Klee, Mia:

Storytelling in Family Talk
How Do Voice, Positioning, and Constructed Dialogue Emerge in Finnish Conversation?

STORYTELLING IN FAMILY TALK

How Do Voice, Positioning, and Constructed Dialogue Emerge
in Finnish Conversation?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction

This thesis will address how the phenomena of constructed dialogue[1] (Tannen 2007), positioning theory (Davies & Harré 1990; Harré & Langenhove 1999; Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann 2004), and voice (Bertau 2013, 2014) emerge in Finnish family storytelling (Langellier & Peterson 2004, Mandelbaum 2013) while placing these phenomena in a context situated in the field of cultural-historical psycholinguistics (Bertau 2011). It will bring together a pragmatic view on Finno-Ugric languages in the linguistic sense, techniques from conversation analysis (Schegloff 2007; Holt & Clift 2007; Tannen 2007; Deppermann 2014), theories from (language) psychology (Harré & Langenhove 1999; Hermans et al. 1992; Hermans 2001; Hermans 2004; Hermans & Gieser 2013), a socio-pragmatic account of interaction (Grundy 2013), and a pragmatic-psychological approach to language activity (Humboldt 1999; Bertau 2011), firmly situating this thesis in an interdisciplinary field. Although this thesis is limited to research done on the Finnish language[2], the transcripts will provide enough material to draw universal conclusions.

The linguistic approach to research a form-function correlation seems ill-fitting for the purpose of this thesis, as every utterance said in a different tone, a different pitch, a different voice can mean entirely different things[3]. Therefore, I work with the inherent relation of form and function of language within a pragmatic context, taking into consideration everything the speakers do during their conversation and not only what they say, but how they say it, investigating the *forms-in-function*. In this, I follow the talk-in-interaction movement which found its beginnings in the 1970s, when Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson began working closely together, formulating ideas around turn-taking, sequence organization, and more (for more details see Lerner 2004; Grundy 2013). Starting in the 1980s, conversation analysis was becoming a well-researched field in which Tannen invited linguists to join in her 1989s book *Talking Voices*. However, linguists seem prone to have an 'extremely reductive view on language', to be 'simplifying real-world data', sometimes 'inventing model or idealized examples to illustrate out assumptions', and 'promote reason and overlook the various psychological and affective factors' that shape human interaction (Grundy 2013: 213). To study talk-in-interaction, a 'Cartesian', reason-based perspective on language is unfitting, which is why many of the investigations in almost all of the research fields at hand rely on the notion of dialogicality that Bakhtin (1929/1984) and

---

[1] Same as Tannen (2007), I find the term *reported speech* 'grossly misleading' (2007: 104) which is why this thesis uses the concept of *constructed dialogue* (see chapter 2.4.3.)

[2] I thank the Studienbüro der Fakultät für Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaften der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München for helping me facilitate my research in the context of their project Lehre@LMU.

[3] This is the reason I decided against a glossing of the corpus.

Vološinov (1929/1986) developed in the 1930s. For them, 'dialogue is crucial: not dialogue *per se*, that is the exchange of turns is of central concern to conversation analysts, but the polyphonic nature of all utterances, of every word' (Tannen 2007: 103). Tannen goes on to argue that not 'only is every utterance dialogic, but also hearing and understanding are dialogic acts because they require active interpretation, not passive reception' (Tannen 2007: 103). On exactly this notion of dialogicality hinges the theory of the dialogical self (Hermans & Gieser 2013), where the outer *society-of-minds* is interiorized to form a *society-of-selves*, building a narrative concept of the self. In this underlying notion of a 'narrative identity' of human beings, narration plays an important role in creating a sense of coherency and continuity for the self (cf. Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann 2004: 167). Identity that was produced and portrayed in the medium of narration holds specific features and opens up insights about the narrating individuals (ibid.). The positioning theory can help discover patterns of how selves act in talk-in-interaction (Davies & Harré 1990, Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann 2004) and how their attitude towards themselves, the other conversational partners, and the object of discourse influences their utterances.

One especially productive platform for storytelling is found in family conversations, where 'families perform themselves to themselves and to others' (Langellier & Peterson 2004: 112). Many researchers before me have made the connection of how constructed dialogue shows itself prominently in storytelling, where 'story climaxes [...] are one of the recurrent interactional sites for reported speech' (Holt & Clift 2007: 2).

Much of the research done on reported speech and similar disciplines seem to focus on Indo-European languages, mainly English and German (Tannen 2007; Tannen, Kendall & Gordon 2007, Hold & Clift 2007; Deppermann 2013, 2014, Imo 2014). Looking into Finno-Ugric languages, there is fascinating research done that is often made hard to access for researchers by being written in Finnish or Hungarian, as only a few publish their findings in more globally accessible languages (De Geer et al. 2002; Haakana 2007; Tuleviste et al. 2003; Raitaniemi 2014; Klee 2014).

This thesis serves to further the field of investigation and contribute to a more accessible plurality of research. It also aims to find out if speakers perform constructed dialogues trough voice rather than through linguistic means during their storytelling, how the family members position themselves during the stories, and how often the phenomena of voice and constructed dialogue appear simultaneously in Finnish family talk.

For this purpose, this thesis has two main parts: the theoretical framework needed for the analysis and the empirical part of the analysis. The theoretical part starts with introducing some aspects of the Finnish language to the reader who is not familiar with Finnish (2.1.) and the

concepts of talk-in-interaction (chapter 2.2.1.) and the theory of the dialogical self (chapter 2.2.2.). In chapter 2.3., family talk (chapter 2.3.1.) and storytelling (chapter 2.3.2.) are discussed before the main concepts of the thesis, positioning (chapter 2.4.1.), voice (chapter 2.4.2.), and constructed dialogue (chapter 2.4.3.) are brought together in chapter 2.4. Comprising the empirical side, the design of the study (chapter 3.1.), the focus of the study (chapter 3.2.), and the outcome (chapter 3.3.) will answer the research question. The thesis will be concluded in chapter 4.

2. Theoretical Framework: Dialogues and Voices

In the following chapters, the theoretical groundwork of this thesis will be laid out. First, I will provide the reader who has no or little knowledge of the Finnish language with some important aspects (chapter 2.1.): as Finnish is a language that differs in many aspects from most of the languages commonly researched by conversation analysts, this short chapter wants to clear up misunderstandings or misinterpretations that could occur in the empirical part of this thesis would they go unmentioned. After that, I will lay down the basic groundwork to provide the psychology-orientated reader with my linguistic approach (study of talk-in-interaction) and the linguistic reader with my psychological approach (theory of the dialogical self) in chapter 2.2. Following that, I will explain the special setting of 'family storytelling', which is a field of research that has very unique features (chapter 2.3.). As the last part of my theoretical framework, in chapter 2.4. I will explain the three phenomena that are the main focus of this study in chapter: positioning, voice, and constructed dialogue. A short summary at the beginning of chapter 3 will bring the separate theories together to form my theoretical groundwork for the analysis of the data given in that chapter.

2.1. 'The Silent Finn': Aspects of the Finnish Language

Finnish is the second largest of the Finno-Ugric languages and has slightly less than 5 Million speakers (Official Statistics of Finland: 2015). It is counted as an agglutinative language and has many interesting features like consonant gradation and vowel harmony (cf. Abondolo 2006: 149ff.). According to Mixdorff et al., 'Finnish has a fairly free word order, rich morphology with suffixation, [...] as well as a relatively large number of grammatical cases (15)' (2002: 515). All these things considered, it seems obvious that Finnish is a language that differs greatly from German or English, the better researched languages when it comes to conversation analysis. As mentioned before, this chapter serves to tell the reader who has no or little knowledge about Finnish the differences from commonly researched languages I anticipate will show themselves clearly in the analysis in chapter 3.2. Due to the limited scope of this thesis, no comprehensive overview over the grammar and other aspects of Finnish can be given here, so only three major aspects will be taken into consideration: intonation, what to expect from the colloquial language, and pauses in conversation.

The most striking difference to German or English is how intonation works in Finnish. 'Due to suffixation and enclisis, the lexical morphemes are at the beginnings of the words leading to a

state in which the lexical stress is invariably on the first syllable of a word', as Mixdorff et al. (2002: 515) explain. The stress of the first syllable even occurs in loan-words (Fromm 1982: 41)[4]. The more interesting thing for this research, however, is the sentence intonation. Due to its features, Finnish is 'an intonationally falling language' (Mixdorff 2002: 515), making the 'basic intonation shape [...] a falling shape with an accent on basically all content words' (ibid.). Fromm explains that the Finnish tone scale is less extensive then the German one (1982: 42). Intonation is not used grammatically in Finnish, and does not influence mode (cf. Välimaa-Blum 1993: 83). A neutral sentence begins in the middle of (or a little bit under) the pitch range of a speaker and falls continually to end with a deeper pitch or even laryngealization (ibid.). Declarative sentences only slightly differ from this scheme, with the finite verb being cause of the changes (cf. Välimaa-Blum 1993: 84, Iivonen 1998: 321), although finite verbs 'are usually less prominent than nominals and are sometimes altogether unaccented' (Mixdorff et al. 2002: 515). On occasion, a final rise can occur, mostly due to an untypical sentence structure (cf. Välimaa-Blum 1993: 90). Final rise is something that is typically assumed to go with questions. However, in Finnish, questions are marked with the question-tag –kO or other grammatical means like interrogative pronouns or particles, often leaving question sentences sounding similar to neutral sentences – with the difference of a higher fundamental frequency to start the sentence with (Iivonen 1998: 318, Mixdorff et al. 2002: 515). Mixdorff et al. found that final rise can occur in more colloquial language, for example in echo-questions (2002: 515).

Another aspect is that the colloquial language may vary more from the literary language as in other European languages, differing in morphological, syntactical and lexical aspects (cf. Buchholz 2007: 195). The colloquial language varies not only on a regional basis (like different dialects) but also – and even more so – based on age, social groups or social situations, and more (ibid.). For a straightforward overview, consider Bucholz 2007 from page 195. Some of the aspects likely to be encountered in this thesis' corpus are: shortened forms of pronouns, incongruence of the third person plural, the first person plural will be replaced by passive voice, possessive suffixes are left out, *yksi* may appear as indefinite article, *se/ne* may appear as definite article, the question-tag –kO will appear as –ks, words in general will be shortened (suffixes will be shortened or left out, assimilation occurs, short forms of words are used and so forth), and numerals receive a shortened form.

The last aspect I want to mention is made obvious in *The Silent Finn*, where Lehtonen & Sajavaara (1995)[5] describe that the Finnish people have a high tolerance when it comes to silence in conversation: 'the duration of silences tolerated by Finns in conversation is much

---

[4] Detailed information on Finnish word stress can be found in Iivonen 1998.
[5] Originally, the book this article is in was first published in 1985; 1995 was the second printing.

longer' than those of other nationalities (Lehtonen & Sajavaara 1995: 194). Furthermore, the closer Finns are to their conversational partners or the more contemplative the conversation is, the longer the pauses between turns are being tolerated (ibid: 195). However outdated the rest of the article may seem (as the authors themselves have revisited and enhanced their article in 1997), the high tolerance of pauses and silences in conversation – especially in family conversation – seems to ring true. For this thesis this means that what may seem like a long pause to researches from countries like Germany or the United States, it is an appropriate length of silence for Finns. In order to see if these pauses indicate that the conversational partner is listening and thinking about what was said, some sort of technique is needed to see if para- or non-verbal cues were used by the participants to signal their listening. The study of talk-in-interaction can provide these techniques and will be considered in the following chapter.

2.2. Dialogues: Linguistical and Psychological Perspectives

Following Bertau & Karsten, the present-day psychology has to shift away from the 'almost absolute focus on meaning' (2018: 8), same as pragmatic linguists have to shift away from decontextualizing their material (Grundy 2013). Instead, a holistic way of research has to be created to be able to study the 'experienced meaningful forms [that] *are occurring*' (italics in original, Bertau & Karsten 2018: 8.). To achieve this goal, this thesis works with two fundamental approaches: concerning the linguistic side, the study of talk-in-interaction mediates basic principles on working with language data from everyday live and how to include para- and non-verbal cues into a transcript. On the psychological side stands the theory of the dialogical self, which shall serve to better understand how narrative selves perform themselves in daily life and how linguists can profit from including this view into their work.

2.2.1. Talk-In-Interaction

In the previous chapter, the question of how to capture para- and non-verbal cues that speakers and listeners give the other participants during a conversation (e.g., to signal they are still listening) arised. Grundy (2013) warns that decontextualized pragmatics won't help in the matter. Traditional linguistics as well as the first and many other pragmatic approaches to language worked with an 'extremely reductive view on language' (Grundy 2013: 213), taking away context, para-, and non-verbal cues, often 'simplifying real-world data' (ibid.) by rewriting the material so no colloquialisms remained. This seemed to promote the idea for inventing models or to 'give idealized examples to illustrate our assumptions' (ibid.). 'This reductive approach is motivated by our belief in the purposefulness of our use of language' as

'we promote reason and overlook the various psychological and affective factors that might explain why what I do today I don't necessarily do tomorrow' (ibid.). Another approach is needed to fill the gap, one that was based on empirical data and not on a rationalistic construct; an 'approach that takes into account the social and psychological contexts in which utterances occur' (Grundy 2013: 211). Thus, in 'a series of papers written between 1968 and 1980, Schegloff and a number of co-researchers established the basic methods underlying talk-in-interaction' (Grundy 2013: 220). Deppermann mentions that Harvey Sacks was the one to establish conversation analysis (Deppermann 2014: 19).

As I see it, there is a split between German and Anglophone conversation analysis: Deppermann and Imo (both 2014) seem to follow a somewhat stricter set of rules, once again creating something resembling a rationalistic approach to language, whereas English-speaking researchers (e.g., Holt & Clift 2007, Tannen 2007) prefer to approach language empirically. The difference in approaches is especially visible when taking into account their respective research data: Imo and Deppermann looked into data from a federal press conference in Germany, a preconceived platform with fixed amounts of talk for each participant, almost no overlapping talk, and often muted microphones (as they remark themselves). Holt & Clift and Tannen, however, work with more natural data where overlapping talk, laughter, comments, and more are ready to be captured. The different take on conversation analysis of Holt & Clift shall be made clear in their own words:

> Conversation analysis (CA) – the adopted name for what is perhaps more accurately termed the study of talk-in-interaction – takes as a basic tenet the fact that social interaction is not haphazard but orderly, and that the methodical, organised nature of our social life can be studied by close attention to naturally occurring materials. [...] The transcription of these audio- or video-recorded materials according to the system devised by Gail Jefferson [...] involves registering features of the production and articulation of talk – and its absence – which capture the temporal unfurling of turns-at-talk. So features such as overlapping talk, in-breaths, the infiltration of laughter into talk, aspects of pace and prosody – all elusive to memory or intuition – are captured in the transcript and so accessible for their possible interactional import. These transcriptions then make the data available for repeated inspection and analysis. [...] It is establishing these systematicities that interpretation becomes analysis. (Holt & Clift 2007: 9)

In contrast, as Imo (2014) explains in some detail, 'conversation analysis' is not a fitting term and its inherent definition of discourse differs greatly from the purpose of interactional linguistics, the term he is using to research talk-in-interaction (2014: 49ff.). The technique of transcription is the same, using video- and audio-recorded material; however, Imo[6] applies

---

[6] In my opinion, Imo (2014) walks a fine line to again acquire *a priori* assumptions on talk-in-interaction, although he always underlines the importance of forming one's categories of analysis *bottom-up* and never *top-down*. As

Auer's (2010) *on-line syntax*, where segmentation of talk-in-interaction is done per actions, per syntactical units, per intonation, or per breaks and pauses in talk ('*Zäsuierung*'), as the sequence organization from Schegloff (2007) in *turn-constructional-units* (or TCUs) doesn't recognize the role syntax plays thoroughly enough for Imo.

In general, the methodology of both interactional linguistics and the study of talk-in-interaction relies on the fact that language is not a monological, static thing to analyze when taken out of context, but rather the opposite: language and its inherent grammatical rules only exist in spoken conversation, in interaction, where definitions of meaning and grammar are produced and negotiated by the participants in the moment (Imo 2014, Schegloff 2007). In fact, 'CA approaches language without a pre-existing explanatory theory. The idea is that by studying use, we establish usage principles' (Grundy 2013: 212). And the 'study of talk, or talk-in-interaction [...], adopts an ethnomethodological approach. [...] Ethnomethodologists begin without *a priori* assumptions' (bold removed by MK, Grundy 2013: 217). Of course, criticism that 'the study of talk within the CA tradition is largely a study of the member's methods that talkers use rather than of the meanings they convey' (Grundy 2013: 224) has emerged. To some extent, this is true: no big comparable studies are possible with sensible statistical numbers as background are possible in conversation analysis, as everything has be analyzed 'by hand' (Imo 2014). The lack of quantity of material doesn't diminish the quality of research, though, and both approaches are needed and relevant in today's society.

It should be clear by now that the study of talk-in-interaction, with taking in everything that a person does during interaction, has to consider the whole human being in their analysis. But how is such a human being structured and is language a basic part of us? The theory of the dialogical self shall help to come closer to answering these questions.

2.2.2. Dialogical Self Theory

Linguists often tend to disregard the medium their beloved object of research (that is: language) comes from: the human being. The study of talk-in-interaction regards all kinds of cues a speaker can generate during a conversation: verbal, para-verbal, and non-verbal, because these can influence the whole meaning of a locution in subtle, more or less obvious ways. We as humans are always confronted with language; we take it in from before we were born until the day we leave again. We linguists are so immersed in our medium that we often want to decontextualize as much as possible in order to see more clearly. However, oftentimes we talk simply to talk, to fill the silence, even if it is just us there, one person in the room. Many linguists

---

his approach seems very analytical in contrast to e.g., Tannen's, it could distort his concept somewhat, especially considering him using the federal press conference as transcript of choice.

have considered the question in what way language influences our way of thinking (one of the most prominent ones coming to mind being the Sapir-Whorf-hypothesis, cf. Bußmann 2008: 599). I'm however more interested in the question in what way language can and is influencing our being. One of the most holistic answers can be found in the theory of the dialogical self, established by psychologist Hubert Hermans in the 1990s, who has since constantly refined the theory by himself and with other scholars (Hermans et al. 1992, Hermans 2001, Hermans 2004, Hermans & Gieser 2013).

For Hermans, the personal space on the inside of our minds is expanded by the recollection of others in our thoughts. The 'society-of-selves' (Hermans & Gieser 2013: 2), a term with which Hermans describes the persons living side by side in a society, are depicted and mirrored on the inside, in our minds, as a 'society of minds' (2013: 2). This inner society is made up out of different '*I*-positions' (2013: 8). These *I*-positions can be differentiated between internal and external *I*-positions, where internal *I*-positions describe positions that refer to the self in different 'roles' (e.g. I as a teacher, I as a student, I as a wife), whereas external *I*-positions refer to the outer world (e.g. voice of my mother, voice of a role model). In this society of minds, all that can happen in the outside society can happen on the inside: I can criticize others, I can criticize myself; I can ask another person a question, I can ask myself a question (and receive an answer as well). This leads to the notion that the internal world is also made up of dialogues between the different *I*-positions, where the solution of a problem is possible through dialogue, creating a dialogic and narrative concept of self. To this approach where the other plays a significant role not only important for, but also *in* the self (c.f. Hermans & Gieser 2013: 3ff.), Hermans adds the polyphonic nature of the self found in Bakhtin's metaphor of the polyphonic novel to his account of the self (c.f. Hermans & Gieser 2013: 6f.). Thus, DST works under the hypothesis that there is the real, physical other as well as the interiorized other in the self, connecting the inner and the outer society closely whilst being bound to certain positions in space and time.

As the name suggests, dialogue plays an important role for the theory of the dialogical self. Although dialogue is important for both the society and for the self in order to solve problems, to create meaning, etc., it shouldn't be washed out to simply be defined as an act of communication. As Bakhtin (1929/1984) presumes that every utterance is dialogic, Hermans insists that monologue and dialogue aren't opposites, but different values of a continuum. Thus, some *I*-positions tend towards the monological end of the continuum whilst others are located at the dialogical end.

'The notion of *I*-positions acknowledges the multiplicity of the self, while preserving, at the same time, its coherence and unity' (Hermans & Gieser 2013: 14) through 'decentring

movements' (ibid.), where the *I* can choose from new, existing an possible positions, and 'centring movements' (ibid.), where the *I* accepts or declines those position based if the positions would create coherency and continuity for the self. If two positions are in conflict with one another (e.g., the dieting *I* versus the *I* that wants the cake), a *third position* (2013: 15) can manage to reconcile the two positions. To reflect about oneself, a *meta-position* (ibid.) helps to see which features the self can improve; balancing and aligning different *I*-positions with each other (e.g., while asking how I can be a better student and a better daughter at the same time). To keep the different *I*-positions from slipping into chaos, *promoter positions* (2013: 16f.) help to organize the self and point all *I*-positions in a common direction. They help to plan the future and stabilize the self, often incorporating the 'voices' of important persons into the self (e.g., the voice of a religious idol, the voice of grandma; idioms like 'I believe in myself' also work as promoting *I*-positions).

I-positions are connected to voices (cf. Hermans et al. 1992, Josephs 2002). 'The concept of *voice* is the central construct in the theory of the dialogical self [...]. The self is regarded as a plurality of different, including even opposite, voices, rather than a unidimensional, monological entity' (italics in original, Josephs 2002: 162). Josephs also point out that as 'irritating as this might be [...] the range and characteristics of the voices populating the self are in principle unlimited, and also unpredictable by anybody but the person her- or himself' (ibid.), making it impossible to generalize voices into labels (as my 'I as a student-voice' differs from other's student-voices). Based on Hermans, Josephs makes it clear that all *I*-positions have voices; if not, how could they be in dialogue with one another? The self is thus a dialogical narrator, as the 'voices function like interacting characters in a story. [...] As different voices these characters exchange information about their respective *Me*s and their worlds, resulting in a complex, narratively structures self.' (italics in original, Hermans et al. 1992: 28f.).

This narrative aspect of the theory of the dialogical self is especially interesting to this thesis: Will the different voices come up in storytelling, narrating different parts of the story? In the following chapter, thus, storytelling will be considered in more detail.

2.3. 'To Us Happened This Thing': Narratives in Family Settings

Telling stories is a big part of how the self structures and makes meaning in day-to-day life. In the underlying notion of a 'narrative identity' of human beings, as is done in the theory of the dialogical self (see chapter 2.2.2.), narration plays an important role in creating a sense of coherency and continuity for the self (cf. Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann 2004: 167). One

particular place where narrative is often found is in families: 'in performing narrative, families struggle over personal and family identities that are always destabilized and deferred' (Langellier & Peterson 2004: 113). However, family is 'not a single, naturally occurring biological phenomenon but variations of small group cultures produced in embodied, situated, and material performances such as family storytelling', it is an 'ongoing formation rather than a natural, pregiven phenomenon' (ibid.). According to Langellier & Peterson, approaching 'family storytelling as a small group culture resists the idealization or romanticization of a "natural" family to examine how communication practices produce family' (2004: 35). Tannen notes that 'the intimacy of family bonds makes is particularly likely' that certain stories or certain information will be told in family settings 'because exchanging personal information is a means of maintaining intimacy' (Tannen 2007: 108f.). As this thesis aims to research phenomena often found in storytelling, the decision was made to look closely into family talk, as the chance to come across storytelling seemed particularly high. In the following, family talk and storytelling are considered more closely.

2.3.1. Family Talk

'Families are our first culture, and family stories are the cornerstones of family culture. [...] In acts of imagination and reimagination, families perform themselves to themselves' (Langellier & Peterson 2004: 35). It 'is a multilevel strategic discourse carried out in diverse situations by multiple participants who order personal and group identities as family' (ibid.: 113). Family talk is also about 'content-ordering' (ibid.: 42) and 'task-ordering' (ibid.: 111): sorting through one's day in telling the family members about what happened during the day, going through schedules, planning meals or journeys, or sometimes just ordering your own thoughts. Another aspect of this is tellability:

> In content-ordering, families sort through and negotiate tellability, discovering and evaluating what happened and its significance to family culture now and for the future. Tellability emerges within and from a family's ordering of content rather than from the decontextualized remarkableness of an event. (Langellier & Peterson 2004: 42)

What Langellier & Peterson refer to here are stories that have the potential to get retold; something that will get part of the family culture. However, I find the term 'tellability' fitting for other contexts, too: how will I decide about what to tell my family? Is it entertaining enough, does it relate so something family members want to know more about, does it help me and others negotiate my or their position and my or their identities? All is a concern of tellability: if a particular story doesn't meet the requirements of the family in a particular situation and is ignored, maybe it can be reiterated on another occasion. 'Any act or event can always be

narrated in multiple and sometimes conflicting ways; there are always other ways to tell what happened' (ibid.: 40).

Family talk is about the 'making and doing of family' (ibid. 111): doing family means living together on a day-to-day basis, creating meaning together; making family is about narrating and ordering myself to my family and vice versa, of creating a sense of coherency not only for myself but for the whole family. 'In the conversations and rituals of family, group identities are formed, solidified, and transformed' (ibid.).

I suspect that, as you have (normally) known your family members for a very long time, the relationships to your family members tend to be particular ones simply because of the length. Especially the relationships to your core family members – mother, father, sister, brother – tend to be very intricate and often very close. Almost certainly, they have become internalized voices and *I*-positions in the self. Because you tend to anticipate their reactions, their behavior, you develop a particular way of telling stories to close family members. Furthermore, as you tend to negotiate certain aspects of your identity with family members (as opposed to with strangers or co-workers), family talk is also a place of finding, being, and becoming more acquaintanced with your own voices and *I*-positions. I also surmise that you will feel at ease while conversing with family members and may find yourself talking just to fill the silence, or even talk without thinking – thus, what may come close to losing face in front of someone else may well be a resolvable situation in a family context. 'The emphasis on storytelling over story [...] places issues of meaning and sensibility at the heart of family narrative. To some extent, what will become meaningful content is not predictable outside particular performance conditions and consequences' (Langellier & Peterson 2004: 40). The aspect of narrativity as a performance (the act of storytelling) and of performing (the act of forming family through storytelling; cf. ibid.: 39ff) is of particular interest in the context of family talk, which is why the following chapter will go into detail about storytelling.

2.3.2. Storytelling

Storytelling 'is an integral and consequential part of daily life', because 'people make sense of their experiences, claim identities, interact with each other, and participate in cultural conversations through storytelling' (Langellier & Peterson 2004: 1). This mundane experience of listening to and telling stories 'suggests that storytelling is first and foremost a human communication practice' where 'performing narrative combines the performative "doing" of storytelling with what is "done" in the performance of a story" (ibid.: 2). This is why narrative is a 'significant site of communication and study' (ibid.: 1): there is so much potential to show

in research, which is why there 'is a substantial body of literature on storytelling in a number of fields, including Linguistics, Anthropology, Folklore, Sociology, Cultural Studies, Communication, Psychology and Cognitive Science' (Mandelbaum 2013: 492).

Storytelling involves the body, the voice, gestures, feelings, memories, and more (cf. Langellier & Peterson 2004: 8). While telling stories you experienced yourself, the role as a narrator has many facets: myself in the past, myself in the now narrating something from the past, myself having learned from the past, myself as storyteller, and so forth. With this, you don't only construct your past self but you have to keep the current listeners and narrative situation in mind. Thus, some aspects may get more attention because of the reaction of your current listeners – was there another audience, something else would get the attention – so personal and social aspects of the narrative self will be negotiated by the narrative self in the current situation. (cf. Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann 2004: 167f.) In other words: 'The emergence and invention of new meanings show the heuristic function of storytelling to exceed memory of the past, participate in problem-solving in the present, and anticipate the future' (Langellier & Peterson 2004: 73). Simultaneously, it is 'socially and culturally reflexive' (ibid: 4).

Langellier & Peterson work with storytelling as a means of remembering certain events and retelling or repeating them, of group memories given over generation to generation. This thesis, however, works with the act of *telling stories*, of how the concept of a story holds a basic pattern, of how actually *telling* a story to others means playing and enacting different parts and participants of the story, as can be seen in Tannen (2007: 105ff.). She sees storytelling as a 'means by which humans organize and understand the world, and feel connected to each other' (ibid.: 106). Furthermore, storytelling is a 'key element in the establishment of intrapersonal involvement in conversation: It heightens the active participation of listeners' (ibid.: 107). 'In focusing on the *telling* of stories, conversation analysts have shown that stories are *interactive* productions, co-constructed by teller and recipient and tailored to the occasions of their production' (italics in original, Mandelbaum 2013: 492).

There have to be certain features that have to be known by all conversational partners of what a story entails: how it is initiated (so that other conversational partners can wait for their turn-taking), how it is ended (so others can have their turn at telling, can comment on the story, can elaborate), when to signal to the teller that the conversational partners are in fact listening (laughter, small comments, affirmatives), how to provide enough background information for the respective listeners for the story, and more. This complexity entails, of course, that more than just one TCU is needed to build the story (cf. Mandelbaum 2013). While the teller (tries to) initiate a particular story, the conversational partners 'must do some work both to determine

that there may be a story to tell, and to understand what its relevance might be here' (Mandelbaum 2013: 496). Instead of the approach of simply beginning to tell a story (called 'first position' by Mandelbaum), speakers can project storytelling with initiating sentences (e.g., '*to us happened this thing*', this thesis, chapter 3.3., line 04). This 'puts prospective recipients in a position to forward or block the storytelling' (Mandelbaum 2013: 496). The teller also has to provide 'resources' for their conversational partners to signal to them 'an upcoming extended turn, and to project what kind(s) of responses will be relevant to the story and when, not only while in progress, but also upon completion' (ibid.). When beginning a story on 'second position', they are 'responsive to something prior' like inquiries or invitations (ibid.: 497).

There are a 'variety of indications of what is important in the telling and how [conversational partners] should react to the telling' (Mandelbaum 2013: 498): reformulations, providing context (e.g., location references), characterizations of the story or personas of the story, and more. It is important to note that the persons involved in a particular conversation and a particular story will have opinions, or *stances* (ibid.) towards the telling. 'The teller's stance, and the extent to which it is conveyed, is a crucial resource for recipients, as it makes available the teller's expectations regarding how the events of the storytelling are to be responded to' (Mandelbaum 2013: 499). Although Mandelbaum doesn't use the term 'positioning' here, it is essentially what he described: how the participants of the conversation position themselves to each other, to the topic of conversation, and to themselves (more on positioning in chapter 2.4.1.). Linked to positioning are storylines which frame the events of a conversation and organize the story for oneself and the others, depending on the current context. Besides, storylines are reoccurring; they give a familiar feeling to a conversation and a structure to build or to guide it. As an example, the happenings in a classroom can be seen as a storyline for instruction. It involves a certain positioning of the teacher and makes his utterances, behavior, and actions relatively determined (Langenhove & Harré 1999).

 As mentioned before, conversational partners play an active role in storytelling: they 'must monitor for the possible climax of the story so that they can produce a proper response' (Mandelbaum 2013: 499). The context of a story as well as the cues that come from the teller tell the conversational partner(s) how to react (is it a sad story, a funny story?), when to react (pauses, question tags), co-participating in the structuring of storytelling, all the while inducing an asymmetrical amount of talk. The (short) responses of conversational partners therefore constitute key components for successful storytelling ranging from passive to active participation which can be vocal, embodied, or both. This co-participation can, of course, be used to disrupt, derail, or divert the telling of a story, e.g., to tell one's own story or to avoid a

14

certain topic (cf. Mandelbaum 2013: 499ff). To successfully reach the end of a story, the involvement of all participants is needed – it is 'interactionally arrived at' (ibid.: 505) which means that the teller has to arrive at a point in the story the conversational partners can find a way to signal their understanding, to comment on the story, to start with a story of their own; to elicit some kind of reaction from the conversational partners (ibid.).

Storytelling is a crucial part of interaction: identities are formed, opinions are discussed, meanings are made. It involves certain techniques a speaker has to master before a successful story can be told while the conversational partners actively participate in telling the story. As has been mentioned, one important aspect of storytelling is how the conversational partners position themselves, the object of discourse, and the other participants. Furthermore, 'story climaxes [...] are one of the recurrent interactional sites for reported speech' (Holt & Clift 2007: 2). That is why the next chapter will concern itself the phenomena that make storytelling interesting for this thesis: positioning, voice, and constructed dialogue.

2.4. Make Your Voice Heard: Positioning, Voice, and Constructed Dialogue

As the previous chapters have shown, storytelling involves intricate patterns created in conversation. On the peak of a story, a crated character may voice something that was said before. A family member may bring the pet into the conversation and let her voice some concerns about the new plant the mother brought. The family members then show how they stand towards what was said. Positioning, voice, and constructed dialogue are tangible aspects of almost any conversation, which is why the following chapters will illuminate the main aspects of the respective phenomena.

2.4.1. Positioning

Positioning originated in British discursive psychology and is connected to the names of Wendy Hollway and Rom Harré (cf. Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann 2004: 168; Harré et al. 2009, Langenhove & Harré 1999). It was further developed for the use in narrative studies and other fields by many researchers (Bamberg 1997; Grossen & Salazar-Orvig 2006; De Fina 2013, Davies & Harré 1990, Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann 2004, Roland 2001). Positioning theory 'is concerned with revealing the explicit and implicit patterns of reasoning that are realized in the ways that people act towards others' (Harré et al. 2009: 5). Also, positioning is 'seen an especially adequate way of conceiving of identities in narratives, because it allows for a reconstruction of discursive actions by which identities are accomplished, be it by description or by action' (Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann 2004: 166). That means that positioning can help discover patterns of how selves act in talk-in-interaction, which is why Davies & Harré (1990) point out that personal 'experience is organized in terms of storylines, which draw on discursive repertoires' and 'underscore that positioning means to choose among competing storylines' (Deppermann 2013: 64).

Following Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann, positioning generally describes the discursive practices with which humans depict and enact themselves and their fellow human beings as persons in spoken interaction, which attributes, roles, features, and motives they take with their actions, and how functional those are for creating the narrative identity in the current conversation (ibid.: 168). They go on to explain that positioning focuses on those aspects of verbal interaction that a speaker uses to make themselves a discernible, social person in a certain interaction, taking a certain 'position' in the social space for themselves and signaling with this how the conversational partner should see them (*self-positioning*). The conversational partner gets positioned by the current speaker as well, as the speaker sees a social position for the

partner and acts a certain way towards him (*other-positioning*). According to Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann, positions can include aspects of personality (e.g., creativity), social identities (e.g., teacher), role-specific rights (e.g., authority), and moral attributes and demands of a speaker (e.g., honesty) (ibid.: 171). Mostly, those emerge from subconscious processes that help to create local identities while the positionings can be accepted or rejected. These fluid, reciprocal positioning activities continue throughout the interaction, so that certain aspects of identity will be taken, accepted, rejected, or negotiated. As Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann put it, the positioning activity influences the next options of action in the discourse, and many of these positioning activities only make sense in the context of former positioning activities. This is why, in my opinion, linguists interested in talk-in-interaction should pay close attention to positioning[7], as these acts influence what and how something is being said; it influences the forms-in-function and how they are perceived by the conversational partner. This being said, positionings are *not* executed by a specific class of speech acts – it is a function of arbitrary verbal actions that allocate positionings (cf. Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann 2004: 171). In fact, it is the other way around: speech acts can have more or less relevant aspects to positioning.

Positioning can be *direct* or *indirect*, *explicit* and *implicit*. That means that self- and other-positioning, role assignment and moral categorization can either be very clearly expressed or very vague and only indicated to the conversational partner, with the true meaning being left to the imagination. The rhetoric art of positioning is to use those communicational means in a way that the conversational partner can accurately draw the desired conclusions without the risk of negative effects, e.g., to be too direct, to lose face, to dive too deep into self-praise, or to risk being critiqued. That positioning is a subtle but detectable act is visible in the fact that the conversational partner always has the possibility to react on (self- and other-) positionings, to comment on them, or to reject them (cf. Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann 2004: 171).

As positionings result in forming and reforming the identities of all participating conversational partners, there are prone to be conflicts and power-struggles over the identity claims of all participants in a conversation (cf. Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann 2004: 172). That is why it is so interesting to look into family talk: how do the family members, who are supposed to know each other very well, negotiate their identities in family storytelling?

Positioning is also dialogical: not only is there the dialogical turn-taking of the conversational partners, but also the dialogicality of positioning where the positions of 'past-I' can differ from the positions of the 'now-I'. In this, the speaker splits into the 'narrating-I' (the current speaker

---

[7] Especially the fact that the implicitness and indirectness of positionings transport more meaning than the spoken word can convey by following complex discursive rules and conventions (cf. Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann 2004: 172) should be of particular interest for pragmatic linguists.

of the narration, *erzählendes Ich*) and the 'narrated-I' (the protagonist of the narration, *erzähltes Ich*) because of the special temporal relation to the past (cf. Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann 2004: 172). Günthner (2002: 63) uses the terms of 'narrated world' (*erzählte Welt*) and 'narrating world' (*Erzählwelt*): if an utterance is taken out of its former context ('decontextualization') and put into a new one ('recontextualization'), the narrated world is the world where the utterance came from originally and the narrating world is where the speaker tells his story. Bamberg (2004a) takes it further and has developed a three level approach to positioning (cf. Deppermann 2013: 64f.): in level 1, positionings of the narrated world take place; level 2 describes the positioning processes of the narrating world, and level 3 describes positionings 'with respect to master narratives or dominant discourses' (ibid.), meaning that here, identities locate themselves in the society (e.g., 'I as teacher'-positions from the dialogical self theory). This is why positioning should be so closely linked to researching constructed dialogue: small nuances of talk-in-interaction can be explained by how the speaker positions himself towards what was said of a person in his story, towards the reported person, towards the listener, the conversational partners will position themselves and react to the reported story/persons (cf. Günthner 2002, Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann 2004: 173).

During storytelling, a certain aspect close to positioning may emerge: membership categorization[8] (or MC; Deppermann 2013). Membership categorization 'deals with how members categorize persons and how this is used as a resource of ascribing properties, explaining and evaluating actions, attributing responsibility and engendering inferences and expectations regarding actions of category members' (ibid.: 65). In family talk, membership categorization may be a useful tool to trace certain storylines, e.g., 'our family vs. the others', 'student vs. teacher', and so on. I suspect that membership categorization may emerge during constructed dialogues while inhibiting a certain voice, to drive the point across that something is different/unusual/not how the family does things.

Something that Bertau & Klee (2016) found in analyzing family talk is 'co-positioning': co-positioning 'is a movement between speakers that relate them to each other not only as persons but as a strong tendency to relate them as members of a moral order vis-a-vis someone else (other persons, groups)' (ibid.: 6). The phenomenon is situated in something called the 'mid-level' (or 'transpersonal level', Bertau 2014), which is the state between Bamberg's first and third level where the self locates itself not on a personal, not on a social, but on a transpersonal dimension (ibid; Bertau 2014). 'The transpersonal level permits a subject to be conceived

---

[8] Membership categorization was already laid out by conversation analysis-co-founder Harvey Sacks; his college Schegloff, however, warned about MC being applied top-down rather than bottom-up and being infused with own beliefs about social categories (cf. Deppermann 2013: 65ff).

simultaneously as unique, [...] involved in interpersonal relationships and symbolically related to a broader community' (Bertau & Klee 2016: 5). Co-positioning emerges in conversation between closely connected conversational partners: it is a close follow-up by a speaker, not only in regard to temporal dynamics but also in relation to the preceding utterance. In this, is it more than just an affirmation: it serves to closely connect the two conversational partners, to create rapport. In this, we (Bertau & Klee) assume that constructed dialogues in narratives serve as a fertile ground for co-positioning, and voice-shift commonly found during constructed dialogue is probably part of the positioning process for co-positioning.

Positioning and voice seem to be interconnected through the *I*-positions of the dialogical self: I can voice the difference in positions between past-*I*s and present-*I*s during narratives, differentiating into narrating I and narrated I (which may be traced back to different *I*-positions). How exactly voice factors into the different facets of positioning and dialogical self will be the topic of the next chapter.

2.4.2. Voice

In the last chapter and in the chapter about the theory of the dialogical self, voice was already mentioned. In the latter, voice is used to convey that certain (or even all) *I*-positions inhibit a voice, so the self can find coherence and continuity in the multivoiced dialogues within and without, in narrating oneself to oneself and to others. In positioning, voice is more of a stylistic device to portray positions, figures, or categorizations of others with certain changes made through the voice of a storyteller: the speaker can alternate his own voice through change of intonation, pitch level, volume, tempo, or register and so forth, thus signalizing the conversational partner(s) that a different voice is speaking. This stylistic change of voice serves not only as contextualization of the portrayed figure, but is simultaneously a medium of evaluation (cf. Günthner 2002). One might think that a phenomenon as rich in variation as voice may have gotten much attention from linguists, but unfortunately, this is not the case. Calling voice an important contextual device, Mey (2003) points out that voice 'has found no accepted place in the deliberations of those pragmatically oriented researchers who hail from various linguistic backgrounds: in most cases, their span of attention is limited by the purely grammatical, contextual phenomena' (Mey 2003: 793f.). From the perspective of literary pragmatics, Mey defines voice as follows:

> The process by which (theatrical or literary) voices are created is called **voicing**. The voices appearing on the scene are embodied in the *dramatis personae* [...]. Voices are made possible within the *universe of discourse*, that is, they neither represent independently created roles, to be played at will as exponents of the actor's self-expression, nor are they strictly grammatically produced and

semantically defined units, to be interpreted by linguists and text analysts according to the rules of grammar or narration. Rather, voices have to be understood in an interactive process of ongoing collaboration between all the parties involved. It is this **contextual cooperation** that the process of "voicing", in the final analysis, presupposes and represents. (cursive and bold in original, Mey 2003: 794)

Mey touches on many points here: with the performative aspect of using voice (voicing), the narrating I can 'construct' persons in narratives. However accurate those 'impersonations' may be, they will always be a construct of the internalized event (and the voices, and the *I*-positions) of the recollection of the speaker. Also, voices don't follow grammatical rules: as they emerge in talk-in-interaction, they may be constructed 'on the go' – a fabrication of the moment, so to speak. They might change in regard of who is listening to the particular story and who other conversational partners are, and are, in a way, a context-sensitive, interactive process of all participants of a conversation.

Mey is not the first to have arrived at a notion of voice through literary science. The 'proposal of the Bakhtin/Volosinov circle that much of what we say is permeated with the voices of others has proven highly influential beyond the domain of literary theory' (Holt & Clift 2007: 2f.). In the 1930s, both Bakhtin and Vološinov 'started from formal linguistics of the time, with its abstract conception of language' (Linell 2007: 164). However, they came to argue that 'languages live only in and through the mouths of real people, in utterances. Utterances in talk are always carried by individual voices' (ibid.). With this notion, they began forming the idea of dialogicality, as for them, 'dialogue is crucial: not dialogue *per se* [...] but the polyphonic nature of all utterances, of every word' (Tannen 2007: 103). 'From these notions, Bakhtin arrives at voice, thereby describing the foundations of language as a dynamic structure of acts of answering' (Bertau 2013: 44). In this reasoning, every spoken (or written) word is already associated with contexts, genres, people, voices, and 'traces of those voices and contexts cling inevitably to them.' (Tannen 2007: 103).

Drawing on Bakhtin, Bertau (2011, 2013, 2014) refines the notion of voice. She explains that '[...] one can assume that an individual voice is always manifold. It has a mulitplicity of expressions, corresponding to the social language needed in an actual situation' (Bertau 2013: 45). This multiplicity of voice shows itself in three dimensions: firstly, the *indexicality* of voice; secondly, the *embodiment* of voice, and thirdly, the *intonation* of voice.

 'While the voice, particularly its "voice quality", is personal, it also to some extent reflects the person's biography' (Linell 2007: 164.). Thus, the voice always inhibits the speaker's own personal signature. (ibid.) This is the *indexicality* of voice (Bertau 2013: 47): as we speak to another person, we give away many facts about us with merely the way we talk: our mood,

where we are from (regional accent, sociolect), how old we are, what gender we have, if we currently have a cold (state of health); all these things condense in our voice. Thus, voice serves as an index; it points so certain features about us, just as well as gestures would. Another point of the indexicality lies in the way we speak about us, i.e., the use of pronouns: they change when we deploy methods of storytelling or constructed dialogue (ibid.). Concerning constructed dialogue, voice is particularly interesting, as it is voice that shifts perspective, even on a phonetic level (Bertau 2013; Tannen 2007).

The second dimension, *embodiment*, is about voice being a 'bodily experience' as it originates from a physical body and connects speech and body with one another (Bertau 2013: 50). Voice is 'a vocal-auditory event' that belongs to a 'certain socioculturally constructed way of expression', being individual and societal at the same time (ibid.). The fact that language can be detached from the vocal-auditory dimension (e.g., in writing) does not imply that it will be disembodied completely, as still, the connection to the spoken word connects written language to voice (ibid.: 50f.). It is the realization of the tangible voice someone has; the voice that stems from a body. How a voice says something – in what pitch, in what tone, what accent, how the intonation is – all this influences the meaning the person is making, through utilizing the physical ability of the voice someone possesses. 'These properties of the voice contribute to sense-making in communication, especially to the emotional flavours attributed to the utterances in context' (Linell 2007: 164)

The third dimension of voice is *intonation*. In short, intonation is everything that can willingly be modified during the course of a conversation, to bring certain points across (e.g., speak high-pitched when constructing dialogue for a child), acutely depending on the present story and audience. The listener deciphers these clues from pitch level, loudness, tempo, and other linguistic features and choices we as speakers make, may they be conscious or subconscious (cf. Bertau 2013: 47f.). Speakers can use voice to 'express particular ideas and views' (Linell 2007: 165). This means that voice can convey your attitude towards or your perspective on the subject of discourse. These may not always be your own, as ideas can stem from the social group you belong to (ibid).

Coming back to the theory of the dialogical self and voice, Bertau (2013) states that the 'notion of voice is fundamental for the theory of the dialogical self. [...] The spatialization of self [...] allows for simultaneously different positions, and for movement between these positions' (2013: 41). Different positions inhabit different voices, 'thus establishing dialogic relationships between positions' (ibid.). Evidently, voice is not only connected to positioning (as positions are made visible through the attitude and intonation conveyed by voice), it is also closely connected to constructed dialogue, as with the alternation of intonation, pitch level, volume,

tempo, or register and so forth, one can signal the conversational partner(s) that the voice of a portrayed figure is speaking. This stylistic change of voice serves not only as contextualization of the portrayed figure, but is simultaneously a medium of evaluation of the reported situation (cf. Günthner 2002). This means that one speaker can inhibit several voices during a narration. These voices may be expressed by constructed dialogue in a conversation, which is what the next chapter is about.

2.4.3. Constructed Dialogue

Constructed dialogue is closely interwoven with storytelling, as the story climaxes often involve constructed dialogue. Some of what has been said in the chapter about storytelling (2.3.2.) is relevant for constructed dialogue as well, but to avoid redundancy, will not be explained again. 'Work on reported speech in recent years has emerged from a variety of disciplines, most prominently literal theory, philosophy, linguistics and sociology' (Holt & Clift 2007: 2). The majority of most of this work is focused on the 'forms of reported speech', 'its authenticity' and on 'what it does' (bold removed by MK, Holt & Clift 2007: 3).

Regarding the *form* of constructed dialogue, it has long been the common understanding that constructed dialogue consists of a pronoun or name in connection with a *verbum dicendi*, followed by the content of what was supposedly said (Holt & Clift 2007, Tannen 2007). It is also universally believed that constructed dialogue comes in these two forms, where 'direct' represents the content of what was said from the perspective of the reported person (e.g., 'Poika said, "I can go"') whereas 'indirect' undergoes a shift in pronouns, paraphrasing the content (e.g., 'Poika said he can go') (cf. Tannen 2007: 102; Holt & Clift 2007: 3). 'Direct speech has long been seen as a way of not simply recalling a locution but also giving evidence about its form and content' (ibid.: 12), whereas the indirect form serves as a means to comment on the authenticity and/or credibility of the content (Tannen 2007).

However, regarding the introductory clause, 'research has identified a number of alternatives' (Holt & Clift 2007: 3): In English, a version of name/pronoun and *be* + *like* as an introductory clause is increasing (ibid; also Tannen 2007); in German, a popular colloquial introductory clause is *und* + *pronoun* + *so*. In Finnish, Haakana (2007) found that speakers in his corpus often used *että* in the direct instead of the indirect form, where the usage would be in literary use. The introduction to a constructed dialogue can even be completely omitted: a change of voice can serve the same purpose (Günthner 2002, Tannen 2007, Klee 2014). What these alternatives have in common is that they 'blur the boundary' (Holt & Clift 2007: 3) between direct and indirect constructed dialogue. Holt (2007) remarks on two separate occasions about findings of other researchers that there is a possibility of other means replacing the introductory

clause (mostly referring to means described in the chapter about voice in this theses); she herself finds in her corpus that 'the majority of the enactments are accompanied by marked shifts in prosody or voice quality' (Holt 2007: 57f.), which I can confirm with findings in a Hungarian corpus (cf. Klee 2014).

Regarding *authenticity*, Tannen remarks that reported speech 'is not reported at all but [...] creatively constructed by a current speaker in a current situation' (Tannen 2007: 108). As 'taking information uttered by someone in a given situation and repeating it in another situation is an active conversational move that fundamentally transforms the nature of the utterance' (ibid.), Tannen suggests that

> what is called "reported speech", "direct speech", "direct discourse," or "direct quotation" (that is, a speaker framing an account of another's words as dialogue) should be understood not as report at all, but as constructed dialogue. It is constructed just as surely as is the dialogue in drama or fiction. This view does not diminish our image of the individual speaking; rather it enhances it. [...] The act of transforming other's words into one's own discourse is a creative and enlivening one. (Tannen 2007: 112)

What Tannen claims here is that as soon as I decontextualize the words of someone else (or of myself in the past) and put them in a new context, I can fundamentally change the meaning of what was once said. As was indicated in the chapter about positioning, the split between narrating I (or narrating world) and narrated I (or narrated world), means decontextualizing and then recontextualizing an utterance (cf. also Günthner 2002). Because the 'reported context' (Tannen 2007: 104) is crucial to constructed dialogue, it is an active act of storytelling, using the former utterance as 'source material' for a story (ibid.: 110). The authenticity or intention of the narrator is not what is questioned by Tannen, rather it is 'the spirit of the utterance, its nature and force' (ibid. 111) that will transform the object of discourse in constructed dialogue. Taking into consideration that what speakers tend to remember is the *meaning* of an utterance and not the exact words (Tannen 2007), authenticity is a rather questionable aspect of constructed dialogue. This is especially true for instances of constructed dialogue where the 'source' doesn't have a voice of its own, e.g., when talking for a pet or an infant (Tannen 2007). Constructed dialogue can be 'used to portray the words of invented (often stereotypical) characters and to suggest what someone might say/have said on some (often hypothetical) occasion' (Holt 2007: 47). It can also be used to convey what wasn't said, what may have been said, or what the inner speech of myself or others is (Tannen 2007: 112ff). It is clear that, depending how much dramaturgical effect a speaker wants to give his story, the embellishment of constructed dialogue may blur the line of how accurate the content of a constructed dialogue truly is. However, the intention remains the same for all constructed dialogues, regardless of

the truthfulness of content, and that is to refer to an incident of the past and the involved persons and to create involvement.

The purpose and effect of constructed dialogue ('*what it does*') is not only to create involvement but also to establish solidarity in interaction or simply to dramatize the story itself (Tannen 2007). In this, as was already mentioned in chapter 2.3.2., the role of other conversational partners is as important as the role of the speaker (Holt & Clift 2007, Holt 2007, Tannen 2007, Bertau 2013, Klee 2014). Not only is the 'audience [...] involved by actively interpreting the significance of character and action' (Tannen 2007: 124), but they have to actively participate in telling the story (cf. chapter 2.3.2.). With this, the conversational partners 'create their understanding by drawing on their own history of associations' (Tannen 2007: 132). Furthermore, by

> giving voice to characters, dialogue makes story into drama and listeners into an interpreting audience to the drama. This active contribution in sensemaking contributes to the creation of involvement. [...] Moreover, and perhaps paradoxically, it is a supremely social act: by appropriating each others' utterances, speakers are bound together in a community of words. (Tannen 2007: 132)

As it seems, the purpose of constructed dialogue is manifold and can range from simply 'citing' information that was given by someone else to actively caricature and dramatizing a person portrayed in a story, always providing information and involvement for the conversational partners.

This is why I suggest that there is actually a spectrum of constructed dialogue: located on one end is the *evidential constructed dialogue* that serves the purpose to order content for conversational partners (and in case of inner speech to order content for oneself). Here, constructed dialogue closely represents what was actually said, e.g., citing that my brother told me that he would be here at noon. On the other end of the spectrum is stands *constructed voice*: a vivid, tangible change of voice quality is taking place during constructed dialogue, dramatizing the story to an extreme extend in order to evoke a thorough reaction in the conversational partners.

In these last chapters, many concepts have been introduced in order to create a foundation that can provide a holistic view on storytelling-in-interaction. The next part of the thesis comprises the data and its analysis. In the following, the theories that were brought together will be applied to a Finnish conversation.

3. Empirical Study: A Finnish Family Dialogue

As we have learned from the previous chapters, family talk is a productive source of storytelling, as family members tend to perform themselves to other family members on almost a daily basis. In storytelling, story climaxes often contain constructed dialogue, where voices of not only the narrating-I, but also of the narrated-I and other *I*-positions can penetrate the utterance of the speaker in the present. In doing so, the speaker not only positions himself towards himself, but also to the object of discourse as well as towards his conversational partners. As these have an integral part in storytelling, they get positioned and position themselves constantly during an interaction. Voice connects positioning with constructed dialogue, as through voice, positions can be conveyed in constructed dialogue.

In the beginning of the thesis, the question was asked if speakers introduce constructed dialogues trough voice rather than through linguistic means during their storytelling, and how the family members position themselves during the stories in Finnish family talk. With the following analysis of the data, these questions shall be answered along with other questions: how often do the phenomena of voice and constructed dialogue appear simultaneously? Will a Finnish family include voice as vividly in constructed dialogue or are they truly 'silent Finns'? Will the hypothesis of a spectrum of constructed dialogue hold true?

3.1. Design of the Study: Acquiring the Data

Due to a very limited time-frame, I did two one-hour-recordings with one four-person-family. An unplanned change in the family's schedule led to us doing both recordings in one day with a break of three hours in between. In the following, I will describe the family members and the set-up, so the reader gets a clear picture of how the data for this thesis was acquired.

3.1.1. The Family

The family[9] is higher middle-class living in a small but busy city located between Turku and Helsinki. The father, Isä, 46 years old, is the CEO of his own company in the metal industry. They have 40 employees and served about 350 customers in 2016. The mother, Äiti, 45 years old, works for a small company that is constructing components of mining and forestry machinery. She only recently began working full-time, after having been unemployed for two years as the department of the company she was with was decommissioned. Their daughter,

---

[9] To ensure the family's anonymity, I replaced their names with the Finnish form of their family role instead of a pseudonym: *isä* means father, *äiti* means mother, *tyttö* means daughter, and *poika* means son. In the transcripts, only the 'initials' used (e.g. I for Isä).

Tyttö, 19 years old, just finished high school and started studying environmental studies in another city a few days after the recording. Her brother, Poika, 16 years old, just started high school and plays football as a goalkeeper.

The family is somewhat used to having strangers around, as they had three au-pairs staying with them for one year respectively, so it wasn't a too unusual situation for them to have a stranger in the house. As will become clear in the transcripts, the family speaks a very colloquial form of Finnish. The father cautioned me that he may use swearwords, as in work, they are used to lots of swearing, although he tries not to swear too much at home. The son had caught a cold shortly before I arrived, which will be apparent in the transcripts as well; so coughing and sniffling on his part have to be interpreted as him having a cold, not as other non-verbal means to achieve something in the conversation. Also, his having a cold contributed to me not being able to transcribe everything that was said, as he sometimes coughed in 'unfortunate' moments and he was hard to understand at times – being a male teenager made him slur his speech somewhat, plus the tempo of talk from some family members was very fast.

3.1.2. The Set-Up and the Setting

I recorded[10] the family with two cameras (Panasonic HDC-TM700 and a similar Sony model) and a dictaphone[11] (Olympus LS-5). The cameras were placed to get two angles on the family sitting on a corner sofa, while the dictaphone was placed on the sofa's coffee table with a paper placed on top of it as to not distract the study participants. Although I didn't give a time limit, the family decided for themselves that they wanted to talk for one hour per recording. The family didn't get any guidelines from me as to what to talk about; they only knew I was researching 'family talk'. For the second take, I took the daughter aside and made her my confidante, asking her to push her family members towards part of the stories where constructed dialogue is used most often. She instantly knew what I meant as she herself asked if those where the parts where one changes one's voice. In my opinion, she did a very subtle job, as in the second debriefing session after the recordings, no family member remarked about noticed anything different. The family indicated that they felt natural while talking, although the second take felt even more natural than the first one. This comment implicates that the first take did feel somewhat unusual to them after all. I was not present during the recordings as not to influence the family in any way.

---

[10] I want to thank Christoph Draxler from the Phonetics Department of the LMU Munich for helping me with tips on how to record successfully, even on short notice.
[11] I want to thank Riho Grünthal from the University of Helsinki for lending me the equipment and giving me valuable tips for the task ahead. His help was greatly appreciated.

Due to the limited scope of this thesis, only certain parts of the recordings were transcribed. In order to decide on which occurrences to use, I first went through the material of the dictaphone with Katri Wessel[12], the lecturer for Finnish at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University of Munich, and after deciding on which parts were the most fitting, I transcribed and translated the occurrences, which then went through a last check by Katri Wessel. For the transcription, I used the conventions found in Holt & Clift 2007 (which are provided under: 6. Transcription Conventions). I had to make three adjustments to those, which need a short explanation: ((nose exhale)) describes the state of someone nearly starting to laugh at something where more air than normal gets pushed through the nose to make a distinguishable noise. ((hhrrm)) is the sound of clearing one's throat – due to it happening so much during overlapping talk, I wanted to shorten the description of it. The last of my additions is a cursive *h*, which signals considerable aspiration during talk (it m*h*ay l*h*ook l*h*ike th*h*is). Please note that the transcription conveys intonation through punctuation marks, but the Finnish intonation differs somewhat from the intended conventions, so keep in mind that punctuation marks don't end the turn takings or implicate a question but simply convey intonation. In the transcripts, turns containing constructed dialogue are marked.

3.2. Focus of the Study: Working with the Data

In the following, six transcripts will be discussed. A translation of the Finnish original is given in between the lines, however, the translation is very literal and should only serve as a reference to what is being said in Finnish – I followed the Finnish structure closely, which, of course, was not always possible. For a better understanding, I will give a more freely translated version conveying the meaning, not the words, in the text when necessary.

The family generally talks about mundane, everyday topics like school, teachers, a mutual acquaintance. However, a good part of the second recording is about politics and refugees, as shortly before the recordings took place, a fatal knife attack in Turku left two victims dead and eight injured. The attacker was a Moroccan man who was shot in the leg from Finnish police to immobilize him. Throughout the whole passage discussing the failings of politics over the refugee problem, no evidence of storytelling, constructed dialogue, or voice was detected. My impression is that the more serious the topics, the less these phenomena were used. However, before and after the serious passage, the storyline about refugees was used in storytelling, mainly by the son and the father.

---

[12] I am indebted to Katri Wessel for her kind and patient help in this matter.

The family starts their dialogue fairly normal, recounting their respective days. In the first transcript (1) 'That Name List', the mother asks the son how a type of assembly led by the guidance teacher was in school, which prompts a story from the son: a name list had to be signed by every student (of which there were about 200), but someone gave the list back unfinished. After the lesson, the teacher asked if the list was complete, which evoked a negative response. The son mainly talks to his mother; daughter and father smile and nod but don't actively take part in this occurrence.

(1) 'That Name List'

01   Ä   mites opo:n tunti tänää:,
how was the guidance counselor's hour today:,

02   P   ei me tehty siel yhtään mitään
we didn't do nothing there at all

03   Ä   mut [s oli]
but ['t was]

04   P   [ni- meil] meil tuli semmonen ju<u>ttu</u>, (0.8) ett piti pistää nimilista?
[so- to us] to us happened this thing, (0.8) that one has to be on that name list?

05   Ä   jo=
yes=

06   P   =niin kun sen >piti käydä kaikki ne kakssataa< oppilasta läpi?
=so when it >had to pass by every of those two hundred< students?

07   Ä   ju:?
yeah:?

08   (0.5)

09   P   sit ku se o käynny kakskyt oppilasta läpi,
then when it had gotten twenty students on it,

10   (0.3)

11   Ä   mm.
mm.

12   P   joku ↑idiootti (.) oli vienny sen sinne <u>ta</u>kaisin sinne opettajal <u>ku</u>ka ei ollu sanonu
some ↑idiot (.) had given it <u>ba</u>ck there to the teacher <u>wh</u>o did not say

13   siit mitää. (0.3) niin se oli käyny pelkästään ne niiku [ne ensimmäiset,] si
anything to that. (0.3) so it had got only those like [those first,] then

14   Ä   [((laughs))]

15   P   TUnnin jälkeen op- se opettaja huuta siel, ett (0.7) ett että että onko   ←
AFter the lesson te- this teacher yells there, that (0.7) that that that are

16		kaikki- (.) kaikkien nimet täällä lapu<u>ss</u>a?	←
		every- (.) everyone's names <u>on</u> this paper?	
17	Ä	jo:?	
		yeah:?	
18	P	sit kaikki huutaa set ett ↑ei, ↑ei ↑ole	←
		then everybody yells this that ↑no, ↑they're ↑not	
19		(0.3)	
20	T	[((nose exhale))]	

After being asked about his school day, the son responds with a story from 'second position' (Mandelbaum 2013), adopting a storytelling-voice (which is slightly louder than his speaking voice). He introduces his story in line 04 with a short characterization (*meil tuli semmonen ju<u>ttu</u>*, 'this thing happened to us'): *juttu* can mean 'thing', 'story', 'anecdote', so the family knows that a small story (Bamberg 2004b) will follow. Poika goes on two fill in relevant information for his story in lines 04 and 06, indicating with a rising intonation that he needs confirmation to proceed. The confirmation is given by Äiti both times, positioning herself as the attentive listener. Poika goes on to introduce one part of the foundation of his climax, namely that only twenty student's names were on the list (line 09), followed by the characterization of the protagonist of his story (line 12), an idiot. This characterization is two-fold: not only does it say what he thinks of his class mate, but it characterizes the story as a complaint-story: some idiot did something, and I am not happy about it. That Poika positions himself against the 'idiot' is apparent in his voice: he raises the pitch, speaking somewhat agitated. Had he delivered his line laughing, it would have changed the effect it had.

Closely after this his second part of the foundation of his climax, Poika prepares his first punchline, namely that the teacher didn't comment on receiving the list back (lines 12, 13) until after the lesson. After a short pause, he again emphasizes that the list only had the first few names on it, which elicits a short laugh from the mother.

As the story nears its climax, the first constructed dialogue is introduced in line 15, but with great difficulty: Poika needs four attempts (*ett (0.7) ett että että*)[13] with finishing the introductory clause before the constructed dialogue can follow. In this, it is unclear if he uses the direct or indirect form of constructed dialogue; it could be both. In this instance, it doesn't matter either way: with no alteration of voice quality and breaking off while voicing the teacher, the result is that no obvious positioning of the teacher is taking place. This can be due to this

---

[13] What couldn't always be conveyed in the translation is that *ett* is the shortened, colloquial version of *että*, 'that'.

constructed dialogue not being the climax of the story, which is also seen as Poika again uses rising intonation to indicate he needs confirmation of this aspect of his story before he can proceed (line 16).

After this is given, he follows up with his true punchline: the whole remaining 180 students yell back to the teacher that no, their names are not on that list (line 18: *sit kaikki huutaa set ett ↑ei, ↑ei ↑ole,* 'then everyone shouts that no, [their names] are not [on that list]'). The constructed dialogue Poika uses is similar to the 'choral dialogue' from Tannen (2007), where one speaker condenses what was said by many in a short summary. Here, the voice of Poika clearly changes: due to the high pitch (marked by '↑') in only the constructed dialogue, it transmits the panic of the students not being on the list, positioning them explicitly. It is interesting that he uses *kaikki huutaa* ,everybody yells/shouts' instead of a form with a first person plural pronoun plus verb. By choosing to word it like that, he gains some distance from the events of his climax, making it hard to interpret if he was one of the ones shouting or not. It is a clever method of not having to position his narrated I, not losing face in the moment of panic. This positioning gets accepted by Tyttö, as she reacts to Poika's story with amusement (a 'nose exhale').

This transcript thus contains two constructed dialogues: the first one (lines 15, 16) doesn't include a voice change and is delivered with difficulty. It doesn't position the teacher in any obvious way. It serves only to convey to Poika's conversational partners that the teacher did something in a certain way, but cautions them through intonation that this is not yet the climax. The climax itself is then delivered through a constructed dialogue with a voice change, namely a significantly higher pitch encompassing the complete constructed dialogue. Poika speaks for the collective of panicky students while distancing himself from them at the same time through a clever choice of words. The two different constructed dialogues hint at the spectrum of constructed dialogues: the first constructed dialogue only serves to convey what was said where the information came from, thus serving as *evidential constructed dialogue*. The second one is more towards the middle of the spectrum, changing the pitch and tone in the constructed to convey more than just meaning, including positioning activities.

The next transcript (2) 'I Can Go' follows after a passage of content-ordering and scheduling of the family. As if Poika suddenly remembered, he nearly cuts of the train of thought his mother had (not in the transcript) and starts with mentioning that on the next day, he will go to a friend's football match, where he was asked to be the goalkeeper. His spot would be taken by someone else if he wouldn't go, so he informs the family of this match and his going there, who affirm him in his decision.

(2) 'I Can Go'

21 P [↑on]ko muute
        [is] there by the way

22   (0.8)

23   tui mieleen ett keskiviikko? (0.2) mä meen siiheen been peliin.
        i had the idea that wednesday? (0.2) i go there to bee's match.

24   (1.1)

25 Ä eli [↑huomenna.]
        so [↑tomorrow.]

26 P [(been yste)]   ((looks to dad to confirm he knows who 'bee' is))
        [(bee's friend)]

27   (0.3)

28 I okei
        okay

29 Ä selvä. onks se salo[ssa] vai jossain muua[lla.   ]
        sure. is that in [salo] or somewhere   [else].

30 P   [ja.]   [emmä] so a ei o salos (0.2)
                          [yeah.]   [nah] that's not in salo (0.2)

31 P .hh tai, (.) (>yleisin s yle<) ((coughs)) kysyi että että ma halunks ma   ←
        .hh or, (.) (>usually usu<)   ((coughs))   asked that that i wanted i to

32   mennä sinne, niku veskaks,   ←
        go there, like as goalkeeper

33   (0.6)

34   ett ett (so) ett jo ett jos mä en nyt mee niin sit menee varmaankin (mosti)
        that that (it's) that now that if i don't go so now then most likely goes (name)

35 I *jo:
        **yea:*

36 P mä: voin mennä
        i: can go

37   (0.7)

38 Ä jo: ((nods))
        yea:

39 T °selvä° ((nods))
        °sure°

31

Although this transcript looks like it could be a story at the first glance, this is not the case; rather it is a form of decision making by including the family. The son starts with claiming the turn for himself though an unfinished question in line 21, quickly ordering his thoughts (line 22) and then starting with what he wanted to say. Poika's rising intonation in line 23 isn't for seeking confirmation from the family members as it was in transcript (1), but for asking himself if it was indeed Wednesday he was thinking about (which can also be seen in the fact that the Wednesday in question was the very next day, as asked by the mother in line 25). After being sure it was indeed Wednesday (as can be seen in the very short pause), he informs the family that he will go to a football match of his friend Bee. In line 26, he makes sure that his Dad knows what he is talking about, who is confirming his understanding in line 28. The mother then wants to know if the match will be in Salo or not, which gets answered by Poika in line 30. Line 31 and 32 could be mistaken to be the climax of the story, as here, constructed dialogue appears: *kysyi että että ma halunks ma mennä sinne, niku veskaks* 'I was asked if I if I wanted to go there, like as a goalkeeper'. This form of indirect constructed dialogue falls near one end of the spectrum: *evidential constructed dialogue*. It is delivered without any indication of voice change and merely serves to communicate information to the family. Poika then switches to instanced inner speech (Bertau 1999, 2011), where he muses that if he doesn't go, someone else will (line 34). Although it seemed like he already made the decision to go in line 23 (*mä meen siihen* 'I go there'), the true decision is reached in line 36, where he claims he can and will go there (*mä: voin mennä*, which can be interpreted as 'I could go' or 'I will go'). Both mother and daughter affirm his decision.

 It is not unusual for family members to carry out their decision making in a form of thinking in dialogue. Especially in family talk, the border of inner speech can be crossed (which is apparent in the idiom 'thinking out loud'). What doesn't change is the addressivity of the inner speech: although externalizing his thoughts, Poika is still in dialogue with himself in line 34, conversing with his *I*-positions if he would feel bad if someone else would be the goalkeeper of the match.

This transcript demonstrates that in family talk, content-ordering by externalized inner speech is part of everyday family life. It shows that content-ordering can follow the same basic pattern as a story: introduction of a thought, giving background information, introducing characters, coming to a conclusion/climax. The transcript also underlines that constructed dialogue can serve as a mere informational tool, making it obvious that the source of information comes from someone else than the speaker without characterizing or dramatizing the constructed dialogue through voice.

In the next transcript (3) 'That Parent Conference Day', the mother comes up with an anecdote because they talked about a gym teacher. In the anecdote, she talks about the high school parent conference day the winter before, where she met the gym teacher. This teacher told her about some of his/her[14]courses that are worth applying to. As, however, her son, unbeknownst to the teacher now a high school student, already was in the coaching class and didn't need luck to get in the class or be hoping for a spot, the information was somewhat useless to her.

(3) 'That Parent Conference Day'

40 Ä sillon kun lukiolla oli se, ett vanhemille tä esittelypäivä? viime talvena?
then when in high school it was, that for parents that conference day? last winter?

41 P noni
allright

42 Ä niin sinnä mä nää *m- (0.5) hh liikkaopet oli siinä ja jotain mä >menin niku sitä
so there i see *m- (0.5) hh gym teacher was there and something I >went like that

43 no mites siihe< l- ojevalmennukse[en ni]iku se hake:minen tai jotain ja=
well what's that< l- (kind of traini[ng) like this s/he is searching or something and=

44 I   [m::]
                           [mh:]

45 Ä =sit se (yle-) ja sanos ett jo, ett .hh k*h*yll siihe k*h*annattaa yritt*h*ää   ←
=then s/he ( ) and says that yeah, that .hh yhes thhis his whorthwhile

46 hak*h*eutuu ett sitt saa helppol kurss:ei*h*.   ←
apphlying that then one gets courses ea:sily

47 T ((laughs softly))

48 Ä ((short laugh))

49 Ä ja se ei ollu niku [tää] juttu ja et saa [että, tää] minun lapseni on nyt=
and s/he wasn't like [this] story and didn't get [that this] my own child is now=

50 P   [((hrrm))]   [((hrrm))]

51 Ä =jo yläasteella (jo/ja) valmennuksessa. .hhhhhh °ett tota° hh
=already a high schooler (already/and) in coaching. .hhhhh °that like° hh

52 T °hän tulee sinne joka tapau[ksessa°]   ←
°he goes there any[way°]

53 Ä   [hän tulee] sinne joka tapauksessa ett hän   ←
*   [he goes] there anyway that he's*

---

[14] As there is no Genus in Finnish, I don't know if the teacher is a male or female.

54		ei ny vaan oo niinku ett=
		not now but is like that=

55	P	=((sniffels))=

56	Ä	=ett ett kokeile: pääseeks tuuril sisää sinne,
		=that that is trying to be so lucky to get in there,

In line 40, she introduces her story from 'first position' (Mandelbaum 2013), meaning she initiates the story with a projection (*silloin kun lukiolla oli se, ett vanhemille tä esitellypäivä?* 'when I was at that parent conference day in [your] high school?'). As both the introduction and the clarification that the event took place last year are delivered with a questioning tone, the mother needs a confirmation of the conversational partners to go on with her story. After her son provides the affirmation in line 41, she goes on to introduce the character in her story, the gym teacher (line 42: *sinnä mä nää* [...] *liikaopet* 'there I see [...] the gym teacher'). After giving more context to the story in line 43, she goes on to initiate her climax with a constructed dialogue. The introductory clause is delivered somewhat haltingly (*ja sit se* [...] *ja sanos ett jo, ett* 'and then s/he [...] and says that yeah, that'). This is followed by a constructed dialogue: here, she changes her voice, introducing excessive aspiration to her words. In this, she positions the gym teacher through membership categorization: apparently, this teacher has a certain way of acting around people, giving unsolicited advice, promoting his/her own courses over others. With the image of someone speaking with a lot of aspiration[15], she puts the teacher in a 'us vs. teacher'-context: we, the family, don't talk like that, but the teacher's idiolect is over-the-top exaggerated. Her general tone of voice remains rather passive throughout this passage (and throughout the recordings, really), but with this simple change, she manages to provide a certain, comical effect to her story.

This characterization makes the daughter laugh (line 47), which in turn makes the mother laugh at her own joke (line 48). Encouraged by the reaction, she goes on to further elaborate on her story (lines 51, 52) but seems to have difficulties in expressing what she wants to say, creating a fade-out (Tannen 2007) of her story (*.hhhhhh °ett tota° hh*). Her daughter notices this and provides a line of thought to her mother (line 52). In doing so, she executes two important acts of positioning: she co-positions herself towards her mother, picking up the mother's train of thought and allowing the mother to continue with the story (see line 53); however, she also subtly co-positions herself towards the object of discourse, her brother, in placing him in an active role in the story (*hän tule sinne joka tapauksessa* 'he goes there anyway').

---

[15] This is not a sign of accent/vernacular in Finnish, but rather seems like a portrayal of idiolect.

The mother picks up the provided assistance of her daughter, echoing it word for word before continuing (and finishing, not in the transcript) her story. With this, she accepts the co-positionings of her daughter.

This transcript shows that the combination of constructed dialogue and voice can serve to position characters in a story through membership categorization. Voice can be a powerful and effortless tool to convey the social standing, mannerisms, or peculiar character traits (or the habitus of a person), as only the way of saying has to be changed in order to magnify the meaning; no explanation necessary. This typification of characters of a story shows how intricately connected positioning, voice, and constructed dialogue can be.

In the next transcript (4) ‚You Are Actually a Failure‘, the talk has progressed to a more serious point: the family discusses the terror attack that happened in Turku shortly before the recordings took place. Obviously, all family members are emotionally involved in the topic to some extent. In the transcript, the father comments on how things were handled when the attacker was hospitalized. In his opinion, everything would have been better if the doctors would have told the attacker that he didn't manage to kill anybody and he himself was in the worst physical condition out of anybody he had attacked. The daughter instantly reacts to what was said and states that two people were actually killed, which the son affirms (somewhat late in the transcript, the *nii* in line 70 is the affirmation of the daughter's line 66). The father wants to support his theory by suggesting the doctor could lie, which gets rejected by an eye-roll-reaction from the daughter and an open rejection of the notion from the mother.

(4) 'You Are Actually a Failure'

```
57  I   [>(siinä ois ollu)<]      [SIInä ois-]
        [>(there'd've been)<]     [THEre'd hav-]

58  T   [    (mi-)        ]       [MIkä    ] toveri se olisi koski [sitte hhh he]
        [    (wha-)       ]       [WHat    ] comrade that would harm [then hhh he]

59  I                                              [nii >siinä   ] ois=
                                                   [so >there    ]'d 've=

60      =ollu< [kaikki-  ]=
        =been [everyone-]=

61  Ä          [ (kantele) ] ((looks at daughter and nods))
               [(do tell) ]

62  I   kaikkein paras, (0.4) ollu ku s' lääkäri oo menny sanomaa sä          ←
         the best, (0.4) been when the doctor had gone there to say you

63      oot kaikkein huonommas kunnos itte, ett ↑sä et saannu ↑kettää         ←
```

		are out of everyone in the worst condition yourself, that ↑you did not get ↑any	

64   hengilt. (0.6) sä olet todellinen epäonnistuja. (0.8) ni- (.) mieti: ←
people killed. (0.6) you are actually a failure.   (0.8) so- (.) think about

65   kun, miten se ois alkaan itkee siel [tota   ]
when, how he would've started crying there [so]

66   T   [no kyl]lä se [tappo] kaks
[well ye]s he [killed] two

67   Ä   [mhm:]
[mhm:]

68   (0.6)

69   I   ↑nii, mutta ku lääk[äri] o: valehtelis,
↑yeah, but when the doc[tor] would be lying,

70   P   [nii]
[yeah]

71   T   [(((clicks tongue and rolls eyes))]

72   Ä   [m::   ei lääkäri [valeh]telis
      ]
      [m::   the doctor [wouldn't] lie
      ]

73   P   [eh   ]   nii=
[nah   ]   yeah=

74   T   =[°ahhe°] ( )=
=[°ahhe°] ( )=

75   I   =[niin   ]
=[so]

76   Ä   [eejoo]
[ohyeah]

This transcript doesn't contain a 'story' *per se*: no characters or characterizations are introduced, as they are already talked about before the transcript starts, and no background information needs to be given, as all conversational partners are already at the same level of knowledge. However, the father does have an idea he wants to share, a comment he wants to give, and does this in a rather anecdotal way, making it seem like a story. In the occurrence, the father wants to start his comment on things but has serious difficulties in getting his word in (lines 57 – 62). Remaining persistent, he manages to claim a turn for himself and starts with the introductory part for a constructed dialogue (*kaikkein paras ollu ku s' lääkäri oo menny sanomaa* 'everything would've been better when the doctor had gone there to say'). He

proceeds to talk directly to the attacker through the voice of the doctor in his narrated world, using a constructed dialogue with a direct form (lines 62 – 64: *sä oot kaikkein huonommas kunnos itte, ett sä et saannu kettää hengilt.* 'out of everyone, you are in the worst condition yourself, that you didn't manage to kill anybody.'). He explicitly and morally positions the attacker through the voice of the doctor while positioning himself as someone who would have handled the situation differently. After a short pause, he adds to the constructed dialogue, still in the doctor's voice: *sä olet todellinen epäonnistuja* 'you are actually a failure', adding to the positionings. After a longer pause, he exits the constructed dialogue and wants to go on explaining how the attacker would have reacted to such news as his daughter cuts him off in line 66, strongly rejecting his positions and his claim by stating that the attacker did kill two people. Her mother agrees with her right away (line 67), also rejecting Isä's positions and positioning herself with her daughter. As the father goes on to explain his thoughts, the son belatedly joins the daughter's and mother's position against the father (this is clear from the video-material, as the son looks at the daughter and nods earnestly). With his explanation, the father wants to stand his ground and reason with the family why he took up these positions (line 69: *nii, mutta ku lääkäri o: valehtelis* 'yeah but if the doctor was lying') to which the daughter reacts strongly with a rejective, non-verbal answer (clicking her tongue and rolling her eyes), distancing herself even further from her father's position. The mother, too, doesn't accept this: *ei lääkäri valehtelis* 'no doctor would lie', is her immediate answer to her husband's attempt at keeping his position. The son, too (line 73) positions himself against the father and aligns with the position of mother and daughter. Thus, a strong positioning of three family members against the father emerges, which the father has to accept (line 75) begrudgingly. After this (not in the transcript), the family goes on to discuss that the attacker would have gotten the information about how many people were injured from the news anyway.

In this transcript, a prototypic constructed dialogue is used to convey the voice of a story's character to position someone in the narrated world by talking directly to them through that voice. This, in turn, positions the narrator. If the positions get accepted (as they had been in transcript (3)), the story can be continued. If the positions get rejected, however, the storyteller may have serious problems to finish his story and may have to let others take over his turns, as can be seen here. On the spectrum of constructed dialogue, this instance would be placed in between the middle and the end of *constructed voice*: the father does use voice(s) in his constructed dialogue, changing intonational patterns, changing his tone ever so slightly to convey that another voice than his storytelling-voice (or his narrating I) is speaking. However, there is no considerable change of quality or register to be found, which is why this doesn't classify as *constructed voice* yet. Rather, I would label it as *model constructed dialogue*, as it

serves to represent someone else's voice and words in a direct form and was introduced by a clean introductory clause. Regarding that there is no prototypical storytelling involved, it is obvious that this intensive positioning and re-positioning certainly solidified the identities of the family members, helping to understand and organize their world through dialogue.

After further discussing ongoing events from the news, the father is back on the topic about terrorist attacks and refugees in transcript (5) 'That Hurts Your Privacy a Little'. He muses that refugees could get chips implanted under the skin so software could track when certain chips group up and the situation seems shady. He admits that a method like that would hurt someone's privacy, but the refugees could go back to Morocco if they find the method unsuitable. The mother goes on to speculate that the chips could be removed, to what the father replies that such an attempt would mean deportation. The son and mother go on to discuss if removed chips would be collected somewhere, and the mother creates an image of a chip transportation service.

(5) 'That Hurts Your Privacy a Little'

77   I   [(( ))] ihan täysim ma- niin kun, .h tehtävissä ett ö:: (0.3) nähin pakolaisinkin
            [(( ))] very full I- so like, .h in this situation that erm:: (0.3) those refugees too

78   laitettais tämmönen tota, (0.7) ((smacks tongue)) IHon alla oleva,
            device like so, (0.7) ((smacks tongue)) being under the SKin,

79   (0.6)

80   T   °siru vai?°=
            °like a chip?°=

81   I   =SIru.=
            =a CHIp.=

82   T   =°niin.°
            =°yeah.°

83   (0.9)

84   I   millä pystytään seuraamaan missä ne on, mitä ne tekee.
            on which one it is able to monitor where they are, what they do.

85   (3.9)

86   I   ja:, sen jälkee ni .h jos on tämmösi tota, (.) tietyt sirut kokoontuu
            a:nd, after that like .h if it's kind of like, (.) certain chips group up

87   tiettyyn paikkaan hämäriin aikoihin [ni]=
            'course in that place in the dusk [like]=

| 88 | Ä | [aha] |
| | | *[aha]* |

89 I =ja >pystytään heti olemaan< ett näe ihmiset. (.) okee, luokkaa pikkasen ←
=and >is able in a moment to be< that these people (.) okay, that hurts a little

90   sun tota vapauttas, mut tota (0.6) [voi] mennä takaisin sinne ←
your like privacy, but so (0.6) [can] go back there to

91 Ä   [mm:]
[mm:]

92 I marokkoon [sitte] ((gestures with hands)) ←
morocco [then]

93 Ä   [mut] simmosen siru saa, (.) kaivettu siit ylös si ihon [alta]
[but] a chip like that can be, (.) dug out from under your [skin]

94 I   [nu] silloin,=
[well] then,=

95   =silloin se on automaatti[sesti ulos] ((gestures with pointed index finger))
=then it's automatica[lly out]

96 P   [ni sit se-] sit se hua- eikö sit se huomaa ett
[yeah then it-] then it note- doesn't it notice

97   so on kato PAIkalla koko=
it is you see in one place all the=

98 I =nii=
=yeah=

99   =koko ajan [( )]
=all the time [( )]

100 Ä   [nyt niin] jo sit o: joo veljet sitt kato o: (mm) sirukuljetus
[now yeah] already then yea brothers then there i:s (mm) a chiptransport

101   palvelu, sit sitä siirellään siru=
service, then there the chip is moved=

102 P =mm
=mm

103 Ä tai s-, sä voit, (0.4) pitää sitä mukanas muute? mut si(t)ku sä met tämmösiin
or y-, you can, (0.4) have to move this with you? but then when you go to like

104   HÄmäriin niin sillo sä jätät jonnekki(n).=
these dusky meetings then you leave it somewhere.

105 P =KYllä sit. KYllä sit.
=JUST like that, JUST like that.

Same as in the transcript before (4), there is no actual 'story' to be told but a problem to be solved. In this case, the father believes that the problem might be the refugees and how to handle

them. As he starts his theory in line 77, a word eludes him (line 78, 79), which the daughter cautiously provides in line 80. He finishes his theory in line 84, having acquired a rather earnest tone of voice – this subject obviously agitates him. In the rather long pause following this theory (line 85, 3.9 seconds), no family member wants to claim the turn for themselves. They acknowledge it is still the father's turn to speak and patiently wait for him to continue, which he does: he theorizes that *tietyt sirut kokoontuu tiettyyn paikkaan hämäriin aikoihin* which can be interpretet as 'of course under shady circumstances certain chips group up in one place'. He is significantly agitated by now and needs to make his standpoint clear, which is why a constructed dialogue emerges: in lines 89 and 90, he speaks directly to the collective refugees, gesturing with his hands as if to show them the door (*okee, luokka pikkasen sun tota vapauttas, mut tota voi mennä takasisin sinne marokkoon sitte* 'okay, that hurts like your privacy a little, but like, you can go back home to morocco then'. He falls into a very colloquial register, positioning the refugees in a membership categorization ('me vs. them') through a collective voice, as if to express that if they didn't like it, he doesn't have to be too polite to them either. His agitation shows itself prominently after the next exchange: the mother follows his line of thought and suggests that the chip could be extracted from the skin (line 93), to which the father reacts with both a very strong voice as well as a very strong gesture: he points his index finger and waves his hand while saying *nu silloin, silloin se on automaattisesti ulos* 'well then, then it means to be out automatically', which deepens his position against the refugees. That both mother (line 93) and son (line 96) seem to be more interested in the chip-extraction-dilemma than his idea to show the refugees out is a sign for them implicitly positioning themselves somewhat differently to the father; they don't share his opinion but are too polite and too caught up in the storyline to openly express that. This is obviously the case as the mother goes on to address the general society with the problem at hand in a positioning level 3: *nyt niin jo sit o: joo* **veljet** *sitt kato o: (mm) sirukuljetus palvelu* 'well yeah like then **brothers** it's a chip transport service', which the son affirms in line 102. The rest of the transcript goes on to show the co-positioning of son and mother in their musings: the mother thinks out loud in line 103, using rising intonation as if needing confirmation but instantly carrying on her line of thought, which as soon as she ends it gets confirmed by the son almost immediately and very strongly, showing his full support of the things she said. It remains to be said that the daughter distanced herself from the discussion and the topic soon after her interaction in lines 80 and 82, sitting back with crossed arms and listening intently. Although she doesn't verbally take part in the discussion, her actions show that the positions her father adopts are openly rejected by her, and even the more moderated positions of mother and son are too extreme as to be accepted by her.

This transcript highlights the embodied aspect of voice. The drastic gestures of Isä are a manifestation of his aggravation towards the issues the refugees supposedly brought. The embodied voice becomes a rhetoric means in gestures, as if voice alone can't mediate properly what he feels. Keeping in mind that this is a Finnish native speaker (as opposed to Italian, where hand gestures are a common form of communication) and the family members normally tend to gesticulate rather cautiously (from a German perspective), this embodiment yields a lot of meaning. Another normally verbally expressed phenomena takes place in an embodied form: the daughter's positioning. She shows her position almost explicitly in not taking part in the conversation, which in itself is also a strong gesture.

Sticking to the topic of refugees, transcript (6) 'Fat and Stupid Idiot' is a story from Poika, which he mainly directs at his father. The son's football team played against a team consisting of teenage refugees, who behaved rudely. In the beginning of his story, he explains that the refugee players were boasting and insulting other players. The father comments that they apparently were already agitated (line 110). The insulted players don't comment on this behavior too much, but after an exchange from the present adult who acted as the son's team's trainer, the refugee team began to shout insults. The daughter asks if those insults were at point-blank, which Poika confirms and resumes his story by explaining that the refugee teenagers couldn't speak much Finnish, which is why they insulted the team's trainer by yelling something in English. The daughter first finds this amusing, reacting with a nose exhale and then clicks her tongue, while the mother goes on to comment that it is not a good attitude to go to a football match just to insult people.

(6) 'Fat and Stupid Idiot'

106	P	ÄIt:i.
		MO:om.
107		(0.4)

108	P	ne ol' kyll semmoset, (0.2) no nii ku ↑JOka asiassa soitti suutassa ja IHan koko
		they are surely like, (.) so like at ↑EVery opportunity they boasted and TOtally all
109		[aja, en- ei ku] sis sis semmoset ne ne nii oikein niku (0.3) niku alko
		[the time i don't- no like] then then like they they so right like (0.3) like began
110	I	[ja: no tuntel mukana]
		[ye:ah well with feeling]

111	P	HAUkkumaa ett ni kes haukkuma meni me pelaji muille ne ei ny
		INSULting that like who went insulting to our players at others they don't so much
112		mitää pahemmin sanonnu
		really they said anything
113	I	ja:
		yea:h
114	P	mut semmosen niku KAikist sit (.) niiku ihan kaikkille (0.7) sil tavalla melko
		but like like out of ALL then (.) like just from all (0.7) then a great deal somewhat
115		ei- meil oikasti ees o mitää valmentajaa [meil] o sell(ane) yks aikuiNE
		we don't really have no trainer we've this kind of one adULT
116	I	[ja:]
		[ye:ah]
117	I	joo
		yeah
118	P	sjaa (0.3) joka on niinku vaihdos
		s yeah (0.3) who was like on exchange
119	I	[ja]
		[ja]
120	P	[ne] sit se sit se alko silleki niku sil huuhtamaa jot[ain]
		[they] then they then they began at him too like then to shout some[thing]
121	T	[(( ))] jota
		[(( ))] like
122		hENkilökohtasuuksii tai jotain [muuta]
		fACE to face insults or something [else]
123	P	[NIin] ((nods at sister))
		[YEah]
124		(0.6) ((P turns to look back at I))
125	P	jotain ett- ett (0.2) ett ett ootko ett jotai ei nem- ei ne paljon
		something tha- that (0.2) that that are you that something no they don't much
126		suomea puhunu, mut nika ENemmän englanniks ni huus, (0.3) ett- he ett ← (.)
		finnish they don't speak, but like MOre in english so yell, (0.3) that- they that (.)
127		look at that fat and stupid idiot se ja jotain [tomm]ost huuteli siäl ←
		look at that fat and stupid idiot it and something [that] kind of yelling there
128	T	[((nose exhale))]
129	T	oho [((clicks tongue))]
		wow [((clicks tongue))]
130	Ä	[no] se o tieteki [hy]vää asenne [tul]la tänne näi,
		[well] it was surely a good attitude to come here like that,

42

131	I		[o::]	[o::]
			[oh:]	*[oh:]*
132	I	joo:		
		yea:h		
133	Ä	haukkuu		
		insulting		
134	I	[joo]		
		[yeah]		
135	T	[mm:]		
		[mh:]		
136	Ä	mm		
		mh		
137	I	oikei nikui		
		right like		
138	Ä	mm		
		mh		

In this transcript, the son once again adopts his storytelling voice. Before the transcript starts, he was lost in thought but by hearing something from his mom who discussed an acquaintance organizing the football match this transcript is about, he looks up as if he just remembered something and turns to his father (!) to say *ÄIt:i.* 'MO:m.' in his storytelling-voice. After having claimed the turn for himself, he starts his story (line 108, 109) with a characterization of the opposing team (*no nii ku ↑JOka asiassa soitti suutassa ja IHan koko aja* 'so like at ↑EVery opportunity they TOtally boasted all the time'), exaggerating his voice a bit, positioning them in a membership categorization: they are loud, they are boasting. His father positions himself towards the notion, commenting that they were probably already somewhat agitated and emotional (*ja: no tuntel mukana* 'yeah well with feeling'). The son goes on to tell his story but needs eleven (!) attempts to find the right words, all the while claiming his turn for himself (line 109: *en- ei ku sis sis semmoset ne ne nii oikein niku*). After having found the right track of thought, he goes on to provide more background information about the event and to characterize the refugee team in his narrated world. He deepens the membership categorization in line 111: *ni kes haukkuma meni me pelaji muille* 'like who goes to our players and insults them', morally positioning them with the notion of 'who does that?'. In turn, he positions his own team in a membership categorization (lines 111, 112): *ne ei ny mitää pahemmin sanonnu* 'they really didn't say anything at all to that', positioning the team to rise above the insults and don't let the others bother them, which his father accepts and approves in line 113.

From line 114 to 115, he wants to go on with his story but goes on haltingly, breaking off and taking up a new line of thought before deciding more background information is needed in order to initiate his climax sequence. Thus, he provides the information that they don't really have a trainer (this being the acquaintance that organized the match), who he characterizes as *sellane yks aikuiNE* 'that one adULT'. His father confirms that characterization (line 116) so Poika presses on to provide even more background information: there was an exchange of players happening (line 118) when the refugees began shouting at the trainer, too (line 120), which the daughter finds somewhat disturbing: *hENkilökohtasuuksii tai jotain muuta* 'like in-your-face insults or something else'. Here, she morally positions the refugee team with her voice: she is incredulous, thus placing them within the frame of 'something that is not done'. Her brother confirms this kind of action and nods at her as if to say 'I know right?' before turning to his father to resume telling his story. He proceeds to give his last bit of background information (lines 125, 126): *ei ne paljon suomea puhunu, mut nika ENemmän englanniks ni huus* 'they don't speak much finnish, so they like yell in english'. As this was the last vital part of background information needed to initiate his climax, he skips an elaborate introductory clause (which he places at the end of the constructed dialogue), using *ett- he ett* as introduction to switch to a truly remarkable voice: a muffled and dull quality without changing his tempo, pitch, or volume. In this voice he goes on to say: *look at that fat and stupid idiot* before providing a postposed introductory clause *ja jotain tommost huuteli siäl* 'and something of that kind they shouted', creating a fade-out (Tannen 2007). This is clearly a case of *constructed voice* where the voice change conveys several things at once. The most obvious one is the reenactment and dramatization of the event in the narrated world. The second is an explicit positioning of the refugee team as dull and mean, but also a self-positioning where the position of his narrated I permeates his narrating I, still being of the same opinion about the event during the storytelling as when the incident took place. The membership categorization is deepened as the constructed voice conveys his incredulity that the refugee team would insult an adult like that, firmly morally positioning them.

During the son's fade-out, the daughter reacts with amusement (nose exhale, line 128) that quickly turns to contempt (clicking of tongue, line 129), co-positioning herself towards her brother's moral position (line 129, *oho*). The mother, too, co-positions herself towards her son's story, commenting that *no se o tieteki hyvää asenne tulla tänne näi, haukkuu* 'well that's certainly a good attitude to come here like that, insulting people', which the father in turn also confirms (line 132). The comment of the mother is very sarcastic: she smiles while delivering it in a very serious tone of voice, deepening the co-positioning and conveying her amusement

over the enactment of her son at the same time. The family goes on to complete this storytelling with small sounds of confirmation.

In this transcript, storytelling is prototypical: starting from first position (Mandelbaum 2013), the son claims a turn for himself and proceeds to give background information while the conversational partners actively contribute to his storytelling with inquiries and small comments. Building up his climax, he uses a constructed dialogue to emphasize what was said. This elicits strong reactions and a conclusive comment from his family members.

This transcript also shows an instance of *constructed voice*, where voice quality is so drastically changed that very strong, multilevel positioning activities take place not only because of the choice of words, but because of how they were delivered in the constructed dialogue. The strong quality change of voice is similar to transcript (3), where strong aspiration was used to convey a voice change as part of a membership categorization, although here, the effects of the voice change are considerably stronger.

3.3. Outcome: Finnish Family Voices

These six transcripts show that storytelling in Finnish family talk is as varied as possible, far from the image of the stereotypical 'silent Finn'. In general, the family used storytelling for content-ordering purposes (2), to solve problems (4 and 5), and to tell stories (1, 3, 6). Transcript (1) strengthened my speculation of a spectrum of constructed dialogue: containing two instances of constructed dialogue, one was used to merely convey information in the form of *evidential constructed dialogue*, where no or nearly no positioning activities took place and one where a voice change was included to dramatize the climax, which included positioning activities.

Transcript (2) showed that externalized inner speech can be found in family content-ordering, and there, an *evidential constructed dialogue* helped the son making a decision. It showed that an instance of content-ordering decision making can follow the same basic pattern as telling a story does, with the introduction of a thought followed by the giving of background information with a climax/decision at the end point.

Transcript (3) showed that the combination of constructed dialogue and voice can serve to position characters in a story through membership categorization. The constructed dialogue in this instance contained a noticeable voice-change in one aspect of voice (adding aspiration) and was thus able to convey a typification of a character. On the spectrum of constructed dialogue, this would go in the direction of *constructed voice*.

Transcript (4) had intricate positioning activities, showing that families cannot only position themselves closely towards each other in co-positioning activities, but also how they can reject one another's opinions and positions. The constructed dialogue in transcript (4) was labeled as a *model constructed dialogue*, signifying the middle between *evidential constructed dialogue* and *constructed voice*. This is explained in the structure: an orderly introductory clause is followed by a constructed dialogue with a subtle voice change that dramatizes the characters in the narrated world and evokes positioning activities in both the narrated I as well as the narrating world. Transcript (4) also helped to show that family dialogue helps to solidify the identities of family members through positioning activities (self- and other-positioning, membership categorization, and re-positionings).

Transcript (5) highlighted the embodied element of voice, as the father incorporated dramatic gestures into his narration. His gestures were a manifestation of the anger he felt towards the object of discourse and voice alone couldn't convey all his intended meaning. Transcript (5) also showed that the absence of dialogue does not mean the absence of positioning activities:

in remaining silent and crossing her arms, the daughter positioned herself explicitly against the family members' storyline.

 Transcript (6) was the manifestation of *constructed voice*: an extreme change in voice quality led to a heightened dramatization of the story, involving strong positioning activities in both narrated and narrating world.

All in all, the transcripts showed that the theoretical framework laid down in chapter 2 was a useful one to answer the research question: Finnish native speakers use both voice and more traditional linguistic means in their constructed dialogues and positioning, voice, and constructed dialogue do emerge in Finnish family talk, both simultaneously and in more isolated instances.

4. Conclusion

This thesis addressed how the phenomena of positioning (Davies & Harré 1990; Harré & Langenhove 1999; Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann 2004), voice (Bertau 2013, 2014), and constructed dialogue (Tannen 2007) emerge in Finnish family storytelling (Langellier & Peterson 2004, Mandelbaum 2013). For this, the underlying notion of dialogicality (Vološinov 1929/1986; Bachtin 1929/1984) was used for finding a linguistic-psychological basis by connecting the study of talk-in-interaction (Schegloff 2007; Holt & Clift 2007; Tannen 2007; Deppermann 2014) to the theory of the dialogical self (Hermans et al. 1992; Hermans 2001; Hermans 2004; Hermans & Gieser 2013). Taking a socio-pragmatic view on language, a decontextualization and reductive view on language was avoided by looking into *forms-in-function*, taking every verbal, para-verbal, and non-verbal action of the conversational partners into consideration. In the empirical part, the analysis of six Finnish transcripts helped to answer the research questions: do Finnish native speakers perform constructed dialogues trough voice rather than through linguistic means during their storytelling? How do the family members position themselves during the stories and how often do the phenomena of voice and constructed dialogue appear simultaneously in Finnish family talk?

The analysis of the transcripts showed that positioning, voice, and constructed dialogue do emerge in Finnish family talk, and Finnish native speakers use both voice and more traditional linguistic means in their constructed dialogues. The family uses storytelling as a means to solve problems, order content, create and solidify identities, and share anecdotes and stories with each other. In this, the various *I*-positions of the speakers surface in both narrated I and narrating I, creating self-positioning activities. The characterization of personas in the narrated world creates involvement for the conversational partners, initiating implicit and explicit positioning activities. The important role of the conversational partners became apparent in speakers needing the confirmation of their audience before continuing their storytelling. That story climaxes are a recurring site for constructed dialogues was once again underlined as every story's climax included a constructed dialogue. Also connected to stories were positioning activities: all instances of storytelling (where stories and not content-ordering or problem-solving was the intention) were closely interwoven with a variety of positioning activities.

It seems that the stronger the voice change in constructed dialogue, the stronger the involved positioning activities were. This confirms my suggestion of a spectrum of constructed dialogue: on one end, *evidential constructed dialogue* is a means to merely convey information and to illustrate the source of information, with almost no positioning activities taking place. The middle is *model constructed dialogue*, containing a medium amount of voice change and

positioning activities that serve to underline climaxes in day-to-day storytelling (e.g., for small stories or anecdotes). The other end of the spectrum is *constructed voice* which contains a considerable change of voice quality, leading to intricate positioning activities in both narrated and narrating world, often linking the narrating I to the narrated I. As all of these three instances can be found in the transcripts, it underlines that the three phenomena are indeed interrelated in Finnish family storytelling.

There were many instances in which co-positioning (Bertau & Klee 2016) could be detected in the transcripts. It seems that family talk in general and family storytelling in particular is a productive ground to locate co-positioning. As co-positioning was not the main focus of this thesis, more research concerning this phenomenon has to be done.

Generally, more research on many aspects of this thesis is necessary: how interconnected are the three phenomena of positioning, voice, and constructed dialogue in other languages? As the border of the direct and indirect forms of Finnish constructed dialogue are often blurry, more research in that area seems necessary. Is co-positioning initiated by constructed dialogue or by storytelling? Does the spectrum of constructed dialogue hold true in other circumstances?

This thesis is a good example that linguists can profit from working with interdisciplinary theories when researching talk-in-interaction and forms-in-function. In general, linguists can benefit by considering a holistic, socio-psychological approach to language, as language is ultimately formed by us, humans: a society-of-minds made up by narrative identities, constantly performing ourselves to ourselves and others.

5. References

Abondolo, Daniel 2006: *The Uralic Languages*. Reprinted Version. London – New York: Routledge.

Auer, Peter 2010: Zum Segmentierungsproblem der gesprochenen Sprache. In: *InList Volume 49*. P. 1-19. http://www.inlist.uni-bayreuth.de/issues/49/InList49.pdf [PDF online; last access 23.01.2018]

Austin, John L. 1962: *How to Do Things with Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bakhtin, Michail M. 1929/1984: *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bamberg, Michael 1997: Positioning Between Structure and Performance. In: *Journal of Narrative and Life History Volume 7*. P. 335 – 342.

Bamberg, Michael 2004a: Form and Functiona of ‚Slut Bashing‘ in Male Identity Constructions in 15-Year-Olds. In: *Human Development Volume 47 Issue 6*. P. 331 – 353.

Bamberg, Michael 2004b: Talk, Small Stories, and Adolescent Identities. In: *Human Development Volume 47 Issue 6*. P 366 – 369.

Bertau, Marie-Cécile 1999: Spuren des Gesprächs in innerer Sprache. Versuche einer Analyse der dialogischen Anteile des Lauten Denkens. In: *Zeitschift für Sprache & Kognition Volume 6 Issue 1*. P. 4 – 19.

Bertau, Marie-Cécile 2011: *Anreden, Erwidern, Verstehen – Elemente einer Psycholinguistik der Alterität*. Berlin: lehmanns media.

Bertau, Marie-Cécile 2013: Exploring Voice: A Psycholinguist's Inquiry into the Dynamic Materiality of Language. In: Bertau, Marie-Cécile, Miguel Gonçalves & Peter Raggatt (eds.) 2013: *Dialogic Formations – Investigations into the Origins and Developement of the Dialogical Self*. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing Inc.

Bertau, Marie-Cécile 2014: *Public Dialogical Selves: Excentric Beings in Language*. Keynote at the Eighth International Conference on the Dialogical Self; The Hague, The Netherlands, 2014. https://epub.ub.uni-muenchen.de/21465/1/Bertau_Keynote_TalkFINAL_E_PUB.pdf [PDF online; last access 26.01.2018]

Bertau, Marie-Cécile & Andrea Karsten 2018: Reconsidering Interiorization – Self Moving across Language Spacetimes. In: *New Ideas in Psychology Volume 49*. P. 7 – 17.

Bertau, Marie-Cécile & Mia Klee 2016: *Co-Positioning in the Self*. Unpublished conference presentation presented at the Ninth International Conference on the Dialogical Self; Lublin, Poland, 2016.

Bucholz, Eva 2007: *Grammatik der finnischen Sprache*. Dritte korrigierte Auflage. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.

Bußmann, Hadumod (ed.) 2008: *Lexikon der Sprachwissenschaft*. Vierte durchgesehene und bibliographisch ergänzte Auflage. Stuttgard: Alfred Kröner Verlag.

Clift, Rebecca & Elizabeth Holt (eds.) 2007: *Reporting Talk – Reported Speech in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, Bronwyn & Rom Harré 1990: Positioning: the Discursive Production of Selves. In: *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour Volume 20 Issue 1*. P. 43 – 63.

De Fina, Anna 2013: Positioning Level 3 – Connecting Local Identity Displays to Macro Social Processes. In: *Narrative Inquiry Volume 23 Issue 1*. P. 40 – 61.

De Geer, Boel, Tiia Tuleviste, Luule Mizera & Marja-Terttu Tryggvason 2002: Socialization in Communication – Pragmatic Socialization During Dinnertime in Estonian, Finnish and Swedish Families. In: *Journal of Pragmatics Volume 34*. P. 1757 – 1786.

Deppermann, Arnulf 2013: How to Get a Grip on Identities-in-Interaction – (What) Does ‚Positioning‘ offer more than ‚Membership Categorization‘? Evidence from a Mock Story. In: *Narrative Inquiry Volume 23 Issue 1*. P. 62 – 88.

Deppermann, Arnulf 2014: Konversationsanalyse: Elementare Interaktionsstrukturen am Beispiel der Bundespressekonferenz. In: Staffeldt, Sven & Jörg Hagemann (eds.): *Pragmatiktheorien – Analysen im Vergleich*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg. P. 19 – 48.

Fromm, Hans 1982. *Finnische Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

Goffman, Erving 1981: *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Grossen, Michéle & Anne Salazar-Orvig 2006: *The Speaker's Positioning – A Manifestation of the Dialogicality of the Self*. Unpublished conference paper presented at the Fourth International Conference on the Dialogical Self; Braga, Portugal, 2006.

Grundy, Peter 2013: *Doing Pragmatics*. Third Edition. London – New York: Routledge.

Günthner, Susanne 2002: Stimmenvielfalt im Diskurs: Formen der Stilisierung und Ästhetisierung in der Redewiedergabe. In: *Gesprächsforschung – Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion Ausgabe 3*. P. 59 – 80. http://www.gespraechsforschung-online.de/fileadmin/dateien/heft2002/ga-guenthner.pdf [PDF online; last access: 11.01.2018]

Haakana, Markku 2007: Reported Thought in Complaint Stories. In: Holt, Elizabeth & Rebecca Clift (eds.): *Reporting Talk – Reported Speech in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. P. 150 – 178.

Harré, Rom, et al. 2009: Recent Advances in Positioning Theory. In: *Theory & Psychology Vol. 19 (1)*. Sage Publications. P. 5 – 31. http://tap.sagepub.com/content/19/1/5.refs [PDF accessible online; last access: 15.11.2014]

Hermans, Hubert 2001: The Dialogical Self: Toward a Theory of Personal and Cultural Positioning. In: *Culture & Psychology Volume 7 Issue 3*. P. 243 – 281.

Hermans, Hubert 2004: Introduction: The Dialogical Self in a Global and Digital Age. In: *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research Volume 4 Issue 4*. P. 297 – 320.

Hermans, Hubert & Thorsten Gieser (eds.) 2013: *Handbook of Dialogical Self Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hermans, Hubert, Harry Kempen & Rens van Loon 1992: The Dialogical Self – Beyond Individualism and Rationalism. In: *American Psychologist Volume 47 Issue 1*. P. 23-33.

Holt, Elizabeth 2007: 'I'm Eyeing Your Chop Up Mind': Reporting and Enacting. In: Holt, Elizabeth & Rebecca Clift (eds.): *Reporting Talk – Reported Speech in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. P. 47 – 80.

Humboldt, Wilhelm von 1999: *On Language – On the Diversity of Human Language Construction And Its Influence on the Mental Development of the Human Species*. Edited by M. Lonsonsky. Translated by P. Heath. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/ge/vhumboldt-wilhelm.htm [partly online; last access: 11.01.2018]

Iivonen, Antti 1998: Intonation in Finnish. In: Hirst, Daniel & Albert Di Cristo (eds.): *Intonation Systems – A Survey of Twenty Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. P. 311 – 327.

Imo, Wolfgang 2014: Interaktionale Linguistik. In: Staffeldt, Sven & Jörg Hagemann (eds.): *Pragmatiktheorien – Analysen im Vergleich*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg. P. 49 – 82.

Josephs, Ingrid 2002: `The Hopi in Me' - The Construction of a Voice in the Dialogical Self from a Cultural Psychological Perspective. In: *Theory & Psychology Volume 12 Issue 2*. P. 161 – 173.

Klee, Mia 2014: *Ungarische wiedergegebene Rede und Positionierung der Sprecher*. Unpublished bachelor's thesis at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University of Munich.

Langellier, Kristin & Eric Peterson 2004: *Storytelling in Daily Life – Performing Narrative*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Langenhove, Luk van & Rom Harré 1999: Introducing Positioning Theory. In: Harré, Rom & Luk van Langenhove (eds.): *Positioning Theory – Moral Contexts of Intentional Action*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. P. 14 – 31.

Lehtonen, Jaakko & Kari Sajavaara 1995: The Silent Finn. In: Tannen, Deborah & Muriel Saville-Troike (eds.) 1995: *Perspectives on Silence*. Second Printing. New York – Ablex Publishing. P. 193 – 201.

Lerner, Gene 2004. *Conversation Analysis – Studies from the First Generation*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Linell, Per 2007: On Bertau's and Other Voices. In: *International Journal for Dialogical Science Volume 2 Issue 1*. P. 163 – 168.

Lucius-Hoene, Gabriele & Arnulf Deppermann 2004: Narrative Identität und Positionierung. In: *Gesprächsforschung – Online Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion Ausgabe 5*. P. 166 – 183. http://www.gespraechsforschung-online.de/fileadmin/dateien/heft2004/ga-lucius.pdf [PDF online; last access: 11.01.2018]

Mandelbaum, Jenny 2013: Storytelling in Conversation. In: Sidnell, Jack & Tanya Stivers (eds.) 2013: *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. P. 492 – 507. https://comminfo.rutgers.edu/sites/default/files/2017-03/Mandelbaum-Storytelling-CA%20Handbook.pdf [PDF online; last access: 25.01.2018]

Mey, Jacob 2003. Literary Pragmatics. In: Schiffrin, Deborah, Deborah Tannen & Heidi Hamilton (eds.) 2003: *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Mixdorff, Hansjörg, Martti Vainio, Stefan Werner & Juhani Järvikivi 2002: The Manifestation of Linguistic Information in Prosodic Features of Finnish. In: *International Speech Communication Association Archive – Speech Prosody 2002.* P. 515 – 518. http://www.isca-speech.org/archive/sp2002/papers/sp02_515.pdf [PDF online; last access: 18.01.2018]

Official Statistics of Finland (OSF) 2015: Population structure [e-publication], Appendix table 2. Population according to language 1980 - 2015. Helsinki: Statistics Finland. http://www.stat.fi/til/vaerak/2015/vaerak_2015_2016-04-01_tau_002_en.html [online access; last access: 22.1.2018].

Raitaniemi, Mia 2014: *Die Beendigung von finnischen und deutschen Telefonaten – Eine interaktionslinguistische, kontrastierende Untersuchung.* Frankfurt – Peter Lang Verlag.

Roland, Alan 2001: Another Voice and Position: Psychoanalysis across Civilisations. In: *Culture & Psychology Vol 7, Issue 3.* P. 311 – 321.

Sajavaara, Kari & Jaakko Lehtonen 1997: The Silent Finn Revisited. In: Jaworski, Adam (ed.) 1997: *Silence – Interdisciplinary Perspetives.* Berlin – New York: Mouton De Gruyter. P. 263 – 284.

Schegloff, Emanuel 2007: *Sequence Organisation in Interaction – A Primer in Conversation Analysis.* Volume 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, Deborah, Anna De Fina & Anastasia Nylund (eds.) 2010: *Telling Stories – Language, Narrative, and Social Life.* Washington: Georgtown University Press.

Schiffrin, Deborah, Deborah Tannen & Heidi Hamilton (eds.) 2003: *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Searle, John 1969: *Speech Acts – An Essay in the Philosophy of Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tannen, Deborah 2007: *Talking Voices – Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse.* Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tannen, Deborah, Shari Kendall & Cynthia Gordon (eds.) 2007: *Family Talk – Discourse and Identity in Four American Families.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tuleviste, Tiia, Luule Mizera, Boel De Geer & Marja-Terttu Tryggvason 2003: A Silent Finn, a Silent Finno-Ugric, or a Silent Nordic? A Comparative Study of Estonian, Finnish, and Swedish Mother-Adolescent Interactions. In: *Applied Psycholinguistics Volume 24.* P. 249 – 265.

Välimaa-Blum, Riitta 1993: A Pitch Accent Analysis of Intonation in Finnish. In: Bartens, Hans-Hermann, János Gulya, Klaus Röhrborn & Klaus Sagaster (eds.): *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher Neue Folge, Band 12.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag. P. 82 – 94.

Vološinov, Valentin 1929/1986: *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Translated by Ladislav Matejka and I.R. Titunik. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

6. Transcription Conventions

The following transcription conventions are found in Holt & Clift 2007: xi – xvii. For a comprehensive explanation and overview, please consider reading it in original; I provide a simple overview in my own wording (including made-up examples). They don't remark about how orthography should be treated in transcripts (as GAT does), and likely any rules wouldn't have been applicable to Finnish anyway. As Finnish fortunately has a very phonology-based orthography, I wrote everything down as heard.

As explained in chapter 3.2., I had to make two additions to the list: one for signaling significant aspiration (*h*) and one for the state of not-yet-quite-laughing ('nose exhale').

Simultaneous turns:

Where turns are begun simultaneously they are marked by a **[** at the start of the turns.

> Tom: [I used to smoke a lot
>
> Bob: [I used to drink

Overlapping turns:

When not starting simultaneously, the point where the new turn begins is marked by **[** within the first turn and at the start of the new turn. When overlapping talk stops, it is marked in both turns with **]**

> Tom: I used to drink [a lot]
>
> Bob: [he] thinks he's so cool

NB: overlaps are shown as they are heard in real time, but the amount of talk that is produced often doesn't fil the same amount of space in the transcript. I adjusted the brackets in the transcripts accordingly (see above); it doesn't say anything about the actual length of the utterance.

Contiguous turns:

When one turn immediately follows another turn without overlapping, it is marked by **=**

> Tom: thats so neat=
>
> Bob: =i know right=
>
> Tom: =yea:

Intervals in and between turns:

Intervals ('pauses') are timed to the tenth of a second and marked by numbers in parentheses within and in between turns. (.) is a micropause (shorter than 0.2 seconds)

>Tom: i ate ice cream the other day (0.3) like good ice cream
>
>Bob: (0.7)
>
>Bob: well thats nice

Characteristics of speech delivery:

A colon **:** indicates a stretched or lengthened sound; the more colons, the longer the strech:

>Tom: the ice cream was so: goo:::d

A single hyphen **-** indicates a cut-off (e.g., abruptly terminated):

>Bob: but wha- what about your diet

Intonation:

A full stop indicates a falling tone:

>Bob: this is nice.

A comma indicates continuing intonation:

>Tom: ye:s, but what about my ice cream

A question mark indicates rising intonation:

>Bob: still thinking about ice cream? really?

Marked rises (or falls) are indicated by ↑↓arrows:

>Tom: ye::s ↑ice ↑cream

Underlining indicates emphasis:

>Bob: your ice cream is driving me <u>nuts</u>, i tell you, <u>nut</u>s

A glottal stop is marked by an *asterisk

>Tom: *uh- *oh

Volume:

Increased volume is marked by the use of capital letters.

>Tom: i want IT NOW

Decreased volume is marked by degree °symbols° at the start and end of the quite phase:

>Tom: °give it to me now°
>
>   ple::ase?

Aspiration:

A series of 'h's preceded by a dot indicates in-breath; the more 'h's, the longer the breath:

<div align="center">Bob: .hhhhhhhh okay</div>

Out-breath is a series of 'h's without dot:

<div align="center">Bob: .hhh well hhhhh</div>

Aspiration in words is a cursive *h*:

<div align="center">Tom: °y*he*:s,° WInner.</div>

Speed of delivery:

Talk which is noticeably quicker is put in 'less than' and 'more than' symbols on either side of the fast talk:

<div align="center">Bob: in fact you >eat too much and get fat<</div>

Indecipherable sounds

Where a transcriber is unable to make out what is said, spaces within paranthesis are used to convey the approximate extent of the missed talk:

<div align="center">Tom: you [(   )</div>
<div align="center">Bob: [what</div>

Where the transcriber is able to guess at the words or sounds, these are included in the paranthesis:

<div align="center">Tom: i said you (duck)</div>

Verbal descriptions:

Double parenthesis is used to enclose a description of the talk or other para- or non-verbal phenomena present during interaction.

<div align="center">Tom: ((sniffels))</div>
<div align="center">Bob: ((gestures with hands))</div>

Presentation conventions:

A horizontal arrow on the right side of the transcription indicates a turn that the author wants to call attention to:

<div align="center">Tom: okay, sorry   ←</div>

Numbering of lines or turns:

This is done for convenience of reference. Intervals within talk are also numbered.

<div align="center">12   Bob: this was nice</div>
<div align="center">13   (0.4)</div>
<div align="center">14   Tom: yes it was</div>

7. Transcripts

(1) 'That Name List'

01 Ä mites opo:n tunti tänää:,
how was the guidance counselor's hour today:,

02 P ei me tehty siel yhtään mitään
we didn't do nothing there at all

03 Ä mut [s oli]
but ['t was]

04 P   [ni- meil] meil tuli semmonen ju<u>tt</u>u, (0.8) ett piti pistää nimilista?
[so- to us] to us happened this thing, (0.8) that one has to be on that name list?

05 Ä jo=
yes=

06 P =niin kun sen >piti käydä kaikki ne kakssataa< oppilasta läpi?
=so when it >had to pass by every of those two hundred< students?

07 Ä ju:?
yeah:?

08   (0.5)

09 P sit ku se o käynny kakskyt oppilasta läpi,
then when it had gotten twenty students on it,

10   (0.3)

11 Ä mm.
mm.

12 P joku ↑idiootti (.) oli vienny sen sinne ta<u>ka</u>isin sinne opettajal <u>ku</u>ka ei ollu sanonu
some ↑idiot (.) had given it <u>ba</u>ck there to the teacher <u>w</u>ho did not say

13   siit mitää. (0.3) niin se oli käyny pelkästään ne niiku [ne ensimmäiset,] si
anything to that. (0.3) so it had got only those like   [those first,] then

14 Ä   [((laughs))]

15 P   TUnnin jälkeen op- se opettaja huuta siel, ett (0.7) ett että että onko   ←
AFter the lesson te- this teacher yells there, that (0.7) that that that are

16   kaikki- (.) kaikkien nimet täällä lapu<u>ss</u>a?   ←
every- (.) everyone's name <u>on</u> this paper?

17 Ä jo:?
yeah:?

18 P sit kaikki huutaa set ett ↑ei, ↑ei ↑ole   ←
then everybody yells this that ↑no, ↑they're ↑not

19   (0.3)

20 T [(((nose exhale))]

(2) 'I Can Go'

21 P [↑on]ko muute
   [is] there by the way

22   (0.8)

23   tui mieleen ett keskiviikko? (0.2) mä meen siiheen been peliin.
   i had the idea that wednesday? (0.2) i go there to bee's match.

24   (1.1)

25 Ä eli [↑huomenna.]
   so [↑tomorrow.]

26 P   [(been yste)]   ((looks to dad to confirm he knows who 'bee' is))
   [(bee's friend)]

27   (0.3)

28 I okei
   okay

29 Ä selvä. onks se salo[ssa] vai jossain muua[lla.   ]
   sure. is that in [salo] or somewhere [else].

30 P   [ja.]   [emmä] so a ei o salos (0.2)
   [yeah.]   [nah] that's not in salo (0.2)

31 P .hh tai, (.) (>yleisin s yle<) ((coughs)) kysyi että että ma halunks ma   ←
   .hh or, (.) (>usually usu<)   ((coughs))   asked that that i wanted i to

32   mennä sinne, niku veskaks,   ←
   go there, like as goalkeeper

33   (0.6)

34   ett ett (so) ett jo ett jos mä en nyt mee niin sit menee varmaankin (mosti)
   that that (it's) that now that if i don't go so now then most likely goes (name)

35 I *jo:
   *yea:

36 P mä: voin mennä
   i: can go

37   (0.7)

38 Ä jo: ((nods))
   yea:

39 T °selvä° ((nods))
   °sure°

(3) 'That Parent Conference Day'

40 Ä sillon kun lukiolla oli se, ett vanhemmille tä esittelypäivä? viime talvena?
then when in high school it was, that for parents that conference day? last winter?

41 P noni
allright

42 Ä niin sinnä mä nää *m- (0.5) hh liikkaopet oli siinä ja jotain mä >menin niku sitä
*so there i see *m- (0.5) hh gym teacher was there and something I >went like that*

43 no mites siihe< l- ojevalmennukse[en ni]iku se hake:minen tai jotain ja=
well what's that< l- (kind of traini[ng) like this s/he is searching or something and=

44 I [m::]
[mh:]

45 Ä =sit se (yle-) ja sanos ett jo, ett .hh k*h*yll siihe k*h*annattaa yritt*h*ää ←
=then s/he ( ) and says that yeah, that .hh yhes thhis his whorthwhile

46 hak*h*eutuu ett sitt saa helppol kurss:ei*h*. ←
*apph*lying that then one gets courses ea:sily*

47 T ((laughs softly))

48 Ä ((short laugh))

49 Ä ja se ei ollu niku [tää] juttu ja et saa [että, tää] minun lapseni on nyt=
and s/he wasn't like [this] story and didn't get [that this] my own child is now=

50 P [((hrrm))] [((hrrm))]

51 Ä =jo yläasteella (jo/ja) valmennuksessa. .hhhhhh °ett tota° hh
=already a high schooler (already/and) in coaching. .hhhhh °that like° hh

52 T °hän tulee sinne joka tapau[ksessa°] ←
°he goes there any[way°]

53 Ä [hän tulee] sinne joka tapauksessa ett hän ←
[he goes] there anyway that he's

54 ei ny vaan oo niinku ett=
not now but is like that=

55 P =((sniffels))=

56 Ä =ett ett kokeile: pääseeks tuuril sisää sinne,
=that that is trying to be so lucky to get in there,

(4) 'You Are Actually a Failure'

57 I [>(siinä ois ollu)<] [SIInä ois-]
[>(there'd've been)<] [THEre'd hav-]

58	T	[(mi-)] [MIkä] toveri se olisi koski [sitte hhh he]
		[(wha-)] [WHat] comrade that would harm [then hhh he]
59	I	[nii >siinä] ois=
		[so >there]'d 've=
60		=ollu< [kaikki-]=
		=been [everyone-]=
61	Ä	[(kantele)] ((looks at daughter and nods))
		[(do tell)]
62	I	kaikkein paras, (0.4) ollu ku s' lääkäri oo menny sanomaa sä ←
		the best, (0.4) been when the doctor had gone there to say you
63		oot kaikkein huonommas kunnos itte, ett ↑sä et saannu ↑kettää ←
		are out of everyone in the worst condition yourself, that ↑you did not get ↑any
64		hengilt. (0.6) sä olet todellinen epäonnistuja. (0.8) ni- (.) mieti: ←
		people killed. (0.6) you are actually a failure. (0.8) so- (.) think about
65		kun, miten se ois alkaan itkee siel [tota]
		when, how he would've started crying there [so]
66	T	[no kyl]lä se [tappo] kaks
		[well ye]s he [killed] two
67	Ä	[mhm:]
		[mhm:]
68		(0.6)
69	I	↑nii, mutta ku lääk[äri] o: valehtelis,
		↑yeah, but when the doc[tor] would be lying,
70	P	[nii]
		[yeah]
71	T	[((clicks tongue and rolls eyes))]
72	Ä	[m:: ei lääkäri [valeh]telis
		]
		[m:: the doctor [wouldn't] lie
		]
73	P	[eh] nii=
		[nah] yeah=
74	T	=[°ahhe°] ( )=
		=[°ahhe°] ( )=
75	I	=[niin]
		=[so]
76	Ä	[eejoo]
		[ohyeah]

(5) 'That Hurts Your Privacy a Little'

77   I   [(( ))] ihan täysim ma- niin kun, .h tehtävissä ett ö:: (0.3) nähin pakolaisinkin
           [(( ))] very full I- so like, .h in this situation that erm:: (0.3) those refugees too

78   laitettais tämmönen tota, (0.7) ((smacks tongue)) IHon alla oleva,
           device like so, (0.7) ((smacks tongue)) being under the SKin,

79   (0.6)

80   T   °siru vai?°=
           °like a chip?°=

81   I   =SIru.=
           =a CHIp.=

82   T   =°niin.°
           =°yeah.°

83   (0.9)

84   I   millä pystytään seuraamaan missä ne on, mitä ne tekee.
           on which one it is able to monitor where they are, what they do.

85   (3.9)

86   I   ja:, sen jälkee ni .h jos on tämmösi tota, (.) tietyt sirut kokoontuu
           a:nd, after that like .h if it's kind of like, (.) certain chips group up

87   tiettyyn paikkaan hämäriin aikoihin [ni]=
           'course in that place in the dusk [like]=

88   Ä   [aha]
                                   [aha]

89   I   =ja >pystytään heti olemaan< ett näe ihmiset. (.) okee, luokkaa pikkasen   ←
           =and >is able in a moment to be< that these people (.) okay, that hurts a little

90   sun tota vapauttas, mut tota (0.6) [voi] mennä takaisin sinne   ←
           your like privacy, but so (0.6) [can] go back there to

91   Ä   [mm:]
                                   [mm:]

92   I   marokkoon [sitte] ((gestures with hands))   ←
           morocco   [then]

93   Ä   [mut] simmosen siru saa, (.) kaivettu siit ylös si ihon [alta]
               [but] a chip like that can be, (.) dug out from under your [skin]

94   I   [nu] silloin,=
                                     [well] then,=

95		=silloin se on automaatti[sesti ulos] ((gestures with pointed index finger))
		=then it's automatica[lly out]
96	P	[ni sit se-] sit se hua- eikö sit se huomaa ett
		[yeah then it-] then it note- doesn't it notice
97		so on kato PAIkalla koko=
		it is you see in one place all the=
98	I	=nii=
		=yeah=
99		=koko ajan [( )]
		=all the time [( )]
100	Ä	[nyt niin] jo sit o: joo veljet sitt kato o: (mm) sirukuljetus
		[now yeah] already then yea brothers then there i:s (mm) a chiptransport
101		palvelu, sit sitä siirellään siru=
		service, then there the chip is moved=
102	P	=mm
		=mm
103	Ä	tai s-, sä voit, (0.4) pitää sitä mukanas muute? mut si(t)ku sä met tämmösiin
		or y-, you can, (0.4) have to move this with you? but then when you go to like
104		HÄmäriin niin sillo sä jätät jonnekki(n).=
		these dusky meetings then you leave it somewhere.
105	P	=KYllä sit. KYllä sit.
		=JUST like that, JUST like that.

(6) 'Fat and Stupid Idiot'

106 P   ÄIt:i.
        MO:om.

107   (0.4)

108 P   ne ol' kyll semmoset, (0.2) no nii ku ↑JOka asiassa soitti suutassa ja IHan koko
        they are surely like, (.) so like at ↑EVery opportunity they boasted and TOtally all

109   [aja, en- ei ku   ] sis sis semmoset ne ne nii oikein niku (0.3) niku alko
        [the time i don't- no like] then then like they they so right like (0.3) like began

110 I   [ja: no tuntel mukana]
        [ye:ah well with feeling]

111 P   HAUkkumaa ett ni kes haukkuma meni me pelaji muille ne ei ny
        INSULting that like who went insulting to our players at others they don't so much

112   mitää pahemmin sanonnu
        really they said anything

113 I   ja:
        yea:h

114 P   mut semmosen niku KAikist sit (.) niiku ihan kaikkille (0.7) sil tavalla melko
        but like like out of ALL then (.) like just from all (0.7) then a great deal somewhat

115   ei- meil oikasti ees o mitää valmentajaa [meil] o sell(ane) yks aikuiNE
        we don't really have no trainer we've this kind of one adULT

116 I   [ja:]
                                                [ye:ah]

117 I   joo
        yeah

118 P   sjaa (0.3) joka on niinku vaihdos
        s yeah (0.3) who was like on exchange

119 I   [ja]
        [ja]

120 P   [ne] sit se sit se alko silleki niku sil huuhtamaa jot[ain   ]
        [they] then they then they began at him too like then to shout some[thing]

121 T   [(( ))] jota
                                                             [(( ))] like

122   hENkilökohtasuuksii tai jotain [muuta]
        fACE to face insults or something [else]

123 P   [NIin] ((nods at sister))
                                       [YEah]

124   (0.6) ((P turns to look back at I))

125 P   jotain ett- ett (0.2) ett ett ootko ett jotai ei nem- ei ne paljon

64

		something tha- that (0.2) that that are you that something no they don't much	
126		suomea puhunu,mut nika ENemmän englanniks ni huus, (0.3) ett- he ett (.)	←
		finnish they don't speak, but like MOre in english so yell, (0.3) that- they that (.)	
127		look at that fat and stupid idiot se ja jotain [tomm]ost huuteli siäl	←
		look at that fat and stupid idiot it and something [that] kind of yelling there	
128	T	[((nose exhale))]	
129	T	oho [((clicks tongue))]	
		wow [((clicks tongue))]	
130	Ä	[no] se o tieteki [hy]vää asenne [tul]la tänne näi,	
		[well] it was surely a good attitude to come here like that,	
131	I	[o::] [o::]	
		[oh:] [oh:]	
132	I	joo:	
		yea:h	
133	Ä	haukkuu	
		insulting	
134	I	[joo]	
		[yeah]	
135	T	[mm:]	
		[mh:]	
136	Ä	mm	
		mh	
137	I	oikei nikui	
		right like	
138	Ä	mm	
		mh	