CASE STUDY 1

THE GOLDEN GIRLS OF HAMBURG:
THREE WOMEN AT A BAR
I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In the Fall of 1989, the student researcher asked Prue to interpret the behavior of the participants in an event of her choosing. Here is what the student researcher says about how they relate to each other: “I am very close to Prue. We tell each other everything. I think she was very comfortable with the interview and I am sure she meant what she said.”

At the time of the study Prue is 45 years old, has been separated from her husband of 29 years for less than one year and is in the process of a divorce. She has two daughters, Sherri, nineteen, and Kris, 29. In the student researcher’s words “Prue was always very close to Sherri, who has a learning disability. Prue was always very involved in Sherri’s life and problems. When Prue left home, in some ways she felt as though she had left Sherri, who was a senior in high school at the time. I think Prue was worried about how Sherri would make it in the college environment. Kris has always been very independent. At the time of Prue’s separation, she was living and working at Vassar in Poughkeepsie, from where she graduated.

Prue lives alone and works as a part-time sales clerk at Brand Names, a small retail catalog store in Hamburg, NY, to support herself for the first time in her life. She works there only in the evening. During the day she drives a school bus part-time.”

Prue picked a recurrent event of great significance to her in that period of her life: her meeting after work in the local bar with a group of women friends who also work in the same store but are full time day people. Sometimes they eat together, but mostly they drink together.

Prue’s mental image of “the place” in which these meetings occur and “the atmosphere”, is as follows:

    some of the people I work with
    sort-of hang out at this place
    called the Fairview Inn
    it’s on the corner of South Park and McKinley
    so they’re very sports oriented folk
    and the whole place is like a...um...a rural Cheers
    everybody in there knows one another
    and they’re all sort-of a family as they call each other
    and a lot of times as I am closing the store I’ll get a call and say “com’on down and we’ll buy ya a beer”
    so I wander on down there
    and I am slowly being included in the family
    I’ve met several down there and made friends with them

and further down

    the only trouble is they’ve always had dinner
    and are relaxed before they get down there
    I’m comin from work and I’m hungry
    and those ladies can usually get me trashed pretty quickly

She goes on describing the kind of talking they do and its function, as follows:

    but the conversations that ensue after that are pretty uh...
    pretty interesting to all of us
    it’s...
    other than that I can’t think too/too much else goes on except what’s usually bar banter
we just sort-of climb up on the bar stools
and just start chitty-chatting
talk about
work
talk about our life situations
talk about
ahh...
give each other advice
and
the more we drink the more advice we give each other
the more we pat each other on the back
and usually by midnight we’re such soul sisters you can’t get us apart

In another context she describes the implied rules of barroom interaction, as follows:
some things are more ok at a bar... people in a bar make a contract to mix real hearts and BS... knowing full well that if disclosures get too close to the bone, you can always retract them and blame it on drinking

There is a danger endemic to this type of interaction for relationships outside the bar. As Prue puts it:
the only trouble with that—like with Julie—is that basically she’s a very quiet person and the next day when you meet her and she’s very quiet you’re never quite sure if it wasn’t something you said the night before that’s caused it

Summarizing the function of these meetings Prue says:
but on the whole we do this periodically
and a ...
it’s ...just a source of um... companionship and comradeship
and a ... way of blowing off steam about things at work that you can’t do at work
and getting a more personal touch

The student researcher describes how the audio-tape recorded occasion was obtained:
“I asked the respondent to take a tape-recorder to a Friday evening meeting of the group. The meeting this particular evening started in the dining room. Later on they went to the bar. The respondent joined two of the women of the group (there usually are four women in addition to Prue) for dinner as well as drinks. I did not accompany her to the meeting as she thought that my presence in the group would inhibit their usual candor. With the permission of the other participants, ninety minutes of conversation were recorded.”

Prue describes the impact of the tape recorder as follows:
I recall, despite trying to keep the tape recorder out of sight,
everyone was AWARE it was going
normally under usual circumstances, other people would have come up in the conversation
and of course no one wanted to be responsible for that
consequently we kept the topics to ourselves
and Julie, who does not easily disclose anything about herself,
had to be prodded to participate
being co-workers for sometime, we were always looking for those areas we could connect at, on other levels
I do know that most of the time, our conversation over drinks at the end of the day
may not have been suitable to record
and so we started meaningless chitchat to avoid it

The two other women are Julie and Win. Julie is the oldest of the group. She is twice divorced and has a grown son. Her parents were divorced when she was a child. Win is the youngest member of the group. She is 30 years old, single and living alone.
In presenting them in her recollection, Prue specifies that she is giving a “description of the people’s situation in life. Not personality style. What they’re involved in. Not personal -- situational”:

I was gonna say if we need sort-of a description of the characters we’ve got:

... Julie’s the very efficient dedicated quiet worker ah... faithful for all these years who reminds me very much of my sister Gwen Win is the enviable 30 year old she’s much younger than the rest of us who owns her own house has a job but is subject to depression and very unhappy basically with her life ... so I guess you might say we got um... several women from different phases in life all experiencing and sharing our feelings about what phase we’re going through in fact we sort-of kiddingly said we were going to form the Golden Girls of Hamburg

The specimen lasts only 7 minutes. The women are in the dining room. Though bar-room conversation was taped, the noise level prevented any meaningful interpretation of the tape. Here is how, in her blow-by-blow, Prue compares the interaction taking place in the specimen to the rest of the evening:

I was gonna say out of this whole darn tape it’s so hard to make one little selection because throughout the whole course of the evening the focus seemed to shift first on Julie and Julie’s concerns and things about Julie and then as Win started talking about her job and dissatisfaction it took a turn to Win’s personality and what’s going on with her we all injected our thought and our feelings at this point and then even later on as we left the dining room and went into the bar the conversation that went on was almost a pick up and continuance and probably on a deeper level or something more meaningful level on the earlier conversation so it’s kind-a hard to just pick out one at this point even though it’s clearer on the tape
PLACE OF SPECIMEN IN EVENT

The event occurs in two environments:

first, in the dining room
later on, in the bar

The place of the specimen in the entire event is as follows:

BEGINNING: Julie and Win arrive first
Prue arrives last

Envir.1: in the dining area

FOCUS ON JULIE

SPECIMEN
they eat and talk
at one point waitress comes in and out
they go back to eating and talking

FOCUS ON WIN

Envir.2: in the bar

they drink and talk

END: they leave
II. VERBAL FLOW STRUCTURE

A: SEGMENTATION OF TALK IN SPECIMEN

1) RESPONDENT'S SEGMENTATION:

The respondent uses one type of talk, CHITCHAT/SOCIAL BANTER, to characterize talk in the specimen:

just start chitchatting

While listening to the recorded specimen the respondent gave a lengthy blow-by-blow commentary. Later, in a follow-up interview, she characterized the information given in the blow-by-blow as follows:

The overall organization is in terms of two phases: I: Getting on the playing field and II: On the playing field.

Within each phase, the information is further characterized on the basis of topics, and subtopics, which she calls Trigger Topics: family, smoking, divorce and food.

This yields the following organization of talk in the specimen:

I: Getting on the playing field

Family: comparison between Julie’s mom and mine (1-10)

II: On the playing field

Family: inquiry and explanation of Julie’s family (11-25)

Smoking: current chitchat on previous subject (26a-32)

Divorce (33-73):

introduction to Julie’s experience as a child (33-49)

comparison of Julie’s experience as a child with Prue’s daughter’s experience (50-51)

comparison of Julie’s folks to Prue’ and her ex-husband (52-58)

comparison of how Julie felt to how Prue’s kids feel (59-73)

Food: current chitchat (74-8

Family: Julie's brother and sister from a second marriage (82-118)

Julie's brother: Win’s persistence (82-96)

Julie's sister (97-118):

inquiry and explanation about Julie’s sister (97-108)

our perception of inquiry (109-116)

description of sister (117)

explanation of first description (118)
Transcript of talk segmented and characterized by respondent:

I: GETTING ON THE PLAYING FIELD
COMPARISON BETWEEN JULIE’S MOM AND MINE
W to J (1): is your mother little?
J to W (2): she isn’t now as much
     I shouldn’t say it she goes over 130 pounds
P to J (3): and how old is she?
J to P (4): 72
P to all (5): well my-god! yea ok
     my mother looks a/like a/sort-of a beach ball
J (6): she was ...
W to P (7): (laughter) what?
P to W (8): my mom looks like kinda a beach ball
     I-mean she’s 5 foot nothing and ...
W to P (9): I thought you said a bridge wall (laughter)
P to W (10a): oh no
     (10b): a beach ball
     (10c): so for 72 and she only goes 130 pounds

II: ON THE PLAYING FIELD
FAMILY: INQUIRY AND EXPLANATION OF JULIE’S FAMILY
W to J (11): how’s she doing?
J to W(12): ok
     (13): she’d never let you know if she wasn’t
W to J (14): no?
     how about your dad?
     his eyes ok?
J to W (15): he’s hanging in there
W to J (16): can he drive still?
J to W (17): he’ll know by next week
P to J (18): now they’re sep/they’re divorced or separated?
W to J (19): is there something they can do for it?
J to W (20): no
     (21): and the eye specialist told him that one of the factors that hastened this ...
     noise
P to J (22): his smoke? for his eyes?
J to P (23): there’s a leakage from behind the retina
P to J (24): oh I thought that was from diabetes
J to P (25): he said smoking
     it thins one of the veins that goes back into the connecting membrane

SMOKING: CURRENT CHITCHAT ON PREVIOUS SUBJECT
P to J (26a): really?
     (26b): I know it thins the blood vessels under here
     and like Mary-Ann says, I get smoker’s face
     because...
     and I can tell from when I started smoking
W to P (27): really?
P to all (28): yea
     the wrinkles and the deterioration under my eyes is hastened immensely
     and it’s because those tiny blood vessels broke
J to all (29): it happens
W to all (30): you don’t need them
J to all (31): it happens
P to all (32): (sigh) oh nobody needs them honey
DIVORCE:
INTRODUCTION TO JULIE’S EXPERIENCE AS A CHILD
P to J (33): …curiosity and if it’s none of my business tell me
how old were you when your parents divorced?
J to P (34): 12
W to J (35): 12?
P to J (36): how did that hit you?
J to P (37): it didn’t really affect me that much ‘cause both of my parents were always there for me
P to J (38): ok
J to P (39): and there was none of this animosity crap
P to J (40): ‘cause I wonder about ...
Sherri said it doesn’t affect her a whole lot
she says every once in a while
J (41): no
J to P (42): it/I remember at the time it upset me but my dad was always there for me and my mom too
W to J (43): did you know it was being ...
J to W (44): they never/I never felt like I was being deprived of ...
P to J (45): attention?
J to all (46): never/never/I never felt like that
P to J (47): ok
W to J (48): who did you live with?
J to W (49): my mother

COMPARISON OF JULIE’S EXPERIENCE AS A CHILD WITH PRUE’S DAUGHTER’S EXPERIENCE
P (50a): ‘cause
(50b): when I went up to see Sherri when she was up at ...
and—oh I was so damn proud -- I went
-- she’s all dormed in on Saturday and/or-whatever—
and I drove in on Sunday to see her
and Buff State’s got a beautiful running track
and I’m pulling around the parking lot
and who’s with her headset on out there running ...
it’s my Sherri!
so I met her at her dorm room and-everything
and we’re sort-of/she’s showing me around
and we had something to eat
and her friend Jenny is there and-everything
and coming out, you-know, we sort-of start talking about:
“mom could you ask dad about the FAS” and all-this-business
and I was telling her it was sort-of like a shame, you-know,
that we’ve got to split the conversations like this
and she/
and I don’t know if it’s a defense or-whatever
and I just wonder how/that/really how she really feels about this
but if you say there’s no animosity may-be I’m reading more into it
J (51): unintelligible

COMPARISON OF JULIE’S FOLKS TO PRUE AND HER EX-HUSBAND
W to J (52): did your parents talk?
P to J (53): yea
J to W (54): oh yea all the time
W to J (55): do they now?
J to W (56): oh yea all the time
P to J (57): yea? oh yea?
-- holy-shit I hope that’s still possible!
J to P (58a): no
(58b): they weren’t the best of buddies but ... I feel bad but ...there was never that ...
COMPARISON OF HOW JULIE FELT TO HOW PRUE'S KIDS FEEL

W to J (59): did you know they were going to get divorced?
I-mean did they tell you?
J to W (60): oh yea they talked to me about it
P to J (61): oh yea
J to P(62): oh it was terrible
it was better/it’s better not having that situation
P to J (63): ok
J to P (64): but my dad was always there for me
P to J (65): ok
J to P (66): always called during the week
P to J (67): ok
J to P (68): pick me up
took me here took me there
W to J (69): now did you/were your brother and sister around then?
J to P (70): made sure I had horseback riding lessons
and took me fishing
took me hunting
P to J (71): you had a dad that took you hunting and fishing huh?
J to P (72): oh yea
W to J (73): were your brother and sister around then?

FOOD: CURRENT CHITCHAT

Waitress enters
w (74): may I take this for you?
sure
what about your french-fries?
W to J (75): Julie do you want anymore?
P to w + J (76): yea leave em
she’ll ...
w (77): may I take them?
I’ll wrap them/I’ll be happy to wrap them
do you want them in some tin foil?
J to w (78): yes that would be lovely
P to w + J (79): no she/she/I was gonna say
she’ll nibble on them through the course of the night
J to P (80): that comes from the waste-not-want-not days  (laughter)
P to J (81): yea

JULIE'S BROTHER AND SISTER FROM A SECOND MARRIAGE:
JULIE'S BROTHER: WIN'S PERSISTENCE

W to J (82): you were their only child then?
J to W (83): Peg and John are from my mother’s second marriage
P to J (84): ok/ok
are/and so you’re still close to them
even though they’re half brother and sister?
J to P (85): with my sister
P to J (86): yea I can understand that
W to J (87): your brother looks like you
J to W (88): pfffffffff  (laughter)
W to J (89): you don’t think so?
P to J (90): don’t get excited!
J to W (91): I can’t stand him
W to J (92): what?
J to W (93): you said that ...
W to J (94): I think he does
P (95): no
W to J (96): I think he does
JULIE'S SISTER:
INQUIRY ANDEXPLANATION ABOUT JULIE’S SISTER

W to J (97): I think I met her once
noise
W to J (98): did she get that job?
J to W (99): she’s waiting
W to J (100): still waiting?
P to J (101): what’s she waiting on?
W to J (102): isn’t she supposed to know?
J to W (103): they called and told her/the receptionist told her that they still hadn’t made up their mind
J (104): she’s ...a/she applied to Birmingham, Cook and something else
a ... firm
P to J (105): oh so she’s had training in ...?
J to all (106): the Statler ...the Statler
  what they’re looking for is a computer operator to handle all the bookkeeping
  all the accounts
  everything concerned ...
P to J (107): yea
J to P (108): this is right up her alley

OUR PERCEPTION OF INQUIRY
W to P (109): she used to walk to school everyday
  it’s how she got her degree
noise
P to J (110): how old is Peggy?
J to P (111): 28
W to P (112): and she has a son
J to all (113): it’s tough
P to J (114): your mother raised some tough daughters huh?
J to P (115): she doesn’t appear to be tough
P to J (116): no I don’t mean tough-tough
  I mean ...

DESCRIPTION OF SISTER
J to P (117): in fact in some respects she comes across kinda flakey if you just initially meet her, you-know?
  she just kinda flies ... you-know
  she’s ..

EXPLANATION OF FIRST DESCRIPTION
P to J (118): but her real stuff is tough
(2) ANALYST'S SEGMENTATION: VERBAL FLOW SECTIONS

The systematization of the respondent's segmentation yields candidate basic units, the Verbal Flow Sections. They are obtained as follows:

**DEFINING CRITERIA FOR VERBAL FLOW1:**
Type of Talk: CHITCHAT (in 3 modes: Neutral, Praising-Julie, and Ritualistic)
Modality of Talk: displaced
Focality: focal

**SEGMENTATION CRITERIA FOR VF1 SECTIONS:**
main topics and subtopics:
1: P learning from comparisons:
   - J’s mother’s weight (1-10c)
   - J’s parents’ health (11-32)
   - Effect of parents’ divorce on J (33a-51)
   - How J’s parents related to each other once divorced (52-58b)
   - J’s feelings about being the child of divorced parents (59a-73)
2: W’s interest in J’s siblings:
   - J’s siblings (82-86)
   - J’s brother (87-89)+(91-96)
   - J’s sister (97-118)

**DEFINING CRITERIA FOR VERBAL FLOW2:**
Type of Talk: CHITCHAT
Modality of Talk: here-and-now
Focality: focal (?)

**SEGMENTATION CRITERION FOR VF2 SECTION:**
triggering agent: Julie’s exclamation of disgust (90)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINING CRITERIA FOR VERBAL FLOW3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Talk:</strong> WORK-RELATED (in 2 modes: Neutral and Teasing-Julie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modality of Talk:</strong> here-and-now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focality:</strong> focal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEGMENTATION CRITERION FOR VF3 SECTION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>triggering agent:</strong> waitress comes in to clear table (74-81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(3) COMPARISON between A’S and R’S ORGANIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANALYST’S</th>
<th>RESPONDENT’S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the dining room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOCUS ON JULIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHITCHAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VF1 Section (1-10c)  [1: comparison.... (1-10c)]
VF1 Section (11-32)  [2: inquiry & expl..... (11-25)]
VF1 Section (33a--51)  [3: Current Chitchat (26a-32)]
VF1 Section (33a--51)  [4: introduction.... (33a-49)]
VF1 Section (52-58b)  [5: comparison.... (50a-51)]
VF1 Section (52-58b)  [6: comparison.... (52-58b)]
VF1 Section (59a-73)  [7: comparison.... (59-73)]
VF3 Section (74a-81)  [8: Current Chitchat (74a-81)]
VF1 Section (82-86)  [9: W’s persistence (82-96)]
VF1 Section (87-89)  [10: inquiry & expl....(97-108) (97-118)]
VF2 Section (90)  [11: our perception… (109-116)]
VF1 Section (91-96)  [12: description… (117)]
VF1 Section (97-118)  [13: explanation.... (118)]
B: BASIC UNITS: INTERNAL STRUCTURE
and
PARTIAL RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION of
TALK IN CORES

Each VF Section is now examined in turn in order to ascertain how many basic units it contains. Then, the internal structure of each basic unit, and the partial rhetorical organization of Talk in their respective cores, are described in some detail.

---

fn1

Note that the analyst’s changes in the transcript from the respondent’s segmentation are shown by letters appended to the numerals. Thus, the respondent’s original segmentation:

P to W: (8) my mom looks like kinda a beach ball I-mean she’s 5 foot nothin and...

is changed to:

P to W: (8a) my mom looks kinda a beach ball

(8b) I-mean she’s 5 foot nothin and ...
VF SECTION (1-10c)

(1) RECAPITULATION

a) Analytic Specification of Section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow 1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of talk:</strong> CHITCHAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modality of Talk:</strong> displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focality:</strong> focal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Segmentation Criterion for VF1 Section (1-10c):**
- **main topic:** P learning from comparisons
- **subtopic:** J’s mother’s weight

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

W to J (1): is your mother little?
J to W (2a): she isn’t now as much
   (2b): I shouldn’t say it she goes over 103 pounds
P to J (3): and how old is she?
J to P (4): 72
P to J (5a): well my-god! yeah ok
P to J (5b): my mother looks [a] like [a] sort-of a beach ball
J to P (6): she was/
W to P (7): *(laughter)* what?
P to W (8a): my mom looks like kinda a beach ball
   (8b): I-mean she’s 5 foot nothing and/
W to P (9.): I thought you said a bridge wall *(laughter)*
P to W (10a): oh no
   (10b): a beach ball
P to J (10.c): so for 72 and she only goes 3 pound...

(2) BASIC UNITS:

There is only one basic unit, VF1 Stretch (1-10c)
It is a QUERY specified by the semantic schema: Win asks Julie about her mother’s weight.
(3) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF QUERY (1-10c)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF QUERY:

The QUERY has a nucleus and one primary satellite.

The nucleus has only a core, a dialogue initiated by W and addressed to J, with one exchange.

The primary satellite is an incidental query. It has a nucleus and one satellite.
The nucleus has an entry, a core and an exit,
The entry and the exit are univoxes.
The core is a dialogue initiated by P and addressed to J, with one exchange.
The satellite is a univocal remark. It has an extension, a repair request.
The latter has only a core, a dialogue initiated by W and addressed to P, with two exchanges.
**Analyst note 1**

Note that in the data base, in (5a) well, my god! yea, ok and (5b) my mother looks a/like a beach ball Prue is said to be addressing both Win and Julie.

The proposed interpretation is that Prue is not addressing anyone in particular, but rather responding to what Julie was saying.
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORES:

M1: W’s request for information to J:¹
   (1): is your mother little?²
M2: J’s response²
  •1: response proper: implied negative
  •2: elaboration (in format of contrast between present and past):
      (2a): she isn’t now as much
      (2b): I shouldn’t say it she goes over 130 lbs

INCIDENTAL QUERY
M1: P’s request for information to J: ³
    (3): how old is she?
M2: J’s response
    (4): seventy two

REMARK
comparison by P⁴
initiation:
P (5a) well my-God! yeah ok⁵
development:
P(5b): my mother looks [a] like [a] sort-of a beach ball⁵'

REPAIR REQUEST
Ex1: initial use of schema
M1: W ‘s request for repeat:
    (7): what?⁶….laughter
M2: P’s response
  •1: response proper (repeat):
    (8a): my mom looks like a beach ball
  •2: elaboration (=explanation)
    (8b): I-mean she’s 5 foot nothin and /⁷
Ex2: justification of repair request
M1: W ‘s presumption:
    (9): I thought you said “a bridge wall”⁸…laughter
M2: P’s rejection of presumption
  •1: rejection proper: ⁹
      (10a): oh no!¹⁰
  •2: elaboration:¹⁰
      (10b): “a beach ball “
Respondent’s account:

- fn1
just social chitchat
no great emotional thing
social banter with the purpose of sharing information
no loaded conversation (1-10c)
- fn1'
question
- fn2
answer
at this part we’re starting to make the comparison between Julie and her mother
which as we go on develops a little more
and if you know Julie and you know her mother and sister
and that there is a correlation
Julie’s mentioning how small her mother is
and Julie’s a very tiny person
goes 5 foot nothin
um... very petite
and to watch her eat is sort-of phenomenal
so we’re asking her where she gets it from
and her mom is brought up here
(lots of laughter) (2a-2b)
- fn3
Prue is jumping on the pile
She is bringing in her concern, making a comparison between Julie’s mother and her own mother.
- fn4
at this point I make a very unfavorable comparison with my mother
- fn5
reaction
- fn5'
and at this point I make a very unfavorable comparison with my mother
who is approximately the same age as Julie’s
Julie’s mom + her: my mom + me (5b)
- fn6
question
- fn7
description (8a-8b)
- fn8
explanation
and Win misinterprets it
and sort-a even makes it worse
and now hearing it on tape sort-a makes me feel even more absurd
- fn9
implied negative correction: I didn’t say ‘a bridge wall’, I said ‘a beach ball’.
- fn10
explanation
VF1 SECTION (11-32)

(1) RECAPITULATION
a) Analytic Specification of Section:

Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow1:
Type of talk: CHITCHAT
Modality of Talk: displaced
Focality: focal

Segmentation Criterion for VF1 Section (11-32):
main topic: P learning from comparisons
subtopic: J’s parents’ health

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

W to J (11): how’s she doing?
J to W (12): ok
(13): she’d never let you know if she wasn’t
W to J (14a): no?
W to J (14b): how about your dad?
(14c): his eyes ok?
J to W (15): he’s hanging in there
W to J (16): can he drive still?
J to W (17): he’ll know by next week
P to J (18): now they’re sep/ they’re divorced or separated?
W to J (19): is there something they can do for it?
J to W (20): no
(21): and the eye specialist told him that one of the factors that hastened this / noise

P to J (22a): his smoke?
(22b): for his eyes?
J to P (23): there’s a leakage from behind the retina
P to J (24): oh I thought that was from diabetes
J to P (25): he said smoking
it thins one of the veins that goes back into the connecting membrane
P to J (26a): really?
P to all (26b): I-know, it thins the blood vessels under here and like Mary-Ann says I get smoker’s face because...
and I can tell from when I started smoking
W to P (27): really?!?
P to W (28a): yeah
P to all (28b): the wrinkles and the deterioration under my eyes is hastened immensely
and it’s because those tiny blood vessels broke
J to P (29): it happens
W to P (30): you don’t need them
J to P (31): it happens
P to W (32): (sigh) oh nobody needs them honey!
(2) BASIC UNITS:

There are three basic units, as follows:

1. VF1 SubStretch (11-14a) is a Query, specified by the semantic schema: Win asks Julie how her mom is doing;

2. VF1 SubStretch (14b-26a) is also a Query, specified by the semantic schema: Win asks Julie how her dad is doing;

3. VF1 SubStretch (26b-32) is a LAMENT specified by the semantic schemas: Prue leads a lament on the ill effects of smoking.
(3.1) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF QUERY (11-14a)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF QUERY:

The QUERY has only a nucleus. The latter has a core and an exit.
The exit is a univox.
The core is a dialogue initiated by Win and addressed to Julie, with one exchange.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1: W to J (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: J to W (12-13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT: W to J (14a): no?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORE:

M1: W’s request for information to J: ¹
(11): how’s she doing?¹
M2: J’s response
• 1: response proper: ²
  (12): ok
• 2 elaboration (= comment): ³
  (13): she’d never let you know if she wasn’t

Respondent's account:

fn1
family inquiry and explanation of Julie’s family
in the meantime talking about Julie’s father
she’s talking about an eye difficulty he’s having
and the doctor’s explanation that it’s his heavy smoking that caused it
Julie is a tremendously heavy smoker
I am also a heavy smoker
and for some odd reason
that smoking between Julie and even myself
I have a sense of when that subject’s brought up
not even a sense
I always have my sister Gwen come to mind
’cause Julie’s so much like her in so many ways
and especially with the smoking
and of course my sister Mary-Ann looms over my head
and I have to bring up her comments on my smoker’s face
and we take it on (11-26a)
-fn1'
question
-fn2
answer (12)
-fn3
comment (13)
(3.2) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF QUERY (14b-26.a)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF QUERY:

The QUERY has a nucleus and two primary satellites.

The nucleus has only a core, a dialogue initiated by Win and addressed to Julie, with three exchanges.

The first primary satellite is an incidental query. It has an entry and a partial core. The entry is a univox. The core is a partial dialogue, initiated by Prue and addressed to Julie, with one partial exchange.

The second primary satellite is also an incidental query. It has an entry, core and an exit. The entry and the exit are univoxes. The core is a dialogue initiated by Prue and addressed to Julie, with two exchanges.
**Respondent's account:**

fn1
exclamatory comment
Note that in the transcript (26a) goes with the following unit
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORES:

Ex1: initial use of schema  
M1: W’s request for information:  
•1: preparation:  
  (14b): how about your dad?  
•2: request proper:  
  (14c): his eyes ok?  
M2: J’s response proper:  
  (15): he’s hanging there

Ex2: additional use of schema  
M1: W’s request for information:  
  (16): can he drive still?  
M2: J’s response  
  implied response proper  
  elaboration:  
  (17): he’ll know by next week

INCIDENTAL QUERY  
M1: Prue’s request-for-information to J (disregarded):  

REPAIRABLE:  
  (18): they’re sep/  
  (18): they’re divorced or separated?

Ex3: additional use of schema  
M1: W’s request for information:  
  (19): is there something they can do for it?  
M2: J’s response  
•1: response proper (negation):  
  (20): no  
•2: elaboration (=comment):  
  (21): and the eye specialist told him that one of the factors that hastened this /
INCIDENTAL QUERY
Ex1: initial use of schema
M1: P’s request for explanation:
   (22b): for his eyes?!  
M2: J’s response proper (explanation):  
   (23): there’s a leakage from behind the retina
Ex2: follow-up use of schema
   (justification of request for explanation)
M1: P’s presumption  
   (24): oh I thought that was from diabetes!
M2: J’s rejection of presumption
   •1: response proper (implied negation):
      (25): he said smoking
   •2: elaboration (reported explanation):  
      (25): it thins one of the veins that goes back into the connecting membrane

Respondent's account:

-fn1
question (14a-b-c)
-fn2
answer (15)
-fn3
question (16)
-fn4
answer (17)
-fn5
interruption
try to steer conversation
   my attempt to move from chitchat to some heavier conversation
   Julie and Win just ignore me
   they are going to go on chitchatting
-fn6
question
-fn7
question
-fn8
answer
-fn9
comment (implied: one of the factors is smoking)
-fn10
lead on (= a way of continuing the conversation)
-fn11
trigger topic
surprise

explanation (implied: the leakage is caused by smoking)

'oh' marks speaker involvement

explanation
(3.3) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF LAMENT (26b-32)

a) INTERACTIONAL STRUCTURE OF LAMENT:

The LAMENT has a nucleus and two primary satellites.
The nucleus has an entry, a core, and an exit.
The entry and the exit are univoxes.
The core is multilogic, a duo with one round initiated by P and taken up by W.
The first satellite is a back channel dyad involving W and P.
The second satellite is a cluster of 2 repeated univocal back channel by J responding to P.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>SATELLITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTRY: P (26b): I-know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1: P (26b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2: W (30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACK CHANNEL (dyad)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- W to P (27): really?!¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- P to W (28a): yeah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACK CHANNELS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J (29): it happens²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J (31): it happens²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT: P to W (32): (sigh) oh nobody needs them, honey!³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent's account:
- fn1
  exclamation
  lead on
- fn2
  affirmation
- fn3
  'oh' marks speaker involvement
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORE:

D1: P’s initiation of lament

• 1: introduction (repeat of line 25):
  (26b): it thins the blood vessels under here

• 2: body of lament (ill effect of smoking)

  REPAIRABLE (false start)
  (26b): and like Mary Ann says I get smoker’s face because/

  (26b): and I can tell from when I started smoking
  (28b): the wrinkles and the deterioration under the eyes is hastened immensely
    and it’s because those tiny blood vessels broke

D2: W’s continuation of lament:

  (30): you don’t need them

Respondent’s account:

-fn1
For an account of ritual lamenting used for bonding by Greek women, see Tannen, 1990, pp100-102.

current chitchat on the previous subject (smoking)
the three women get on the ill effects of smoking (26b-32)

-fn2
statement

-fn3
opinion
assertion
VF1 SECTION (33a-51)

(1) RECAPITULATION
a) Analytic Specification of Section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow 1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of talk:</strong> CHITCHAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modality of Talk:</strong> displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focality:</strong> focal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Segmentation Criterion for VF1 Section (33a-51):**

- **main topic:** P learning from comparisons
- **subtopic:** effect of parents’ divorce on J

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

P to J (33a): ...curiosity and if it’s none of my business tell me
   (33b): how old were you when your parents divorced?
J to P (34): 12
W to J (35): 12?
P to J (36): how did that hit you?
J to P (37): it didn’t really affect me that much ‘cause both of my parents were always there for me
P to J (38): ok
J to P (39): and there was none of this animosity crap
P to J (40a): ‘cause I wonder about/
   (40b): Sherri said it doesn’t affect her a whole lot
   (40c): she says every once in a while
J to P (41): no
   (42): it/I remember at the time it upset me but my dad was always there for me and my mom too
W to J (43): did you know it was being?!
J to P (44): they never/I never felt like I was being deprived of...
P for J (45): attention?
J to P (46): never/never/I never felt like that
P to J (47): ok
W to J (48): who did you live with?
J to W (49): my mother
P to J (50a): ‘cause
   (50b): when I went up to see Sherri when she was up at/
       and—oh I was so damn proud -- I went
       --- she’s all dormed in on Saturday and/or-whatever---
       and I drove in on Sunday to see her
       and Buff State’s got a beautiful running track
       and I’m pulling around the parking lot
       and who’s with her headphones on out there running ...
       it’s my Sherri!
   (50c): so I met her at her dorm room and-everything
       and we’re sort-of/she’s showing me around
       and we had something to eat
       and her friend Jenny is there and-everything
       and coming out, you-know, we sort-of start talking about:
       “mom could you ask dad about the FAS” and all-this-business
and I was telling her it was sort-of like a shame, you-know, 
that we’ve got to split the conversations like this 
and she—and I don’t know if it’s a defense or-whatever—sorta blows it off like/ lightly like all her friends 
were doing it and all her friends’ parents are divorced and this-sort-of-stuff 
and I just wonder how/that/really how she really feels about this 
(50d): but if you say there’s no animosity may-be I’m reading more into it 
J to P (51): unintelligible

(2) BASIC UNITS:

There is only one basic unit, VF1Strech (33a-51).
It is an INFORMING specified by the semantic schema: Prue expresses her concern about her daughter.
(3) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF INFORMING (33a-51)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF INFORMING:

The INFORMING has a nucleus and six primary satellites.

The nucleus has a pre and a main part.
The pre has only a core, a dialogue initiated by P and addressed with two exchanges.
The second member of the second exchange has an extension, a univocal co-construction by P.

The main part occurs in two sections, an interrupted main part and a full main part.
Both have an entry and a core.
The entry is the same in both cases, a univox.
The core of the interrupted section and that of the full main part are monologues by P addressed to J.

Three of the satellites are back channels and two are incidental queries.
The first back channel is a univox by W responding to J (35).
The second and third back channels are univoxes by P responding to J (38) and (47).

The two incidental queries have only a nucleus each with only a core.
The core of the first incidental query is a partial dialogue initiated by W and addressed to J with one partial exchange (43).
The core of the second incidental query is a dialogue initiated by P and addressed to J with one exchange (48-49).

The sixth satellite is unintelligible. It is probably either a back channel or a remark by J (51).
## NUCLEUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M1: P to J (33a+b)</th>
<th>BACK CHANNEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex1</td>
<td>W (35): 12? 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M2: J to P (34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M1: P to J (36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M2: J to P (37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### SATELLITES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACK CHANNEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P (38): ok²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PRE: CORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACK CHANNEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P (38): ok³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAIN PART (INTERRUPTED)

**ENTRY:** P (40a): 'cause

**CORE:** P to J: (40b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCIDENTAL QUERY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1: W to J (43)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CO-CONSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACK CHANNEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P (47): ok³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCIDENTAL QUERY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1: W to J (48)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M2: J to W (49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**MAIN PART**

**ENTRY:** P: (50a): ‘cause

**CORE:** P to J
(50a-50c)

**BACK CHANNEL**
J (51): ?

**Respondent's account:**

- fn1
  rhetorical question
  jumping on the pile
- fn2
  acceptance
  go on
- fn3
  acceptance
- fn4
dangler.

Julie’s contribution is unintelligible.
**b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORES:**

PRE TO RECOUNTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex1: initial use of schema</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1: P’s request for information to J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•1: preparation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33a): ...curiosity and if it’s none of my business tell me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•2: request proper:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33b): how old were you when your parents divorced?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: J’s response proper:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34): 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex2: additional use of schema

| M1: P’s request-for-information to J: |
| (36): how did that hit you? |
| M2: J’s response |
| (1) first formulation |
| •1: response proper: |
| (37): it didn’t really affect me that much |
| •2: elaboration (explanation): |
| (37): ‘cause both of my parents were always there for me |
| (39): and there was none of this animosity crap |

MAIN PART (INTERRUPTED RECOUNTING)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P’s expression of concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•1: statement proper (unfinished):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40a): I wonder about / (implied: how Sherri feels about the separation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•2: elaboration:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40b): Sherri said it doesn’t affect her a whole lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40c): she says every once in a while</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) second formulation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1: response proper (negative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(41a): no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41b): [it] I remember at the time it upset me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(42): but my dad was always there for me and my mom too</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INCIDENTAL QUERY
M1: W’s disregarded request for information to J: 9
(43): did you know it was being /?

(44): [they never] I never felt like I was being deprived of: 10

CO-CONSTRUCTION
P (45): attention: 11

(46): I never felt like that 12

INCIDENTAL QUERY
M1: W’s request for information to J: 13
(48): who did you live with?
M2): J’s response proper: 14
(49): my mother

MAIN PART (RESUMED RECOUNTING) 15
P’s expression of concern in narrative format
(1) Background
•1: Arrival:

REPAIRABLE (false start)
when I went up to see Sherri when she was up at/

PARENTHESIS :
oh I was so damn proud!

and I went (implied: to see Sherri when she was up at Buff State)

PARENTHESIS :
she’s all dormed in on Saturday [and] or-whatever

and I drove in on Sunday to see her
and Buff State’s got a beautiful running track
and I’m pulling around the parking lot
and who’s with her headsets on out there running?
  it’s my Sherri!
•2: Meeting Sherri  
so I met her at her dorm room and-everything  
and [we’re sort-of] she’s showing me around  
and we had something to eat  
and her friend Jenny is there and-everything  
and coming out y-k we sort-of start talking about:  
“mom could you ask dad about the F.A.S” and all-this-business  
and I was telling her it was sort-of like a shame y-k that we’ve got to split the conversation like this  
and she sorta blows it off [like] lightly like all her friends were doing it  
and all her friends’ parents are divorced and this-sort-of-stuff  
and I don’t know if it’s a defense or-whatever  
and I just wonder [how/that/really] how she really feels about this  

(2) Point of Narrative:  
but if you say there’s no animosity  
may-be I’m reading more into it

Respondent's account:

-fn1
inquiry + explanation [regarding ] Julie’s experience as a child (33-49)  
-fn1’  
The student researcher felt that Prue felt that Julie could help with her confusion
quest  
second attempt to steer conversation  
now Julie’s talking about both her mom and dad  
and I know they were divorced  
and she’s talking about the strength of both of them  
and knowing they were divorced I asked her the question when were they divorced?  
how old was she?  
because being in a similar situation myself  
I am wondering, you-know, how her life has been affected by it  
her mom’s tough  
she’s tough  
her and her sister is tough  
and I am wondering in relationship to their background  
what it was that may have produced this toughness  
so I started talking about divorce and its effect on her  
and she goes on to explain to us what she thought was happening at that time in her life  
from there and get back with the divorce (33a-b)  
-fn2
answer: J understood and was willing to jump in on it  
-fn3
question (36)  
-fn4
answer (37)  
fn5
explanation  
elaboration (39)
The implied question is: should I worry about Sherri?

The student researcher expresses Prue’s concern for Sherri as follows: Prue was always very close to Sherri, who had a learning disability. Prue was always involved in Sherri’s life and problems. When Prue left home, in some ways she felt as though she had left Sherri, who was in high school at the time (a senior). I think Prue was worried about how Sherri would make it in the college environment. Kris, her other daughter, has always been very independent. At the time of Prue’s separation, she was living and working in Poughkeepsie at Vassar (from where she graduated).

P characterizes J’s no as a dangler which indicates that she does not quite know what to make of it. The proposed interpretation is that Julie continues responding to Prue’s question, interrupting the latter’s recounting of her visit to Sherri.

Win knows how Julie feels about her parents

Julie feels responsible for her parents

she feels the need to defend her dad (43)

W abandons this line of inquiry but takes it up again and this time successfully in (line 59a) below: did you know they were going to get divorced?

Julie is helping Prue out but still defending her dad (44)

steering (45)

denial (46)

question to sustain topic (48)

answer (49)

continuation of musing report

comparison of Julie's experience as a child with daughter's experience (50a-b-c-d)

Prue’s narrative is a good example of a story being used as a means to illustrate a point. For a study of the use of story telling in medical discourse, see Ainsworth-Vaughn, 1998.

This section echoes the preceding lines (40b): Sherri said it doesn’t affect her a whole lot and (40c): she says every once in a while

This section echoes the preceding line (40a): I wonder about/

This line echoes the preceding line (39): there was none of this animosity crap
VF1 SECTION (52-58b)

(1) RECAPITULATION
a) Analytic Specification of Section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow 1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of talk: CHITCHAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality of Talk: displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focality: focal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segmentation Criterion for VF1 Section (52-58b):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>main topic: P learning from comparisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtopic: how J’s parents related to each other once divorced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

W to J (52): did your parents talk?
P (53): yeah
J to W (54): oh yeah all the time
W to J (55): do they now?
J to W (56): oh yeah all the time
P (57a): yeah? oh yeah!
(57b): holy-shit I hope that’s still possible!
J to P (58a): no
(58b): they weren’t the best of buddies but/ I feel bad but/ there was never that /

(3) BASIC UNITS:

There is only one basic unit, VF1 Stretch (52-58b).
It is a QUERY, specified by the semantic schema: Win asks Julie how her divorced parents got along.
**(3) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF QUERY (52-58b)**

**a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF QUERY:**
The QUERY has a nucleus and two primary satellites.

The nucleus has only a core, a dialogue initiated by W and addressed to J, with two exchanges.

The first satellite is a univocal back channel by P.
The second satellite is a remark dyad initiated by P and addressed to J.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>SATELLITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1: W to J (52)</td>
<td>BACK CHANNEL&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex1</td>
<td>P (53): yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: J to W (54-55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>REMARK (dyad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex2</td>
<td>P to J (57 a-b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1: W to J (55)</td>
<td>core: J to P (58a-58b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: J to W (56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Respondent's account:**

- fn1
  Prue supports Win’s question. She is jumping on the pile
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORES:

Ex1: initial use of schema\(^1\)
M1: W’s request for information to J: 1’
\((52)\): did your parents talk?
M2: J’s response
  • 1: affirmation proper:
    \((54)\): oh yeah!
  • 2: elaboration:
    \((54)\): all the time

Ex2: additional use of schema
M1: W’s request for information to J:
\((55)\): do they now? 2’
M2: J’s response
  • 1: affirmation proper:
    \((56)\): oh yeah! 2
  • 2: elaboration:
    \((56)\): all the time

**REMARK** (dyad)

wish by P to J \(^3\)

**initiation:**
\((57.a)\): yeah? oh yeah! \(^4\)
\((57b)\): holy shit!

**development:**
\((57b)\): I hope that’s still possible!

response by J to P \(^5\)

  . 1: disclaimer:
  \((58a)\): no
  • 2: elaboration (unfinished justification):
    \((58b)\): they weren’t the best of buddies but/
    I feel bad but/
    there was never that/

**Respondent’s account:**

- fn1
  comparison between Julie’s parents + her and Prue + [her] ex-husband (52-58)
- fn1’
question to sustain topic (52)
- fn2
answer (52)+(54)+(56)
'oh' marks speaker involvement
implied comparison: I hope that it is still possible for me and my ex-husband to talk to each other just like your parents did.

The student researcher explains Prue’s contribution as follows:
I would say Prue’s response was about ‘longing and disbelief’. What I mean is that she was longing for the day when her and [her ex-husband] Charles could be civil to each other but at that moment in time she couldn’t believe it would ever happen.

At that time in her life Prue was only beginning to learn how to handle conflict. It was in some ways why her marriage ended. She said they never fought. I know that she has always fantasized about a friendly divorce to the extent that she wanted her and Charles to be best buddies after the divorce. You know, each seeing other people but still going out with each other to shows etc.

Here is how the student researcher sees Julie’s contribution:
As for Julie, I think she sensed Prue’s tendency to co-opt other people’s experience as her own. I think Julie’s response was as much a damper as a defense. In other words, ‘don’t go too far on this, everything between my parents was not peachy keen.’ I think J was trying to say ‘divorce is not easy or fun’. I think it is an attempt on the speaker’s part to rectify what might be a misunderstanding by the listener. Maybe it is a disclaimer of sorts: ‘don’t exaggerate or take what I have just said too far’
VF1 SECTION (59a-73)

(1) RECAPITULATION

a) Analytic Specification of Section:

**Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow 1:**

- **Type of talk:** CHITCHAT
- **Modality of Talk:** displaced
- **Focality:** focal

**Segmentation Criterion for VF1 Section (59a-73):**

- **main topic:** P learning from comparisons
- **subtopic:** P learning from the child of divorced parents

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W to J (59a): did you know they were going to get divorced?</th>
<th>(59b): I-mean did they tell you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J to W (60): oh yea they talked to me about it</td>
<td>P to J (61): oh yea?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J to P (62a): oh it was terrible!</td>
<td>(62b): [it was better] it’s better not having that situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P to J (63): ok</td>
<td>P to J (64): but my dad was always there for me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J to P (65): ok</td>
<td>P to J (66): always called during the week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P to J (67): ok</td>
<td>J to P (68): pick me up took me here took me there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W to J (69): now [did you] were your brother and sister around then?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J to P (70): made sure I had horseback riding lessons and took me fishing took me hunting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P to J (71): you had a dad that took you hunting and fishing huh?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J to P (72): oh yea!</td>
<td>W to J (73): were your brother and sister around then?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) BASIC UNITS:

There is only one basic unit, VF1 Stretch (59a-73).

It is a QUERY specified by the semantic schema: Win asks Julie how she felt about her parents’ divorce.
(3) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF QUERY (59a-73)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF QUERY:

The QUERY has a nucleus and three primary satellites.
The nucleus has, only a core, a dialogue initiated by W and addressed to, with two exchanges.
The three satellites includes three incidental queries.
The first incidental query is by P and addressed to J. It has a core with one interactive exchange and an exit dyad. The second member of the exchange has three satellites, all univocal back channels by P responding to J.
The other two incidental queries are by W and addressed to J.
The first has a univocal entry and a partial core.
The second has only a partial core.
Respondent's account:

- fn1
  affirmation
- fn2
  question (71)
- fn3
  answer (72)

'oh' marks speaker involvement
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORES:

M1: W’s request for information
•1: initial formulation:
  (59a): did you know they were going to get divorced?
•2: reformulation:
  (59b): I-mean did they tell you?
M2: J’s response
•1: affirmation proper:
  (60): oh yeah!
•2: elaboration:
  (60): they talked to me about it

INCIDENTAL QUERY
M1: P’s request for clarification to J:
  (61): oh yeah?
M2: J’s response:
•1: preparation:
  (62a): oh it was terrible!
•2: response proper:
  (62b): [it was better] it’s better not having that situation
  (64): but my dad was always there for me
•3: elaboration:
  (66): always called during the week
  (68): pick me up took me here took me there

FIRST INCIDENTAL QUERY
W’s request for information to J (steering question)
(69): [did you] were your brother and sister around then?
(70): made sure I had horseback riding lessons and took me fishing, took me hunting

SECOND INCIDENTAL QUERY
W’s request for information to J (steering question)
(73): were your brother and sister around then?

Respondent's account:

-fn1

comparison of how Julie felt to how Prue’s kids feel
how Julie felt as a child (59-73)
Win’s invitation for Julie to talk about herself

Win’s request for information to Julie (lines 59a-59b) is the successful repeat of an initially unsuccessful attempt. Her question line (line 43): did you know [that your parents were getting divorced]? was disregarded by Julie who was involved with Prue. Here, Win asks it again and this time Julie answers it.

'oh' marks speaker involvement

inquiry (what was it like?)

jumping on the pile

monologue (62-70)

expressive statement (62a-b)

Win’s persistence

second steering question (69) and (73)

Prue sees Win’s attempts (lines 69 and 73) as an intrusion into her own territory: Win stabs at what I am doing. She doesn’t have many relationships and siblings are important to her. She is trying to get feedback.
VF3 SECTION (74a-81)

(1) Recapitulation

a) Analytic Specification of Section:

Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow 3:
Type of talk: WORK-RELATED (in 2 modes: Neutral and Teasing-Julie)
Modality of Talk: here-and-now
Focality: focal
Segmentation Criterion for VF3 Section (74a-81):
triggering Agent: waitress comes in to clear table

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:¹

waitress enters
w to ? (74a): may I take this for you
? to w (74b): unspoken response
? to w (74c): unspoken politeness formula
w to ? (74c'): sure
w to all (74d): what about your french-fries?
W for w to J (75): Julie do you want anymore?
P for J to w (76a): yea leave em
  (76b): she’ll ... teasing-J
w to J (77): may I take them?
  (77b): [I’ll wrap them/] I’ll be happy to wrap them
  (77c): do you want them in some tin foil?
J to w (78): yes that would be lovely
P for J to w (79a): no
  (79b): [she/she] I was gonna say she’ll nibble on them through the course of the night teasing-J
J to P (80): that comes from the waste-not want-not days (laughter)
P to J (81): yeah

at some point the waitress leaves

Respondent’s account

-fn1
current chitchat: Food trigger
this is where the waitress comes in to clear the table
and there are a few french-fries left
and she wants to know if we’re going to give them up to the kitchen
or if we want to keep them
of course Win and I don’t care
but Julie grabs them to herself and says: “we’ll keep them”
and that’s in line with the rest of our teasing her earlier on in the evening
ah and indeed she did pull them out later on at the bar and passed them around
and we all ate them (74a-81)

(2) BASIC UNITS:

The section is constituted by 3 sets of verbal responses to the triggering agent: waitress comes in to clear table. There are three basic units as follows:

1. VF3 SubStretch (74a-74c) is an OFFER of SERVICE, specified by the semantic schema: the waitress’ first offer of service;
2. VF 3 SubStretch (74d-76b) is an OFFER of SERVICE, specified by the semantic schema: the waitress’ second offer of service;
3. VF3 SubStretch (77a-81) is an OFFER of SERVICE, specified by the semantic schema: the waitress’ third offer of service.

This is shown in the following Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIGGERING AGENT</th>
<th>VERBAL RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waitress comes in to clear table</td>
<td>OFFER OF SERVICE (74a-74c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OFFER OF SERVICE (74d-76b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OFFER OF SERVICE (77a-81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(3.1) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF OFFER OF SERVICE (74a-74c')

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF OFFER:

The OFFER has only a nucleus. The latter has a core and an exit. The exit is a univox. The core is a dialogue initiated by the waitress and very likely addressed to all but responded to by one person speaking on behalf of all, with one exchange.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1: w to all (74a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M2: X to w (74b-74c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w to X (74c'): sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORE:

M1: The waitress’ offer of service to X:
(74a): may I take this for you?

M2: X’s implied nonverbal response
• 1: response proper (very likely acceptance):
  (74b): yes
• 2: elaboration (politeness formula):¹
  (74c): thank-you

Analyst's note:
The polite formula “thank you” is inferred on the basis of the waitress’ acknowledgement in the exit.
(3.2) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF OFFER-OF-SERVICE (74d-76b)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF OFFER:

The OFFER has a nucleus and one satellite.

The nucleus has only a core, a dialogue initiated by the waitress and addressed to all, with one exchange.

The satellite is an incidental query. It has only a core, a partial dialogue initiated by W and addressed to J, with one partial exchange.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>SATELLITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1: w to all (74d)</td>
<td>INCIDENTAL QUERY M1: W to J (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: P to w (76a-b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Diagram showing the structure of the offer with nucleus and satellite, core and exchange paths]
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORES:

M1: The waitress’ offer of service to all (neutral mode):
   (74d): what about your French fries?

   INCIDENTAL QUERY
   M1: W redirects the waitress’ query to J (teasing mode)\(^1\):
   (75): Julie do you want anymore?

M2: P’s response to the waitress (teasing mode)
   •1: response proper
     ••1: affirmative:
       (76a): yeah
     ••2: echo of offer of service in line 74d:
       (76a): leave ‘em
   •2: elaboration (unfinished justification):
     (76b): she’ll [implied: nibble on them through the night]\(^2\)

Analyst's notes:
1. W teases J by suggesting that she alone should decide what to do with the French fries, an indirect reference to her insatiable appetite.
2. P teases J by implying that the French fries are only for her, here again, an indirect reference to her insatiable appetite (see also line 79a-b)
(3.3) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF OFFER OF SERVICE (77a-81)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF OFFER:

The OFFER has a nucleus and one satellite.

The nucleus has only a core, a dialogue, with one exchange involving three speakers: the waitress who initiates the dialogue addressing herself to Julie; J and P who answer her.

The satellite is a remark dyad initiated by J responding to P.
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M1</th>
<th>The waitress’ offer of service (neutral mode):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•1</td>
<td>preparation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(77a): may I take them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•2</td>
<td>offer proper:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(77b): I’ll wrap them I’ll be happy to wrap them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•3</td>
<td>elaboration:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(77c): do you want them in some tin foil?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M2</th>
<th>J’s acceptance of the waitress’ offer (neutral mode):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•1</td>
<td>response proper (acceptance):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(78): yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•2</td>
<td>elaboration (polite formula):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(78): that would be lovely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M2’</th>
<th>P’s rejection of the waitress’ offer (teasing mode):¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•1</td>
<td>response proper (rejection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(79a): no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•2</td>
<td>elaboration (justification of rejection):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(79b): [she/she] I was gonna say she’ll nibble on them through the course of the night</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REMARK (dyad)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J goes along with the teasing:²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(80a): that comes from the waste-not want-not days .......................laughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P’s acknowledgement:³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(81): yeah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Respondent's account:**

- fn1

P teases J by indirectly suggesting that she has an insatiable appetite.

- fn2
defense/explanation
when she was divorced and raising her two sons on her own and she does not waste and she always refers to it as her “waste-not want-not years” when she was divorced and raising her two sons on her own and she does not waste she is Scotch from the word go
By joining in the teasing J shows that she takes pleasure in it.

- fn3
affirmation
VF1 SECTION (82-86)

(1) RECAPITULATION
a) Analytic Specification of Section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of talk</strong>: CHITCHAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modality of Talk</strong>: displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focality</strong>: focal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segmentation Criterion for VF1 Section (82-86):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>main topic</strong>: W’s interest in J’s siblings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sub-topic</strong>: Julie’s Siblings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

W to J (82): you were their only child then?
J to W (83): Peg and John are from my mother’s second marriage
P to J (84.a): ok/ok
P to J (84.b): [are] and so you’re still close to them even though they’re half brother and sister?
J to P (85): with my sister
P to J (86): yeah I can understand that

(2) BASIC UNITS:

There is only one basic unit, VF1 Stretch (82-86). It is a QUERY specified by the semantic schema: W asks J about her siblings when her parents got divorced.
(3) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF QUERY (82-86)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF QUERY:

The QUERY has a nucleus and two primary satellites.
The nucleus has only a core, a dialogue initiated by W and addressed to J, with one exchange.
The first satellite is a univocal back channel by P responding to J.
The second satellite is an incidental query. It has an entry, a core and an exit.
The entry and the exit are univoxes.
The core is a dialogue initiated by P and addressed to J, with one exchange.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>SATELLITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1: W to J (82)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: J to W (83)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACK CHANNEL</td>
<td>P (84a): ok ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCIDENTAL QUERY</td>
<td>ENTRY: P (84b): and so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M1: P to J (84b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: J to P (85)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT: P (86): yeah I can understand that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent's account:

-fn1

comment
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORES:

M1: W’s request for information to J (steering question)
   \(1\)
   (82): you were their only child then?\(1'\)

M2: J’s response
1: response proper (implied): yes
2: elaboration (explanation):
   (83): Peg and John are from my mother’s second marriage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCIDENTAL QUERY</th>
<th>M1: P’s request for information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(84b): [are] you’re still close to them even though they’re half brother sister?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: J’s response proper</td>
<td>affirmative (implied): yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>restriction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(85): with my sister</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent’s account:
- fn1
  W’s persistence: the continuance of W’s interest in J’s sister and brother
  there we’re questioning about her brother and sister from a second marriage (82-86)
- fn1'
  Win resumes steering
- fn2
  question
  jumping on the pile
- fn3
  answer(85)
OVERLAPPING VF STRETCHES
VF1 Stretch (82-89)+(91-96) is overlapped by VF2 (90)
VF1 SECTION (87-89)+(91-96)

(1) RECAPITULATION

a) Analytic Specification of Section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining Criteria for VF1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of talk:</strong> CHITCHAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modality of Talk:</strong> displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focality:</strong> focal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Segmentation Criterion for VF1 Section (87-89)+(91-96):**

| main topic: W’s interest in J’s siblings |
| sub-topic: J’s brother |

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

W to J (87): your brother looks like you
J resp. to W (88): pfffffff ... (laughter)
W to J (89): you don’t think so?

J to W (91): I can’t stand him
W to J (92): what?
J to W (93): you said that ...
W to J (94): I think he does
P for J to W (95): no
W to all ? (96): I think he does
    noise

(2) BASIC UNITS:

There is only one basic unit, VF1 Stretch (87-89) +(92-96). It is an OPINION, specified by the semantic schema: Win tells Julie her opinion that her brother looks like her.
(3) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF OPINION (87-96)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF OPINION:

The OPINION has only a nucleus. The latter has a core and an exit. The exit is a univox. The core is a dialogue initiated by W and addressed to J, with three exchanges.

The second member of the second exchange has an extension, a repair query. The latter has only a core, a dialogue initiated by W and addressed to J, with one exchange.

**NUCLEUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex1</th>
<th>M1: W to J (87)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M2: J to W (88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M1: W to J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE—Ex2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M2: J to W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(91)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REPAIR REQUEST**

| M1: W to J (92) | M2: J to W (93) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex3</th>
<th>M1: W to J (94)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M2: P on behalf of J to W (95)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXIT:** W to J & P (96): I think he does

**Respondent's account:**

-fn1

assertion

holding ground
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORES:

**Ex1**: initial use of schema
- **M1**: W’s offer of opinion to J:
  - (87): your brother looks like you
- **M2**: J’s rejection of W’s opinion (response cry):
  - (88): pfff + laughter

**Ex2**: follow-up use of schema
- **M1**: W’s request for justification of rejection to J:
  - (89): you don’t think so?
- **M2**: J’s response (justification):
  - (91): I can’t stand him

**REPAIR REQUEST**
- **M1**: W’s request for repeat:
  - (92): what?
- **M2**: J’s response (avoidance to repeat):
  - (93): you said that/

**Ex3**: recycling of Ex1
- **M1**: W’s offer of opinion to J:
  - (94): I think he does
- **M2**: P’s rejection of W’s opinion:
  - (95): no

**Respondent's account:**
- fn1
  W questions her about her brother, remarking that she looks like her brother.
  you should see the look on her face! It was…
  we know how she feels about her brother \((87-89)+(91-96)\)
- fn1'
  statement/assertion
- fn2
  laughter= refusal
- fn3
  question (89)
- fn4
  assertion
- fn5
  question: demand for explanation
-fn6
denial
avoidance
-fn7
assertion/persistence
-fn8
dangler
support for Julie
VF2 SECTION (90)

(1) RECAPITULATION
a) Analytic Specification of Section:

Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow2:
Type of talk: CHITCHAT
Modality of Talk: here-and-now
Focality: focal (?)

Segmentation Criterion for VF2 Section (90):
triggering agent: J’s facial expression

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

P to J (90): don’t get excited!

(2) BASIC UNITS:

The section is constituted by verbal responses to the triggering agent: J’s facial expression.1 There is one basic unit, VF2 Stretch (90). It is a DOWNTONER.

This is shown in the following Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIGGERING AGENT</th>
<th>VERBAL RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J’s facial expression</td>
<td>DOWNTONER (univox)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (90): don’t get excited!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent’s Account
- fn1
verbal response to visual input
you should see the look on her face!
command
- fn2
command(90)
VF1 SECTION (97-118)

(1) RECAPITULATION
a) Analytic Specification of Section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of talk:</strong> CHITCHAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modality of Talk:</strong> displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focality:</strong> focal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Segmentation Criterion for VF1 Section (97-118):**
- **main topic:** W’s interest in J’s siblings
- **sub-topic:** J’s sister

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

W to J (97): I think I met her once

    noise

W to J (98): did she get that job?
J to W (99): she’s waiting
W to J (100): still waiting?
P to J (101): what’s she waiting on?
W to J (102): isn’t she supposed to know?
J to W (103): they called and told her/the receptionist told her that they still hadn’t made up their mind
J to P (104): she’s a/ she applied to Birmingham, Cook and something else a ... firm
P to J (105): oh so she’s had training in /
J to P (106.a): the Statler /the Statler
J to P (106.b): what they’re looking for is a computer operator to handle all the bookkeeping, all the accounts everything concerned
P to J (107): yeah
J to P (108): this is right up her alley
W to P (109): she used to walk to school everyday ...it’s how she got her degree

    noise

P to J (110): how old is Peggy?
J to P (111): 28
W to P (112): and she has a son
J to all (113): it’s tough
P to J (114): your mother raised some tough daughters huh?
J to P (115): she doesn’t appear to be tough
P to J (116.a): no I don’t mean tough-tough
    (116.b): I mean ...
J to P (117): in fact in some respects she comes across kinda flakey
    if you just initially meet her, you-know?
    she just kinda flies ... you-know
    she’s ...
P to J (118): but her real stuff is tough
Respondent's account:

-in1

inquiry and explanation about Julie’s sister
Win asks about Julie’s sister
we both know how she feels about her
we’re giving Julie an opportunity to express her feelings.
Julie won’t ask a lot of questions about anyone’s life.
She’ll ask how you are, but seldom does she initiate anything
Never asks for feedback like me and Win.
This is how we let her know we care for her, by asking questions
I know her loyalty and her love for her sister ...
Julie’s talking about what her sister’s gone through
which was sort-a interesting to me
because in all the time I’ve known Julie she’s mentioned her sister
but she is describing an admiration
even though she describes her sister as being such a flake
but she’s proud of her
for the toughness she’s displayed
which she also mentions the toughness about her mother
and if anybody knows Julie
there’s a quiet toughness about her
so this is the first time I actually heard her describe her sister
and also express her admiration for her (97-108)

(2) BASIC UNITS:

There are three basic units as follows:

1. VF1 SubStretch (97-108) is a QUERY specified by the semantic schema: Win inquires about Julie’s sister’s job;
2. VF 1 SubStretch (109-113) is a PRAISING specified by the semantic schema: Win indirectly praises Julie’s sister for her toughness;
3. VF1 SubStretch (114-118) is also a PRAISING specified by the semantic schema: Prue indirectly praises Julie’s sister for her toughness.
(3.1) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF QUERY (97-108)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF QUERY:
There is a nucleus and one primary satellite.
The nucleus has only a core, a dialogue initiated by W and addressed to J, with two exchanges.

The primary satellite is an incidental query. It has a nucleus and one satellite.
The nucleus has a core and an exit attempt.
The latter is a monad.
The core is a dialogue initiated by P and addressed to J, with one exchange.
The satellite is also an incidental query. It has an entry and a core.
The entry is a univox.
The core is a dialogue initiated by P responding to J, with one exchange.
**NUCLEUS**

| M1: W to J (97-98) |
| Ex1 |
| M2: J to W (99) |

**SATELLITES**

| INCIDENTAL QUERY |
| Entry: (105): oh so² |
| M1: P to J (101) |

| M1: P to J (101) |
| (102) |

| M2: J to W |
| (103) |

| M2: J to P |
| (104) |

| INCIDENTAL QUERY |
| Entry: (105): oh so² |
| M1: P to J (105) |

**EXTRACTION ATTEMPT**:

| P (107): yeah³ |
| (108) |

**Respondent's account:**

- fn1
  dangler
- fn2
  'oh' marks speaker involvement
- fn3
  affirmation
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORES:

Ex1: initial use of schema
M1: W’s request for information to J
  . 1: preparation:
    (97): I-think I met her once
  . 2: request proper:
    (98): did she get that job?

M2: J’s response
  . 1: response proper: negation (implied)
  . 2: elaboration (justification):
    (99): she’s waiting [implied: for the answer]

Ex2: follow-up use of schema
M1: W’s request for explanation of response to J:
  . 1: initial formulation:
    (100): still waiting?1

  INCIDENTAL QUERY
  M1: P’s request-for-information2
    (101): what’s she waiting on?

  . 2: reformulation:
    (102): isn’t she supposed to know?

M2: J’s response (justification of implied negation): 3
    (103): [they called and told her]
    the receptionist told her that they still hadn’t made up their mind

  M2: J’s response (in format of a list):
    . 1: name of firm: 4
      (104): [she’s /a]
      she applied to Birmingham, Cook and something else
      a...firm

  INCIDENTAL QUERY
  M1: P’s request for confirmation: 5
    (105) she’s had training in /
  M2: J’s response:
    (106a): the Statler/the Statler5′
2: job description: what they are looking for is a computer operator to handle all the bookkeeping, all the accounts, everything concerned.

3: sister’s qualifications for the job: this is right up her alley.

Respondent's account:

- fn1 lead on rhetorical question (= how come she is still waiting for the answer?) (100)
- fn2 jumping on the pile inquiry (= what kind of a job did she apply for?) (101)
- fn3 answer (103)
- fn4 danger (104)
P does not understand what this is all about
- fn5 request to join in question
- fn5’ the firm is located in the Statler
- fn6 descriptive statement (106b)
- fn7 comment (108)
(3.2) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF PRAISING (109-113)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF PRAISING:
The PRAISING has a nucleus and one primary satellite.
The nucleus has only a core, a univox by W addressed to P, in the praising mode.
The satellite is an incidental query. It has only a core, a dialogue initiated by P and addressed to J, with one exchange.

**Analyst's notes:**

1. W openly addresses P and indirectly J.
2. It is not clear whether J addresses both W and P, or only W
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORES:

M1: W’s indirect offer of praise to J (in the format of a list of reasons for her to be praised) addressed to P:

. 1: first reason: 2
   (109): she used to walk to school everyday... it’s how she got her degree

INCIDENTAL QUERY
M1: P’s request for information:
   (110): how old is Peggy? 3
M2: J’s response proper:
   (111): twenty eight

. 2: second reason: 4
   (112): and she had a son

M2: J’s acceptance 5
   (113): it’s tough

Respondent’s account:

-fn1
Win’s indirect way of telling Julie how she perceives her perception of the inquiry (= how we see her sister) indirect way of telling Julie how she perceives her Julie is stoic and can’t be told directly ‘cause she’ll deny it (109-118)
-fn2
report (109)
-fn3
my reference to Julie’s sister’s age probably was to compare her to my daughter Kris a point of the connectedness
-fn4
report continues (112)
-fn5
comment
link to Prue (=Prue picks that up in her next statement)
(3.3) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF PRAISING (114-118)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF PRAISING:
The PRAISING has only a nucleus, a dialogue initiated by P and addressed to J, with one three member exchange.

**NUCLEUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M1: P to J (114-116a/b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: J to P (115-117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3: P. to J (118)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORE:

M1: P’s offer of praise
. 1: initial formulation: ¹
(114): your mother raised some tough daughter, huh?
. 2: reformulation (self correction):
• rejection of initial formulation:
  (116a): no
• correction (unfinished):
  (116a): I-don’t-mean ‘tough-tough’
  (116b): [I-mean ]

M2: J’s response
1: response proper (rejection of P’s offer of praise): ²
(115): she doesn’t appear to be tough
2: elaboration (counterclaim)³
  (117): in fact, in some respects she comes across kinda flakey if you just initially meet her y-k
  she just kinda flies y-k
  [she’s/]

M3: P’ s response to response (countering J’s rejection): ⁴
(118): but her real stuff is tough

Respondent’s account:

-fn1
comment
Prue’s acknowledgement of Julie (114)

-fn2
self defense (115)

-fn3
opinion
description of sister (117)

-fn4
statement
explanation of first perception (118)
III: INTERACTION CLIMATE

INTERACTIVE MODE ONLY:

The respondent never describes the activities taking place in the course of the evening for their own sake. Whenever she refers to them, it is always in connection with how they relate to the women’s purpose in meeting, namely, finding and giving support to each other. The student researcher reports that “through the course of taping the commentary, I was struck, and at times frustrated, by my respondent’s tendency to focus almost exclusively on how the women felt towards each other.” When asked why she gave so much information about how she felt and so little about what they did, the respondent said: it’s just the way I think about it.

The respondent gives an account that is entirely self-centered. She attributes to Win the same goals as she has herself but does not attempt to follow that up. As a consequence the picture we get is restricted to what is going on for her.

1: THE SUPPORT STRATEGIES

The respondent views the interaction between herself, Julie and Win as a means for them to convey support for each other. For the women friends the major purpose of getting together at the bar after work is to support each other. The respondent makes this clear in her recollection. The meetings are a source of companionship, camaraderie. The women give each other advice, pat each other on the back. For them it is a way of experiencing and sharing [their] feelings ... [they]’re all sort-a bouncing off one another in [their] interpretation of [their] women’s lives.

The goal of supporting each other is achieved through three support strategies. Two of the strategies aim at fostering companionship by either sharing information or making-Julie-feel-good. The third strategy aims at learning from each other’s experience.

The student researcher describes the participants as “gleaning from each other’s experience advice on present and future choices”. Prue feels that Julie can help with her present confusion: if we’re going to talk, we’re going to use it to our benefit. The student researcher sees Prue’s behavior as a “tendency to co-op other people’s experience as her own”.

The three support strategies make use of different rhetorical resources:
-one type of talk (chitchatting), in two modes, teasing and praising;
-two rhetorical devices, asking questions (making-Julie-talk-by-asking-her-questions and steering-questions) and comparison.

The relation between support strategies and rhetorical resources is as follows:
-In the sharing-information strategy, the participants use one type of talk, chitchatting. This is especially the case with Win and Julie. In spite of Prue’s attempt to move from chitchat to some heavier conversation, J and W just ignore me. They are going to go chitchatting (see line 18).

-In the making-Julie-feel-good strategy, Prue and Win make use of chitchatting in two modes, teasing-J, indirectly-praising-Julie, and one rhetorical device, making-Julie-talk-by-asking-her-questions.
Prue and Win tease Julie because Julie likes it. This is apparently something that happens quite often between them. It happens in the specimen when the waitress comes to clean up the table (see lines 74-81). It had happened before: our teasing relates to earlier comments in the evening. Prue and Win also join forces to indirectly-praise-Julie. Instead of telling her directly how they perceive her, they praise her sister for being tough (see lines 109-118). Prue explains the need for doing so: Julie is stoic and can’t be told directly ‘cause she’ll deny it. Throughout the specimen, Prue, but mostly Win, make Julie talk by asking her questions. Prue explains why they do it: we’re giving Julie an opportunity to express her feelings. Julie won’t ask a lot of questions about anyone’s life. She’ll ask how you are, but seldom does she initiate anything. Never asks for feedback like me and Win. This is how we let her know we care for her, by asking questions.

-In the learning-from-each-other’s experience strategy two rhetorical devices are used: steering questions and comparison. A steering-question is an attempt by either Prue or Win to steer the conversation in the direction most beneficial to her. For Prue it is to make Julie talk about her parents’ divorce. For Win it is to make Julie talk about her siblings: she doesn’t have many relationships and siblings are important to her, she is trying to get feedback, something we can all relate to. Note, however, that once Win has secured the topic of her choice, she uses it for the making-Julie-feel-good strategy, rather than for the learning-from-each-other’s experience strategy. This is in keeping with Prue's perception of her as trying to help.

In the specimen, steering-questions are sometimes unsuccessful and sometimes successful. When unsuccessful, they have no effect on the interaction taking place between the other participants (see line 18). When successful, the topic changes. Thus when Prue repeats her steering question for the second time, Julie understood and was willing to jump on it (see line 33b).

The other rhetorical device for learning-from-each-other’s-experience, comparison, is used only by Prue. It is the means by which she affirms, questions or decides on her own actions, past, present and future. Here is how Prue explains how she makes comparisons:

For Prue some topics trigger comparisons between what the speaker says and herself. Anything talked about is a potential “trigger topic”. There are two kinds of topics: “routine topics” and “natural topics”. “Routines topics” are always brought up by one or another of the women, such as mother, father, brother, sister. “Natural topics” pop up unexpectedly, such as food. Comparisons are based on common “roots”. A “root” is something within a topic that serves as a “tool” for a comparison. “Roots” are either familial or interpersonal. An example of a familial root is Julie talking about her mother’s weight. It serves as a basis for Prue’s comparison with her own mother’s weight (see line 5b). An example of an interpersonal root is Julie talking about how she experienced her parents’ divorce when she was a child. It serves as a basis for
Prue’s comparison with how her daughter Sherri is currently experiencing her own divorce (see lines 33a-49).

2: PARTICIPANT ALIGNMENTS

The participants orient to each other along a closeness vs distance opposition.

Prue emphasizes the closeness between the three women: They are soul sisters, the Golden Girls of Hamburg.

The bar where they meet is a rural Cheers family.

Their regular meetings after work are a source of companionship, comradeship, a way of getting a more personal touch (than at work).

The distance between them is only suggested by Prue:
Julie and Win were friends before I knew either of them
It seems I was the intruder with the ‘tape recorder’
Her feelings toward Win are ambivalent: she was not so much a friend as a co-worker
Prue likes Win—or at least she tries to--:
I did (do) like Win. I was impressed with the hardworking farm background she came from. An afternoon at Crystal Beach was “vacation” to her because they could not leave the cows for very long.
but she feels Win is awkward: Julie and I had a sense of place in a bar that Win did not
and she feels sorry for her: she was a big girl, lacking in self esteem and very giving
but she gets on her nerves: there were times back then when I wanted to shake her

Because of her reluctance to volunteer information about her feelings towards Win, Prue had to be interviewed on that subject again. When asked whether she felt that Win was interrupting her in section 4 (as Julie talks about her experience as a child of divorced parents) and if so, how she felt about it, Prue commented:
Julie had also gone thru a divorce
I think I may have wanted to get a little deeper into the subject and what she thought
and Win’s comments did not let that happen
I probably was somewhat annoyed

Although her annoyance comes through very clearly in her commentary about Win’s steering questions in section 4 (Win stabs at what I am doing), she refuses to characterize Win’s behavior as “competing” or “interrupting”. Here is how she explains why:
I think I do not use the terms competing or interrupting when I describe Win’s statements because she is unassuming and not at all an aggressive person.

those terms would not fit anything I would ascribe to her interactions.
I actually thought she was trying to help the conversation.
if it had been someone else I might have described their efforts as being a pain in the ass.

fn1
The position adopted here is that the notion of interruption is a subjective one.

A ten year old boy, when asked to explain how he conceived of interruption, said:
“you interrupt the teacher, you don’t interrupt a friend”

Note also that Prue’s comments are in keeping with American women’s reluctance to admit that they are competing with one another.
3: Interaction Tone
Prue makes a distinction between the mood of the evening which can be light of serious/heavy, and the quality of the talk which varies from less substantial/less intimate to more substantial/deeper, more personal.

-In the entire event, the mood and the quality of the talk vary with the environment, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in dining area</th>
<th>at the bar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>light</td>
<td>serious/heavy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less substantial</td>
<td>more substantial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To the two environments there correspond two levels of depth in the interaction between the participants:
a lighter, more shallow, less intimate level in the dining area;
a heavier, deeper, more personal level in the bar, obviously due to the alcohol they imbibe.

-In the specimen the mood is consistently light:
no great emotional thing
no loaded conversation
it was not a serious type conversation nor was it a chitchat
the purpose was just social
This is because of the presence of the tape recorder but also because it is still early in the evening:
had Julie and I been at the bar drinking
and under more intimate situation than having a tape-recorder there
I think we would have gotten a-heck-of-a-lot deeper into this
and that’s when we start getting into heavy conversations

-The quality of the talk varies from section to section.
It is less substantial in section 1, which Prue characterizes as: getting on the playing field,
 i.e., preparing for the real thing,
and in section 8, the waitress interlude.
It is more substantial in sections 2-7 and 9-13, which Prue characterizes as: on the playing field,
i.e., enacting the real thing.

The relation between the quality of the talk and the 6 rhetorical resources used in the support strategies is as follows:
less substantial
- chitchat
- teasing-J

more substantial
- comparison
- asking-a-steering-question
- making-Julie-talk-by-asking-her-questions
- praising-Julie
DATA FROM RESPONDENT’S ACCOUNT PERTAINING TO INTERACTION CLIMATE

VF1 SECTION (1-10c)

INTERACTIVE MODE

(1) THE SUPPORT STRATEGIES:
W: sharing-information strategy (chitchat)
P: learning-from-each-other’s experience strategy (comparison)
Prue’s comparison is embedded in chitchat in a sequence of 4 steps, as follows:
In the first step Win chitchats with Julie. The topic is Julie’s mother’s weight. Prue makes use of this information to initiate a comparison between Julie’s mother and her own mother.
In the second step Prue establishes the validity of the comparison by ascertaining that Julie’s mother’s age is about the same as her own mother’s. These two steps can be said to constitute the preparation for the comparison.
In the third step Prue phrases a comparison which is derailed by Win’s misunderstanding.
In the fourth step Prue abandons her comparison to join Win and Julie in the chitchat.

(2) PARTICIPANT ALIGNMENT:
closeness: social banter with the purpose of sharing information

(3) INTERACTION TONE:
less substantial (chitchat)
slightly more substantial (comparison)
### VF1 SECTION (11-32)

**INTERACTIVE MODE**

1. **THE SUPPORT STRATEGIES:**
   - **W:** sharing-information strategy (chitchat)
   - **P:** learning-from-each-other’s-experience strategy:
     - (steering question)
     - (incipient comparison)

   At first Win again chitches with Julie. The topic is Julie’s father. Prue does not participate. She interrupts with an unsuccessful attempt at steering the conversation toward her topic of predilection, divorce. Then Prue’s comparison is submerged under the chitchat, as follows: Prue chitches with Julie on the topic of Julie’s father’s difficulties due to his smoking. Smoking brings up an implicit comparison between Julie and Julie’s father, Julie and Prue, Julie and Prue’s sister Gwen. This is almost a replica of the situation in *subpart I.1*, except that here the comparison is implicit rather than expressed in the actual talk. It is made explicit by Prue only in her commentary.

2. **PARTICIPANT ALIGNMENTS:**
   - closeness: bonding through ritual lamenting (26b-32)

3. **INTERACTION TONE:**
   - less substantial (chitchat, lines 11-21 and 26b-32)
   - more substantial (steering question, line 18, and comparison lines 22-26)
VF1 SECTION (33a-51)

INTERACTIVE MODE
(1) THE SUPPORT STRATEGIE:

P: learning-from-each-other’s-experience strategy: steering question (33a+b) comparison
  P gets involved in a comparison because she feels that Julie’s experience as a child of divorced parents can help her understand better her daughter’s reactions to her own divorce (50a-51)

W: making-Julie-feel-good strategy (asking questions, lines 48, 49)
  Win, while retaining the topic of divorce, makes Julie talk by asking her questions in order to get in.

(2) PARTICIPANT ALIGNMENT:
  closeness: J is helping P out
    J understood and was willing to jump in on it

(3) INTERACTION TONE:
  more substantial (steering; comparison; making-Julie-talk by asking questions)

VF1 SECTION (52-58b)

INTERACTIVE MODE
(1) THE SUPPORT STRATEGIE:
  P is using the learning-from-each-other’s-experience strategy: comparison (57-58)
  W is using the making-Julie-feel-good strategy: asking questions (2-56)
  The situation is similar to that in section1: Win makes Julie talk by asking her questions, and Prue co-opts what is being said for a comparison.

(2) INTERACTION TONE:
  more substantial
VF1 SECTION (59A-73)

INTERACTIVE MODE

(1) THE SUPPORT STRATEGIES:
W: making-Julie-feel-good: W makes J talk by asking her questions
W and P: learning-from-each-others’-experience: steering question and comparison
   -W tries unsuccessfully twice to steer the conversation away from divorce toward the topic of her predilection, siblings. She will be successful in sections 9-13.
   -P finally joins in and make a comparison between how J felt as a child of divorced parents and how her own children feel.

(2) PARTICIPANT ALIGNMENT:
Distance between P and W: W’s persistence
   Win stabs at what I’m doing

(3) INTERACTION TONE:
more substantial

VF3 SECTION (74-81)

INTERACTIVE MODE

(1) The support strategies:
P and W: making-Julie-feel-good (teasing)
   A common trigger for teasing Julie is how much she eats. Prue comments on Julie’s eating habits as follows:
   Julie’s a very thin person
   goes 5 foot nothin
   um very petite
   and to watch her eat is sort-of phenomenal
   Note that in American culture, teasing is a way of showing that you like somebody.

(2) PARTICIPANT ALIGNMENT:
closeness: teasing Julie

(3) INTERACTION TONE:
less substantial
VF1 SECTION (87-89)+(91-96)

INTERACTIVE MODE

(1) THE SUPPORT STRATEGIES:
W and P: making-Julie-feel-good strategy: making-Julie-talk by asking questions
W, with P in tow, makes J talk about her brother.
It seems that instead of using the topic of siblings for herself (as Prue would ) Win
tries to help Julie.

(2) PARTICIPANT ALIGNMENTS:
Distance between P and W: W’s persistence
Closeness between P+W and J: support for J

(3) INTERACTION TONE:
more substantial

VF1 SECTION (97-118)

INTERACTIVE MODE

(1) THE SUPPORT STRATEGIES:
-making Julie feel good strategy by making Julie talk:
Win and Prue make Julie talk by asking her questions.
W, with P attempting and finally managing to get in, makes Julie talk about her sister.
-making Julie feel good by indirectly praising J:
Win and Prue indirectly praise Julie.
-learning from others’ experience through comparison:
In line 110 P expresses concern about Peggy's age, because she's thinking of her own
daughter, Kris. Prue explains her question to Julie, as follows:
my reference to Julie's sister's age was to compare her to my daughter, Kris.
a point in the connectedness.

(2) PARTICIPANT ALIGNMENT:
closeness between P+W and J:
we’re giving J an opportunity to express her feelings
this is how we let her know we care for her by asking questions

closeness between W and J: W’s indirect way of telling J how she perceives her

(3) INTERACTION TONE:
more substantial
P: learning from others’ experience (comparison).