have been made here.

Janwai-initial responses can become relevant after an initiating action that formats a ‘display of lack of understanding’, sometimes formatted as ‘prototypical’ why-questions but sometimes also through the use of other question designs that may or may not feature question tokens. In short, it appears that any initiating action that is hearable as information-seeking (in that it puts the questioner in a relative K-

⁴Notably, does not deny the use of *janwai* to mark causal relationships, which was in fact also observed here. In terms of discourse-interactional functions, the use of *janwai* to make causal relations ‘explicit’ seems to largely be confined to interactional environments related to repair (see Excerpt (26) “Penang Hokkien” and Excerpt (27) “Volleyball championship”). This does indicate, however, that an a priori conception of these items as ‘causal discourse markers’ does not seem interactionally warranted here. Instead, the focus has to be on response formation.

position) and that is locally treated as a Telling-question (in contrast to a Specifying-question) may be met with a *janwai*-response.

Excerpt (1) “All the desks” and excerpt (2) “Tarnished reputation” show that *janwai*-initial responses are relevant responses to Telling-questions, i.e. *janwai* seems to be part of the ‘projected’ response to such questions. It appears that *janwai* prefaces a telling or elaboration of an underlying rationale or larger narrative in response to the ‘telling-requests’. As part of response formation, the following turns or TCUs then present information that is treated as novel or previously unknown, which may make an orientation to an epistemic gradients evident. Also, *janwai* may serve as a type-conforming response token after why-type questions, i.e. constitute an affirmative response token that signals that the question has been understood as seeking an elaboration and that a relevant elaboration is forthcoming (for a deviant case that provides additional evident for this, see excerpt (5) “What to why”).⁵

As part of action ascription, *janwai* responses may be used to signal attendance to ‘why’ aspects of the preceding initiating action, i.e. display an understanding of the question as seeking an elaboration or telling (see Figure 8.4). Thus *janwai* may also be used as a device to retrospectively subvert original action formation of a preceding turn and ascribe the foregoing turn as seeking an elaboration, telling or account. (see excerpt (3) “Six or nine months” and excerpt (4) “Why do they feel this way”). This

Figure 8.4: Sequential pattern of question-response action pair featuring *janwai*

P1:[Why?]	P2:[Because...]
-----------	-----------------

is evidence that the shared orientation to the two-part [Why?]-[Because...] sequential pattern can be employed both ways, uttering a why-type question may project a *janwai*-preface response (*janwai* is a type-conforming response to such questions in that it signals the forthcoming of a relevant response) and, vice versa, a *janwai*-prefaced response may ascribe the preceding turn as a why-type question (thereby constituting a tool to display a certain action ascription of the preceding turn).

Besides *janwai*-initial responses, the corpus also features response designs where *janwai* occurs as part of responsive action, such as after various polar response tokens. Polar question are questions that seek specific pieces of information and they are often followed up by responses that begin with a relevant (polar) response token that may then followed by a *janwai*-initial TCU. Excerpt (6) “Hiking takes a week” and excerpt (7) “Hire an admin” display the formation of such question-response action pairs and it was observed that the part of the responsive action that is prefaced by *janwai* may either account for the preceding response (for instance if the response is negative or dispreferred) or account for something that goes beyond the question-response action pair (i.e. the *janwai*-TCUs or clauses may address other actions or activities that go beyond the question-response adjacency pair).

Generally, *Janwai*-prefaced parts of responses appear to become relevant after some kind of interactional trouble or a ‘lack of understanding’ has become relevant. This includes cases where the speaker utters a negative and dispreferred response (see excerpt (8) “Oily not black”), responds to a display of surprise (see excerpt (9) “Work after graduation”) or utters a non-conforming response (see excerpt (10) “Are you divorced”). In these environments, *janwai* appears to follow a relevant response (token) and may constitute an account for either the response itself or other locally relevant actions or activities.

8.2.2 Interactional trouble and *janwai*-accounts

Previous studies on accounting practices have found that the production of accounts is related to environments where the participants are departing from some aspects of locally relevant normative and moral expectations (Heritage, 1988). This has also been observed in the present data set. One of the ways con-

⁵This type-conformity between why-type question and *janwai*-prefaced responses is also evident in the use of ‘rhetorical questions’ (as opposed to genuine questions) that feature why-type question tokens and *janwai*-prefaced responses, e.g. *janwai zou6 me1* (“why is that, because”) (see excerpt (11) “Google Maps”, (12) “Poor government” and (13) “Prospering Kampongs”).

versational accounting may be formatted is with *janwai*. Accounts may either be elicited, for instance through a question, or they may be produced by the speakers without any ostensible invitation.

Chapter 6 examined the production of ‘post-posed’ *janwai*-accounts that are either delivered ‘step-by-step’ (accompanied by disfluencies) or ‘in-one-go’ (no disfluencies). It was observed that in environments of disfluency, *janwai* accounts can be ‘added on’ by the participants after some form of interactional trouble has been encountered, such as a dispreferred response (e.g. excerpt (14) “Verifying the tax”) or a delayed response (e.g. excerpt (15) “Puts on airs”). Accounts that are added in-one-go (without disfluencies), on the other hand, appear to be ‘designed’ as part of other unfolding actions and in service of interactional goals, e.g. to substantiate a ‘risky’ request (see excerpt (16) “You need to wash”) or to seek an affirmative response after an assessment (see excerpt (17) “Bought as a kid”). This differentiation between accounts that are ‘added-on’ after some ‘unexpected’ trouble and accounts that are ‘designed’ as part of the formation of an action (possibly because the action is a priori already conceived as risky) has also been observed by Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (2018, p.455-457) and this data set confirm these findings. But there is more. The data not only suggest that there is a connection between accounting practices and the use of *janwai*, but also that more can be said that cuts a little deeper into how accounts become relevant after ‘displays of a lack of understanding’.

It appears that *janwai*-prefaced accounts commonly occur in relation to the turns that precede them and, in this position, seem to be related to a possible ‘early’ ascription of what type of action is forthcoming - an account. Notably, the relationship between ‘interactional trouble’ and *janwai*-accounts seems to work two ways. Accounts may occur after trouble has become locally relevant and *janwai*-prefaced TCUs or clauses are then used to ‘attend’ to a trouble source through, for instance, producing an explanation or telling. Vice versa, a *janwai*-account may also be used to retrospectively present something as ‘troublesome’. It appears that participants may utter *janwai*-accounts (and thereby attend to some form of interactional trouble) even though this was not ostensibly invited by an interlocutor.

The discussed excerpts include both cases. Instances where a normative discrepancy (i.e. a ‘lack of understanding’) was formatted by a speaker who, after doing so, then goes on and provides the *janwai*-account (see excerpt (20) “Winter clothes” and excerpt (21) “Hot spring”).⁶ This also includes cases where the accounts is invited by an interlocutor who points out some form of trouble, such as through the use of a question or repair initiator (see excerpt (22) “Paid survey” and excerpt (23) “Pioneer”).⁷

In other environments, however, the accounts are produced without an invitation. For instance, excerpt (24) “Football shoes” shows that an account may also be delivered after an assessment (or a tease) has been formulated which suggests that a ‘normative discrepancy’ has become locally relevant to which the account orients. (see also excerpt (25) “You are Lala” for a *janwai*-account delivered after an assessment but that has not seem to have been ostensibly invited). These instances show that accounts may not only be produced after were ostensibly invited, but that beginning an account with *janwai* ‘out of the blue’ can also serve to retrospectively present preceding talk or actions as in need of an account.

These ‘forward and backward’ projection properties of *janwai*-accounts can be outlined as a shared orientation towards a two-part structure that I will dub as “[Wanna know why?] [because...]”. Sequentially, this structure can be deployed to both present preceding talk as in need of an explanation or account and, vice versa, to present the talk that is prefaced by *janwai* as a relevant account (see Figure 8.5). In

Figure 8.5: Sequential pattern of presenting a preceding turn as in need of an account using *janwai*

this sense, it appears that the participants use *janwai*-prefaced accounts and their projective properties to

⁶Both excerpt (20) and (21) display a speaker who first makes ‘trouble’ evident through the use of the ‘misalignment token’ *m4 hai6* and then goes on and produces a *janwai*-account him/herself.

⁷Excerpt (22) and (23) display the use of a *me1* (咩) final particle that is then followed up with a *janwai* account by another speaker.

navigate normative properties of their talk, working towards achieving a mutually agreeable solution for various tasks. This suggests that *janwai*-prefaced turns, TCUs or clauses are not only a resource to react to account elicitation but they also allow speakers to present other utterances as in need of an account, i.e. as conduct that is in some form normatively incomplete or deviates from locally shared norms. By virtue of making conduct hearable as an account retrospectively, participants can perpetually display an orientation to the division of what conduct reflexively is (or may become) an accountable and conduct that may not (see also ‘normative attrition’, [Heritage 1988](#), p.139-141).

In summary, two discourse-interactional uses of *janwai*-accounts could be identified. The participants appear to use *janwai*-accounts ‘in service’ of other actions (such as risky requests or assessments) to substantiate the initiating action, and sometimes to present themselves and their talk as ‘reasonable’ (for this use, see excerpt (16) “You need to wash”). Notably, this only becomes possible through relying on the ability to distinguish between what commonly is or can be an accountable and what can not. Based on this, *janwai*-accounts may then also be employed to display an orientation to this distinction. Given that *janwai*-accounts commonly seem to become relevant after preceding actions have reflexively been treated as normatively deviant or ‘unreasonable’ (for this use of *janwai*, see excerpt (18) “Doing research” and excerpt (19) “Days off”), producing a *janwai*-account then offers a way to not only orient to this, but also to retrospectively treat the preceding conduct as in need of an account or even to subvert its original action formation by treating it as an ‘accountable’.

8.3 Further studies

This study has shown that *janwai* participates in intricate and complex ways in the processes of action formation and ascription in talk-in-interaction. Using sequential analysis, some of these complexities have been untangled and different discourse-interactional uses that feature *janwai* have been described. So where to go from here? A possible way in which this type of study can be taken is to enable systematic, ethnomethodological and data-driven descriptions of grammatical constructions grounded in talk-in-interaction. Specifically, this means combining conversation analytic exploratory data analysis with interactional variants of construction grammar (CxG), such as those put forward by [Langacker \(1987\)](#), [Ono and Thompson \(1996\)](#) or [Linell \(2009b\)](#).

In a nutshell, these frameworks aim to capture pragma-semantic knowledge that is linked to specific grammatical constructs and describe this knowledge in form of distinct “constructional schemas” (or grammatical constructions). Here, conversation analytic data analysis can be used to explore this knowledge through observation of how ordinary members commonly use these constructs and what sort of interactional tasks they achieve with them. *In-situ* data analysis can aid the exploration of “situated meaning potentials” tied to the usage of specific constructs ([Linell, 2009a](#), p.99). The central idea of this approach is that no grammatical construction has a completely fixed meaning (or function) that is realized in each usage event, but that meaning/function are best explored through exploration of their “surface form”, as potentials (structured sets of Gibsonian affordances), that combined with a given usage environment yields a “situated function” ([Norén and Linell 2007](#); see also [Goldberg 1995](#)).

As this study has shown, the relation between discourse-interactional functions and their formats have to be described as part of recipient-designed, incremental and co-constructed talk-in-interaction between participants. The sequential links that this item participates to constitute can only be captured through *in-situ* exploration. This is especially true for an item such as *janwai* that commonly occurs as part of building responsive action.

8.3.1 *Janwai* as a responsive construction

This study has described a range of projective and responsive properties linked to *janwai*. Based on this, it seems reasonable to assume that “*janwai* constructions” also possess such projective and responsive properties. An important goal of interactional variants of construction grammar is to capture them, working from concrete usage instances to abstract knowledge representations in the form of constructions.

Given the findings described in this thesis, constructions involving *janwai* would have to characterize by their responsive properties. They would constitute “responsive constructions”, i.e. linguistic formats that encode (local) responsivity (Linell, 2009a, p.100).⁸

The task of the interactional linguist is then to investigate *janwai*-constructs in talk-in-interaction with the goal to identify properties of *x-janwai* responsive construction(s), where *x* signifies the properties that *janwai* is contingent on or interacts with retrospectively. Interactional linguistic exploratory data analysis is used to further investigate various (sequentially-evident) structural dimensions and co-occurring resources. This process of “reverse engineering” aims to identify properties of the constructions by way of investigating the observable, instantiated constructs that are licensed by the construction. Notably, the focus of such an inquiry is the relationship between formats and actions (or doings), not constituent structure per se. “Within an overall dialogical framework, we would like to capture methods, procedures and operations, and more generally: actions and processes. If, then, we try to account formally for grammatical constructions, this is not exclusively a matter of dealing with constituent structure, as in most grammatical theories, including CxG [...], but with methods used by the parties to the interaction” (Linell, 2009a, p.107). In summary, while the goals of such a “constructicography of constructs” are set, many challenges remain - especially related to the design of the product of such an endeavour. To the author’s knowledge, to date, no robust methodology of a constructicography of talk-in-interaction has been developed that has produced an inventory of constructions of satisfactory complexity and scope.

8.3.2 Towards constructicography of talk-in-interaction

Constructicography and most constructicons are still largely designed to describe grammatical properties of (lexical) constructions, not discourse-interactional properties (Lyngfelt et al., 2018). A constructicography of talk-in-interaction, however, has to primarily capture action formation and ascription processes, and grammatical properties (internal structures) only as they become relevant as part of it. This makes it necessary to begin with a qualitative exploratory data analysis that captures interactional uses of “construct instantiations” and then carefully generalizes over the observed patterns. In a second step, the results of such an analysis are usually presented as ‘thick descriptions’, organized as lists of observations that make up entries in the constructicon. In summary, the aim is to bring together constructicography and the empirical study of action formation to propose a corpus-based method to describe properties of lexical constructions as they become relevant during talk-in-interaction.

However, important issues remain unsolved. For instance, the presentation (i.e. formalisation) of the constructicon as listemes is by necessity a gross simplification of the complex and dynamic nature of constructions that participants rely on in real-world talk-in-interaction. In fact, this criticism is valid for most existing constructicons as they are largely organized as listemes that specify one or more attribute-value matrices per construction. This means, to date, they are often mere collections of meta-linguistic descriptions and fall short of representing knowledge in a way that convincingly adheres to the discipline’s cognitive commitment. Fortunately, in recent years more comprehensive language resources of talk-in-interaction have become available (with MYCanCor as a small contribution), which opens up new possibilities to investigate patterns in talk-in-interaction in novel ways. At the forefront of this trend, interactional linguistics will certainly continue to shape future developments of this exciting field.

⁸In more detail, Linell (2009a) defines “responsive constructions” as those where “one can tell from the morpho-syntactic (and prosodic) form of any instantiation that it cannot be the first contribution in the discursive sequence (episode) where it occurs; instead, it is responsive to some prior contribution, and sometimes, this prior contribution too must exhibit a particular form.” (Linell, 2009a, p.100)

References

- Allen, J. and Core, M. (1997). Draft of DAMSL: Dialog act markup in several layers.
- Altenberg, B. (1984). Causal linking in spoken and written english. *Studia linguistica*, 38(1):20–69.
- Antaki, C. E. (1988). *Analysing everyday explanation: A casebook of methods*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Auer, P. (2005). Projection in interaction and projection in grammar. *Text-Interdisciplinary journal for the study of discourse*, 25(1):7–36.
- Auer, P. (2010). Zum Segmentierungsproblem in der gesprochenen Sprache. *InLiSt-Interaction and Linguistic Structures*, 49:1–19.
- Auer, P. (2015). The temporality of language in interaction. *Temporality in interaction*, 27:27.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Clarendon Press.
- Austin, J. L. (1971). A plea for excuses. In *Philosophy and Linguistics*, pages 79–101. Springer.
- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words*. Oxford university press.
- Barth-Weingarten, D. (2013). From “intonation units” to cesuring: An alternative approach to the prosodic-phonetic structuring of talk-in-interaction. *Units of talk: Units of action*, pages 91–124.
- Beach, W. A. (1995). Conversation analysis: “Okay” as a clue for understanding consequentiality. In *The Consequentiality of Communication*, pages 121–162. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc, Inc.
- Biber, D. (2010). *Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Pearson Education India.
- Biq, Y.-O. (1995). Chinese causal sequencing and yinwei in conversation and press reportage. In *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, volume 21, pages 47–60.
- Bühler, K. (1934). *Sprachtheorie: Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*.
- Bunt, H. (2009). The DIT++ taxonomy for functional dialogue markup. In *AAMAS 2009 Workshop, Towards a Standard Markup Language for Embodied Dialogue Acts*, pages 13–24.
- Bunt, H. (2010). *DIS, ISO 24617-2 Language resource management–Semantic annotation framework (SemAF), Part 2: Dialogue acts*. International Organization for Standardization, Geneva.
- Bunt, H., Alexandersson, J., Carletta, J., Choe, J.-W., Fang, A. C., Hasida, K., Lee, K., Petukhova, V., Popescu-Belis, A., Romary, L., et al. (2010). Towards an ISO standard for dialogue act annotation. In *Seventh conference on International Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’10)*.
- Bunt, H., Alexandersson, J., Choe, J.-W., Fang, A. C., Hasida, K., Petukhova, V., Popescu-Belis, A., and Traum, D. R. (2012). ISO 24617-2: A semantically-based standard for dialogue annotation. In *LREC*, pages 430–437. Citeseer.
- Bunt, H. and Black, W. (2000). The abc of computational pragmatics. *Abduction, Belief and Context in Dialogue: Studies in Computational Pragmatics*, pages 1–46.
- Bybee, J. L. and Fleischman, S. (1995). *Modality in grammar and discourse*, volume 32. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Carlson, L., Marcu, D., and Okurowski, M. E. (2003). Building a discourse-tagged corpus in the framework of rhetorical structure theory. In *Current and new directions in discourse and dialogue*, pages 85–112. Springer.
- Chafe, W. (1984). How people use adverbial clauses. In *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, volume 10, pages 437–449.
- Chafe, W. (1988). Linking intonation units in spoken english. *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*, pages 1–27.

- Chafe, W. (1994). *Discourse, consciousness, and time: The flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*. University of Chicago Press.
- Chao, Y. R. (1965). *A grammar of spoken Chinese*. University of California Press.
- Charlow, N. and Chrisman, M. (2016). *Deontic modality*. Oxford University Press.
- Chor, W. (2018). Sentence final particles as epistemic modulators in cantonese conversations: A discourse-pragmatic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 129:34–47.
- Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge university press.
- Clark, H. H. and Haviland, S. E. (1977). Comprehension and the given-new contract. *Discourse production and comprehension. Discourse processes: Advances in research and theory*, 1:1–40.
- Clayman, S. E. (2013). Turn-constructual units and the transition-relevance place. *The handbook of conversation analysis*, pages 151–166.
- Clift, R. (1999). Grammar in interaction the case of ‘actually’. *Essex Research Reports in Linguistics*.
- Clift, R. (2001). Meaning in interaction: The case of actually. *Language*, pages 245–291.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. (1996). Intonation and clause combining in discourse. *Pragmatics. Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA)*, 6(3):389–426.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2011). When turns start with because: An exercise in interactional syntax. *Studies in variation, contacts and change in English*, 8.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. and Etelämäki, M. (2015). Nominated actions and their targeted agents in Finnish conversational directives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 78:7–24.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. and Selting, M. (2018). *Interactional linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. and Thompson, S. A. (2000). Concessive patterns in conversation. *Topics in English Linguistics*, 33:381–410.
- Deppermann, A. (2013). Turn-design at turn-beginnings: Multimodal resources to deal with tasks of turn-construction in german. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 46(1):91–121.
- Diessel, H. (2005). *Competing motivations for the ordering of main and adverbial clauses*. Walter de Gruyter.
- Drew, P. (1987). Po-faced receipts of teases. *Linguistics*, 25(1):219–253.
- Drew, P. (2013). Turn design. *The handbook of conversation analysis*, pages 131–149.
- Drummond, K. and Hopper, R. (1993). Some uses of yeah. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26(2):203–212.
- Duque, E. (2014). Signaling causal coherence relations. *Discourse Studies*, 16(1):25–46.
- Duranti, A. (2004). Agency in language. *A companion to linguistic anthropology*, pages 451–473.
- Duranti, A. (2006). The social ontology of intentions. *Discourse Studies*, 8(1):31–40.
- Enfield, N. (2011). 12 sources of asymmetry in human interaction: enchrony, status, knowledge and agency. *The morality of knowledge in conversation*, 29:285.
- Enfield, N. J. (2006). Social consequences of common ground. In *Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, Symposium 134*, pages 399–430. Berg.
- Enfield, N. J. (2013). *Relationship thinking: Agency, enchrony, and human sociality*. Oxford University Press.
- Enfield, N. J. (2014). Human agency and the infrastructure for requests. *Requesting in social interaction*, pages 35–54.
- Enfield, N. J., Stivers, T., and Levinson, S. C. (2010). Question–response sequences in conversation across ten languages: An introduction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 10(42):2615–2619.
- Fang, M. (2012). Discourse structure and emergent meaning of conjunctions. 会话结构与连词的浮现义. *Zhongguo Yuwen 中国语文*, (6):500–508.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1988). The mechanisms of “construction grammar”. In *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, volume 14, pages 35–55.
- Fillmore, C. J., Kay, P., and O’connor, M. C. (1988). Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions: The case of let alone. *Language*, pages 501–538.
- Ford, C. E. (1993). *Grammar in interaction: Adverbial clauses in American English conversations*, volume 9. Cambridge University Press.

- Ford, C. E. (2000). The treatment of contrasts in interaction. *Topics in English Linguistics*, 33:283–312.
- Ford, C. E. (2001). At the intersection of turn and sequence. *Studies in interactional linguistics*, 10:51.
- Ford, C. E. (2002). Denial and the construction of conversational turns. *Complex sentences in grammar and discourse*, pages 61–78.
- Ford, C. E. (2004). Contingency and units in interaction. *Discourse studies*, 6(1):27–52.
- Ford, C. E. and Mori, J. (1994). Causal markers in Japanese and English conversations: A cross-linguistic study of interactional grammar. *Pragmatics. Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA)*, 4(1):31–61.
- Ford, C. E. and Thompson, S. A. (1996). Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. *Studies in interactional sociolinguistics*, 13:134–184.
- Fox, B. A., Hayashi, M., and Jasperson, R. (1996). Resources and repair: A cross-linguistic study of syntax and repair. *Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics*, 13:185–237.
- Fox, B. A., Thompson, S. A., Ford, C. E., and Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2013). Conversation analysis and linguistics. *The handbook of conversation analysis*, pages 726–740.
- Gao, Z. (2013). On the omission of the pre-posed and post-posed ‘yinwei’ and the functional differences between them. 前, 后置“因为”的隐现及功能差异. *Hanyu Xuebao 汉语学报*, 2:57–65.
- Gardner, R. J. (1995). *On some uses of the conversational token mm*. PhD thesis, University of Melbourne.
- Garfinkel, H. (1952). *The perception of the other: A study in social order*. PhD thesis, Harvard University.
- Garfinkel, H. (1963). A conception of and experiments with “trust” as a condition of concerted stable actions. *The production of reality: Essays and readings on social interaction*, pages 381–392.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Prentice-Hall.
- Givón, T. (2005). *Context as other minds: The pragmatics of sociality, cognition and communication*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Glenn, P. J. (1989). Initiating shared laughter in multi-party conversations. *Western Journal of Communication (includes Communication Reports)*, 53(2):127–149.
- Goffman, E. (1959). The presentation of self in everyday life. *New York*.
- Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order*. New York: Basic Books.
- Goffman, E. (1976). Replies and responses. *Language in society*, 5(3):257–313.
- Goffman, E. (2005). *Interaction ritual: Essays in face to face behavior*. AldineTransaction.
- Goldberg, A. E. (1995). *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. University of Chicago Press.
- Goodwin, C. (1994). Professional vision. *American anthropologist*, 96(3):606–633.
- Goodwin, C. (1996). Transparent vision. *Interaction and grammar*, 13:370.
- Goodwin, C. (1997). The blackness of black: Color categories as situated practice. In *Discourse, tools and reasoning*, pages 111–140. Springer.
- Goodwin, C. (2010). Things and their embodied environments. *The cognitive life of things: Recasting the boundaries of the mind*, pages 103–120.
- Goodwin, C. and Goodwin, M. H. (1987). Concurrent operations on talk. *IPrA papers in pragmatics*, 1(1):1–54.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Haspelmath, M. (2006). Against markedness (and what to replace it with). *Journal of linguistics*, 42(1):25–70.
- Hayashi, M. (1999). Where grammar and interaction meet: A study of co-participant completion in Japanese conversation. *Human Studies*, 22(2-4):475–499.
- Hayashi, M. (2004). Projection and grammar: notes on the ‘action-projecting’ use of the distal demonstrative in Japanese. *Journal of pragmatics*, 36(8):1337–1374.
- Hayashi, M. (2005). Joint turn construction through language and the body: Notes on embodiment in coordinated participation in situated activities. *Semiotica*, 2005(156):21–53.

- Helasvuo, M.-L. (2001). Emerging syntax for interaction. *Studies in interactional linguistics*, 10:25.
- Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, pages 299–345.
- Heritage, J. (1988). *Explanations as accounts: A conversation analytic perspective*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Heritage, J. (1998). Oh-prefaced responses to inquiry. *Language in society*, 27(3):291–334.
- Heritage, J. (2010). Questioning in medicine. "Why do you ask?": *The function of questions in institutional discourse*, pages 42–68.
- Heritage, J. (2012a). The epistemic engine: Sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 45(1):30–52.
- Heritage, J. (2012b). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 45(1):1–29.
- Heritage, J. (2013a). Epistemics in conversation. *The handbook of conversation analysis*, pages 370–394.
- Heritage, J. (2013b). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Heritage, J. (2013c). Turn-initial position and some of its occupants. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 57:331–337.
- Heritage, J. and Raymond, G. (2005). The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social psychology quarterly*, 68(1):15–38.
- Heritage, J. and Raymond, G. (2012). Navigating epistemic landscapes: Acquiescence, agency and resistance in responses to polar questions. *Questions: Formal, functional and interactional perspectives*, pages 179–192.
- Hopper, P. J. and Traugott, E. C. (1993). Grammaticalization. *Cambridge: Cambridge*.
- Houtkoop, H. and Mazeland, H. (1985). Turns and discourse units in everyday conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9(5):595–620.
- Iwasaki, S. (2007). Construction of units and interactive turn spaces in Japanese conversation. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, 15:67–80.
- Iwasaki, S. (2009). Initiating interactive turn spaces in Japanese conversation: Local projection and collaborative action. *Discourse Processes*, 46(2-3):226–246.
- Jakobson, R. (1960). Linguistics and poetics. In *Style in language*, pages 350–377. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Jurafsky, D., Shriberg, E., and Biasca, D. (1997). Switchboard-DAMSL labeling project coder's manual. *Tech. Rep.* 97-02.
- Kärkkäinen, E. (2006). Stance taking in conversation: From subjectivity to intersubjectivity. *Text & Talk: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse Communication Studies*, 26(6):699–731.
- Killingley, S.-Y. (1993). *Cantonese*, volume 6. Lincom Europa.
- Kim, S. H. (2016). Ani-prefaced accounts in Korean conversation. In *Accountability in Social Interaction*, page 294. Oxford University Press.
- Kockelman, P. (2013). *Agent, person, subject, self: A theory of ontology, interaction, and infrastructure*. Oxford University Press.
- Kockelman, P., Agha, A., Ahearn, L. M., Colapietro, V., Danesi, M., Duranti, A., Enfield, N., Layton, R., Sugarman, J., Warnier, J.-P., et al. (2007). Agency: The relation between meaning, power, and knowledge. *Current Anthropology*, 48(3):375–401.
- Koffka, K. (1935). *Principles of Gestalt Psychology, International Library of Psychology, Philosophy and Scientific Method*. Harcourt Brace, New York.
- Kwok, H. (1984). Sentence particles in Cantonese. *Centre of Asian Studies occasional papers and monographs*, 56.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Laitinen, L. (2006). Zero person in Finnish. *A grammatical resource for construing human evidence. Marja-Liisa Helasvuo & Lyle Campbell (eds.), Grammar from the Human Perspective. Case, space and person in Finnish*, pages 209–232.
- Landmark, A. M. D., Gulbrandsen, P., and Svennevig, J. (2015). Whose decision? Negotiating epistemic and deontic rights in medical treatment decisions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 78:54–69.

- Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Theoretical prerequisites*, volume 1. Stanford university press.
- Lantolf, J. P. and Pavlenko, A. (1995). Sociocultural theory and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 15:108–124.
- Lerner, G. H. (1991). On the syntax of sentences-in-progress. *Language in society*, 20(3):441–458.
- Lerner, G. H. (1992). Assisted storytelling: Deploying shared knowledge as a practical matter. *Qualitative Sociology*, 15(3):247–271.
- Lerner, G. H. (1996). On the “semi-permeable” character of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. *Studies in interactional sociolinguistics*, 13:238–276.
- Lerner, G. H. (2004). On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: Grammar as action in prompting a speaker to elaborate. *Research on language and social interaction*, 37(2):151–184.
- Leung, C.-S. (1992). A study of the utterance particles in Cantonese as spoken in Hong Kong. *MPhil. Hong Kong Polytechnic*.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (2006). On the human “interaction engine”. In *Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, Symposium 134*, pages 39–69. Berg.
- Levinson, S. C. (2013). Action formation and ascription. In *The handbook of conversation analysis*, pages 103–130. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Li, J. and Wang, Z. (2013). On the choice tendency and usage differences of yinwei (因为) and suoyi (所以) used alone. 论 “因为” “所以” 单用时的选择倾向与使用差异. *Yuyan Yanjiu 语言研究*, 33(1):19–26.
- Li, X. (2010). Reflections on units in talk-in-interaction—an icca10 report. *International Conference on Conversation Analysis, Mannheim, Germany*.
- Li, X. (2014). *Multimodality, interaction and turn-taking in Mandarin conversation*, volume 3. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Li, X. (2016). Some discourse-interactional uses of yinwei ‘because’ and its multimodal production in mandarin conversation. *Language Sciences*, 58:51–78.
- Liesenfeld, A. (2017a). Extracting construction networks from cantonese speech corpora using clustering algorithms. In *Proceedings of the Corpus Linguistics Conference, University of Birmingham*.
- Liesenfeld, A. (2017b). Project notes on building a conversational parser on top of a text parser: Towards a causal language tagger for spoken chinese. In *Proceedings of the 13th Joint ISO-ACL Workshop on Interoperable Semantic Annotation (ISA-13)*.
- Liesenfeld, A. (2018). MYCanCor: A video corpus of spoken Malaysian Cantonese. In *11th edition of the Language Resources and Evaluation Conference (LREC)*.
- Lim, N.-E. (2011). From subjectivity to intersubjectivity: Epistemic marker wo jue de in chinese. *Current issues in Chinese linguistics*, pages 265–300.
- Lim, N.-E. and Hong, H. (2012). Intensifiers as stance markers: A corpus study on genre variations in mandarin chinese. *Chinese Language and Discourse*, 3(2):129–166.
- Lin, Z., Kan, M.-Y., and Ng, H. T. (2009). Recognizing implicit discourse relations in the penn discourse treebank. In *Proceedings of the 2009 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Volume 1-Volume 1*, pages 343–351. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Linell, P. (2009a). Grammatical constructions in dialogue. *Contexts and constructions*, pages 97–110.
- Linell, P. (2009b). *Rethinking language, mind, and world dialogically*. IAP.
- Local, J. and Kelly, J. (1986). Projection and ‘silences’: Notes on phonetic and conversational structure. *Human studies*, 9(2-3):185–204.
- Loebner, S. (2018). Barsalou-Frames in Wort- und Satzsemantik. *Jahrbuch 2017 des Instituts fuer Deutsche Sprache*.
- Louis, A., Joshi, A., Prasad, R., and Nenkova, A. (2010). Using entity features to classify implicit discourse relations. In *Proceedings of the 11th Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on*

- Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 59–62. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lü, S. (1982). *A Brief Sketch of Chinese Grammar*. 中文语法要略. Beijing: Shangwu Yinshu Guan 商务印书馆.
- Luke, K. K. (2005). Shuo yanshenju (On incremental sentences). *Papers in Commemoration of the 50th Anniversary of Zhongguo Yuwen*, pages 39–48.
- Luke, K. K. (2012). Dislocation or afterthought? —A conversation analytic account of incremental sentences in Chinese. *Discourse Processes*, 49(3-4):338–365.
- Luke, K. K., Thompson, S. A., and Ono, T. (2012). Turns and increments: A comparative perspective. *Discourse Processes*, 49(3-4):155–162.
- Luo, J. (2015). *The interactional functions of yinwei-clauses in Mandarin conversation*. PhD thesis, University of Alberta.
- Lyngfelt, B., Borin, L., Ohara, K., and Torrent, T. T. (2018). *Constructicography: Constructicon development across languages*, volume 22. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- MacWhinney, B. (2000). *The CHILDES project: The database*, volume 2. Psychology Press.
- Mann, W. C. and Thompson, S. A. (1987). *Rhetorical structure theory: A theory of text organization*. University of Southern California, Information Sciences Institute.
- Mann, W. C. and Thompson, S. A. (1988). Rhetorical structure theory: Toward a functional theory of text organization. *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 8(3):243–281.
- Marcu, D. and Echihiabi, A. (2002). An unsupervised approach to recognizing discourse relations. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 368–375. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Matthews, S. and Yip, V. (2013). *Cantonese: A comprehensive grammar*. Routledge.
- Mazeland, H. (2007). Parenthetical sequences. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(10):1816–1869.
- Mills, C. W. (1940). Situated actions and vocabularies of motive. *American sociological review*, 5(6):904–913.
- Miltsakaki, E., Prasad, R., Joshi, A. K., and Webber, B. L. (2004). The Penn discourse treebank. In *Proceedings of the Language Resources and Evaluation Conference (LREC)*.
- Mladová, L., Zikanova, S., and Hajicová, E. (2008). From sentence to discourse: Building an annotation scheme for discourse based on Prague dependency treebank. In *Proceedings of the Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*.
- Mondada, L. (2006). Participants' online analysis and multimodal practices: projecting the end of the turn and the closing of the sequence. *Discourse studies*, 8(1):117–129.
- Mondada, L. (2016). Challenges of multimodality: Language and the body in social interaction. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 20(3):336–366.
- Mondada, L. and Doehler, S. (2005). Second language acquisition as situated practice: Task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *Canadian modern language review*, 61(4):461–490.
- Newmeyer, F. J. (2014). *Linguistic theory in America*. Elsevier.
- Norén, K. and Linell, P. (2007). Meaning potentials and the interaction between lexis and contexts. *Pragmatics. Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA)*, 17(3):387–416.
- Ogden, R. (2001). Turn transition, creak and glottal stop in Finnish talk-in-interaction. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association*, 31(1):139–152.
- Ono, T. and Thompson, S. A. (1996). Interaction and syntax in the structure of conversational discourse: Collaboration, overlap, and syntactic dissociation. In *Computational and Conversational Discourse*, pages 67–96. Springer.
- Palmer, F. R. (2001). *Mood and modality*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pitler, E., Raghupathy, M., Mehta, H., Nenkova, A., Lee, A., and Joshi, A. K. (2008). Easily identifiable discourse relations. *Technical Reports (CIS)*, page 884.
- Pollner, M. (2010). *Mundane reason: Reality in everyday and sociological discourse*. Cambridge University Press.

- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Pursuing a response. *Structures of Social Action*, pages 152–163.
- Potter, J. (1996). *Representing reality: Discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. Sage.
- Prasad, R., Miltsakaki, E., Dinesh, N., Lee, A., Joshi, A., Robaldo, L., and Webber, B. L. (2007). The Penn discourse treebank 2.0 annotation manual.
- Prince, E. F. (1981). Towards a taxonomy of given-new information. *Radical pragmatics*.
- Raymond, G. (2003). Grammar and social organization: Yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American sociological review*, pages 939–967.
- Raymond, G. (2013). At the intersection of turn and sequence organization. *Units of talk—units of action*, pages 169–206.
- Raymond, G. and Zimmerman, D. H. (2007). Rights and responsibilities in calls for help: The case of the mountain glade fire. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 40(1):33–61.
- Rett, J. (2011). Exclamatives, degrees and speech acts. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 34(5):411–442.
- Rett, J. (2016). On a shared property of deontic and epistemic modals. *Deontic modality*, pages 200–229.
- Robinson, J. D. (2016). *Accountability in social interaction*. Oxford University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1987). On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. *Talk and social organization*, 54:69.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. Edited by Gail Jefferson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Sacks, H. and Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*, pages 15–21.
- Sacks, H. and Schegloff, E. A. (1995). *Lectures on conversation: Volumes I & II*. Wiley Online Library.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., and Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, pages 696–735.
- Sadock, J. M. and Zwicky, A. M. (1985). Speech act distinctions in syntax. *Language typology and syntactic description*, 1:155–196.
- Sanders, T. J., Spooren, W. P., and Noordman, L. G. (1992). Toward a taxonomy of coherence relations. *Discourse processes*, 15(1):1–35.
- Sara, T., Giuseppe, R., Rashmi, P., and Aravind, J. (2010). Annotation of discourse relations for conversational spoken dialogs. In *7th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American anthropologist*, 70(6):1075–1095.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1978). On some questions and ambiguities in conversation. *Current trends in textlinguistics*, pages 81–102.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1979). The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation in discourse and syntax. *Syntax and Semantics Ann Arbor, Mich.*, 12:261–286.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Recycled turn beginnings: A precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organization. *Talk and social organisation*, 1:70–85.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American journal of sociology*, 97(5):1295–1345.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. *Studies in interactional sociolinguistics*, 13:52–133.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse processes*, 23(3):499–545.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: Volume 1: A primer in conversation analysis*, volume 1. Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2013). Ten operations in self-initiated, same-turn repair. *Conversational repair and human understanding*, pages 41–70.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (1991). Paratactic because. *Journal of pragmatics*, 16(4):323–337.
- Scott, M. B. and Lyman, S. M. (1968). Accounts. *American sociological review*, pages 46–62.
- Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in society*, 5(1):1–23.

- Searle, J. R. and Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*, volume 626. Cambridge university press.
- Selting, M. (2000). The construction of units in conversational talk. *Language in society*, 29(4):477–517.
- Shannon, C. and Weaver, W. (1949). The mathematical theory of communication.
- Sidnell, J. (2011). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*, volume 45. John Wiley & Sons.
- Sidnell, J. (2012). Declaratives, questioning, defeasibility. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 45(1):53–60.
- Song, Z. and Tao, H. (2008). Discourse analysis and comparison of chinese and english causal clauses. 汉英因果复句顺序的话语分析与比较. *Hanyu Xuebao 汉语学报*, 2008(4):61–71.
- Song, Z. and Tao, H. (2009). A unified account of causal clause sequences in mandarin chinese and its implications. *Studies in Language. International Journal sponsored by the Foundation “Foundations of Language”*, 33(1):69–102.
- Sperber, D., Clément, F., Heintz, C., Mascaro, O., Mercier, H., Origgi, G., and Wilson, D. (2010). Epistemic vigilance. *Mind & Language*, 25(4):359–393.
- Stalnaker, R. C. (1978). *Assertion*. Wiley Online Library.
- Steensig, J. and Heinemann, T. (2013). When “yes” is not enough—as an answer to a yes/no question. *Units of talk-Units of action*, pages 207–24.
- Sterponi, L. A. (2003). Account episodes in family discourse: The making of morality in everyday interaction. *Discourse Studies*, 5(1):79–100.
- Stevanovic, M. and Peräkylä, A. (2012). Deontic authority in interaction: The right to announce, propose, and decide. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 45(3):297–321.
- Stivers, T. (2010). An overview of the question–response system in american english conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(10):2772–2781.
- Stivers, T., Enfield, N. J., Brown, P., Englert, C., Hayashi, M., Heinemann, T., Hoymann, G., Rossano, F., De Ruiter, J. P., Yoon, K.-E., et al. (2009). Universals and cultural variation in turn-taking in conversation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(26):10587–10592.
- Su, L. I.-W. (2002). A cognitive exploration of chinese connectives. *Form and function: Linguistic studies in honor of Shuanfan Huang*, pages 305–329.
- Swedberg, R. (1999). Orientation to others and social mechanisms. *Working Papers on Social Mechanisms*, 2.
- Sweetser, E. (1990). *From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*, volume 54. Cambridge University Press.
- Tan, C.-B. (2005). Chinese in malaysia. In *Encyclopedia of diasporas*, pages 697–706. Springer.
- Tanaka, H. (1999). *Turn-taking in Japanese conversation: A study in grammar and interaction*, volume 56. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Tanaka, H. (2000). *Turn-taking in Japanese conversation: A study in grammar and interaction*, volume 56. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Tanaka, H. (2004). Prosody for marking transition-relevance places in japanese conversation. *Sound patterns in interaction: Cross-linguistic studies from conversation*, 62:63.
- Thompson, S. A. and Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2005). The clause as a locus of grammar and interaction. *Discourse studies*, 7(4-5):481–505.
- Thompson, S. A., Fox, B. A., and Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2015). *Grammar in everyday talk: Building responsive actions*, volume 31. Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, T. O. S. A. (1995). What can conversation tell us about syntax? *Alternative linguistics: Descriptive and theoretical modes*, 102:213.
- Toerien, M., Shaw, R., and Reuber, M. (2013). Initiating decision-making in neurology consultations: ‘recommending’ versus ‘option-listing’ and the implications for medical authority. *Sociology of health & illness*, 35(6):873–890.
- Tomasello, M. (2010). *Origins of human communication*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Tsai, M.-C. (1996). A discourse approach to causal sentences in mandarin chinese. In *Proceedings of the 11th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*, pages 93–98.

- Wang, Y.-F. (1996). The information sequences of adverbial clauses in chinese spoken and written discourse. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation. National Taiwan Normal University*.
- Wang, Y.-F. (2001). The preferred information sequences of adverbial linking in mandarin chinese discourse. *Text/22 (1)*, 22(1):141–172.
- Weber, M. (1922). *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*. Tuebingen.
- Weber, M. (1991). The nature of social action in Runciman, W.G. Weber: Selections in translation. *Cambridge University Press*, 2:111.
- Xing, F. (2001). *Hanyu Fuju Yanjiu* 汉语复句研究. Beijing: Shangwu Yinshu Guan 商务印书馆.
- Xue, N., Xia, F., Chiou, F.-D., and Palmer, M. (2005). The Penn Chinese TreeBank: Phrase structure annotation of a large corpus. *Natural language engineering*, 11(2):207–238.
- Yang, C. (2002). Ani ‘no’: It doesn’t always mean ‘no’ in korean. *Discourse and Cognition* (담화와 인지), 9(2):101–119.
- Yoon, K.-E. (2010). Questions and responses in korean conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(10):2782–2798.
- Zhang, W. and Gao, H. (2012). The functions of “zikhai” (即係) in cantonese conversation and its grammaticalization. 粵語自然會話中“即係”的話語功能及其標記化. *Yuyan Kexue* 語言科學, 11(4):387–395.
- Zhang, X. (2015). A research on the chinese cause-effect complex sentences in the context of the prototype theory. 原型理论背景下汉语因果复句考察. *Guoji Hanyu Jiaoxue Yanjiu* 国际汉语教学研究, (2):41–47.
- Zhang, Y. (2012). A syntax-semantics interface study of causal connectives. 因果复句关联标记句法-语义研究——基于“交互主观性”认知观. *Waiguoyu: Shanghai Waiguoyu Daxue Xuebao* 外国语: 上海外国语大学学报, 35(3):42–50.
- Zhou, Z.-M., Xu, Y., Niu, Z.-Y., Lan, M., Su, J., and Tan, C. L. (2010). Predicting discourse connectives for implicit discourse relation recognition. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Computational Linguistics: Posters*, pages 1507–1514. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zinken, J. and Ogiermann, E. (2011). How to propose an action as objectively necessary: The case of polish trzeba x (“one needs to x”). *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 44(3):263–287.

Appendix: Data Excerpts

(1) Data Excerpt: “All the desks” || MYCANCOR 011 (23:30-22:43)

The participants P2 and P3 are friends. P2 is currently visiting the office where P3 works and both sit in a corner of a large office, having a conversation about the company. Prior to the beginning of this excerpt, P3 has been introducing his company, his work and the office. P2 does not seem to have prior knowledge on these topics.

- 01 P3 我哋係六個人嚟呢個office.
ngo5 dei2 hai6 luk6 go3 jan4 ze1 ne1 go3 office
We-have-six-q-people-y-this-q-office
We are only six people ((working)) in this office.
- 02 P2 乜咁多檯嘅.
mat1 gam3 do1 toi4 ge3
What-so-many-desk-y
What’s up with so many desks?
- 03⇒P3 因為我[哋好多volunteer好多volunteer=
jan1 wai4 ngo5 dei2 hou2 do1 volunteer hou2 do1 volunteer
because-we-very-many-volunteer very-many-volunteer
Because we ((have)) so many volunteers, so many volunteers.
- 04 P2 [||超過六個seat耶((coughs))
ciu1 gwo3 luk6 go3 seat ye2
exceeding-six-q-seat-y
More than six seats?
|((points at numerous empty desks in the office behind P3))
- 05 P2 =係啦.
hai6 la3
is-y
Okay.
- 06 P3 輪流入嚟嘅volunte[er.
leon4 lau4 jap6 lai4 ge3 volunteer
rotating-inside-come-y-volunteer
((On a)) rotating ((basis)) volunteers ((are)) coming in.
- 07 P2 [嗯::
ng2
y
Mhm
- 08 P3 我哋(.)冇可能自己做得曬全部嘢.
ngo5 dei2 mou5 ho2 nang4 zi6 gei2 zou6 dak1 saai3 cyun4 bou6 je5
we-not-have-possibly-ourself-make-Vg-completely-all-things

We can not possibly finish all the ((work)) things ourselves.

- 09 P2 so perm:係:你::
so perm hai6 nei5
so-permanent-have-you
So the permanent ((employees)) are you.
- 10 P2 >有幾多個係 perm<
jau5 gei2 do1 go3 hai6 perm
have-how-many-is-permanent
How many ((employees)) are permanent ((as opposed to volunteers)).
- 11 P3 六個咯?
luk6 go3 lo3
six-q-y
Six.
- 12 P2 六個perm嘛.
luk6 go3 perm maa3
six-q-permanent-y
Six permanent, ((that is))?
- 13 P3 六個perm.
luk6 go3 perm
six-q-permanent
Six permanent.

(2) Data Excerpt: “Tarnished reputation” || MYCANCOR 009 (06:53-7:58)

This example features two colleagues and friends (P1 and P2) having a conversation over dinner. Previously the dating life of another colleague came up as a topic of interest and P1 has expressed a negative sentiment towards this colleague named Ah-Lau, saying that his reputation is not good. After a longer pause, while both are eating, P2 asks a question:

- 01 P2 跟住做咩你講而家整臭咗?
gan1 zyu6 zou6 me1 nei5 gong2 ji4 gaa1 zing2 cau3 zo2
then-do-what-you-say-now-tarnish-Vg
Then what are you doing by saying ((his reputation)) is now tarnished.
- 02 |(2.0)
|(((P1 chewing)))
- 03⇒P1 因為(0.3)左近::佢佢:而家on leave.
jan1 wai4 zo2 gan6 keoi5 keoi5 ji4 gaa1 on leave
because-lately-d-d-now-on-leave
Because, lately, he, he is now on leave.
- 04 P1 應該係而家嘅飛機啊(.)
jing3 goi1 hai6 ji4 gaa1 ge3 fei1 gei1 aa1
should-is-now-u-plane-y
((He)) should be on the plane now.
- 05 P1 去韓國療養啊嘛.
heoi3 hon4 gwok3 liu4 joeng5 aa1 maa3
go-korea-recover-y
On the way to Korea, recovering.
- 06 P2 嗯.
ng2
y
Mhm.
- 07 P1 我哋問佢你會同邊個(.) (國)我的朋友(/國)咯
ngo5 dei2 man6 keoi5 nei5 wui2 tung4 bin1 go3 wo de peng you lo3
d-ask-him-you-will-with which-one-my-friend-y
We asked him with whom will you ((go)). “Just my friend.”
- 08 P2 嗯嗯.
ng2 ng2
y-y
Mhm, mhm.
- 09 P1 咁樣講[啊嘛].
gam3 joeng6 gong2 aa1 maa3
like-this-talk-y
Like this.
- 10 P2 [啊].
aa1
y
Yes.
- 11 P1 and then 阿漢咪走去深入調查 哈哈
and then aa3 hon3 mi1 zau2 heoi3 sam1 jap6 diu6 caa4 haa1 haa1
and-then-nr-just-go-to-deep-investigate-laughter

And then Ah-Hon went on and started to further investigate, haha.

- 12 P1 佢就問佢咯 誒。
keoi5 zau6 man6 keoi5 lo3 aai2
he-just-ask-him-y-y
He just asked him, hey.
- 13 P1 (國)你這次去韓國好像很好玩>這樣<喔:(/國)咁講,
ni zhe ci qu han guo hao xiang hen hao wan zhe yang wo gam2 gong2
you-this-time-go-korea-seems-like-very-entertaining like-this-y like-this-say
“When you went to Korea this time, it was really enjoyable, like that,” like that.
- 14 P1 佢就講佢就講因為而家: ,
keoi5 zau6 gong2 keoi5 zau6 gong2 jan1 wai4 ji4 gaa1
he-just-say-he-just-say-because-now
He just said, he just said, because now,
- 15 P1 中國同韓國嗰邊好緊張啊關係。
zung1 gwok3 tung4 hon4 gwok3 go2 bin1 hou2 gan2 zoeng1 aa1 gwaan1 hai6
china-toward-korea-over-there-very-nervous-relations
China and Korea have an uneasy relationship.
- 16 P2 啊::
aa1
y
Yes.
- 17 P2 佢講佢驚佢去到韓國入唔到去返返嚟。
keoi5 gong2 keoi5 ging1 keoi5 heoi3 dou3 hon4 gwok3 jap6 m4 dou3 heoi3 faan2 faan2 lai4
he-say-he-afraid-he-go-to-korea-enter-cannot go-back-back-y
He said he is worried that he can't enter Korea after his arrival and needs to return.
- 18 P2 噃。
ng2
y
Yes.
- 19 P1 俾人彈返嚟嘛,
bei2 jan4 daan6 faan2 lai4 maa3
by-people-throw-back-come-y
Thrown back by them.
- 20 P1 阿漢就借機會又問(國)你的朋友是哪裡↑人(/國):: ,
aa3 hon3 zau6 ze3 gei1 wui2 jau6 man6 ni de pengyou shi nali ren
nr-just-take-chance-again-ask-your-friend-is-where-from
Ah Hon just takes a chance and asks again, “Where is your friend from?”
- 21 P1 跟住佢講。馬來西亞咯(.)阿漢講,
gan1 zyu6 keoi5 gong2 maa5 loi4 sai1 ngaa3 lo3 aa3 hon3 gong2
then-he-say-malaysia-y-nr-say
Then he said, Malaysia, Ah-Hon said.
- 22 P1 (國)你的朋友是馬來西亞人啊。(國)(.)
ni de pengyou shi ma lai xi ya ren a
your-friend-is-malaysian-y
“Your friend is Malaysian?”
- 23 P1 and then 佢就講,

- and then keoi5 zau6 gong2
and-then-he-just-say
And then he just said.
- 24 P1 ↑捏 (國)你上次(.)見到那個(/國)咯.
nie ni shang ci jian dao na ge lo
y-you-last-time-see-to-that-one-y
“Haa, that ((person)) you saw last time.”
- 25 P2 佢講啊.
keoi5 gong2 aa1
he-say-y
He said.
- 26⇒P1 啊:: 因為佢淨係帶過一個人出嚟呀嘛.
aa1 jan1 wai4 keoi5 zing6 hai6 daai3 gwo3 jat1 go3 jan4 ceot1 lai4 aa1 maa3
y because-he-only-take-before-one-person-out-y-y
Because he only took out one person before.
- 27 P1 就即係嗰個咗咯,
zau6 zik1 hai6 go2 go3 zo2 lo3
namely-is-this-one-y
That was exactly that one.
- 28 P1 跟住阿漢就特登咁講.
gan1 zyu6 aa3 hon3 zau6 dak6 dang1 gam3 gong2
then-nr-just-especially-so-say
Then Ah-Hon specifically said.
- 29 P1 哦::: (國)你的對象是嘛:(/國)呵[呵呵呵.
oo ni de dui xiang shi ma he he he he
y your-partner-is-y laughter
“Oh, your significant other, right?” hehehehe
- 30 P2 [當然.
dong1 jin4
of-course
Of course.
- 31 P1 跟住佢就好尷尬咁笑呵呵呵(國)是咯是咯(/國)呵呵.
gan1 zyu6 keoi5 zau6 hou2 gaam1 gaai3 gam3 siu3 hehehe shi la shi la hehe
then-he-just-very-awkward-like this smile laughter is-y is-y laughter
And then he smiled embarrassed. Hehehe “yes, yes,” hehe.

(3) Data Excerpt: “Six or nine months” || MYCANCOR 023 (16:19-16:24)

This example features two colleagues and friends (P1 and P2) having a conversation over dinner. Previously the dating life of another colleague came up as a topic of interest and P1 has expressed a negative sentiment towards this colleague named Ah-Lau, saying that his reputation is not good. After a longer pause, while both are eating, P2 asks a question.

- 01 P2 你去幾耐(.) 九個月.
nei5 heoi3 gei2 noi6 gau2 go3 jyut6
you-go-how long-nine-q-month
How long did you go ((on exchange to New Zealand)), nine months.
- 02 P1 冇啦:(.) 我去七個月嘅.
mou5 laa1 ngo5 heoi3 cat1 go3 jyut6 syu3
not have-y I-go-seven-month-u
No, I went seven months only.
- 03 P2 你冇extend啊.
nei5 mou5 extend aa1
you-not-have-extent-y
You didn't extend ((from 6 to 9 months)).
- 04⇒P1 >°因為°<(.)因為六個月嘛.
jan1wai4 yin wei luk6 go3 jyut6 maa3
because-because-six-q-month-y
Because, because ((it is)) six months.
- 05 P2 [嗯
ng2
y
Mhm.
- 06 P1 [跟住你要extend嘛.
gan1 zyu6 nei5 jiu3 extend maa3
then-you-need-extend-y
Then you need to extend.
- 07 P2 係[咯.
hai6 lo3
is-y
Yes.
- 08 P1 [°ex°↑tend 㗎(.)跟住:(.)淨係得七個月咯.
extend zo2 gan1 zyu6 zing6 hai6 dak1 cat1 go3 jyut6 lo3
extend-y-then-only-Vg-seven-month-y
(I) extended and then it was only seven months.
- 09 P2 ↑哦:::..
ngo4
y
Ohhhh.
- 10 P2 >因為<嗰陣我(.)我parents:佢哋要去台灣[旅行
jan1wai4 go2 zan6 ngo5 ngo5 parents-keoi5 dei2 jiu3 heoi3 toi4 waan1 leoi5 hang4
because-that-time-my-my-parents-they-want-go-taiwan-travel
Because ((at)) that time my, my parents they wanted to go travelling to Taiwan.
- 11 P2 [嗯 嗯

ng2 ng2
y-y
Mhm, mhm.

- 12 P2 嚟啦嚟啦 一齊去啦:.
lai4 laa1 lai4 laa1 jat1 cai4 heoi3 laa1
come-y-come-y together-go-y
Come, come, ((let' s)) go together.
- 13 P2 >啊<所以你就走咗啦.
aa1 so2 ji5 nei5 zau6 zau2 zo2 laa1
y-so-you-just-go-Vg-y
Ohh, so you just went.

(4) Data Excerpt: “Why do they feel this way” || MYCANCOR 017 (10:39-11:28)

Here are two friends and colleagues taking about sentiments of their other colleagues towards a coworker called “Ah-Long”.

- 01 P2 跟住一耐开啊熟咗啦。
gan1 zyu6 jat1 noi6 hoi1 aa1 suk6 zo2 laa1
then-one-long-time-y familiar-Vg-y
Then once you ((know each other)) for a long time, you become familiar.
- 02 P2 就唔会咁啦。
zau6 m4 wui2 gam3 laa1
then-not-will-so-y
Then it wouldn't be like this.
- 03 P2 态度就改咗啦。(0.3)
taai3 dou6 zau6 goi2 zo2 laa1
attitude-will-change-Vg-y
The attitude would change.
- 04 P2 跟住呢佢就总之你唔好做错嘢(。
gan1 zyu6 nei1 keoi5 zau6 zung2 zi1 nei5 m4 hou2 zou6 co3 je5
then-you-he-just all together-you-not-do-wrong-thing
And then, he just- It's just you should not do things wrong.
- 05 P2 你做错嘢呢就俾(0.2)闹到你狗血淋头啦。
nei5 zou6 co3 je5 nei1 zau6 bei2 naau6 dou3 nei5 gau2 hyut3 lam4 tau4 laa1
you-do-wrong-things-y just-give-scold-Vg-you-y
((If)) you do something wrong. ((You'll)) be given a big dressing-down.
- 06 (2.0)
- 07 P2 其實(。)呢啲人semua啊,
kei4sat6 neidi1 jan4 semua aa1-
actually-those-people-all-y-
Actually, all those people,
- (cont.) 我係唔明白點解(。)會對阿朗咁樣嘅feel咯。
ngo5 hai6 m4 ming4 baak6 dim2 gaai2 wui2 deoi3 aa3long5 gam3 joeng6 ge3 feel lo3
I-is-not-understand-is-not-will-to-nr-like-this-u-feel-y
I don't understand why, right, ((they)) feel about Ah-Long in this way.
- 08 P2 >我講<=
ngo5 gong2
I-say
I say-
- 09⇒P1 =因為 佢哋認為自己冇錯 自己啱囉:..
jan1wai4 keoi5 xx zi6 gei2 mou5 co3 zi6 gei2 ngaam1 saai3
because-he-xx-himself-not-have-wrong-self-correct-Vg
Because he xx himself is not wrong ((but)) always right.
- 10 P2 你明冇唔覺得啲自私嘅人好多都係咁嘅咩?
nei5 ming4 mou5 m4 gok3 dak1 di1 zi6 si1 ge3 jan4 hou2 do1 dou1 hai6 gam3 ge3 mei1
you-understand-not-have-no-feel-ok-u selfish-u-person-very-many-all-is-so-what
You understand, I just feel, there are so many selfish people ((who are.)) like this

- 11 P1 跟住(.) 我又講冇嘢呀:.
gan1 zyu6 keoi5 jau6 gong2 mou5 je5 aa1
then-he-also-say-not-have-thing-y
And then he says it's nothing.
- 12 P1 And then佢哋又講,
And then keoi5 dei2 jau6 gong2
And then-they-also-say
And then they also said,
- 13 P1 咁係啦你同阿老嘢關係都唔好,
gam3 hai6 laa1 nei5 tung4 aa3 lou5 je5 gwaan1 hai6 dou1 m4 hou2
so-is-y you-with-Ah-Lou-u-relationship-is-all-not-good
Just like that, your relationship with Ah-Lou is not good.
- 14 P1 點唔同㗎 一樣咯?老細咯?下屬咯?有咩唔同?
dim2m4tung4 ak1 jat joeng6 lo3 lou5 sai3 lo3 haa6 suk6 lo3 jau5 mei1 m4 tung4
why-not-same-y-same-y boss-y subordinate-y have-what-not-same
Why is it not the same, a boss, a subordinate, what is the difference.
- 15 P1 我講唔同㗎 佢哋有出去食嘢:啊 又點樣:..
ngo5 gong2 m4 tung4 ge3 keoi5 dei2 jau5 ceot1 heoi3 sik6 je5 aa1 jau6 dim2 joeng6
I-say-not-same-u they-have-out-go-eat-thing then-what
I said it's different. They go out and eat ((together)), so what.
- 16 P1 我做錯嘢(.)佢 佢一樣照柄我嘅㗎:..
ngo5 zou6 co3 je5 keoi5 keoi5 jat1 joeng6 ziu3 bing2 ngo5 ge3 ak1
I-do-wrong-thing he he-same-still-beat-us-y
((If)) I do something wrong, he- he still beats ((scolds)) us the same way.
- 17 P1 [呵呵呵 呵呵
hehehe hehe
laughter
hahaha haha
- 18 P2 [佢哋佢哋嘅佢哋認為佢哋自己冇錯,
keoi5 keoi5 dei2 keoi5 dei2 ge3 keoi5 dei2 jing6 wai4 keoi5 dei2 zi6 gei2 mou5 co3
He-they they-u-they-believe-they-themselves-not-have-wrong
He- they, they, they believe they ((haven't done anything)) wrong themselves,
- 19 P2 你明冇 唔接受:..
nei5ming4mou5 m4 zip3 sau6
you-understand-not-have-accept
You see, ((they)) don't accept ((it))
- 20 P1 |呵呵 呵呵
hehe hehe
laughter
haha haha
|((P1 shakes head))

(5) Data Excerpt: “What to why” || MYCANCOR 011 (1:21-2:09)

The excerpt shows two friends (P1 and P3) who talk about P3’s job in the film industry. P1 has previously been asking several information-seeking questions related to the skills that P3’s job requires.

- 01 P1 咁咁需要 讀讀啲乜嘢?
gam3 gam3 seoi1 jiu3 duk6 duk6 di1 mat1 je5
so-so-need study-study-what
So-so what do ((you)) need to study-study ((for doing this job))?
- 02⇒P3 hhh. 因為(.)而家::,
jan1 wai4 ji4 gaa1
because-now
Because nowadays.
- 03 P3 >okay< 點解我要做呢行呢?
okay dim2 gaa12 ngo5 jiu3 zou6 ne1 hang4 ne1
okay-why-do-this-work-y
Okay, why do I do this ((kind of)) work?
- 04 P1 [嗯
ng2
y
Mhm.
- 05⇒P3 [因為而家:好多人 拍片都要拍digital.
jan1 wai4 ji4 gaa1 hou2 do1 jan4 paak3 pin3 dou1 jiu3 paak3 digital
because-now many-people shoot-movie-all-want-shoot-digital
Because nowadays a lot of people ((that)) shoot movies all want to shoot digital.
- 06 P1 嗯
ng2
y
Mhm.
- 07 P3 so我係讀IT㗎嘛.
so ngo5 hai6 duk6 IT gaa2 maa3
so-I-is-study-IT-y-y
So that’s why I study IT.
- 08 P1 嗯
ng2
y
Mhm.
- 09 P3 so我係我哋要諗點樣樣. 啊.
so ngo5 hai6 ngo5 dei2 jiu3 lam2 dim2 joeng6 joeng6 aa1
so-I-is we-need-think how y
So I am- we have to think about how to,
- (cont) 保存 IT digital 嘅嘢(.)
bou2 cyun4 IT digital ge3 je5
conserve-IT-digital-things
conserve digital stuff.
- 10 P3 仲艱難過保存膠片.
zung6 gaan1 naan4 gwo3 bou2 cyun4 gaau1 pin3
still-difficult-more conserve-film

- ((That's)) still more difficult than conserving film.
- 11 P3 膠片好容易你放落個:個個個房係咪
gaau1 pin3 hou2 jung4 ji6 nei5 fong3 lok6 go3 go3 go2 go3 fong4 hai6 mi1
film-very-easy you-put-down that-that-that-that room-is-not-is
Film is easy, you just put it in a-a-a that room, right?
- 12 P3 有阿::humidity同埋temperature噃=
jau5 aa3 humidity tung4 maai4 temperature ze1
have-y humidity also-temperature-y
There's humidity and temperature-
- 13 P1 =溫度啦濕度[啦 OK.
wan1 dou6 laa1 sap1 dou6 laa1 OK
temperature-y humidity-y ok
Temperature, humidity, ok.
- 14 P3 [濕度全部啱啊
sap1 dou6 cyun4 bou6 ngaam1 aa1
humidity all correct-y
Humidity everything is correct.
- 15 P3 就可以保存一百年都有問題.
zau6 ho2 ji5 bou2 cyun4 jat1 baak3 nin4 dou1 mou5 man6 tai4
then-can conserve-one-hundred-year no-have-problem
Then ((you)) can conserve ((film)) for one hundred years, no problem.
- 16 P1 OK?
OK
ok
Okay.
- 17 P3 digital係咪(0.2)你(.)兩年你都冇::
digital hai6 mi1 nei5 loeng5 nin4 nei5 dou1 mou5
digital-is-not-is-you two year-you-not-have
Digital, right, after two years you can't even,
- 18 P3 把握可以講(.)你可以再開返個file.
baa2 aak1 ho2 ji5 gong2 nei5 ho2 ji5 zoi3 hoi1 faan2 go3 file
certain-can-say you-can again-open that-file
Be certain that you can still open that file again.
- 19 P1 ↑哦 okay
ngo4 okay
y-okay
Okay.
- 20 P3 harddisk係咪好快就壞
harddisk hai6 mi1 hou2 faai3 zau6 wai6
harddisk-is-not-is very-fast-then-break
Harddisks, right, they break very easily.
- 21 P1 啱啦啱啦啱啦[電子嘢
ngaam1 laa1 ngaam1 laa1 ngaam1 laa1 din6 zi2 je5
right-right-right digital-things
Right, right, right, digital stuff.
- 22 P3 [so呢啲(.)咁嘅嘢

so ne1 di1 gam3 ge3 je5
so-r so-that-thing
So you guys, that kind of stuff.

- 23 P3 所以我比較有◦興趣嚟研究咯◦
so2 ji5 ngo5 bei2 gaau3 jau5 hing1 ceoi3 lai4 jin4 gau3 lo3
so-I-quite-have interest-come-research-y
So I'm rather interested in researching this.
- 24 P3 點樣樣保存digital嘅嘢到長久(.)
dim2 joeng6 joeng6 bou2 cyun4 digital ge3 je5 dou3 coeng4 gau2
how-how conserve-digital-thing to-long-time
How to conserve digital things for a long time.
- 25 P3 到五十年
dou3 ng5 sap6 nin4
to-fifty-year
Up to fifty years.

(6) Data Excerpt: “Hiking takes a week” || MYCANCOR 007 (04:48-04:57)

Prior to the beginning of this excerpt from a casual conversation between three friends in a living room, P1, P2 and P3 have been talking about P2 and P3’s recent holiday hiking trip to Nepal. P1 asked several questions related to the trip and now, at line 1, begins a turn with *ee1* (呃) that signals a topic change and here introduces an information-seeking question (Chor, 2018).

- 01 P1 ↑呃 go2 laai2:除咗 尼泊爾::嗰度(.)
ee1 go2 laai2 ceoi4 zo2 nei4 paak3 ji5 go2 dou6
y go2-laai2 except Nepal there
Eyy, xx, except over there in Nepal,
- 02 P1 你哋::(.)>仲係嗰度附近行一行啊<?
nei5 dei2 zung6 hai6 go2 dou6 fu6 gan6 hang4 jat1 hang4 aa1
you guys also there-near hike-one-hike
did you guys also go somewhere ((else)) nearby?
- 03⇒P2 ↓呃::我哋::(.)其實因為行山都食咗好多時間啊,
aak1 ngo5 dei2 kei4 sat6 jan1 wai4 hang4 saan1 dou1 sik6 zo2 hou2 do1 si4 gaan1 aa1
y we actually-because hike already-eat-very-much-time
Mhm, we, actually because hiking ((a mountain)) takes a lot of time.
- 04 P2 | [行山都: (.) [七日十日咁咯 (.) 噃=
hang4 saan1 dou1 cat1 jat6 sap6 jat6 gam3 lo3 en
hike-already seven-day-ten-day-y-y y
Hiking ((a)) mountain takes seven to ten days, mhm.
- 05 P1 [↓哦:
ngo4
y
Oh ((nods)).
- 06 P3 | ((nods)) [一個禮拜.
jat1 go3 lai5 baai3
one-week
One week.
- 07 P1 =>一個禮拜行成個山啊<?
jat1 go3 lai5 baai3 hang4 sing4 go3 saan1 aa1
one-week hike-whole-mountain
One week to hike one whole mountain?
- 08 P3 [因為你上去三日. [(.)之後再落去=
jan1 wai4 nei5 soeng5 heoi3 saam1 jat6 zi1 hau6 zoi3 lok6 heoi3
because-you-up-go-three-day after-again-down-go
Because you ((need)) three days to go up, after that ((you need to)) go down again.
- 09 P2 [呃. [上去四日啊落去.
aak1 soeng5 heoi3 sei3 jat6 aa1 lok6 heoi3
y up-go-four-day-y-go-down
Yes, going go takes four days. (And) down again.
- 10 P1 =哦:::
ngo4
y
Mhm.

(7) Data Excerpt: “Hire an admin” || MYCANCOR 011 (24:40-25:16)

This excerpt is from a conversation between three friends who sit in an office and talk about work related topics. Around half an hour into the conversation, after a longer stretch of silence, P2 produces a series of TCUs (line 1-2) that are followed by an responsive action (beginning in line 5)

- 01 P2 請admin冇 我個admin又走咗(0.4)
cing2 admin mou5 ngo5go3 admin jau6 zau2 zo2
hire admin not-have my-q admin again-leave-Vg
Did ((you)) hire an admin, my admin left again.
- 02 P2 [千零箍人工嘅噃好便SPMxx
cin1 ling4 kou1 jan4 gung1 ge3 syu3 hou2 bin6 SPMxx
thousand-zero-q salary-u-y very-cheap SPM xx
A salary of thousand plus dollar only, very cheap, SPM xx
- 03 P3 [哈哈.
haahaa
laughter
Haha.
- 04 (2.0)
- 05 P3 請admin冇啊(.)冇啊::(.)
cing2 admin mou5 aa1 mou5 aa1
hire admin not-have not-have-y
Hire an admin, no ((we)) didn't, didn't.
- 06⇒P3 我哋(.)因為::(.).今年嘅(.)嘅:: economy slow down right?
ngo5 dei2 jan1 wai4 gam1 nin4 ge3 ge3 economy slow down right
we because this-year-u-u economy slow down right
Our, because this year the economy slowed down, right.
- 07 P2 [slow好多::
slow hou2 do1
slow very-much
Slowed down a lot.
- 08 P3 [headcount headcount就freeze咗=
headcount headcount zau6 freeze zo2
headcount headcount just-freeze-u
((Our)) headcount, headcount was frozen.
- 09 P2 =↑哦::
ngo4
y
Ohh.
- 10 P3 舊年我哋就已經聽到咗喇 (.)
gau6 nin4 ngo5 dei2 zau6 ji5 ging1 ting3 dou3 zo2 laa1
last-year-we-just-already-hear about-u-y
Last year we already heard about that.
- 11 P3 通常咁樣嘅.
tung1 soeng4 gam3 joeng6 ge3
normally-like that-y
Normally it's like that.

- 12 P3 政府一freeze我哋就知 ok 明年嘅economy冇㗎啦。
zing3 fu2 jat1 freeze ngo5 dei2 zau6 zi1 ok ming4 nin4 ge3 economy mou5 gaa2 laa1
government-is-freeze-we-just-know ok next-year-u economy-not have-y
Once the government freezes ((it)), we know, ok next years' economy ain't gonna be good“.
- 13 P2 =↑哦:
ngo4
y
Ohh.
- 14 P3 因為我哋第一個知㗎嘛。
jan1 wai4 ngo5 dei2 dai6 jat1 go3 zi1 gaa2m aa3
because-we-first-one-know-y-y
Because we are the first to know.
- 15 P2 哦。
ngo4
y
Mhm.
- 16 P3 因為政府一叫我哋 ok 本來我哋plan budget嘅,
jan1 wai4 zing3 fu2 jat1 giu3 ngo5 dei2 ok bun2 loi4 ngo5 dei2 plan budget ge3
because-government-if-tell-us ok originally-we plan budget-y
Because if the government tells us, ok originally our planned budget ((is this much)),
- 17 P3 |哦. ↑哦:: 20八仙籊 ok ok 明年嘅economy冇 哈哈
ngo4 ngo4 20 baat3 sin1 kou1 ok ok ming4 nin4 ge3 economy mou5 haahaahaa
y y 20 percent-u ok ok next-year-y economy-not-have laughter
ok ok, 20 percent, ok, ok, next year's economy will be not ((good)) haha.
|((raises both hands)) ((lowers both hands))
- 18 P2 哦係
ngo4 hai6
y-is
Mhm, yes.
- 19 P3 政府已經°知㗎啦°
zing3 fu2 ji5 ging1 zi1 zo2 laa1
government-already-know-u-y
The government already knows.
- 20 P2 哦(.)係:
ngo4 hai6
y-is
Mhm, yes.

(8) Data Excerpt: “Oily not black” || MYCANCOR 016 (06:18-:06:45)

This is from a conversation between two siblings (older sister (P1) and younger brother (P2)) taking place in a living room. Both sit on a couch. Prior to the beginning of this excerpt, P1 picked up P2’s photo camera and is now preparing to take a picture of P2. Getting ready for the picture, P2 takes the lower end of his T-shirt and swipes it across his face. At line 5, P1 addresses this action.

- 01 P1 |哇:: 咁我要搵返嘅靚角度先得㗎嘛. ((sniffles)).
waa1 gam3 ngo5 jiu3 wan2 faan2 ge3 leng3 gok3 dou6 sin1 dak1 gaa2 maa3
y so-I-need-look for-back-that-beautiful-angle-first-y-y
Wow, so I need to find a nice angle first, right.
|((holds camera in front of her face, preparing to take a picture of P2))
- 02 (1.5)
- 03 P2 |°等陣間°
dang2 zan6 gaan1
wait-bit-time
Wait a moment.
|((P2 begins to rub his face with his shirt))
- 04 (3.0)
- 05 P1 咁你件衫咪好邋邋咯你咁樣搓.
gam3 nei5 gin6 saam1 mi1 hou2 laap6 taap3 gaak3 nei5 gam3 joeng6 caai1
so-your-q-shirt-is-not-very-dirty-y you-like-this-rub
So your shirt, doesn’t ((it)) get dirty (when)) your are rubbing ((your face)) like that.
- 06 P2 油啫嘛.
jau4 ze1 maa3
oil-only-y
((It’s)) only oily.
- 07 P1 咦呀::.
ji2 aa1
y
Eeehh. ((signals disgust))
- 08 P2 冇辦法(.) 好邋邋.
mou5 baan6 faat3 hou2 laap6 taap3
no way- very-dirty
No way, ((yes)) it’s dirty.
- 09 P1 黑黑 冇灰塵嘅咩你=
hak1 hak1 mou5 fui1 can4 ge3 me1 nei5
black-black not-have-dust-that-what-you
Black and dusty and what not, you.
- 10 P2 =吓:?
haak3
y
What?
- 11 P1 你有灰塵嘅咩?
nei5 mou5 fui1 can4 ge3 me1
you-not-have-dust-Vg-what
Isn’t that ((full of)) dust?

- 12 P2 我有黑啊(.)
ngo5 mou5 hak1 aa1
I-not-have-black-y
Nothing black ((on)) me.
- 13⇒P2 >因為我都有出去< 我出=
jan1 wai4 ngo5 dou1 mou5 ceot1 heoi3 ngo5 ceot1
because-I-all-not-have-out-go I-out
Because I didn't go outside, I outside-.
- 14 P1 =你食lunch呢?
nei5 sik6 lunch ne1
you-eat-lunch-y
Didn't you have lunch?
- 15 P2 食lunch 今日係(.)相機腳.
sik6 lunch gam1 jat6 hai6 soeng1 gei1 goek3
eat-lunch today-is-tripod
Have lunch? Today was ((at a restaurant called)) Tripod.
- 16 P1 咩腳哇?
me1 goek3 waa1
what-tripod
What tripod.
- 17 P2 相機腳 >tripod啊<.
soeng1 gei1 goek3 tripod aa1
tripod tripod-y
Tripod, Tripod ((you know)).
- 18 P1 哦::?做咩x相機腳啊>你哋叫佢<.
ngo4 zou6 me1 x soeng1 gei1 goek3 aa1 nei5 dei2 giu3 keoi5
y do-whay tripod-y you guys-call-it
What. What are you doing. Tripod, that's what you guys call it.
- 19 P2 噃.
ng2
y
Yes.
- 20 P1 做咩呢?
zou6 me1 ne1
do-what-y
Do what.
- 21 P2 你要我嗌佢咩嘢.
nei5 jiu3 ngo5 aai3 keoi5 me1 je5
you-want-me-call-it-what-thing
What do you want me to call it.

(9) Data Excerpt: “Work after graduation” || MYCANCOR 054 (10:00-10:14)

The next data excerpt shows two participants sitting in a park. They have just met for the first time but have friends in common and are from the same city in Malaysia. Prior to the beginning of this abstract, the two girls have been talking about past life events, specifically their educational background and employment history. P1 has previously mentioned that she has a degree in psychology.

- 01 P2 咦 你做咩工啊(.)>之後<.
ee2 nei5 zou6 me1 gung1 aa1 zi1 hau6
y you-do-what-work-y after
Eey, what did you do for work - afterwards ((after graduating from uni))?
- 02 P1 之後:我就嚟::呃::NPU呢,
zi1 hau6 ngo5 zau6 lai4 aak1 NIE aak1
after-I-just-come-y nt y
Afterwards, I just began at, mhm, NPU ((name of university)), mhm.
- 03 P1 NPU係[我讀書個邊].
NPU hai6 [ngo5 duk6 syu1 go2 bin1
nt-is-I-study-over-there
NPU is ((that institution)) where I studied.
- 04 P2 [> 嗯 嗯 嗯 嗯 嗯 <
ng2 ng2 ng2 ng2 ng2
y-y-y-y-y-y
Mhh,mhh,mhh,mhh,mhh.
- 05 P1 呃(.)我去個度做research assistant咯.
aak1 ngo5 heoi3 go2 dou6 zou6 research assistant lo3
y I-go-over-there-do-research assistant-y
Mhm, I went there to work as a research assistant.
- 06⇒P1 因為我[一直一畢業,
jan1 wai4 ngo5 jat1 zik6 jat1 bat1 jip6
because-I-straight-once-graduate
Because I always, once I graduated,
- (cont) 我就做我就想做research嘅::[°xx°關係=
ngo5 zau6 zou6 ngo5 zau6 soeng2 zou6 research ge3 xx gwaan1 hai6
I-just-do I-just-want-do-research-Vg xx-related to
I did, I just wanted to do research, something related to x.
- 07 P2 [↑哦:
ngo4
y
Mhm.
- 08 P2 [哦 係咯
ngo4 hai6 lo3
y is-y
Mhm, yes.

(10) Data Excerpt: “Are you divorced” || MYCANCOR 054 (10:00-10:14)

This data excerpt shows part of a conversation between two participants sitting in an office. P1 is a single mother who has come to visit a local government office to seek help with paperwork related to the schooling of her daughter. A couple of minutes into the conversation, she is now sitting at a desk with an office clerk (P2), explaining her case. Prior to the beginning of the excerpt, P1 has been explaining that she is seeking help in order to solve various bureaucratic issues related to applying for benefits. The office clerk, P2, while listening to P1, has been looking through various forms that P2 has brought with her and asked various clarification questions related to the matter. During this sequence, P1 has repeatedly stressed the urgency of her request for help.

- 01 P2 你你你離開婚未。
nei5 nei5 lei4 hoi1 fan1 mei6
you you-divorce-not
Are you, you, you divorced ((done with the divorce)) or not?
- 02 P1 |我::係(.)暫時俾我|一張紙。
ngo5 hai6 zaam6 si4 bei2 ngo5 jat1 zoeng1 zi2
I-is-at the moment-give-me-one-q-paper
I.. was, for now given a piece of paper.
|((looks around and points at several forms on the table))
|((P2 picks up several forms and looks at them))
- 03⇒P1 因為我老公一直搵唔到(.)失蹤咗。
jan1 wai4 ngo5 lou5 gung1 jat1 zik6 wan2 m4 dou3 sat1 zung1 zo2
because-my-husband-still-find-cannot missing-Vg
Because my husband still can't be found, ((he's)) missing.
- 04 P2 OK xxx 係申請單方面|申請離婚=
OK xxx hai6 san1 cing2 daan1 fong1 min6 san1 cing2 lei4 fan1
OK xxx is-apply-single-party-apply-divorce
OK, xxx is to apply for single party ((divorce)), apply to divorce.
|((starts looking through more forms))
- 05 P1 =唔知走咗 單方面 其實呢,
m4 zi1 zau2 zo2 daan1 fong1 min6 kei4 sat6 nei
not-know-left-Vg single-party actually-y
((I)) don't know, ((he)) left.. single party.. actually.
- 06 P1 我已經盡量去聯絡佢。
ngo5 ji5 ging1 zeon6 loeng6 heoi3 lyun4 lok3 keoi5
I-already-try my best-go-contact-him
I already tried my best to contact him,
- 07 P1 到阿尾 掛蚊(?) 都聯絡唔到佢。
dou3 aa3 mei5 gwaa3 man1 dou1 lyun4 lok3 m4 dou3 keoi5
until-end gwaa(?) man(?) all-contact-not-Vg-him
Until the end, even Gwaa-Man ((name)) can't contact him.
- 08 P2 你都幫佢聯絡。
nei5 dou1 bong1 keoi5 lyun4 lok3
you-help-him-contact
You helped him/her to contact him.
- 09 P1 佢係走開戶 佢欠債。
keoi5 hai6 zau2 hoi1 wu6 keoi5 him3 zaai3
he-is-go-away-household he-indebted

- He left the household, he has a debt problem.**
- 10 P1 哦 OK.
ngo4 OK
y-ok
Mhm, ok.
- 11 P1 so走咗去邊度 而家都唔知=
so zau2 zo2 heoi3 bin1 dou6 ji4 gaa1 dou1 m4 zi1
so-go-Vg-go-where now-all-not-know
So he left, where he went, ((I)) don't even know.
- 12 P1 =嗯.
ng2
y
Mhm.
- 13 P1 之先走咗澳洲,
zi1 sin1 zau2 zo2 ou3 zau1
before-go-Vg-ns
Before he went to Australia.
- 14 P1 佢係俾阿窿追數 搞到我都滿-
keoi5 hai6 bei2 aa3 lung1 zeoi1 sou3 gaau2 dou3 ngo5 dou1 mun5
he-is-by-loanshark-chase make-until-I-all-fully
He is being chased by loan sharks, all ((this)) makes me really-
- 15 P1 我bear咗好多債務啊.
ngo5 bear zo2 hou2 do1 zaai3 mou6 aa1
I-bear-Vg-very-much-debt-y
I am also deeply indebted
- 16 P1 我俾佢累到.
ngo5 bei2 keoi5 leoi6 dou3
I-by-him-exhausted-to
He caused so much trouble to me.
- 17 P1 |所以係我想[話xxx.
so2 ji5 hai6 ngo5 soeng2 waa6 xxx
so-is-I-want-say-xx
So I would like to say-
|((P2 picks up another pile of papers and reads))
- 18 P2 [佢嘅報生紙你有帶到冇.
keoi5 ge3 bou3 saang1 zi2 nei5 jau5 daai3 dou3 mou5
his-birth certificate-you-bring-to-not
His birth certificate, did you bring ((it))?
- 19 P1 >有有有<.
jau5 jau5 jau5
have-have-have
Yes, yes, yes.

(11) Data Excerpt: “Google Maps” || MYCANCOR 015 (17:31-17:44)

This is from a conversation between two siblings, taking place in their flat. Around 20 minutes into the conversation, both are getting ready to go outside and P2 has just finished looking up a route to their destination on a navigation app on his smart phone (such as Google maps). Prior to the beginning of the excerpt, he has proposed different routes and the two are now in the process of making a decision of which route to take. Just before the beginning of this excerpt, he has proposed the last of several possible routes. This route involves using a local public transport option called the LRT (Light Rail Transit) instead of the MRT (Mass Rapid Transit).

- 01 P1 |半個鐘就到啦。
bun3 go3 zung1 zau6 dou3 laa1
half-q-hour-then-arrive-y
((We)) will arrive ((at our destination)) in just half an hour?
|((P2 keeps looking at his phone))
- 02 P2 嗯 31 minutes.
ng2 31 minutes
y-31 minutes
Yes, 31 minutes.
- 03 P1 仲快過坐MRT咯。
zung6 faai3 gwo3 co5 mrt lo3
even-faster-than-nt-y
((That's)) even faster than ((taking the)) MRT.
- 04⇒P2 係呀 因為咩呀|嘛 因為我哋|係落(1.0)
hai6 aa1 jan1wai4 me1 aa1 maa3 jan1wai4 ngo5dei2 hai6 lok6
is-y because-what-y-y-because-we-is-get off
Right, because ((that)) what, because we are getting off at,
|((P1 starts yawning))
|((P2 points at window))
- cont 最近呢個(.) 快車站 xx road嘛。
zeoi3gan6 nei3go3 faai3ce1zaam6 xx road maa3
most-close-here-q-nr-ns-y
the xx road railway station close by.
- 05 P1 咁樣去咯 得咯 ((P1 sniffles))
gam3 joeng6 heoi3 gaak3 dak1 lo3
so-that-go-y ok-y
Let's go for this ((route)). That's OK.

(12) Data Excerpt: “Poor government” || MYCANCOR 040 (13:38-14:33)

The is from a conversation between two participants in an office space. It is a local branch of the government that offers counseling services and deals with complaints related to official matters. P1 is an elderly citizen who has come in to seek advice with some paperwork related to government subsidies. P2 is an office clerk. Around 15 minutes into the conversation, the citizen, P1, has already gotten the help she came for and, after their ‘main business’ has been completed, the office clerk now helps her to fill out various forms as a last step before the visit will come to an end. As P2 is filling out the forms and after a longer stretch of silence, P1 takes a turn and utters a TCU in a soft voice.

- 01 P1 °啊 政府都係冇錢嘅。(0.2)
aa1 zing3 fu2 dou1 hai6 mou5 leoi4 ge3
y government-all-is-not have-money-u
Uhh, the government doesn’t have money.
- 02 P2 而你話政府冇錢呢 都係部分啱嘅。
ji4 nei5 waa6 zing3 fu2 mou5 leoi4 nei1 dou1 hai6 bou6 fan1 ngaam1 ge3
u-you-say-government-not have-money-y-also-is-partly-right-u
You say “the government doesn’t have money” ((that’s)) actually partly true.
- 03⇒P2 因為:(.)做咩(.)簡單嚟講一句啊。
jan1 wai4 zou6 mei1 gaan2 daan1 lai4 gong2 jat1 geoi3 aa1
because do-what simple-come-say-one-sentence-y
Because, what happens, ((let me)) say something ((to you)) quickly.
- 04 P2 成日咁樣支持你哋呀:。
sing4 jat6 gam3 joeng6 zi1 ci4 nei5 dei2 aa1
whole day-so-kind-support-you guys-y
((the government)) supports you people all the time.
- 05 P2 依依郁郁 依依郁郁啊 真係㗎(0.2)
ji1 ji1 juk1 juk1 ji1 ji1 juk1 juk1 aa1 zan1 hai6 gaa2
trouble trouble-y really-is-y
Trouble here and there, really is.
- 06 P2 我有嚇你㗎
ngo5 mou5 haak3 nei5 gaa2
I-not have-scare-you-y
I don’t ((want to)) scare you.
- 07 P1 咪係咯
mi1 hai6 lo3
not-is-y
You don’t.
- 08 P2 你淨係睇醫院就好咯
nei5 zing6 hai6 tai2 ji1 jyun2 zau6 hou2 lo3
you-just-see-hospital-just-good-y
Just look at the hospitals.
- 09 P2 嗰啲上咗六十 [上咗六十歲嘅=
go2 di1 soeng5 zo2 luk6 sap6 soeng5 zo2 luk6 sap6 seoi3 ge3
those-above-Vg-six-ten above-Vg-six-ten-years-u
Those above sixty. Those over sixty years old-
- 10 P1 [不過而家啲
bat1 gwo3 ji4 gaa1 di1

but-now-u
But now-

- 11 P1 =我講啦=
ngo5 gong2 laa1
I-say-y
I tell ((you)).
- 12 P2 =咩都唔使俾錢.
me1 dou1 m4 sai2 bei2 cin2
what-all-not-need-give-money
-don't need to pay money for anything.
- 13 P2 有陣時啊:: 佢哋真係攞到啲要去食啊,
jau5 zan6 si4 aa1 keoi5 dei2 zan1 hai6 lo2 dou3 di1 jiu3 heoi3 sik6 aa1
some-time-y they-really-is-take-Vg-some-need-go-eat-y
Sometimes, they really take the medicine and eat ((it)).
- 14 P2 我都冇咁驚啊.
ngo5 dou1 mou5 gam3 ging1 aa1
I-all-not have-so-afraid-y
That's not even that disturbing.
- 15 P2 最驚啊 佢攞到啲藥 佢掉啊.
zeoi3 ging1 aa1 keoi5 lo2 dou3 di1 joe6 keoi5 diu6 aa1
most-afraid-r-take-Vg-some-medicine r-throw away
Most disturbing is ((when)) they get some medicine and throw it away.
- 16 P2 我先至發滾啊.
ngo5 sin1 zi3 faat3 gwan2 aa1
I-only then-start to boil-y
That's when I start to boil.
- 17 P1 所以我哋要食 照顧好自己身體,
so2 ji5 ngo5 dei2 jiu3 sik6 ziu3 gu3 hou2 zi6 gei2 san1 tai2
so-we-need-eat-medicine take care-good-self-body
So we need to take ((medicine)), look after our health.
- 18 P1 唔好成日整自己有病咯,
m4 hou2 sing4 jat6 zing2 zi6 gei2 jau5 beng6 lo3
not-good-whole day-make-self-have-sickness-y
Don't be sick so often.
- 19 P1 因為藥都唔係好嘢嚟㗎,
jan1 wai4 joe6 dou1 m4 hai6 hou2 je5 lai4 gaa2
because-medicine-also-not-is-good-thing-come-y
Because the medicine also isn't good stuff.
- 20 P1 冇辦法咯:: 冇人想去=
mou5 baan6 faat3 lo3 mou5 jan4 soeng2 heoi3
no choice-y no-person-think-go
No choice, nobody likes to.
- 21 P1 =我老公就係,
ngo5 lou5 gung1 zau6 hai6
my-husband-just-is
My husband ((for example)).

- 22 P1 周不時我成日勸佢唔好食咁多啊。
 zau1 bat1 si4 ngo5 sing4 jat6 hyun3 keoi5 m4 hou2 sik6 gam3 do1 aa1
 often-I-whole day-urge-him-not-good-eat-so-much-y
I often urge him to eat less medicine.
- 23 P1 我減減減 有多我都係攞返去自己算了,
 ngo5 gaam2gaam2gaam2 jau5 do1 ngo5dou1hai6 lo2 faan2 heoi3 zi6gei2 syun3 liu5
 I-reduce-reduce-reduce have-many-I-all-is-take-back-go-self-done-y
I reduce and reduce ((it)), I often even take some away for myself and done.
- 24 P1 >我都係唔好叫佢食<.
 ngo5 dou1 hai6 m4 hou2 giu3 keoi5 sik6
 I-also-is-not-good-ask-him-eat
I don' t want to ask him to eat ((the medicine)).
- 25 P1 >因為食得多<.
 jan1wai4 sik6 dak1 do1
 because-eat-u-much
Because ((he)) is eating a lot.
- 26 P1 >食到佢成個人好似<(.) 硬化咗 咁咯.
 sik6 dou3 keoi5 sing4 go3 jan4 hou2 ci5 ngaang6 faa3 zo2 gam3 lo3
 eat-until-he-become-q-person-like-harden-Vg so-y
He ate until his whole body already became stiff, like that.
- 27 P2 咁有陣時你唔食啊.
 gam3 jau5 zan6 si4 nei5 m4 sik6 aa1
 so-have-time-you-not-eat-y
So sometimes you ((shouldn' t)) eat.
- 28 P2 可能捱唔到今日喔.
 ho2 nang4 ngaai4 m4 dou3 gam1 jat6 ak1
 maybe-endure-not-until-today-y
((Or)) maybe ((you)) wouldn' t make it until today.

(13) Data Excerpt: “Prospering Kampongs” || MYCANCOR 053 (17:50-18:15)

This is from a conversation between two participants (P1 and P2) that takes place in a Cafe. Prior to the beginning of the excerpt, around 20 minutes into the casual talk, P1 brings up the topic of *sing4 si5 kwai1 waak6* (“city planning”) (line 1). Related to this, P2 brings up the topic of Kuala Lumpur’s LRT (Light Rail Transit) (line 3) and formulates an initiating action in line 7-8.

- 01 P1 所以有時係咪(0.5) 城市規劃,
so2 ji5 jau5 si4 hai6 mi1 sing4 si5 kwai1 waak6
so-sometimes-is-not-city-planning
So sometimes, right, city planning,
- 02 P1 個路真 路線真係好重要.
go3 lou6 zan1 lou6 sin3 zan1 hai6 hou2 cung4 jiu3
that-road-really road-really-is-very-important
These road, really, roads are really important.
- 03 P2 根係咯:: 就好似:: KL嗰啲(.)輕快鐵啊=
gang2 hai6 lo3 zau6 hou2 ci5 KL go2 di1 hing1 faai3 tit3 aa1
of course-y just-like ns-that-some-nt-y
Of course, just like, those in KL, the Light Railway Transit ((LRT)).
- 04 P1 =係呀.
hai6 aa1
is-y
Yes.
- 05 P2 嗰啲LRT啊=
go2 di1 LRT aa1
those-nt-y
That LRT.
- 06 P1 =係呀.
hai6 aa1
is-y
Yes.
- 07 P2 佢哋兜Kampong再兜去城市嘅,
keoi5 dei2 dau1 Kampong zoi3 dau1 heoi3 sing4 si5 ge3
they-run-ns-again-run-to-city-u
They ((the LRT)) run to the kampongs ((villages)) and then to the city again.
- 08 P2 其實有佢嘅原因嘅.
kei4 sat6 jau5 keoi5 ge3 jyun4 jan1 ge3
actually-have-their-reason-u
Actually there is a reason for that.
- 09⇒P1 >係呀係<因為做咩要慢慢帶旺佢(0.3)
hai6 aa1 hai6 jan1 wai4 zou6 me1 jiu3 maan6 maan6 daai3 wong6 keoi5
is-y is because-do-what need-slow-slow-bring-thrive-them
Yes, yes, because to do what, to slowly make them ((the kampongs)) prosper.
- 10 P1 如果唔係(.)一下子斬斷咗,
jyu4 gwo2 m4 hai6 jat1 haa6 zi2 zaam2 tyun5 zo2
if-not-is all of a sudden-break-Vg-Vg
If not, they would suddenly collapse.
- 11 P1 ↑妖(.)食毛咩>唔係唔係<食粥水咩.

diu1 sik6 mou4 me1 m4 hai6 m4 hai6 sik6 zuk1 seoi2 me1
damn eat-hair-what not-is-not-is eat-porridge-water-what
Damn, nothing to eat, I mean, ((only)) porridge water to eat ((idiom)).

- 12 P2 嗯°好似°係咯.
ng2 hou2 ci5 hai6 lo3
y like is-y
Mhm, seems like, yes.

(14) Data Excerpt: “Verifying the tax” || MYCANCOR 010 (02:44 -02:52)

The excerpt shows a conversation between an elderly citizen (P2) and an employee (P3) of a community center in Malaysia. This center is typically frequented by citizens to seek advice or file complaints regarding a wide range of matters related to citizen-government relations, such as filling out all sorts of paper work, getting documents certified or seeking advice after having trouble with other government agencies. In this case, the elderly citizen has come in after he previously had some trouble related to his income tax report at another agency.

- 01 P2 我聽我女講佢入電腦度睇話。(0.2)
ngo5 ting3 ngo5 nei5 gong2 keoi5 jap6 din6 nou5 dou6 tai2 waa6
I-listen my-daughter-say she into computer-s see-say
My daughter told me that, she checked on the computer ((to find the numbers)).
- 02 P2 攞唔到喔。咁樣樣。=
lo2 m4 dou3 wo3 gam3 joeng1 joeng2
get-no-u y c-r-r
((She)) can't get them.
- 03 P3 |唔係啊(.)lulus喔?
m4 hai6 aa1 lulus wo3
no-is lulus y
That's not what I mean, ((you already)) passed ((the tax review)).
|((looking up from her PC screen where she has been checking the client's file))
- 04 P2 係咩?
hai6 mei
is y
Really?
- 05 P3 Lulus(.)只係叫你補返張糧單::?
lulus zi2 hai6 giu3 nei5 bou2 faan2 zoeng1 loeng4 daan1
lulus just is ask-you supplement-u q-salary-list
Yes, ((they)) just ask you to supplement a list of ((your)) salaries.
- 06 P2 哦:::?:=
oo:::
y
Ohh.
- 07 P3 =所以我要問清楚,
soji ngo4 jiu3 man6 ceng1 co2
so I need ask-clear
So ((therefore)) I need to be specific here ((about the amount of your income)).
- 08 P3 你[到底報所得稅報幾[多。°
nei5 dou3 dai2 bao3 so2 dak1 seoi3 bao3 gei2 do1
you after all report income tax report how-much
How much income did you report after all?
- 09 P2 [嗯:: ((nods)) [哦。
ng2 oo2
y y
Ok. Ok.
- 10 P3 你係咪報千五|[-
nei2 hai6 mai4 bao3 cin1 ng4

- you v report thousand-five
Did you report 1500-
 |((P2 nods))
- 11 P2 [應該就係咯。
 jing3 goi1 zau6 hai6 lo1
 should d is-y
Should be ((something like that)).
- 12 P3 或者你報千二=
 waak6 ze2 nei2 bao3 cin1 ji6
 or you report thousand-two-
Or did you report 1200?
- 13 P2 =°冇啦°(.)[千五到二千咁樣嘛=
 mou5 laa1 cin1 ng5 dou3 ji6 cin1 gam3 joeng6 maa3
 no-y thousand-five u two-thousand c y
I didn't. ((It was)) around 1500 to 2000.
- 14 P3 [或者你報二千。
 waak6 ze2 nei5 bou3 ji6 cin1
 or you-report two-thousand
Or did you report 2000?
- 15 P2 =同個佢幫我寫=
 tung4 go2 go3 keoi5 bong1 ngo5 se2
 with-r he-help-me write
It was with him ((the Malay clerk at the tax office, he)) helped me to write that.
- 16 P3 =咁呢而你係報二千,
 gam3 ne1 ji4 nei5 hai6 bou3 ji6 cin1
 c-y c-you-is report two-thousand
So you are going to report 2000?
- 17 P3 [咁樣講呢(.)個五百我入落你老婆個度.(.)
 gam3 joeng6 gong2 ne1 go2 ng5 baak3 ngo5j ap6 lok6 nei5 lou5 po4 go2 dou6
 c say-y r-five-hundred i-put-into your-wife r
In this case, I will input the 500 to your wife's account.
- 18 P2 [哦。
 ngo5
 e
Oh.
- 19 P3 你保持返千五。
 nei5 bou2 ci4 faan2 cin1 ng5
 you maintain thousand-five
You maintain 1500 ((on your account)).
- 20 P2 係啊(.)因為個個幫我咁樣寫啊嘛。
 hai6 aa1 jan1 wai4 go2 go3 bong1 ngo5 gam3 joeng6 se2 aa1 maa3
 is-y because that-help-me like-this-write y-y
Ok. Because that guy ((the Malay guy at the income tax office)) wrote that for me.
- 21 P2 應該係咁上下。
 jing3 goi1 hai6 gam3 soeng5 haa6
 should is-like around
It should be approximately ((that much)).

- 22 P2 >唔知<千五定二千㗎啦[XX.
m4 zi1 cin1 ng5 ding6 ji6 cin1 gaa2 laa1
not-know 1500 or 2000 y-y
I don't know ((if)) it was 1500 or 2000. xx-
- 23 P3 [你記得幾多:?
nei5 gei3 dak1 gei2 do1
you remember how-much
How much do you remember?
- 24 P3 [唔好寫錯嘢呀.(.)
m4 hou2 se2 co3 je5 aa1
not-good write-wrong-things y
Can't write something incorrect.
- 25 P2 |[係咁上下㗎啦.
hai6 gam3 soeng5 haa6 gaa2 laa1
is-like around y-y
It's like this, approximately ((this much)).
|((shakes head))
- 26⇒P3 .hhh 因為[我哋對所得稅係咪=
jan1 wai4 [ngo5 dei2 deoi3 so2 dak1 seoi3 hai6 mai1
because our verify income tax v
Because we are verifying ((your)) income tax, right.
- 27 P2 [°係咁上下㗎.°
hai6 gam3 soeng5 haa6 gaa2
is-like around y
It's like this, approximately ((this much)).
- 28 P1 |=喂我入去裡面啊入[XX.
wai3 ngo5 jap6 heoi3 leoi5 min6 aa1 jap6
e I inside-go inside y inside xx
Hey, I am going inside.
|((touches P2's shoulder))
- 29 P2 [| 嗯嗯嗯.
ng2 ng2 ng2 ng2
e-e-e-e
Ok ok ok.
|((Raises arm))
- 30 (2.0) ((P3 starts typing))
- 31⇒P3 因為我哋對所得稅呀:
jan1 wai4 ngo5 dei2 deoi3 so2 dak1 seoi3 aa:1
because we verifying income tax y
Because we are verifying ((your)) income tax.
- 32 P3 有陣時係咪(.)[要清楚交待.
jau5 zan6 si4 hai6 mi1 jiu3 cing1 co2 gaau1 doi6
sometimes v need-clear account
At times, you know, it's important to do this correctly,
- 33 P2 [嗯:.

ng2
e
Yes.

- 34 P3 .hhh 唔係一陣間呀導致到呀,
m4 hai6 jat1 zan6 gaan1 aa2 dou6 zi3 dou3 aa2
not-is later y result u y
Or later this will result in,
- 35 P3 你哋呀(1.0)被調查嘅gwo3結果呀.
nei5 dei2 aa2 bei6 diu6 caa4 ge3 gwo2 git3 gwo2 aa1
you y passiv-investigate u nx result y
You guys getting investigated ((for tax evasion)).
- 36 P2 | 恩.
ng2
e
Yes.
|((nods))

(15) Data Excerpt: “Puts on airs” || MYCANCOR 009 (01:53 -02:10)

This is a conversation over dinner between two participant who are colleagues and friends. Both work in the catering industry and, after a working day, now sit in a restaurant, talking about their colleagues. Prior to the beginning of the excerpt they have been talking about a colleague named Ah-Ciu.

- 01 P2 有好多人都唔鍾意佢㗎,
jau5 hou2 do1 jan4 dou1 m4 zung1 ji3 keoi5 gaa2
have-many-people also-not-like-him-y
There are many people who also don't like him (Ah-Ciu),
- 02 P2 xx 有陣時.
xx jau5 zan6 si4
xx-some-time
XX that time.
- 03 P2 |佢冇入嚟CPA仲好啊,
keoi5 mou5 jap6 lai4 CPA zung6 hou2 aa1
he-not-come-in nt-better-y
It's better that he didn't join CPA ((name of company)),
|((points at P1))
- 04 P2 如果佢入嚟CPA有好多人都好嬲佢㗎.
jyu4 gwo2 keoi5 jap6 lai4 CPA jau5 hou2 do1 jan4 hou2 nau1 keoi5 gaa2
if he-come-in-nt have-many-people very-angry-him-y
If he would have joined, a lot of people would have been angry at him.
- 05 (1.8)
- 06⇒P2 因為佢(.)擺起個款咯:好似.
jan1 wai4 keoi5 baai2 hei2 go3 fun2 lo3 hou2 ci5
because-he i y likely
Because he puts on airs, it seems.
- 07 P1 佢係把口衰啲嘅::.
keoi5 hai6 baa2 hau2 seoi1 di1 ze1
he-is q-mouth-bad-y
He is just a bit foul-mouthed.
- 08 P1 個人其實係(.)[OK
go3 jan4 kei4 sat6 hai6 OK
that-person actually-is ok
His personality is actually ...OK.
- 09 P2 [係OK嘅.
hai6-ok-ge3
is-ok-y
Is OK.
- 10 P2 but佢(.)但係佢會命令人哋做嘢你知冇
but keoi5 daan6 hai6 keoi5 wui2 ming6 ling6 jan4 dei2 zou6 je5 nei5 nei5 zi1 mou5
but-he but-he-would command-people-do-things you-you-know-not
but he would boss people around to do things, you- you know?
- 11 (7.0)
- 12 P1 所以我都(0.4)好慶幸啊
so2 ji5 ngo5 dou1 hou2 hing3 hang6 aa1

so I-also-very-fortunate
So I' m ... fortunate.

13 P1 佢一嚟咗我有響嗰邊做嘢咗 呵|呵呵
keoi5 jat1 lai4 zo2 ngo5 mou5 hoeng2 go2 bin1 zou6 je5 zo2 he he he
he-once-come-in-Vg I-not-have-to-there do-something-laughter
Once he comes, I wouldn' t work there anymore, hehehe.

14 P2 |((P2 smiles and thumbs-up gesture))

(16) Data Excerpt: “You need to wash” || MYCANCOR 016 (02:45 -03:09)

This is a conversation between two siblings (who seem to know each other well) taking place in their living room. P1 is the older sister of P2, her brother. The activity that takes place immediately before the excerpt begins is this: P1 stands next to a laundry rack in the back of the room and, one by one, picks up pieces of clothing that are hanging over the rack. Her interlocutor, P2, is at the other end of the room and not part of this activity. P1 then stops picking up pieces of clothing, turns around and starts walking towards another room, carrying several pieces of clothing on her arm (02:45). As she turns around, she begins a turn that constitutes a request. This action unfolds throughout a sequence of four TCUs and a pointing gesture (line 2-5). P1 asks P2 to do the laundry and, as it will become clear later (line 8 and 9), seems to be concerned about getting enough dirty laundry together to make another round of using a washing machine worthwhile.

- 01 P1 | (3.0)
| ((picks up pieces of clothing from a laundry rack in the living room))
- 02 P1 | 個毛巾應該仲要洗呀。
go3 mou4 gan1 jing3 goi1 zung6 jiu3 sai2 aa1
q-towel-should-also-need-wash-y
That towel needs to be washed.
| ((gaze falls on a towel hanging over a chair))
| ((starts walking across the living room towards another room))
- 03 P1 | 你要洗你嘅個。
nei5 jiu3 sai2 nei5 ge3 go2 go3
you-need-your-that-q
You need to wash your that ((thing)).
| (((gaze on a basket full of laundry on the floor as she walks towards it))
| ((P2 slowly walks around the room with the basket not in view))
- 04 P1 | 你要洗你堆衫嘅。
nei5 jiu3 sai2 nei5 deoi1 saam1 ngo4
you-need-wash-your-q-clothes-y
You need to wash your pile of clothes.
| ((points at basket as she walks into another room))
| ((P2 turns toward the basket))
- 05⇒P1 [因為你有個個(.) gym | > 個個 < 長褲 | .
jan1wai4 nei5 jau5 go2 go3 gym go2 go3 coeng4 fu3
because-you-have-that-q gym-that-q-long pants
Because you have these long pants for the Gym.
| ((P1 enters another room))
| ((P2 walks past basket and looks inside))
- 06 P2 | 係呀.(1.0)((sniffles))
hai6 aa1
is-y
Right.
| ((walks away from basket and into the center of the living room))
- 07 P2 | 個唔會臭。
go2 m4 wui2 cau3
that-not-will-smelly
That ((one)) wouldn't smell bad.
- 08 (9.0)

- 09 P1 |我又可以開一輪(.)開一輪洗開開一輪洗.
ngo5 jau6 ho2ji5 hoi1 jat1 leon4 hoi1 jat1 leon4 sai2 hoi1 hoi1 jat1 leon4 sai2
I-also-can-start-one-roung start-one-round-wash start start-one-round-wash
I can start another round. Start a round , start a round of using ((the machine)).
- 10 P1 衣機嚟洗.
ji1 gei1 lai4 sai2
washing machine-come-wash
Take the washing machine to wash.

(17) Data Excerpt: “Bought as a kid” || MYCANCOR 013 (22:46-24:02)

This is a family conversation over lunch featuring four participants. P2 is the mother, P1 and P3 are her daughter and son, P4 is the husband of her daughter. The action under study here is related to the topic that the mother (P2) does not know her own birth date (see line 6 - 8). What follows in line 9 to 53 is a longer telling-sequence located in the realm of Chinese mythology (omitted here for brevity). The telling sequence ends with the punchline that a person cannot be brought back to life if the person doesn't know the exact date and time of birth. As a result of this lack of knowledge, the thread or 'fishing line' with which that person can be pulled out of the underworld cannot be found (line 55).

- 01 P2 嗰陣時佢又喺[日本仔打仗嘅]時候。
go2zan6si4 keoi5 jau6 ngaam1 ngaam1 jat6 bun2 zai2 daa2 zoeng6 ge3 si4 hau6
q-that-time-d-also-just-just-japan-ng-fight-that-time
That was just at the time during the war with the Japanese.
- 02 P3 [XX
XX
xx
xx
- 03 P4 [係啦好亂。
hai6 laa1 hou2 lyun6
is-y very-chaotic
Very chaotic.
- 04 P2 七國咁亂=
cat1 gwok3 gam3 lyun6
i
Very chaotic” .
- 05 P4 係咯。
hai6 lo3
is-y
Mhm.
- 06 P2 你話佢邊個日子喺。
nei5 waa6 keoi5 bin1 go3 jat6 zi2 ngaam1
you-say-he-which-day-correct
How do you know which ((birth)) day is correct.
- 07 P4 係咯。
hai6 lo3
is-y
Mhm.
- 08 P2 都唔知係阿媽喺(.)就政府喺。
dou1 m4 zi1 hai6 aa3 maa1 ngaam1 zau6 zing3 fu2 ngaam1
all-not-know-is-mother-correct or-government-correct
((You)) don't know if mom or the government is right.
- 09 P2 你話邊個喺呢。
nei5 waa6 bin1 go3 ngaam1 nei
you-say-which-q-correct-y
Who is right.
- 10 P1 咁冇理由政府唔喺。
gam3 mou5 lei5 jau4 zing3 fu2 m4 ngaam1 gaa2

- so-no-reason-government-not-correct-y
So the government doesn' t have a reason to not be right.
- 11 P4 係阿媽喺啦:.,
 hai6 aa3 maa1 ngaam1 laa1
 is-mother-correct-y
Mom is right.
- 12 P4 阿媽知道嘛.
 aa3 maa1 zi1 dou6 maa3
 mother-know-y
Mom knows.
- 13 P4 你生佢你唔知佢幾時咩=
 nei5 saang1 keoi5 nei5 m4 zi1 keoi5 gei2 si4 me1 =
 you-give birth-he-not-know-what-time-y
You gave birth, how do you not know the time.
- 14 P2 哈哈=
 haa1 haa1
 laughter
haha.
- 15 P4 =你唔知佢你幾大月有啊.
 nei5 m4 zi1 keoi5 nei5 gei2 daai6 jyut6 mou5 aa1
 you-not-know-he-what-old-month-not-a
You don' t know how many months old ((the child)) is.
- 16 P2 [哈哈
 haa1 haa1
 laughter
haha.
- 17 P1 [哈哈
 haa1 haa1
 laughter
haha.
- 18 P3 你自己嘢都唔喺啦,
 nei5 zi6 gei2 je5 dou1 m4 ngaam1 laa1
 you-yourself-what-all-not-correct-y
How do you don' t even know yourself what' s right.
- 19 P3 咁啊咩啦 [哈哈
 gam3 aa1 me1 laa1 haa1 haa1
 so-y-like that-y laughter
Then what, haha.
- 20 P4 [哈哈
 haa1 haa1
 laughter
haha.
- 21 P4 自己都唔喺=
 zi6 gei2 dou1 m4 ngaam1
 yourself-all-not-correct
You don' t know yourself.

- 22 P2 =[哈哈 哈哈
haa1 haa1 haa1 haa1
laughter
haha haha.
- 23 P1 =[哈哈 [哈哈
haa1 haa1 haa1 haa1
laughter
haha haha.
- 24 P2 [咁啊我嘅唔喺[]°又唔出奇°
gam3 aa1 ngo5 ge3 m4 ngaam1 jau6 m4 ceot1 kei4
so-y-our-not-right also-not-strange
So it' s not a surprise of you are not correct yourself.
|((points at P3))
- 25 P3 [佢又差成個月嘅嘅,
keoi5 jau6 caa1 sing4 go3 jyut6 ge3 ak1
he-also-difference-like-q-month-y-y
But for him the different is a couple of month.
- 26 P3 佢有出世紙同正式嘅出世日子=
keoi5 jau5 ceot1 sai3 zi2 tung4 zing3 sik1 ge3 ceot1 sai3 jat6 zi2
he-have-birth certificate-with-official-u-birth date--
He has a birth certificate with an official birth date.
- 27 P4 =噃(.) 咁[喺
ng2 gam3 ngaam1
yes-so-correct
Mhm, so ((that' s)) correct.
- 28 P3 [出生嗰時未賣之前有一張嘅=
ceot1 saang1 go2 si4 mei6 maa1 zi1 cin4 jau5 jat1 zoeng1 ak1
give birth-q-time-not-buy-before-have-one-q-y
((They)) didn' t buy ((the certificate)) at after birth, but had one before.
- 29 P4 =呃 係咯 [佢阿媽唔喺
aak1 hai6 lo3 keoi5 aa3 maa1 m4 ngaam1
y is-y his-mother-not-correct
Ohh, mhm, then his mom is correct.
- 30 P3 [賣咗之後又一張嘅=
maai6 zo2 zi1 hau6 jau6 jat1 zoeng1 ak1
buy-Vg-after-also-one-q-y
But afterwards they bought another one.
- 31 P2 =哈哈
haa1 haa1 haa1
laughter
hahaha.
- 32 P1 =哈哈
haa1 haa1
laughter
haha.
- 33 P3 係咪 唔喺 xxxx 嗰嗰嗰嗰張又唔喺,
hai6 mi1 m4 ngaam1 xxxx go2 go2 go2 go2 zoeng1 jau6 m4 ngaam1

- is-y not-correct xxxxx q-q-q-q-q-also-not-correct
mhm, right, xxxx that, that, that, that one is also wrong.
- 34 P3 離曬譜咯=
 lei4 saai3 pou2 lo3
 very unreasonable-y
Very strange.
- 35 P2 =咪係咯.
 mi1 hai6 lo3
 not-is-y
mhm.
- 36 P3 差成個月嘅=
 caa1 sing4 go3 jyut6 ge3
 difference-q-month-Vg
The difference is about a month.
- 37 P2 =我唔啱又(.) 唔緊要啊 唔知時
 ngo5 m4 ngaam1 jau6 m4 gan2 jiu3 aa1 m4 zi1 si4
 I-not-correct-also not-important-y not-know-time
((If)) I' m wrong it doesn' t matter, I know the time.
- 38 P3 咪就咁咯 xx 有咩大 咪有咩大[不了
 mi1 zau6 gam3 gaak3 xx jau5 me1 daai6 mi1 jau5 me1 daai6 bat1 liu5
 not-is-just-like this-y xx have-what-big not-is-that-big thing
Like that, xx, what big, that' s not a big deal.
- 39 P4 [xxx 係咯 一樣=
 xxx hai6 gaak3 jat1 joeng6
 xxx is-y-same
xxx is the same.
- 40 P3 =人都死[咯 有咩.
 jan4 dou1 sei2 gaak3 jau5 me1
 people-all-dead-y have-what
The person is dead anyway, isn' t it.
- 41 P4 [呃:::
 aak1
 y
Ohhh.
- 42 P1 [哈哈
 haa1 haa1
 laughter
haha.
- 43 P4 [咪係咯
 mi1 hai6 lo3
 is-not-is-y
It' s not.
- 44 P3 [呢啲唔啱 嗰啲唔啱嘅=
 ne1 di1 m4 ngaam1 go2 di1 m4 ngaam1 ngo4
 you guys-not-correct q-is-not-correct-y
You guys are wrong, you guys are wrong.

- 45 P4 =差個幾日啊 哎唷
caa1 go2 gei2 jat6 aa1 aai1 jo1
difference-is-a couple-day-y y-y
The difference is a couple of days.
- 46 P4 差幾耐啊 唔差個幾日.
caa1 gei2 noi6 aa1 m4 caa1 go2 gei2 jat6
difference-how-long-y not-difference-q-a couple-day
What was the difference, it wasn' t a couple of days.
- 47 P4 唔係話[差個幾年.
m4 hai6 waa6 caa1 go2 gei2 nin4
not-is-say-difference-q-a couple-year
Can' t the difference be a couple of years.
- 48 P3 [唔係話而家.
m4 hai6 waa6 ji4 gaa1
not-is-say-now
Can' t it, now.
- 49 P3 而家要起死回生咁招個魂返嚟,
ji4 gaa1 jiu3 hei2 sei2 wui4 saang1 gam3 ziu1 go3 wan4 faan2 lai4
now-need-rebirth-then-summon-q-soul-back-come
Now you need to bring that person(('s soul)) back to life,
- 50 P3 冇時辰八字,
mou5 si4 san4 baat3 zi6
not-have-birth date and time
((But)) there' s no birth date and time,
- 51 P3 勾唔到x 就唔得講啦=
ngau1 m4 dou3 x zau6 m4 dak1 gong2 laa1
hook-not-on-x then-not-work-y
((Then)) you can' t find that person, it doesn' t work.
- 52 P4 |佢自己都唔知道.
keoi5 zi6 gei2 dou1 m4 zi1 dou6
he-himself-also-not-know
He himself also doesn' t know.
|((P1 and P2 start smiling and laughing))
- 53 P2 [。哈哈。
haa1 haa1
laughter
haha.
- 54 P1 [。哈哈。
haa1 haa1
laughter
haha.
- 55 P3 |哎(.)搭錯線咗=
aai1 daap3 co3 sin3 zo2
y connect-wrong-line-Vg
Oops, got the wrong line ((to bring a person back to life)).
|((gestures pulling in a fishing line))
- 56 P1 =|唔係你唔係你 。哈哈。=

- m4 hai6 nei5 m4 hai6 nei5 haa1 haa1
is-not-you-not-is-you laughter
Not you, not you, haha.
|((shaking hands; smiles))
|((P4 smiles))
|((P2 smiles, then opens mouth, possibly in-breath; puts hand on the table))
- 57 P2 =| 如果我唔知道又係情有可原㗎係咪?
jyu4 gwo2 ngo5 m4 zi1 dou6 jau6 hai6 cing4 jau5 ho2 jyun4 gaa2 hai6 mi1
if-I-not-know-also-is-have excuse-y-is-not
If I don't know ((my birth date)), that can be excused, right.
|((puts both hands on table, palms facing up))
- 58⇒P2 因為我係買返嚟㗎嘛,
jan1wai4 ngo5 hai6 maa15 faan2 lai4 gaa2 maa3
because-I-is-buy-come-back-y-y
Because I was bought ((as a kid)).
- 59 P2 又唔係我阿爸生嘅[(.)點知?
jau6 m4 hai6 ngo5 aa3 baa1 saang1 ge3 dim2 zi1
also-not-is-my-father-give birth how-know
And it wasn't my father who gave birth to me, how to know?
|((P4 nods))
- 60 P4 [°>哦<°
ngo4
y
Uh.
- 61 P4 係咯.
hai6 lo3
is-y
Mhm.
- 62 P2 佢又係唔知嘅,
keoi5 jau6 hai6 m4 zi1 ge3
he-again-is-not-know-Vg
And he also doesn't know.
- 63 P2 佢講幾時咪幾時啦(.)
keoi5 gong2 gei2 si4 mi1 gei2 si4 laa1
he-say-what-time-is-not-what-time-y
He says a time and then that's the time.
- 64 P2 佢出個報生紙(.)
keoi5 ceot1 go3 bou3 saang1 zi2
he-issue-q-birth certificate
He got a birth certificate.
- 65 P2 同去我[老豆生嘅-
tung4 heoi3 ngo5 lou5 dau6 saang1 ge3
with-go-my-father-give birth-Vg
((And)) the dad who gave birth to me,
- 66 P4 [冇嘢嘅 差個幾日啫.
mou5 je5 ge3 caa1 go2 gei2 jat6 ze1
not-have-what-Vg difference-q-a couple-day-only
Not a big deal, only a couple of days difference.

67 P2 都唔一樣.: 嘅
dou1 m4 jat1 joeng6 ge3
all-not-same-Vg
-has a different ((one)).

68 P4 °係咯°
hai6 lo3
is-y
Mhm.

(18) Data Excerpt: “Doing research” || MYCANCOR 023 (04:11-04:31)

To recap, the two female participants (P1 and P2) have just met for the first time but have friends in common and are from the same city in Malaysia. Prior to the beginning of this abstract, they have been taking about past life events, specifically their educational background and employment history.

- 01 P2 噢 你做咩工啊(.)>之後<.
ee2 nei5 zou6 me1 gung1 aa1 zi1 hau6
y you-do-what-work-y after
Eey, what did you do for work - afterwards ((after graduating from uni))?
- 02 P1 之後:我就嚟::呃::NPU呃,
zi1 hau6 ngo5 zau6 lai4 aak1 NIE aak1
after-I-just-come-y nt y
Afterwards, I just began at, mhm, NPU ((name of university)), mhm.
- 03 P1 NPU係[我讀書個邊].
NPU hai6 [ngo5 duk6 syu1 go2 bin1
nt-is-I-study-over-there
NPU is ((that institution)) where I studied.
- 04 P2 [> 噁噁噁噁噁 <
ng2 ng2 ng2 ng2 ng2
y-y-y-y-y-y
Mhh,mhh,mhh,mhh,mhh.
- 05 P1 呃(.)我去嗰度做research assistant咯.
aak1 ngo5 heoi3 go2 dou6 zou6 research assistant lo3
y I-go-over-there-do-research assistant-y
Mhm, I went there to work as a research assistant.
- 06⇒P1 因為我[一直一畢業,
jan1 wai4 ngo5 jat1 zik6 jat1 bat1 jip6
because-I-straight-once-graduate
Because I always, once I graduated,
- (cont) 我就做我就想做research[嘅::[°xx°關係=
ngo5 zau6 zou6 ngo5 zau6 soeng2 zou6 research ge3 xx gwaan1 hai6
I-just-do I-just-want-do-research-Vg xx-related to
I did, I just wanted to do research, something related to x.
- 07 P2 [↑哦:
ngo4
y
Mhm.
- 08 P2 [哦 係咯
ngo4 hai6 lo3
y is-y
Mhm, yes.
- 09 P2 =>因為<我有(.)之前我有friend都係讀psychology,
jan1wai4 ngo5 jau5 zi1 cin4 ngo5 jau5 friend dou1 hai6 duk6 psychology
because-I-have-before-I-have-friend-also-is-study-psychology
Because I have this friend who also studied psychology,
- 10 P2 即係唔知做乜嘢..
zik1 hai6 m4 zi1 zou6 mat1 je5

exactly-is-not-know-do-what
Who just didn't know what to do.

- 11 P2 >除咗做research之外<哈哈.
ceoi4 zo2 zou6 research zi1 ngoi6 haa1 haa1
beside-do-research-beside laughter
Besides doing research, haha.

(19) Data Excerpt: “Days off” || MYCANCOR 008 (00:00-00:40)

The excerpt shows a conversation between two participants, older sister (P2) and younger brother (P1), who sit at a table. The conversation has just begun and no prior information related to the topics that come up have previously been shared. At the beginning of the excerpt, the two talk about P1’s job. Specifically, they are talking about the amount of vacation days that P1 has left this year. Up to this point, no additional information related to the topic has been brought up.

- 01 P2 你剩返幾耐假?|(0.5)
nei5 zing6 faan2 gei2 noi6 gaa3
you-have-left-Vg how-many-holidays
How many holidays ((days off work)) do you have left?
|((puts phone near P1))
- 02 P1 |我?(1.8)
ngo5
r
Me?
|((looks at phone then up))
- 03 P1 兩個:拎咗:::(0.8)一日(0.5)兩日(0.5)
loeng5 go3 ling1 zo2 jat1 jat6 loeng5 jat6
two-q take-already one-day two-day
Two have been taken. One, two.
- 04 P1 過年應該兩日=
gwo3 nin4 jing3 goi1 loeng5 jat6
new year should two-day
((Chinese)) New Year should be two days.
- 05 P2 =你一年[有幾多日].
nei5 jat1 nin4 jau5 gei2 do1 jat6
you-one-year have-how-many-day
How many days do you have a year?
- 06 P1 [xx =>十五日<=
xx sap6 ng5 jat6
xx five-ten-day
xx Fifteen.
- 07 P2 =十五日:日(0.2)
sap6 ng5 jat6
ten-five-day
Fifteen days.
- 08 P2 之後::(.)過年你攞開幾多日=
zi1 hau6 gwo3 nin4 nei5 lo2 hoi1 gei2 do1 jat6
after new year you-take-away-how-many-day
How many days did you take off after ((Chinese)) New Year?
- 09 P1 =我帶開四日過來啊嘛.
ngo5 daai3 hoi1 sei3 jat6 gwo3 loi4 aa1 maa3
I-bring-over four-day-over-come-y-y
I brought four days over ((from last year)).
- 10 P2 你帶咗四日過來::.=
nei5 daai3 zo2 sei3 jat6 gwo3 loi4

- you-bring-already-four-day-over-come
You brought four days over ((from last year)).
- 11 P1 | = 恩
 ng2
 y
Yes.
 | ((nods))
- 12 P2 > 跟住 < (0.3)
 gan1 zyu6
 then
Then.
- 13 P1 四日 (0.2) 加多兩日 > 一日用 XXX < 即係 > 我哋可以一日啫 <.
 sei3 jat6 gaa1 do1 loeng5 jat6 jat1 jat6 jung6 XXX zik1 hai6 ngo5 dei2 ho2 ji5 jat1 jat6 ze1
 four-day add-vg-two-day one-day-use xxx then-we-can-one-day-y
Four days plus two days. One day for XXX. Then we can ((use)) one day.
- 14 P2 你拎開一日 [恩恩
 nei5 ling1 hoi1 jat1 jat6 ng2 ng2
 you-take-away-one-day y-y
You took one day off? Yes.
- 15 P1 [跟住 XXX 嗰啲又加返呢
 gan1 zyu6 XXX go2 di1 jau6 gaa1 faan2 nei
 then xxx r c-add-Vg-y
Then XXX we add that back.
- 16 P1 所以我仲有 好多日㗎 (0.2)
 so2 ji5 ngo5 zung6 jau5 hou2 do1 jat6 gaa2
 so-I-still-have very-many-day-y
So I still have a lot of days.
- 17 P1 > 十 [五日 <.
 sap6 ng5 jat6
 five-ten-day
Fifteen days.
- 18 P2 | [其實係幾多日.
 kei4 sat6 hai6 gei2 do1 jat6
 actually-is how-many-day
So how many days do you actually have left?
 | ((raises hand and turns palms upwards; looks at P1))
- 19 | (0.4)
 | ((P2 looks up, then on her phone))
- 20 ⇒ P2 因為: (0.2) 如果媽 | 咪係::: 下個月出嚟嘅話,
 jan1 wai4 jyu4 gwo2 maa1 mi1 hai6 haa6 go3 jyut6 ceot1 lai4 ge3 waa6
 because if-mother-is next-q-month-out-come-if
Because if mother is coming over next month,
 | ((looks at phone))
- 21 P2 你應該冇攞假=
 nei5 jing3 goi1 mou5 lo2 gaa3
 you-should-no-take-holiday
You ((probably)) wouldn't take any leave.

- 22 P1 =冇啊=
 mou5 aa1
 no-y
No.
- 23⇒P2 =因為你有假用嘛|. (0.4)
 jan1 wai4 nei5 mou5 gaa3 jung6 maa3
 because-you-no-holiday-use-y
Because you can't take any days off.
 |((P1 looks at P2))
- 24 P1 去日本。時候先拎呀嘛。=
 heoi3 jat6 bun2 si4 hau6 sin1 ling1 aa1 maa3
 go-japan time-first-take-y-y
When ((I)) go to Japan I take ((some days off)) first.
- 25 P2 =所以|:::你之後去係十三號出來。
 so2 ji5 nei5 zi1 hau6 heoi3 hai6 sap6 saam1 hou6 ceot1 loi4
 so you-after-go-is ten-three-day-come-out
So when you come over later, that's the thirteenth (day of the month)?
 |((P2 gestures P1 to look at her phone))
- 26 P1 嗯((nods))
 ng2
 y
Yes.

(20) Data Excerpt: “Winter clothes” || MYCANCOR 015 (04:34-05:30)

Here are two participants, a younger sister (P1) and her older brother (P2), who have just moved in a new flat and are in the process of unpacking boxes in the living room. As of the beginning of the excerpt, P1 is sitting on the floor and takes a piece of clothing out of a plastic box in front of her. It is a thick sweater.

- 01 P1 | 喂 呢啲冷衫又唔愛著嘅:,
wai3 ne1 di1 laang5 saam1 jau6 m4 ngoi3 zyu3 ge3
y-q-these-cold-cloth-also-not-like-wear-Vg
Hey, these winter clothes, ((you)) don't wear ((them)).
|((takes a piece of clothing out of a box))
- 02 P1 °你冇著°=
nei5 mou5 zyu3
you-not-wear
You don't wear ((them)).
- 03 P2 =咩唔愛著啊平時:.
me1 m4 ngoi3 zyu3 aa1 ping4 si4
what-not-like-wear-y normally
What ((do you mean I)) don't wear them, normally-
- 04 P1 唔係呀:..
m4 hai6 aa1
not-is-y
No ((that's not it)).
- 05⇒P1 因為係咪(.)冬天嘅衫,
jan1 wai4 hai6 mi1 dung1 tin1 ge3 saam1
because-is-not-winter-Vg-clothes
Because, right, ((these are)) winter clothes.
- 06 P1 我放落一個::大袋嘢.
ngo5 fong3 lok6 jat1 go3 daai6 doi6 je5
I-put-down-one-q big-bag-thing
I put ((them)) in a big bag ((with the big bag things)).
- 07 P2 放袋度咩你放個邊度=
fong3 doi6 dou6 me1 nei5 fong3 go2 bin1 dou6
put-bag-there-what you-put-q-there
Put them in a bag. You ((can)) put them over there.
- 08 P1 =大袋°個°因為個啲全部都係冬天嘅衫嚟嘅.
daai6 doi6 go2 jan1 wai4 go2 di1 cyun4 bou6 dou1 hai6 dung1 tin1 ge3 saam1 lai4 ge3
big-bag-q because-q-these-all-is winter-Vg-clothes-come-Vg
((In the)) big bag. Because that's for all the winter clothes.
- 09 P1 但係呢個又=
daan6 hai6 ne1 go3 jau6
but-is-this-q-also
But isn't this one also-
- 10 P2 =衫房啦衫房都冇位冇嘢°放°=
saam1 fong4 laa1 saam1 fong4 dou1 mou5 wai2 mou5 je5 fong
wardrobe-y wardrobe-all-not have-c not have-thing-put
((The)) wardrobe ((changing room)), the wardrobe is full, can't put ((it)) there.

- 11 P1 =但係呢個又冬夏唔冬夏咁喔
 daan6 hai6 ne1 go3 jau6 dung1 haa6 m4 dung1 haa6 gam3 ak1
 but-is-that-q-also-winter-summer-not-winter-summer-so-y
But this one is also for winter and summer.
- 12 P1 睇吓你有冇掛住呢?
 tai2 haak3 nei5 jau5 mou5 gwaa3 zyu6 ne1
 look-Vg-you-have-not-have-miss-y
Let's see ((if)) you will miss is.
- 13 P2 °放住.°
 fong3 zyu6
 put-Vg
Put ((it away)).
- 14 P1 你發燒咁著呀嘛.
 nei5 faat3 siu1 gam3 zyu3 aa1 maa3
 you-have fever-then-wear-y-y
Wear it when you have a fever.
- 15 P2 發燒(.)發燒唔開冷氣咪得咯.
 faat3 siu1 faat3 siu1 m4 hoi1 laang5 hei3 mi1 dak1 lo3
 have fever-have fever-not-turn on-air con-is ok-y
A fever? ((When I)) have a fever ((I)) just don't turn on the Air-Con.

Data Excerpt: “Hot spring” || MYCANCOR 012 (12:20-13:03)

This excerpt is from a conversation between wife (P1) and husband (P2), taking place in a restaurant over a cup of tea. Both have been talking for a while and, immediately preceding the beginning of the excerpt, recount a visit to hot spring spa together with friends. Typically, such hot springs in Malaysia feature a variety of pools that differ in temperature. P1 also mentioned that one of the friends at the spa did not cope well with the hot water (see full transcript). Related to this incident, P1 then goes on and proposes a strategy of how to adapt to the hot water - by entering a less hot pool first for a while before moving on to the hotter ones.

- 01 P1 其實阿年血壓高啊。
kei4 sat6 aa3 nin4 hyut3 ngaat3 gou1 aa1
actually-nr-blood preassure-high-y
Actually Ah-Nin ((has)) high blood pressure.
- 02 P1 佢:行過嗰度都[唔知有咩=
keoi5 hang4 gwo3 go2 dou6 dou1 m4 zi1 jau5 mei
he-walk-over-there-all-not-know-have-what
((When)) he was walking over there, he didn't know ((how hot it was)).
- 03 P2 [係咯係咯,
hai6 lo3 hai6 lo3
is-y is-y
mhm, mhm.
- 04 P2 =冇囉(.)佢浸一浸佢都 哎呀好似冇咩=
mou5 saai3 keoi5 zam3 jat1 zam3 keoi5 dou1 aai1 aa1 hou2 ci5 mou5 mei
not-have he-soak-one-soak-he-all y-y-like-not-y
Nothing, he went into ((the hot water in a hot spring)) for a bit, and it seems, didn't what-
- 05 P1 佢冇。
keoi5 mou
he-not-have
He didn't.
- 06 P1 =冇停留。
mou5 ting4 lau4
not-have-stop-stay
((He)) didn't stay ((in the water)).
- 07 P2 熱呀咁啊(.)嗯。
jit6 aa1 gam3 aa1 ng2
hot-y-like-that-y mhm
((It was)) hot, yes.
- 08 P1 唔係呀 太熱唔得啊佢。
m4 hai6 aa1 taai3 jit6 m4 dak1 aa1 keoi5
not-is-y too-hot-cannot-y-he
No, ((the water was)) too hot for him.
- 09 P1 其實其實應該我哋去浸開嗰個,
kei4 sat6 kei4 sat6 jing3 goi1 ngo5 dei2 heoi3 zam3 hoi1 go2 go3
actually-actually-should-we-go-soak-open-that-one
Actually, actually ((he)) should ((go to)) that one where we usually go first,
- (cont) 比較冇咁熱嘅先,
bei2 gaau3 mou5 gam3 jit6 ge3 sin1

- relatively-not-have-that-hot-y-first
the one that is not so hot.
- 10 P1 =至去浸個好熱嘅唉=
 zi3 heoi3 zam3 go2 go3 hou2 jit6 ge3 aa1
 until-go-soak-that-one-very-hot-y y
And then go to the really hot one ((sigh)).
- 11 P2 =嗯
 ng2
 y
Mhm.
- 12 P1 如果唔係呀 哎唷.
 jyu4 gwo2 m4 hai6 aa1 aa1 jo1
 if-not-is-y y-y
If not, uuuh.
- 13 P1 一下就落熱嘅好咩嘢嘅哦?
 jat1 haa6 zau6 lok6 jit6 ge3 hou2 me1 je5 gaa2 ngo4
 suddenly-d-drop-hot-y-like-that-y-y
Suddenly going into ((the)) hot ((water)), really ((what)).
- 14 P2 xx熱就好熱嘅
 xx jit6 zau6 hou2 jit6 ge3
 xx-hot-just-very-hot-y
xx hot, really hot.
- 15 P2 一陣嚟就唔覺㗎啦,
 jat1 jat1 zan6 syu3 zau6 m4 gok3 gaa2 laa1
 one-one-time-y just-no-feeling-y-y
For some time you won't feel ((hot)).
- 16 P2 一落 一落開就唔覺㗎囉(.)
 jat1 lok6 jat1 lok6 hoi1 zau6 m4 gok3 gaa2 ak1
 if-drop if-drop-start-d-no-feeling-y
Once, once you are in ((the water)) for a while you won't feel ((hot)).
- 17 P2 係咯.
 hai6 lo3
 is-y
Mhm.
- 18 P2 哇咁熱啊點頂啊九十度啊
 waa1 gam3 jit6 aa1 dim2 ding2 aa1 gau2 sap6 dou6 aa1
 y so-hot-y how-cope-y nine-ten-degree-y
Woah, so hot, how to cope ((with the heat)), 90 degrees.
- 19 P1 九十熱度啊?
 gau2 sap6 jit6 dou6 aa1
 nine-ten hot-degree-y
90 degrees.
- 20 P2 呢 個度 個地下寫著九十度啊嘛.
 aak1 go2 dou6 go3 dei6 haa6 se2 zyu3 gau2 sap6 dou6 aa1 maa3
 y-over-there that-place-down-write-Vg nine-ten-degree-y-y
Yes, over there, on the floor it says 90 degrees.

- 21 P1 淥熟你啊。呵呵呵。
luk6 suk6 nei5 aa1 hehehe
boil-hot-you-y laughter
You ((are)) boiling, haha.
- 22 (3.0)
- 23 P2 浸開嚟(.) >係<松啲啊。
zam3 hoi1 lai4 hai6 song1 di1 aa1
soak-Vg-come is-relaxed-little bit-y
After soaking ((in the water)) for a while it ((gets)) more comfortable.
- 24 P1 唔係呀 (.)
m4 hai6 aa1
not-is-y
No.
- 25⇒P1 因為你你浸開冇咁熱嘅先
jan1wai4 nei5 nei5 zam3 hoi1 mou5 gam3 jit6 ge3 sin1
because-you you-soak-start-not-have-so-hot-y-first
Because you you soak in the less hot one for a while first.
- 26 P1 你俾你個|啲
nei5 bei2 nei5 go2 di1
you-give-you-that
You let your-
|((points at her arm))
- 27 P2 皮膚啊=
pei4 fu1 aa1
skin-y
Skin.
- 28 P1 =皮膚啊適應咗[啲啲。而唔係。
pei4 fu1 aa1 sik1 jing3 zo2 go2 di1 ji4 m4 hai6
skin-y adapt-Vg-that-so-is-not
Skin adapt ((to the heat)), rather than.
- 29 P2 [一膨脹收縮啊咁樣
jat1 paang4 zoeng3 sau1 suk1 aa1 gam3 joeng6
if-expand-contract-y-like that
((The skin)) expands and contracts.
- 30 P1 你一下咁熱喂噃。
nei5 jat1 haa6 gam3 jit6 wai3 jo1
you-suddenly-so-hot y-y
((If)) you suddenly go ((into the hot water)), uh.

(22) Data Excerpt: “Paid survey” || MYCANCOR 026 (02:15-02:21)

This is from a conversation between two university students (P1 and P2). Both sit on a couch on a university campus and have been talking for some time. After a longer pause, P1 brings up a new topic.

- 01 P1 你唔覺得以後做研究愛俾錢好多嘅咩?
nei5 m4 gok3 dak1 ji5 hau6 zou6 jin4 gau3 ngoi3 bei2 cin2 hou2 do1 ge3 me1
you-not-think-later-do-research will-give-money-very-much-u-y
Don't you think when doing research later, ((you'll)) be given lots of money?
- 02 P2 係咩?
hai6 me1
is-y
Is it?
- 03⇒P1 因為有係咪你成日睇到成日(.)睇個啲survey啊,
jan1wai4 jau5 hai6 mi1 nei5 sing4 jat6 tai2 dou3 sing4 jat6 tai2 go2 di1 survey aa1
because-have-is-not you-whole day-see-Vg all-day-see-q-u-survey-y
Because aren't there, you always see, always see these survey ((ads)),
- (cont) paid survey啊有有睇過冇?
paid survey aa1 jau5 jau5 tai2 gwo3 mou5
paid survey-y have have-see-Vg-not-have
paid surveys, didn't you see?
- 04 P2 我有我去個assessment咪xxx=
ngo5 jau5 ngo5 heoi3 go2 di1 accessment mi1 xxx
I-have I-go-that-q-accessment-is-not-xxx
I have. I went to that assessment, right xxx.
- 05 P1 =啊 你去 你去個xx睇入低有好多paid survey,
aa1 nei5 heoi3 nei5 heoi3 go2 go3 xx tai2 jap6 dai1 jau5 hou2 do1 paid survey
y-you-go you-go-that-q-xx-see-Vg-Vg-have-very-many-paid-survey
Yes, you went, you went to that xxx, did you see there are many paid survey ((ads)),
- (cont) 咩咩survey(.)然後全部都係俾人哋錢幫人做survey.
me1 me1 me1 survey jin4 zi1 hau6 cyun4 bou6 dou1 hai6 bei2 jan4 dei2 cin2 bong1 jan4 zou6 survey
what-what-what-survey afterwards-all-is-give-people-u-money help-people-do-survey
this and that survey, afterwards they all give money to the people to help them with the surveys
- 06 P2 係咯 你個publish個個paper(.)you will(.)佢有鑄賺㗎啦:.
hai6 lo3 nei5 go3 publish go3 go2 paper you will keoi5 jau5 leoi4 zaan6 gaa2 laa1
is-y you-q-publish-that-q-paper you will he-have-money-earn-y-y
Yes, ((when)) you publish your paper, you will, they get paid for it.

(23) Data Excerpt: “Pioneer” || MYCANCOR 011 (03:28-03:43)

This is from a conversation between three friends (P1, P2 and P3). Sitting in an office in Singapore, P1 and P3 talk about who moved from Malaysia to Singapore first. Prior to the beginning of the excerpt, P3 has been asking several question in order to find out when P1 moved to Singapore.

- 01 P3 你::: form five之後過咗嚟啊.
nei5 form five zi1 hau6 gwo3 zo2 lai4 aa1
you form five after-over-Vg-come-y
You came over after form five ((school grade)).
- 02 P1 form five之後:冇,
form five zi1hau6 mou5
form five after-not
After form five, no.
- 03 P1 form five之後仲有讀(0.2)讀college咯diploma咯.
form five zi1 hau6 zung6 au5 duk6 duk6 college lo3 diploma lo3
form five-after-still-have-study study-college-y diploma-y
After form five I also studied studied in college, for a diploma.
- 04 P3 哦:::
ngo4
y
I see.
- 05 P1 之後咪過咗嚟咯.
zi1 hau6 mi1 gwo3 zo2 lai4 lo3
after-u-over-Vg-come-y
After that you came over.
- 06 P3 so你係pioneer嚟㗎你 哈哈 先鋒 哈哈,
so nei5 hai6 pioneer lai4 gaa2 nei5 haa1 sin1 fung1 haa1 haa1
so-you-is pioneer-come-y you laughter pioneer laughter
So you are the pioneer haha pioneer haha.
- 07 P3 你仲早過我哋.
nei5 zung6 zou2 gwo3 ngo5 dei2
you-still-early-over-us
You are still earlier than us.
- 08 P1 即係係咯我哋呢班=
zik1 hai6 hai6 lo3 ngo5 dei2 ne1 baan1
still is-y we-this-class
Should be, yes, our class.
- 09 P3 =嗯=
ng2
y
Yes.
- 10 P1 =小學嚟講應該[係。呢度。
siu2 hok6 lai4 gong2 jing3 goi1 hai6 ne1 dou6
elementary school-come-study-should-is-there
((You went to)) elementary school over there, right.
- 11 P3 [應該係你 你先嚟 我:2006年先到.
jing3 goi1 hai6 nei5 nei5 sin1 lai4 ngo5 2006 nin4 sin1 dou3

should-is-you you first-come me-2006-year-first-arrive
That should be you, you came before me, ((you)) arrived in 2006.

12 (1.0)

13 P1 06咩=
06 me1
06-y
06, really?

14⇒P3 =°06° 因為啊 2006我讀完::STBM啊. (1.0)
06 jan1 wai4 aa1 2006 ngo5 duk6 jyun4 STBM aa1
06 because-y 2006-me-study-finish STBM-y
06, because in 2006 I finished STBM ((school)).

15 P3 | 恩 2[005.
ng2 2005
y 2005
Mhm, 2005.
|((P1 nods))

16 P1 [咁你嚟幾年啊而家 06.
gam3 nei5 lai4 gei2 nin4 aa1 ji4 gaa1
so-you-come-which-year-y now 06
So how many years have you been here, 06?

17 P3 11年咯計埋[今年.
11 nin4 lo3 gai3 maai4 gam1 nin4
11-year-y total-this-year
This year it's 11 years in total.

18 P1 [咁咁你咪仲早過我.
gam3 gam3 nei5 mi1 zung6 zou2 gwo3 ngo5
so-so you-u-still-early-over-me
So you came earlier than me.

19 P3 係咩?
hai6 me1
is-y
Really?

20 P1 係咪啊.
hai6 mi1 aa1
is-u-y
Isn't it.

(24) Data Excerpt: “Football shoes” || MYCANCOR 039 (14:37-15:07)

The excerpt is from a conversation between three participants (P1, P2 and P3) taking place in a park. The three male participants talk about the sport “Ultimate Frisbee”, a team sport using a Frisbee somewhat similar to football or rugby. P3 is the only participant who is familiar with the game and has been trying to convince the other two (who seem to be only vaguely familiar with the rules of the game) to give the game a go and try it out.

- 01 P1 搵日試吓過嚟搞啊
wan2 jat6 si3 haak3 gwo3 lai4 gaau2 aa1
look for-day-try-a little-come-over-play-y
Let’s find a day and come have a try ((playing the Ultimate Frisbee game)).
- 02 P3 [得一場啊
dak1 jat1 coeng4 aa1
yes-one-game-ys
Only a game.
- 03 P2 [又好似又好似好爽咁喔=
jau6 hou2 ci5 jau6 hou2 ci5 hou2 song2 gam3 ak1
again-seems like again-seems like-very-cool-like this-y
Also it seems like, it seems like it’s ((a)) really cool ((game)).
- 04 P3 =好爽嘅=
hou2 song2 ge3
very-cool-y
Very cool.
- 05 P2 [=咁樣
gam3 joeng6
like-this
Like this.
- 06 P3 [你著釘鞋你唔著釘鞋或者冇著鞋.
nei5 zyu3 deng1 haai4 nei5 m4 zyu3 deng1 haai4 waak6 ze2 mou5 zyu3 haai4
you-wear-football shoes you-not-wear-football shoes or-you-wear-no-shoes
You wear football shoes, you don’t wear football shoes or you wear no shoes.
- 07 P2 唔著鞋啊.
m4 zyu3 haai4 aa1
not-wear-shoes-y
Not wearing shoes.
- 08 P1 哇::[唔著鞋啊,
waa1 m4 zyu3 haai4 aa1
y not-wear-shoes-y
Wow, not wearing shoes.
- 09 P2 [又得啊:
jau6 dak1 aa1
also-ok-y
((That’s)) also OK.
- 10 P1 俾人踩你冚家創[咯.
bei2 jan4 caai2 nei5 kam2 gaa1 caan2 lo3
by-people-trample-you-fudged up-y
((If)) people step on you((r foot)), you are fudged up.

- 11 P2 [釘釘鞋。
deng1 deng1 haai4
football football shoes
Football shoes.
- 12 P3 冇其它嘢你有>冇protect啊嘛<=
mou5 kei4 taa1 je5 nei5 mou5 mou5 protect aa1 maa3
not have-other-thing you-not have not-have-protect-y-y
Nothing else, you don't, don't have protection.
- 13⇒P2 =因為佢而家有=
jan1 wai4 keoi5 ji4 gaa1 mou5
because-he-now-not-have
Because now it doesn't-
- 14 P1 =腳趾好短啊[呢啲
goek3 zi2 hou2 dyun2 aa1 nei di1
toe-very-short-y-you guys
You guys have short toes.
- 15 P2 [唔係因為佢而家有身體接觸你可以，
m4 hai6 jan1wai4 keoi5 ji4 gaa1 mou5 san1 tai2 zip3 zuk1 nei5 ho2 ji5
not-is because-he-now-not-have-body-contact-you-can
No, because it doesn't have body contact, ((so)) you can.
- 16 P2 如果你有身體接觸唔得，
jyu4 gwo2 nei5 jau5 san1 tai2 zip3 zuk1 m4 dak1
if-you-have-body-contact-not-can
If you have body contact, ((then)) it's not possible.
- 17 P1 大家一齊走[梗，
daai6 gaa1 jat1 cai4 zau2 gang2
everybody-together-go-certainly
While everybody ((is)) running together.
- 18 P3 [著料
zyu3 liu2
wear-xx
Wear xx
- 19 P1 [佢踩到你你卵知啊。
keoi5 caai2 dou3 nei5 nei5 leon2 zi1 aa1
he-trample-Vg-you you-how-know-y
S/he steps on you, how do you know.
- 20 P3 [著梗鞋。
zyu3 liu2 zyu3 gang2 haai4
wear-what wear-Vg-shoes
Wear something, wear shoes.
- 21 P2 咁啊係啦=
gam3 aa1 hai6 lo3
so-y is-y
So, yes.
- 22 P1 =咁啊麻煩啲。
gam3 aa1 maa4 faan4 di1
so-y trouble-some

So, you are in trouble.

(25) Data Excerpt: “You are Lala” || MYCANCOR 003 (22:24-22:32)

This is a conversation between four female friends, taking place on a university campus. Prior to the beginning of this excerpt, the girls have been chatting about a Japanese restaurant and P3 recounts a visit to this restaurant and the dishes she tried there.

- 01 P3 係有少少海鮮嘅。
hai6 jau5 siu2 siu2 hoi2 sin1 ge3
is have little-little seafood y
They have a little bit of seafood ((at the restaurant)).
- 02 P3 佢有喇喇，
keoi5 jau5 laa4 laa5
r have Lala
They have Lala ((a kind of shellfish popular in Malaysia)),
- 03 P3 =佢有Scallo[p啊::.
keoi5 jau5 Scallop aa1
r have scallop y
They have Scallop.
- 04 P2 [呃::|XX[XX喇喇好好食。
eeh xx xx laa4 laa5 hou2 hou2 sik6
y xx xx Lala very-delicious
Ummm xx Lala are very delicious.
|((turns head to P1))
- 05 P1 [上一拜佢嘅喇喇好食=
soeng5 jat1 baai3 keoi5 ge3 laa4 laa5 hou2 sik6
last-time their Lala delicious
Last time their Lala were delicious.
- 06 P2 |=喇喇好食=
laa4 laa5 hou2 sik6
Lala very-delicious
The Lala are delicious.
|((nodding))
- 07 P1 =上一拜佢嘅|喇喇好[大隻。
soeng5 jat1 baai3 keoi5 ge3 laa4 laa5 hou2 daai6 zek3
last-time r Lala very-big-q
Last time their Lala were really big.
|((gestures scallop with both hands))
- 08⇒P4 [因為|你係喇喇咯。
jan1 wai4 nei5 hai6 laa4 laa5 lo1
because you are Lala y
Because you are Lala ((lesbian, another sense of this utterance)).
- 09 (0.5)|(1.0)
|((P3 starts smiling))
- 10 P3 |<唔好理佢>=
m4 hou2 lei5 keoi5
do-not-pay-attention-her
Ignore her.
|((dismissive hand gesture to P4))

11 P4 =哈哈[哈哈
haha haha
laughter
Haha haha

12 P1 [哦
oo1
y
Ok.

(26) Data Excerpt: “Penang Hokkien” || MYCANCOR 022 (03:14-03:33)

This is from a conversation between two participants (P1 and P2) that have a casual chat about different varieties of Hokkien (Southern Min) spoken in different cities in Malaysia. Prior to the beginning of the excerpt, P1 has mentioned that she is from the city of Taiping and that the variety of Hokkien spoken there differs from that spoken in other parts of the country.

- 01 P1 好似Penang嘅:佢哋係(.)好Penang嘅福建話.
hou2 ci5 Penang ge3 keoi5 dei2 hai6 hou2 Penang ge3 fuk1 gin3 waa6
seemingly-ns-u-they-is-very-ns-u-hokkien
It seems like Penang’s, they have a very Penang Hokkien ((over there)).
- 02 P1 其它嘅地方係冇嘅.
kei4 taa1 ge3 dei6 fong1 hai6 mou5 ge3
other-u-place-is-not-have-u
Other places don’t have ((it)).
- 03⇒P1 之後:(.)因為(.)我哋太平[係參少少=
zilhou6 jan1wai4 ngo5 dei2 taa1 ping4 hai6 sam1 siu2 siu2
after-because-we-ns-is-add-little-little
And then, because, we ((in)) Taiping are adding a little bit of.
- 04 P2 [| ° 即 ° -
zik1
zik
Zik((but))-
|((points at P1))
- 05 P2 =係咯 你哋比較近Penang嘛.
hai6 lo3 nei5 dei2 bei2 gaau3 gan6 Penang maa3
is-y you guys-relatively-close-ns-y
Yes, you guys ((in Taiping)) are relatively close to Penang.
- 06 P2 [so你哋講嘅福建話[都應該比較近.
so nei5 dei2 gong2 ge3 fuk1 gin3 waa6 dou1 jing3 goi1 bei2 gaau3 gan6
so-you guys-u-hokkien-also-should-relatively-close
So the Hokkien that you guys speak is also relatively close.
- 07 P1 [係 [但係
hai6 daan6 hai6
is but
Yes- But-
- 08 P1 | ° > 唔係呀 < ° (.) 唔一樣(.)
m4 hai6 aa1 m4 jat1 joeng6
not-is-y not-same
No, it’s different.
|((P1 shakes head))
- 09⇒P1 因為參參到啲咁廣東話 同埋(.)客家.
jan1 wai4 sam1 sam1 dou3 go2 di1 gwong2 dung1 waa6 tung4 maa1 haak3 gaa1
because-add-add-Vg-q-some-cantonese-and-hakka
Because ((we in Taiping)) add some Cantonese and Hakka.
- 10 P2 噃.
ng2
y
Mhm.

- 11 P1 所以(.)係好似有|少少::>dist[ance< already
so2 ji5 hai6 hou2 ci5 jau5 siu2 siu2 distance already
so-is-like-have-little-little-distance-already
So there seems to be a little distance ((difference)) already.
|((gestures distance using one hand))
- 12 P2 [好似有啲rojak=
hou2 ci5 jau5 di1 rojak
like-have-some-rojak
Like a little rojak ((mixed)).
- 13 P1 |=嗯.
ng2
y
Yes.
|((P1 nods)) ((P2 smiles and laughs))

(27) Data Excerpt: “Volleyball championship” || MYCANCOR 005 (08:44-09:30)

This is from a conversation between two male participants in a domestic setting (P1 and P2). The two have been talking about sports and hobbies for a while. P1, an avid volleyball player, has just told P2 that he would like to participate in an annual competition that is hosted in different countries across Asia every year.

- 01 P1 | 呢都唔知幾時(.)打返波哦
ee dou1 m4 zi1 gei1 si4 da1 fan1 bo1 ngo4
y really-not-know what-time play-again-ball y
Eey, I really don't know when I can play ((Volleyball) again.
|((points at P1))
- 02 (0.5)
- 03 P1 °好耐冇打咯°
hou2 noi6 mou5 da1 lo3
very-long not-play y
I didn't play for a long time.
- 04 (0.5)
- 05 P2 你講嘅係(.)咩波啊
nei5 gong2 ge3 hai6 me1 bo1 aa1
you-talk is what-ball y
Play what again?
- 06 P2 即係(.)[排球
zik1 hai6 paa14 kau4
is volleyball
((I mean)) Volleyball.
- 07 P1 [排球(.)哦(0.2)
paa14 kau4 ngo4
volleyball y
Volleyball, mhm.
- 08 P1 哦咩event.
ngo4 me1 event
y what-event
Oh, ((there is)) that ((volleyball)) event.
- 09 (0.8)
- 10 P1 |XXX
|((opens hands))
- 11 P2 唔知|唔知唔知可以唔可以去嗰個咩,
m4 zi1 m4 zi1 m4 zi1 ho2 ji5 m4 ho2 ji5 heoi2 go2 go3 me1
not-know not-know not-know can-not-can go-this-one
I d.. don't don't know if I can go attend that ((event)).
|((points at P1))
- 12 P1 Mak Su=
Mak Su
event name
Mak Su ((the name of the event or locality)).

- 13 P2 =Macau
Macau
place name
Macau.
- 14 P1 Maca ((turns head away))
Maca
Macau
Maca((u)).
- 15 P1 諗(.)今年唔係:嚟::馬來西亞咩?(0.2)
Aai2 gam1 nin4 m4 hai6 lai2 maa5 lai4 sai1 aa3 me1
y this-year not-is-coming Malaysia y
Ey, this year, is ((the event)) not coming to ((taking place in)) Malaysia?
- 16 P2 啊.(.)
aa1
y
Yes.
- 17 P2 |本來係馬來西亞嘅.
bun2 lai4 hai6 maa5 lai4 sai1 aa3 ge3
originally is Malaysia y
Originally it ((would be)) in Malaysia.
|((points at P1))
- 18 P2 >之後<佢哋話(.)
zi1 hau6 keoi5 dei2 waa2
after they-say
((But)) then they said.
- 19⇒P2 啊:因為:(.)啊::|before Hong Kong嗰係唔係=
aa1 jan1 wai4 aa1 before Hong Kong go2 hai6 m4 hai6
y because Y before Hong Kong-this is-not-is
Because, mhm, the one before Hong Kong ((in the ranking of hosts)), right.
|((tapping back of hand))
- 20 P1 =嗯.
ng2
yes
Yes.
- 21 P2 係Macau (.)
hai6 Macau
is Macau
Is Macau.
- 22 P2 之後Macau做唔成就俾Ho[ng Kong做
zi1 hau6 Macau zou6 m4 cing4 zau6 bei2 Hong Kong zou6
after Macau-do-not-success just-give Hong Kong-do
But then Macau couldn't do it and just gave ((the event)) to Hong Kong.
- 23 P1 [哦:做先::
ngo 4 zou6 sin1
y do-first
Oh, ((Hong Kong)) hosts ((the event)) first.
- 24 P2 啊

- aa1
yes
Yes.
- 25 P1 到而家|(0.3)之後[咪有可能
dou3 ji4 gaa1 zi1 hau6 mai1 jau5 ho2 nang4
to-now after y-just-have-chance
Until now, afterwards, isn't it possible ((that)).
|((raising hand gesture))
- 26 P2 [by right係Malaysia嘛
by right hai6 Malaysia maa3
by right is Malaysia y
According to the order, it ((should be)) Malaysia.
- 27 P2 |所所以個Macau就take over|先
so2 so2 ji5 go3 Macau zau6 take over sin1
so this-Macau just take-over first
So Macau is taking over first ((to host the event)).
|((hand points left)) |((hand points to hand back))
- 28 P1 ↑恩=
ng2
y
Yes.
- 29⇒P2 |=因為(.)到佢哋個Turn(0.2)|啊先至到(.)到Malaysia=
jan1 wai4 dou3 keoi5 dei2 go3 Turn aa1 sin1 zi3 dou3 dou3 Malaysia
because to-r that-turn y first-then-to to Malaysia
Because its their ((Macau's)) turn, and after that it's Malaysia's ((turn)).
- 30 P1 =Malaysia.
Malaysia
Malaysia
Malaysia.
- 31 P2 |恩.
en1
yes
Yes.
|((nods))
- 32 (2.5)
- 33 P1 ((snaps fingers)) 咁(.)去啦::
gam2 heoi2 laa1
then-go-y
Then go.

(28) Data Excerpt: “Language Problems” || MYCANCOR 005 (08:44-09:30)

This is from a conversation between two participants (P1 and P2) who have a casual chat about their work in the dental care industry. Prior to the beginning of the excerpt, P2 began recounting the visit of an elderly patient and described having difficulties communicating with this patient who spoke Hokkien Chinese.

- 01 P2 我就完全一粒字我都聽唔明,
ngo5 zau6 jyun4 cyun4 jat1 lap1 zi6 ngo5 dou1 ting3 m4 ming4
I-then-completely-one-q-word-I-all-not understand
I don’t even understand a single word,
- 02 P2 你你你仲要就係嗰個(.) patient仲係冇牙嘅添喔,
nei5 nei5 nei5 zung6 jiu3 zau6 hai6 go2 go3 patient zung6 hai6 mou5 ngaa4 ge3 tim1 ak1
you-you-you-still-need-then-is-that-q-patient-also-is-not-have-teeth-Vg-y-y
You, you, you still have that patient who also has no teeth,
- 03 P2 講話仲係漏風,
gong2 waa6 zung6 hai6 lau6 fung1
speak-is-leak-air
and speaks very unclear all the time,
- 04 P2 我根本就聽唔明佢講梗[啲乜嘢 除非=
ngo5 gan1 bun2 zau6 ting3 m4 ming4 keoi5 gong2 gang2 di1 mat1 je5 ceoi4 fei1
I-basically-just-don’ t understand-he-what-things except
I basically can’t understand what he says, except-
- 05 P1 [哦::
ngo4
y
Mhm
- 06 P1 =家下你聽得到咩?
gaa1 haa6 nei5 ting3 dak1 dou3 me1
now-you-can-hear-y
Now you can listen to it, right?
- 07 P2 聽到(.)你:如果你識嗰個語言嘅話,
ting3 dou3 nei5 jyu4 gwo2 nei5 sik1 go2 go3 jyu5 jin4 ge3 waa6
listen-Vg you-if-you-know-that-q-language-if
Yes, if you know the language,
- 08 P2 你 你識福建話,
nei5 nei5 sik1 fuk1 gin3 waa6
you-you-know-hokkien
You know Hokkien,
- 09 P2 [你點樣你都知道[佢講梗啲咩㗎嘛.
nei5 dim2 joeng6 nei5 dou1 zi1 dou6 keoi5 gong2 gang2 di1 me1 gaa2 maa3
you-anyhow-you-all-know-he-talk-Vg-what-y-y
You anyhow just know what he is talking about.
- 10 P1 [大概大概啦 [嗯
daai6 koi3 daai6 koi3 laa1 ng2
roughly-roughly-y y
Roughly. Yes.
- 11 P2 係啦(.)

hai6 laa1
is-y
Mhm.

12⇒P2 °上次係做得好辛苦咯 就係因為語言問題.°
soeng5 ci3 hai6 zou6 dak1 hou2 san1 fu2 lo3 zau6 hai6 jan1 wai4 jyu5 jin4 man6 tai4
last-time-is-do-Vg-very-tiring-y just-because-language-problem
Last time it was so hard, just because of language problems.

13 P1 噃.
ng2
y
Mhm.

14 P2 如果係廣東話嘅話就簡單咯:..
jyu4 gwo2 hai6 gwong2 dung1 waa6 ge3 waa6 zau6 gaan2 daan1 lo3
if-is-cantonese-is-then-easy-y
If it's Cantonese, then ((it's)) easy.

(29) Data Excerpt: “Home for Chinese New Year” || MYCANCOR 037 (09:05-09:26)

The excerpt shows another instance of *janwai* as part of a phrase and not in turn/TCU initial position. This is from a conversation between two female participants, daughter (P1) and mother (P2) taking place in a domestic setting. Prior to the excerpt, P1 has been talking about difficulties she encountered with her employer when trying to apply for holiday leave during Chinese New Year.

- 01 P1 佢哋啊嗰日同我講話,
keoi5 dei2 aa1 go2 jat6 tung4 ngo5 gong2 waa6
they-y that-day-to-me-say
They said to me that day,
- 02 P1 你知唔知 xxx 叫我同阿經理傾:..
nei5 zi1 m4 zi1 xxx giu3 ngo5 tung4 aa3 ging1 lei5 king1
you-know-not-know xxx call-me-to-manager-chat
You know xxx told me to speak to the manager.
- 03 P1 講:睇佢可唔可以俾我過年返.
gong2 tai2 keoi5 ho2 m4 ho2 ji5 bei2 ngo5 gwo3 nin4 faan2
say-look-he-can-not-can-give-me-new year-back
Said ((let's)) see whether he can let me ((go home)) for Chinese New Year.
- 04 P1 我講冇可能嘅事啊.
ngo5 gong2 mou5 ho2 nang4 ge3 si6 aa1
I-say-not possible-u-things-y
I said that's not possible.
- 05 P1 放我一個人都有得返,
fong3 ngo5 jat1 go3 jan4 dou1 mou5 dak1 faan2
let-me-one person-all-cannot-back
Permit only me, nobody is allowed to go back ((home for CNY)),
- 06 P1 |即係星加坡人都冇得返嘅.
zik1 hai6 sing1 gaa1 bo1 jan4 dou1 mou5 dak1 faan2 ge3
also-singaporean-also-cannot-back
Even Singaporeans can't go back ((home)).
|((P2 nods))
- 07⇒P1 咁冇可能因為我:.,
gam3 mou5 ho2 nang4 jan1 wai4 ngo5
so-not possible-because-me
So it's not possible ((that)) because of me,
- 08⇒P1 如果因為我:而咁樣,
jyu4 gwo2 jan1 wai4 ngo5 ji4 gam3 joeng6
if-because-me-so-like-that
If ((it is)) like that because of me,
- 09 P1 即係俾我一個人|返.
zik1 hai6 bei2 ngo5 jat1 go3 jan4 faan2
so-give-me-one-person-back
that is to allow only me to go back ((home)).
- 10 P2 過嚟啦:=
gwo3 lai4 laa1
come-over-y
Come over.

- 11 P1 =噃.
ng2
y
Mhm.
- 12 P2 係呀個個都吵愛咯.
hai6 aa1 go3 go3 dou1 caau2 ngoi3 lo3
is-y that-q-all-quarrel-want-y
Yes, everybody argues that ((they)) also want.
- 13 P1 個個都吵嘅
go3 go3 dou1 caau2 ge3
everybody-all-quarrel-u
Everybody argues.