



<http://www.diva-portal.org>

Postprint

This is the accepted version of a chapter published in *The Appropriation of Media in Everyday Life: What People Do with Media*.

Citation for the original published chapter:

Beers Fägersten, K. (2012)

Intertextual quotation: References to media in family interaction.

In: Ayass, Ruth; Gerhardt, Cornelia (ed.), *The Appropriation of Media in Everyday Life: What People Do with Media* (pp. 79-104). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company

Pragmatics & beyond new series

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published chapter.

Link to the published version: <http://benjamins.com/#catalog/books/pbns.224/main> The publisher should be contacted for permission to re-use or reprint the material in any form.

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:sh:diva-19859>

Beers Fägersten, K. 2012. Intertextual quotation: References to media in family interaction. In R. Ayass and C. Gerhardt (Eds.), *The Appropriation of Media in Everyday Life. What People Do with Media*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam.

NB: This version may be slightly different from the final published copy and should not be quoted.

Chapter 3

Intertextual quotation: References to media in family interaction

Kristy Beers Fägersten
Södertörn University College, Sweden

Abstract

In this paper, I analyze conversations among family members whose appropriation of media texts represents conversational strategies whereby common ground is exploited for different purposes. In particular, intertextual quotation is shown to 1) allow participants to take evaluative stances towards ongoing conversation, 2) reflect interactive alignment and 3) serve as pragmatic moves to rekey or reframe interaction as strategies for conflict resolution.

The data come from recorded conversations among members of a four-person, Swedish-American family. Within the case-study family, the intertextual quotation of media texts is primarily established by the parents as a playful act, ratified by repetition and laughter. The association of intertextual quotation and playfulness is subsequently exploited both by parents and children to reframe and rekey potentially contentious interactions.

1. Introduction

Interaction with media is a common, everyday practice, which contributes to its distinct social significance. All forms of mass media have the potential to reach a wide audience, thus increasing the chances that a vast amount of people will share common experiences of media reception.

Individual experiences with the media such as reading a newspaper article or viewing a film can be established or confirmed as common experiences via talk, initiated, for example, by an explicit mention of the experience: “Did you read/hear/see X?” or by a non-explicit remark of reference, which, if recognized by other interlocutors as such, will establish common past activity.

Alternatively, people can experience media together, for example by watching a film or television program as a group, by participating in a multi-player video game, or by otherwise engaging in simultaneous media intake. This shared reception of media renders the explicit mention of it in talk unnecessary; commonality does not need to be established in this way, since it is evident by virtue of the shared act. Instead, talk can be in parallel with and integrated into the act of a shared media experience; Ayass, Gerhardt, and Schürmann all illustrate in this volume how talk is woven into the media text itself. Such shared receptions of media as well as the talk-in-interaction which often accompanies it establish common ground among the participants. This common ground can be exploited in subsequent interactions, resulting in conversational references – explicit or implicit – which trade on the participants’ mutual awareness of their shared media-based activities.

Mutual knowledge of common ground can be considered to vary directly with social distance and intimacy: the closer the social distance between individuals, the more likely they are to engage in activities together and thus not only be mutually aware of these shared experiences, but incorporate them into subsequent talk. Families represent an example of social constellations of individuals who, generally, can be placed on the intimate end of the social distance scale, and who, generally, participate in various activities of shared media intake. Consequently, in a delimited group such as a family, mutual knowledge of shared activities tends to be clear: family members can be expected to be aware of which of their previous activities they have engaged in together, and this knowledge in turn will influence their subsequent talk.

This chapter is concerned with how shared media-based activities within a family, in particular watching television, videos, or movies together, contribute to intertextuality in subsequent talk. Specifically, this chapter represents a case study of how family members appropriate media texts and deploy them as conversational and pragmatic strategies. I begin by introducing and differentiating between the terms *intertextuality*, *intertextual repetition* and *intertextual quotation*. Next, I present the background to this study and a description of the data collecting and analysis methodology. Providing examples of recorded data from single-family, multi-party interaction, I then illustrate three functions of intertextual quotation: 1) to reflect an evaluative stance towards ongoing conversation, 2) to establish interactive alignment and 3) to strategically rekey or reframe interaction for the purpose of conflict resolution. Within the four-member, case-study family, intertextual quotation of media texts is primarily established by the parents as a playful act, ratified by repetition and laughter. The association of intertextual quotation and playfulness is subsequently exploited both by the parents and the children to reframe and rekey potentially contentious interactions. Importantly, although intertextual quotation is a function of shared viewing, it is shown also to occur in conversations in which not all participants are privy to the original media source. In such cases, it is the intertextual quotation itself which is salient, and as such establishes a shared activity among the participants. In this way, common ground is nevertheless ultimately achieved, to be exploited in subsequent interaction.

2. Intertextuality, intertextual repetition, intertextual quotation

Repetition, in particular in the form of repeating someone else’s words, is a well-documented phenomenon in conversation (Johnstone 1994; Norrick 1987; Tannen 1987, 2007). According to Bakhtin (1981:293), “the word in language is half someone else’s. It becomes ‘one’s own’ only when the speaker populates it with his own intention, his own accent, when he appropriates the

word, adapting it to his own semantic and expressive intention.” This claim is perhaps most true in the case of intertextual quotation, which is the proposed term for the practice of appropriating exact bits of media text and integrating them into conversation. Intertextual quotation is therefore an example of repetition, and can be expected to serve similar interactional functions.

The term intertextual quotation is based on Kristeva’s (1980) use of the term ‘intertextuality’, referring to the status of any text as one that naturally is comprised of other texts. Gordon (2009:9) uses the terms ‘intratextual repetition’ and ‘intertextual repetition’ to refer to repetition within and across texts, respectively. As the repetition of words, phrases or syntactic structures within one communicative event, intratextual repetition is easily identified in conversation, particularly when interlocutors repeat each other sequentially. Intertextual repetition, on the other hand, as repetition across communicative events, can only be identified or recognized with knowledge of the prior or source texts. Intertextual repetition necessarily presupposes a shared history among interaction participants. Gordon (2009: 9) thus proposes that intertextual repetition in particular functions “as a means of binding people together.” As a meta-linguistic strategy, it encourages participants to consider their shared history and prior linguistic experiences: “Through repetition, conversations are co-constructed and co-interlocutors experience a sense of coherence and connectedness.” (Gordon 2009: 10)

If social groups are, according to Becker (1994: 165), “bound primarily by a shared repertoire of prior texts,” then identifying prior texts becomes an essential exercise in understanding, analyzing or successfully participating in interaction. As the term suggests, ‘prior texts’ refer to any texts previously (and commonly) encountered by conversation participants, including public texts. Media texts, such as the language of television shows and films, are included in this genre of public texts, and by virtue of their potentially vast audiences, they have an equally vast potential for serving as prior texts. The intertextual repetition of media texts in personal conversation can thus unite the public and private spheres (Tovares 2006).

Essential to the occurrence of intertextual repetition of public prior texts, perhaps more correctly labeled a pre-requisite, is the status of the prior text as common ground among the speaker and hearer. A cornerstone of pragmatic theories of the interpretation or negotiation of meaning, common ground (Karttunen & Peters, 1975; Stalnaker 1978) is also referred to as common knowledge (Lewis 1969) or joint knowledge (McCarthy 1990). Clark (1996: 92) refers to common ground as the “sine qua non for everything we do with others.” An important aspect of common ground is the concept of mutuality, in terms of mutual knowledge and mutual beliefs. It is not only the participants’ common ground of having experienced prior texts which enables intertextual repetition, but also the mutual knowledge and mutual belief among the participants that they have that shared history and thus have common ground.

Intertextual quotation is proposed as a specific form of intertextual repetition. Whereas intertextual repetition involves the repeating of another interlocutor’s words or utterance in a subsequent communicative event, intertextual quotation is the repeating of a media text in a communicative event subsequent to the intake of the media text. Similar to intertextual repetition, intertextual quotation occurs across communicative events. In contrast, however, intertextual quotation is not the repetition of an utterance issued by an active interlocutor, but of an utterance featured in a media text. Intertextual quotation is thus the appropriation (via repetition) of a media text.

Intertextual quotation transforms media texts, as prior, public texts, into source texts through a process of appropriation. This process occurs as a manifest event, which, according to Stalnaker (2002:708), is “an event that, when it occurs, is mutually recognized to have occurred.” The resulting mutual awareness is therefore an effect or product of the manifest event. The common ground emerging from the shared appropriation of the media text as a prior text is the pre-requisite for an utterance to function as a manifest event of intertextual quotation. Intertextual quotation transforms prior texts to source texts; mutual awareness of the media text as a source text confirms such moves as manifest events.

In this section, I have provided a brief introduction to intertextuality and distinguished

between intertextual repetition and intertextual quotation. Intertextual quotation is proposed as being a function of common ground, based on the shared appropriation of media texts as prior texts. It occurs as a manifest event which transforms the prior media texts into source texts, and secures mutual awareness among participants of the source text as common ground. This approach to the appropriation of media texts will allow us to consider examples of intertextual quotation in their conversational contexts from the perspective of the common ground that ultimately enables this phenomenon.

3. Data description and method of analysis

The data presented in this chapter are extracted from audio recordings of conversation among the author's own family, consisting of a mother (the author, American), a father (Swedish), and their two sons, aged three and five at the time of data collection. Data collection took place in the family's home in Stockholm, Sweden, during the period of August 2006-February 2007 through a process of digital recording. A total of thirteen conversations were recorded, ranging in length from 12-23 minutes each. Only conversation sequences relevant to this chapter have been transcribed, nine of which are included in the data analysis. Transcriptions follow the conventions described at the end of the chapter.

Swedish serves as the common language of the family, while English is the language used exclusively among the mother and the children. The mother has near-native fluency in Swedish, while the father has near-native fluency in English. The shared linguistic knowledge among these bilingual family members represents an additional common ground, which enables code-switching between English and Swedish. Furthermore, at the time of data collection, the family had recently moved back to Stockholm after living two years in Germany, and thus German exists as a third language resource available to all family members.

Sarangi (2006) has proposed that a family is a

social institution that [...] is a kind of hinterland that connects the private and public spheres of any society. [...] The importance of family lives in our understanding of social processes is a shared basis for the disciplines in the social and human sciences, although very few studies have examined the dynamics of family interaction microscopically. (p. 403)

Among these few microscopic studies are Watts's (1991) work on interruption and power plays in the family, and Keppler's (1994) work on *Tischgespräche*, the (predominantly) dinnertime conversations which take place within a family, and which highlight the importance of collaborative processing of media in order to make sense out of it or derive social meaning. Each of these studies is ground-breaking within the field of family interaction research, not in the least for having overcome the all too familiar challenge of accessing private domains such as 'family'; more recent studies include Tovares 2006 and Gordon 2003, 2009. Observation, recording, or other data collection procedures within this interpersonal domain risk interfering or influencing the subjects and their normal linguistic behaviors, while accurate analysis often requires knowledge of family routines and conversational history. As in Watts (1991) and Gordon 2003, the present study is based on data collected by the author within her own family domain, and thus these challenges have, to a certain extent, been overcome. Indeed, a clear advantage to this kind of data-driven study is that interpretation and analysis are facilitated by the possession of or access to relevant background knowledge. For this study in particular, a non-member observer would have very little chance of understanding or even identifying examples of intertextual quotation. Upon review of the recorded material, however, intertextual quotations emerged as a significant characteristic of this particular family's interaction patterns.

The methodology for data analysis is conversation analytic, in recognition of the facts that the data 1) have been recorded in real life situations of action, 2) reflect ordinary conversations

between family members, and 3) can reveal “how participants orient themselves in ways relevant to the activities they are engaged in and how situated analysis of an emerging course of action shapes the further development of that action.” (Goodwin 1990: 292) In this chapter, the application of conversation analysis is informed in part by Garfinkel's (1967) observation that participants make use of both mutual understandings and shared knowledge, referred to here as ‘common ground,’ to make sense of communication and to reevaluate contexts. The analysis includes an investigation of intertextual quotation as contextualization cues (Gumperz 1982). Understanding the pragmatic meaning of intertextual quotation is a function of common ground: “Unlike words that can be discussed out of context, the meanings of contextualization cues are implicit. They are not usually talked about out of context. Their signaling value depends on the participants’ awareness of their meaningfulness.” (p. 140). In the following analysis, I investigate the meaningfulness of intertextual quotation in family interaction.

4. Intertextual quotation as evaluative stance

In this section, I present examples of intertextual quotation in multi-party conversations within the family. I begin by providing one example of a source text followed by several extracts of different conversations illustrating how part of the source text is recurrently appropriated by members of the family during interaction.

The first series of examples is based on dialog from the 1998 film *Buffalo '66*. The data examples below feature intertextual quotation from the source text of a scene where the main character, Billy, has been sentenced to jail for a year. To avoid revealing this fact to his parents and also to prevent them from finding out, he has prepared letters for them, to be sent from outside the prison. In the dialogue below, Billy is instructing his friend Goon, a somewhat dimwitted character, to mail the letters according to a monthly schedule:

This one is going to go in June. See how I've been doing it? I write on every envelope. You don't have to think, Goon. This goes in June. Any day in June. Any day in June. All you have to look at...is the thing, like all the other ones. You look at the month. Goon, Goon, pay attention. We're almost done. We're almost done. This one says June. They all have a month marked. This one goes June. June comes before July, and after May. So, anytime you hear that it's June, just put this in the mailbox, alright? Can I trust you on these? Are we done with these? Got it? They all got their own month. Any day of the month, you could send it. You know the month, because it's written on the back. This one goes at Christmastime. Please, please don't pick your nose in front of me.

Noticeable in this text is Billy's repetition of ‘June,’ particularly within utterances of similar syntactic structure: ‘This one is going to go in June’, ‘This goes in June’, and ‘This one goes June’. The salience of ‘June’ is further established by virtue of it rhyming with ‘Goon,’ the addressee of Billy's instructive lecture. Within this short series of utterances, Billy utters ‘June’ and ‘Goon’ a total of eight and three times, respectively. As the viewer/hearer, it is difficult to miss the overtly deliberate repetition, the effect of which is an impression of Goon's diminished intellect or at least Billy's obvious judgment of Goon's questionable intellectual capacity.

Although this film was only viewed by the parents and thus constitutes mutual knowledge and common ground for this dyad only, the text is appropriated in conversation among all family members. The following examples illustrate how the father in particular repeatedly appropriates the sentence ‘This goes in June.’ In each of the examples presented below, the author is represented by her actual name, ‘Kristy’, while the remaining family members have been renamed as ‘Eric’ (the husband/father), ‘Luke’ (son, age 5) and ‘Alec’ (son, age 3). Intertextual quotations are underlined; English translations of turns in Swedish appear in italics.

In the first example, the repetition is conversational, brought on by an explicit question-eliciting repetition. In this example, all family members are in the kitchen, eating dinner at the table. Eric has initiated a conversation about planning a skiing vacation for the winter break, and Luke is

asking where the family will go.

- (1) 1 Luke Var ska vi åka skidor, Pappa?
Where are we going skiing, Pappa?
2 Eric På ett ställe som heter Säfsen.
A place called Säfsen.
3 Luke Var ska vi åka skidor, pappa?
4 Eric {*louder*} På ett ställe som heter SÄFSEN!
5 {*softer*} This goes in June.
6 Kristy {*laughs*}

In line 1, Luke asks Eric, “Where are we going to go skiing, Pappa?” The use of Swedish and the direct address of ‘Pappa’ make it clear to whom the question is addressed, i.e. to Eric. Eric then answers in line 2, “A place called Säfsen.” Luke’s next turn, in line 3, does not include any indication that he is aware of Eric’s answer. It is thus unclear whether Luke did not hear the answer, or has another reason for posing the question again, but he does precisely that, using the exact same wording. Speaking more loudly, Eric answers the question again, also using the exact same wording of his previous response. The conversation thus adopts a conspicuously repetitive pattern, to which Eric draws attention with his intertextual quotation ‘This goes in June.’ This reference suggests by analogy that such repetition is necessary in interaction with someone of diminished intellectual capacity; in other words, Eric seems to be suggesting that Luke is playing the part of Goon. The intertextual quotation is offered in lieu of an overtly negative comment regarding Luke’s attentiveness or comprehension skills. The reference is intended for Kristy, with whom Eric shares the common ground of this film, and who acknowledges and ratifies the intertextual quotation via her laughter response. It is important to note, however, that both Luke and Alec, as part of the participation framework, can hear Eric’s utterance and witness Kristy’s reaction.

In the next example, it is a thematic repetition as opposed to a conversational one which triggers another use by Eric of this particular intertextual quotation. All family members are in the kitchen, preparing to eat dinner. Luke has suggested they first recite together a pre-meal poem which he and Alec learned in Germany. At the time of data collection, the reciting of the poem was in the process of being established as a dinnertime ritual, and thus all family members were familiar with the text.

- (2) 1 Luke Vänta!
Wait!
2 We have to say,
3 Wir wünschen uns—
We wish each other—
4 Kristy Okay,
{*all hold hands*}
5 All Wir wünschen uns
We wish each other
6 einen guten Appetit.
bon appetit.
7 Frau Mitt,
Mrs. Mitt
8 Pommes Frites,
French fries
9 in der Badewanne Schmitt.
in the Schmitt bathtub.
{*all release hands*}
10 Luke (.)What’s Schmitt?

11	Kristy, Eric	{ <i>laugh</i> }
12	Kristy	{ <i>laughing</i> } It's a NAME.
13		Haven't we talked about this before?
14	Eric	<u>This goes in June.</u>
15	Kristy	{ <i>to Eric</i> } Seriously.
16	Luke	Why did you say,
17		"this goes in June?"
18	Eric	Jag säger det när du repeterar saker. <i>I say it when you repeat things.</i>

In this example, Luke initiates a familiar theme in line 10, namely, what 'Schmitt' refers to in the poem. The question prompts laughter from Kristy and Eric, and this response is explained in lines 12-13, when Kristy emphasizes the answer ("It's a NAME.") and then points out the fact that this has been discussed before: "Haven't we talked about this before?" Eric responds by quoting, "This goes in June," which is acknowledged and ratified by Kristy's uptake ("Seriously."). Similar to the previous example, Eric's use of the quote encourages a comparison between this interaction and the one between Billy and Goon, where abundant repetition was used as a strategy for dealing with a dimwitted interlocutor. In effect, Eric is again commenting on the aspect of dimwittedness which characterizes Luke by virtue of his need to revisit this familiar topic. Eric's intertextual quotation implies that the interaction is absurd, but, as in the previous example, it is directed at Kristy, with whom he has common ground with regards to the film. Nevertheless, as in example 1, both Luke and Alec are part of the participation framework and thus are legitimate receivers of all turns within the interaction. This is illustrated when Luke notices Eric's quotation and asks about it in lines 16-17, speaking to Eric in English. Eric nevertheless understands that the question was addressed to him, and responds, in Swedish, "I say it when you repeat things." The use of English by Luke when talking to Eric is probably brought on by the persistence of English in lines 10-15, during which Eric uses English in quoting, and Kristy likewise uses English to respond to Eric in line 15, "Seriously."

Swedish is the normal language of communication for this dyad, and for communication between Luke and Eric as well, but it would seem that the use of English by Eric to quote has instigated the persistent sequence of English-language communication, which is not resolved until line 18, when Eric returns to Swedish. This sequence thus represents an intersentential code-switch. Code-switching is enabled by bi- or multilingualism; it is most commonly practiced, however, when two or more participants have the same repertoire of linguistic codes (Milroy and Muysken 1995). In the case study family, each of the participants has access to at least two codes, Swedish and English. In practice, however, participant constellations determine which code will be the dominant one. Swedish is used between Eric and Kristy as well as between Eric and the children. English is used between Kristy and the children¹. This participant-determined method of selecting a dominant code is well-established in this family and quite rigidly adhered to. Code-switching, in particular intersentential code-switching, is a marked behavior. Eric's intertextual quotation of English-language source texts is manifested as intersentential code-switching, but it can also be considered as crossing. The term crossing is used to refer to the socio-political phenomenon of appropriating the linguistic identity of another. It refers to "code alternation by people who are not accepted members of the group associated with the second language they employ." (Rampton 1995: 280) In his study on linguistic crossing among minority ethnic groups, Rampton is careful to point out that the code-switching discourse of bilingual families, while patterned on a one code-one group system, can reveal little about how language choice in the greater domain of society can display "social evaluations [of] strategic interactional code selection." (p. 283) Nevertheless, I would argue that parallels can be drawn between crossing and a family member's use of a code that is not ratified by

1 As it is the parents who represent and determine different language usage, both Swedish and English are used alternately in communication between the children.

convention. In example 2, Eric thus 'crosses' into the conversation between Kristy and the children via intertextual quotation, resulting in a code-switch to English which is maintained by both Kristy (line 15) and Luke (lines 16-17). Code-switching as crossing can therefore serve as a contextualization cue (Gumperz 1982), allowing participants to show orientation and interactive alignment. I return to this concept in section 5.

The next example illustrates how the practice of intertextual quotation is subsequently appropriated by Luke, despite a lack of familiarity with the film from which the quotation comes, and thus despite a lack of common ground with regards to the source text. In this sequence, all family members are in the kitchen, eating dinner at the table. The conversation leading up to this sequence has been about dinosaurs, and Luke is reciting the names of some he knows.

- | | | | |
|-----|----|--------------|---------------------------------|
| (3) | 1 | Luke | I'm good at saying alamosaurus. |
| | 2 | | I just say it really fast= |
| | 3 | | =Alamosaurus. |
| | 4 | | Alamosaurus. |
| | 5 | Eric | Alamosaurus= |
| | 6 | Alec | =Alamosaurus. |
| | 7 | Kristy | Alamosaurus. |
| | 8 | Luke | Alamosaurus. |
| | 9 | Eric | <u>This goes in June.</u> |
| | 10 | Luke | <u>This goes in June.</u> |
| | 11 | Kristy, Eric | { <i>laugh</i> } |
| | 12 | Luke | {smiles} |

In example 3, it is again Eric who indirectly comments on the repetition which characterizes this sequence, suggesting it reflects an aspect of inanity. Indeed, the overt and systematic repetition –all conversation participants take distinct, orderly turns repeating ‘alamosaurus’ at least once– introduces silliness into the interaction, thus resulting in a play frame (Goffman 1974). While Luke does not independently use the quote, his repetition of Eric’s ‘This goes in June’ suggests that he has understood the connection of its use with interaction sequences containing repetition; this conversation was, in fact, recorded at a later date than the conversation featured in example 2. Luke’s specific repetition in this interaction also suggests that he has recognized the play frame and thus contributes to continuing the ‘game’ of repeating. Ultimately, the repetition reflects a rejection of Eric’s attempt to conclude the original repetition sequence. Kristy’s laughter in line 13 ratifies Luke’s conversational turn and, by extension, his own appropriation of what by now has been established as Eric’s conventional response to lexical or thematic repetition. Originally an appropriation of a media text, this intertextual quotation has itself been appropriated, such that it has evolved into common ground within the family.

Since the source of the media text, a film, was viewed by only two of the four family members, the appropriation of the text as intertextual quotation can only be recognized by these two interlocutors. Their common ground can thus be exploited in interaction together, but as the examples illustrate, the occurrence of intertextual quotation in *multiparty* interaction also allows for parallel communication among this subset of interlocutors. Eric’s intertextual quotation is, in effect, a meta-message, as he consistently uses the same utterance to covertly express a negative evaluation of overly repetitive conversational or thematic sequences. Intertextual quotation is thus employed as a strategy for assuming an evaluative stance or as perspectivation (Graumann 1989).

Perspectivation refers to the acts of perspective setting, i.e., revealing one’s perspective in a consistent manner so as to enable others to recognize it, and perspective taking, i.e., acknowledging an other’s perspective by relating to it. Eric's intertextual quotation is a form of perspective setting, whereby he makes his perspective known as an evaluative stance towards the development of the interaction. Both Kristy and Luke acknowledge Eric's perspective setting, engaging in perspective taking via laughter (Kristy) or repetition (Luke). Both types of perspective taking ratify Eric's

perspective setting. However, due to the parameters of common ground, only Kristy is initially positioned to recognize Eric's perspective as issuing a meta-message of an evaluative stance based on a prior text. After repeated appropriation, however, the phrase becomes common ground within the family, available to each of the members for further appropriation. What once divided the family, namely the parents from the children, now also serves to further align them via the children's appropriation of the parents' discourse.

In this section, I have shown an example of a media source text, part of which was appropriated and included in subsequent interaction among the members of a family. The examples illustrate how intertextual quotation characterizes family interaction and contributes to establishing this practice as ratified, supported behavior. The examples further suggest that the appropriation of a media text can serve as a strategy for taking an evaluative stance, in these cases, on different instances of repetition within family interaction.

5. Intertextual quotation as interactive alignment

In this section, I present examples illustrating how intertextual quotation reflects interactive alignment (Garrod and Pickering 2004; Goffman 1974, 1981; Pickering and Garrod, 2006), triggered by specific lexical items or syntactic structures. Interactive alignment is "a process by which people align their representations at different linguistic levels at the same time. They do this by making use of each others' choices of words, sounds, grammatical forms, and meanings." (Garrod and Pickering, 2004: 9) Intertextual quotation is shown to occur as direct responses to the wording of the utterances preceding it. It thus serves to maintain and further the conversation in a scaffolding manner, building on previously employed lexical items or syntactic structures, which trigger a memory of prior talk from a media source.

The following sequence is an example of how Luke's appropriation of a media text, triggered by one of his own conversational turns, functions as a conversational strategy. The intertextual quotation has as its source text the phrase 'I got a rock,' from *It's the Great Pumpkin, Charlie Brown* (1966). In this video, Charlie Brown goes trick-or-treating with friends. After each visit to a house, the children review their treats (e.g., 'I got a candy bar!'), prompting Charlie Brown to repeat the phrase 'I got a rock.'

(4) {*Kristy, Luke and Alec are in the playroom, preparing to do a puzzle.*}

- | | | |
|----|--------|--|
| 1 | Kristy | Okay, |
| 2 | | open it up |
| | | { <i>Luke and Alec open the puzzle box and pour out the pieces on the table. Kristy, Luke and Alec sort through the pieces. Kristy explains that the pieces need to be turned right side up.</i> } |
| 3 | Kristy | Ooooh, |
| 4 | | a CORNER piece. |
| 5 | Luke | Alec got an edge (.) |
| 6 | | and <u>I got a rock.</u> |
| 7 | Kristy | <u>I got a rock.</u> |
| 8 | Luke | Why did Charlie Brown always get a rock? |
| 9 | Kristy | I don't know, |
| 10 | | (.) bad luck I guess. |

It is Luke's own utterance, 'Alec got an edge,' which seems to serve as a syntactic trigger for the intertextual quotation, "I got a rock." Luke thereby aligns interactively with himself by reusing the same syntactic structure of his previous utterance, which has triggered an intertextual quotation. Kristy's turn in line 7 serves as a further interactive alignment, where repetition of Luke's quotation ratifies it and, by extension, supports this intertextual quotation within their conversation.

The family-viewing contributes to common ground among each of the participants, and thus Luke is aware of his own, Alec's and Kristy's mutual knowledge of the video. It is this common

ground which not only enables the intertextual quotation as a manifest event, but also the question turn immediately after, in line 8: “Why did Charlie Brown always get a rock?” This question is therefore very different in nature from Luke’s question in example 2, lines 16-17, “Why did you say, ‘this goes in June’?” In example 4, the question reflects recognition of the common ground between Luke and his mother. In example 2 on the other hand, the question reflects the lack of common ground between Luke and his parents. Luke does not recognize the utterance from any common ground material; he does, however, recognize that the utterance is an unexpected conversational turn by virtue of it being a seemingly inappropriate response to Kristy’s question in line 13, “Haven’t we talked about this before?” These examples in juxtaposition help to illustrate the relationship between common ground and intertextual quotation. In example 2, Eric means something else besides the words he says; there is a conflict between the dictum and the implicatum (Sperber & Wilson 1981). The implicatum can only be understood via access to the source text. The lack of common ground in example 2 prompts Luke to focus on what is said, as he cannot process what is meant. In example 4, common ground allows for an uninterrupted progression in the conversation.

In example 4, Kristy’s repetition of ‘I got a rock’ helps to develop the conversation by maintaining focus on the source text. This turn thus functions as repetition as participation, “showing listenership and acceptance.” (Tannen 1987: 577) Similarly, in the following example, each family member repeats a turn of intertextual quotation, revealing no other function to the repetition than participation. Such conversational duetting (Falk 1979), similar to choral performance, signals the participants’ desire to be involved and take an active role in the conversation.

In example 5, it is two lexical items, first ‘baby’ and then Swedish ‘se’ (‘see’), which trigger two instigating turns of the same intertextual quotation. Kristy, Eric, Luke and Alec are in the kitchen, having just sat down to dinner. Alec has brought along a toy horse, with which he is playing. Kristy and Eric are cooperating to serve dinner, talking to each other and accompanied by background noise. Alec interrupts the interaction.

- | | | | |
|-----|----|--------|---|
| (5) | 1 | Alec | Mamma, |
| | 2 | | you have a baby horse climbing up you: |
| | 3 | | Mamma, |
| | 4 | | you have a baby horse! |
| | 5 | | MAMMA! |
| | 6 | | a baby horse is climbing up you: |
| | 7 | Kristy | Oh! |
| | 8 | | a BABY! |
| | 9 | | Hello, baby! |
| | 10 | Eric | <u>You gotta see the BA:BY:!²=</u> |
| | 11 | Kristy | = <u>You gotta see the BA:BY:!</u> |
| | 12 | Luke | Pappa, |
| | 13 | | jag vill också se!
<i>I want to see too!</i> |
| | 14 | | Pappa, |
| | 15 | | jag (.)
<i>I</i> |
| | 16 | | [jag- |
| | 17 | Eric | [<u>You gotta see the BA:BY:≡</u> |
| | 18 | Kristy | = <u>You gotta see the BA:BY:!</u> |
| | 19 | All | [<u>You gotta see the BA:BY:!</u> |
| | 20 | | [<u>You gotta see the BA:BY:!</u> |

2 Seinfeld, 1994, “The Hamptons”

21		[<u>You gotta see the BA:BY!</u>
22	All	{ <i>laugh</i> }
23	Kristy	{ <i>laughing</i> } Okay, horses away.
24		Let's eat.

In this example, it is first the word ‘baby’, uttered by Alec in lines 2, 4, and 6 and by Kristy in lines 8 and 9 which trigger Eric’s intertextual quote, “You gotta see the baby!” This utterance receives immediate uptake by Kristy, and although the quoting turns cease or are possibly interrupted by Luke in lines 12-16 (‘Pappa, I want to see too! Pappa, I...I’), they are triggered again by Luke’s use of Swedish ‘se’, which means ‘see’. Luke’s utterance, ‘I want to see too!’ is a genuine reaction to Eric’s previous utterance, the dictum, instead of the common ground. Luke does not recognize the intertextual quotation; instead, his utterance suggests that he believes there is something to see. “You gotta see the baby!” thus prompts Luke to indeed try to see the baby, which he verbalizes, “Pappa, jag vill också se!” in turn retriggering the intertextual quotation from Eric, which Kristy again appropriates and echoes, prompting all family members to quote in unison. The duetted repetition establishes a playframe, which is ultimately confirmed and concluded by laughter. The diversion created by the playframe is implicitly recognized by Kristy, who in lines 23-24 moves to reframe the interaction by saying, “Okay, horses away. Let’s eat.”

It is important to point out that the repetitive intertextual quotation occurring in this family is triggered by repetition in the source texts as well. In other words, it is phrases which are repeated in the media which tend to get appropriated –repetitively– in this family.

The quotation in example 5, “You gotta see the baby!” comes from an episode of a television show only Eric and Kristy have viewed together. In this particular episode, there is a scene where two characters are imitating a mutual friend of theirs who has just had a baby, and insists that the two come out to see the newborn: “You gotta see the baby!” The two television show characters take turns imitating the mother, resulting in repetition of this sentence. In example 5, Eric and Kristy each take turns imitating the imitators, and thus a series of repetitions is part of the quotation ritual. Similarly, the next example features each of the family members attempting to approximate the pronunciation of an original media text. All family members are in the kitchen eating dinner. Alec has gotten up from the table to fetch the salt, which is on a high shelf. Kristy has asked him if he can reach.

(6)	1	Kristy	Can you do it?
	2	Alec	(.) Are you asking me if I can do it?
	3		What are you thinking?
	4		Of course I can do it!
	5	Kristy	{ <i>in British accent</i> } <u>I CAN do it!</u> ³
	6	Eric	{ <i>in British accent</i> } <u>I CAN do it!</u> =
	7	Luke	{ <i>in British accent</i> } = <u>I CAN do it!</u> =
	8	Alec	{ <i>in British accent</i> } = <u>I CAN do it!</u>
	9	All	{ <i>laugh</i> }

The sentence ‘I can do it!’ comes from a children’s video which the family viewed together. The video features talking trains, all of which have a British accent. In a number of different stories featured on the video, various trains utter, “I can do it!”, and the repetition of this line, similar to “This goes in June,” “I got a rock,” and “You gotta see the baby”, renders it memorable (cf. “kernel phrases”, Tannen 1987) and thus more likely to be featured in intertextual quotation. Kristy’s quotation “I can do it!” is triggered by the lexical and syntactic similarity of Alec’s exclamation, “Of course I can do it!” Similar to example 3 and the systematic repetition of ‘alamosaurus’, each participant takes a distinct, orderly turn in repeating the phrase. Each family member is also aware

3 Thomas the Tank Engine, 2004, “You can do it, Toby!”

of the fact that he or she is quoting, of what the source text is, and of what it means. The participants ratify each other's quotation via repetition, each taking turns at attempting an accurate pronunciation of the utterance, resulting in a familiar repetition-play frame, and concluding with shared laughter, signaling the joint recognition of common ground and confirming the playfulness of the sequence.

Both Tannen (1987) and Norrick (1993) identify humor as one of the possible functions of repetition. In examples 3, 5, and 6, multiple repetitions culminate in laughter among each of the participants, suggesting that repetition has resulted in a play frame. It is important to note, however, that it is the turns of intertextual quotation which have been the subject of multiple-repetition, and thus it must be considered that intertextual quotation also contributes to establishing a play frame, in turn establishing a relationship between intertextual quotation and play. In the next section, I present examples of intertextual quotation that trade on this relationship for the purpose of reframing or rekeying interaction.

6. Intertextual quotation as a strategy of reframing or rekeying

In the previous section, examples of intertextual quoting triggered by lexical or syntactic cues were presented to illustrate how interlocutors align interactively, thereby progressing the development of the conversation. In each of the examples, intertextual quotation was ratified and supported by repetition, and the culmination of multiple repetitions in laughter suggests that intertextual quotation is associated with play frames. In this section, I present examples of intertextual quotation which illustrate how the play frame association can be invoked for team-building and for reframing or rekeying interactions of conflict.

In the following example, Kristy and Luke are in the kitchen together. Luke is drawing at the kitchen table, while Kristy is standing at the stove, preparing dinner. They are discussing the cost of Christmas, and Kristy has explained that presents and Christmas activities require money, which has to be earned.

- (7)
- | | | |
|---|--------------|---|
| 1 | Luke | How do you earn money? |
| 2 | Kristy | You work (.) hard. |
| | | {3.0 seconds of silence} |
| 3 | Luke | Maybe we could build a big house- |
| 4 | Kristy | {slightly frustrated} It would TAKE money t- |
| 5 | | to BUILD a house (.) |
| 6 | | How do you think we could MAKE money from that? |
| 7 | Luke | (.) You'd have to be an innkeeper, |
| 8 | | <u>Despite my outward appearance I shall try to keep a neat inn.</u> ⁴ |
| 9 | Kristy, Luke | {laugh} |

The significance of example 7 lies in the rekeying of the interaction via intertextual quotation, bringing about "a change in the tone or tenor" (Tannen 2006: 601) of the interaction.

Kristy's turns in lines 4-6 are delivered in slight frustration, which Luke may have noticed. His intertextual quotation may then reflect a conscious effort to rekey the interaction, attempting to conjure up the play frame associated with this practice, which, in his experience as a member of this family, leads to shared laughter. If this is the case, the effect is the desired one. The quoting may not, however, be a reaction to Kristy's key of frustration, but rather a planned contribution. Luke was interrupted in line 3, and thus it is possible that he had intended all along to direct the conversation towards innkeeping, so as to enable the intertextual quotation.

In the next example, all family members are in the kitchen, eating dinner at the table. Alec has

4 A Charlie Brown Christmas, 1965

brought a toy car to the table, but after playing with it instead of eating his dinner, Eric has taken it away.

- | | | | |
|-----|----|--------------|---|
| (8) | 1 | Alec | Jag vill ha min BIL! { <i>Alec waves his hands</i> }
<i>I want my car!</i> |
| | 2 | Eric | Ät upp din mat istället för att vinka som ett fån.
<i>Eat your food instead of waving like a fool.</i> |
| | 3 | Luke | { <i>to Eric</i> } Ne::j:
<i>Nooo</i> |
| | 4 | | det var dumt.
<i>that was mean.</i> |
| | 5 | | Det får man inte säga=
<i>You don't get to say that</i> |
| | 6 | Eric | = Nej=
<i>No--</i> |
| | 7 | Kristy | = Jo!=
<i>Yes!</i> |
| | 8 | | Sure he can! |
| | 9 | Luke | { <i>to Kristy</i> } Daddy called him a FÅN! |
| | 10 | Eric | { <i>laughs</i> } |
| | 11 | Kristy | { <i>to Eric</i> } <u>Fly, you fools!</u> ⁵ { <i>laughs</i> } |
| | 12 | Eric, Kristy | [{ <i>laugh</i> } |
| | 13 | Luke | [{ <i>moans</i> } |

In this example, Alec responds to having his car taken away by saying in Swedish, ‘I want my car!’ and waving his hands. Eric refuses to return the car to Alec, saying in line 2, ‘Eat up your food instead of waving your hands like a fool.’ Luke immediately aligns with Alec as a team, objecting to Eric’s statement (‘Nooo, that was mean. You don’t get to say that.’), causing Eric to concede, ‘No.’ Kristy then aligns with Eric as a team, crossing into the conversation between Eric and Luke by using Swedish, ‘Jo!’ (Yes (he can)!). By crossing into Swedish, Kristy can align supportively with Eric, using the language of the participant constellation in which he is involved. Kristy then addresses Luke specifically, in English, ‘Sure he can!’ Luke then directs his protests to Kristy, ‘Daddy called him a fån (fool)!’, causing Eric to laugh at the intra-sentential code-switch. Kristy then continues her supportive alignment with Eric, invoking the intertextual quotation, “Fly, you fools!” While the English translation ‘fool’ is never explicitly uttered, the word ‘fån’, which has a zero plural morpheme, triggers the association with ‘fools’, in turn triggering the intertextual quotation. Both Kristy and Eric laugh, recognizing the translation process and source text, and their laughter effectively concludes the sequence. Luke’s simultaneous moaning suggests he has understood that the sequence has concluded, with Kristy and Eric the victors of this conflict.

Similar to examples 1-3, and 5, Kristy’s practice of intertextual quotation reflects the exploitation of common ground among a limited set of interlocutors, namely of her and Eric. She is aware that neither Alec nor Luke will recognize the quotation, and she is aware that Eric will also recognize the children’s lack of common ground. By appealing to common ground between her and Eric, Kristy manages to exclude Alec and Luke, thereby further establishing a team with Eric. It is improbable that Luke or Alec are even aware of the intertextual quotation, but it may nevertheless be clear to both of them that Kristy and Eric share some kind of knowledge and, significantly, seem to understand and appreciate Kristy’s utterance in line 11. The laughter in lines 11-12 further serves to exclude the children, and, along with Luke’s moaning in line 13, ultimately indicates that the conflict has been resolved in favor of Kristy and Eric.

In the final example below, intertextual quotation is again featured as a strategy for alignment,

5 The Lord of The Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring, 2001

team-building and conflict resolution via reframing. All family members are in the kitchen, getting ready to eat dinner. Kristy has asked Luke and Alec what they want to drink, and Luke has asked if they get to drink cola. Kristy has said no, causing the boys to complain and point out that, earlier that same day, Eric was in fact drinking cola. Furthermore, earlier in the same week, Alec was given cola to drink by a new babysitter, which Kristy harshly criticized.

- (9) 1 Kristy You guys don't get to drink Coca-Cola,
 2 it's bad for your teeth.
 3 It's too sugary.
 4 You eat enough candy as it is.
 5 You don't need any more sugar.
 6 Eric *{softly}* You don't need to see their identification.⁶
 7 *{louder}* h Yeah,
 8 ni äter verkligen mycket godis.
You guys really eat a lot of candy.
 9 Luke We don't need any more sugar.
 10 Kristy Exactly.
 11 Alec!
 12 You need to pay attention to what I'm saying.
 13 Eric *{softly}* Pay no attention to the man behind the curtain.⁷
 14 Kristy We don't ever have Coca-Cola at home.
 15 We're just drinking it because it's leftover.
 16 *{to Luke}* Will you s:it s:till!
 17 You're moving around like a worm on a hook!
 18 Luke, Alec, Eric *{laugh}*
 19 Luke *{to Kristy}* YOU'RE moving around (.)
 20 like a (.)
 21 bump.
 22 Kristy *{nodding}* Like a bump on a log,
 23 which is to say not at all.
 24 I'm solid.
 25 Like a rock.
 26 Luke I got a rock.⁸
 27 Eric *{laughs}*
 28 Luke, Alec, Kristy *{laugh}*

In example 9, no fewer than three occurrences of intertextual quotation can be observed. The sequence begins with Kristy explaining her reasons, in lecture format, why the children are not allowed to drink cola. Kristy is doing parenting work, and thus it is expected that Eric would align with Kristy supportively. Building on the concept of alignment as sharing the same frame (Goffman 1981), supportive alignment is one “in which one participant ratifies and supports another’s turns at talk and what he or she has to say, creating ties of cooperation, collaboration, and agreement.” (Gordon 2003: 397) As parents, Kristy and Eric are a pre-existing team, based on “extra interactional relationships” (Kangasharju 1996: 292). In this sequence, however, Eric ultimately does not align with Kristy as a team: these participants do not “explicitly act as an association visible to the other participants.” (p. 292) Instead, the spontaneous nature of the three instances of intertextual quotation functions to align Eric and the children as an interactional team (Lerner 1987).

6 Star Wars: A New Hope, 1977

7 The Wizard of Oz, 1939

8 It's the Great Pumpkin, Charlie Brown!, 1966

In line 6, Eric contributes with an intertextual quotation, “You don’t need to see their identification”, triggered by Kristy’s last utterance in line 5, ‘You don’t need any more sugar.’ This first intertextual quotation thus reflects interactive alignment, but this turn, unlike the examples in section 5, does not have the primary function of progressing the conversation. On the contrary, Eric’s intertextual quotation rather steers the conversation away from the topic, thereby reflecting a reframing (Tannen 1987) function. Furthermore, simply by engaging in intertextual quoting, Eric is introducing a play frame, which is in direct conflict with Kristy’s serious frame, already initiated by the lecture format. Thus there is an attempt to rekey the interaction as well. There are conflicting goals exhibited by the parents, and in fact, Eric recognizes this conflict and attempts once to align supportively with Kristy as a parenting team, addressing the children in Swedish by saying, in lines 7-8, ‘Yeah, you guys really eat a lot of candy.’

Luke’s turn in line 9 signals his attention and comprehension, which Kristy in turn acknowledges, ‘Exactly.’ The sequence does not end there, however, as Kristy instead focuses on Alec, who, in contrast to Luke, is not paying attention. Kristy’s utterance, ‘You need to pay attention to what I’m saying,’ resumes the lecture mode of the serious frame, but also serves again to trigger an intertextual quotation by Eric, “Pay no attention to the man behind the curtain.” Like the first intertextual quotation, this one seems to reflect interactive alignment, triggered by the phrase ‘pay attention.’ However, as this is the second quotation, it is now very clear that Eric is instead aligning supportively with the children, by attempting to reframe the sequence from serious to play, and to rekey the conflict tone. At this point, it is clear that Eric is in fact disaffiliating himself with Kristy and her lecture frame. He does this by exploiting common ground for the whole family, quoting from films which the family has viewed together. His moves are ignored, as Kristy resumes her lecture, explaining why there is cola in the home. It is interesting here to note that Kristy implicitly teams up or aligns supportively with Eric in her use of ‘we’ in lines 14-15, although Eric is the only one who drank the cola. The use of the inclusive pronoun suggests that Kristy is trying to realign with Eric as a parenting team and continue with the lecture. This proves to be a futile attempt. Kristy is further side-tracked from the topic by Luke’s movements, and in lines 16-17, she does more parenting work, demanding that Luke sit still, pointing out that he is ‘moving around like a worm on a hook.’ This comparison causes a laughter reaction by each of the other interlocutors, who are now primed for a play frame. The reframing of the sequence as such thus seems to be a *fait accompli*. Luke’s teasing/challenging turn in line’s 19-21, ‘You’re moving around like a bump...’ confirms the topic change brought about by the reframing. The use of ‘bump’ triggers Kristy’s use of the idiom “like a bump on a log,” referring to someone who doesn’t move at all or is lazy. Kristy’s turn in lines 22-25 reflects an uptake of the topic change, a collaborative rekeying of the interaction, and a definitive relinquishing of the topic of cola drinking, suggesting she has finally accepted the play frame. Although the interruptions, reframing and rekeying superficially seem to sabotage the parenting work, it can be instead argued that they actually serve to deliver the message successfully by introducing humor and inviting participation. When Kristy ends her turn in line 25 with, “Like a rock”, the lexical trigger of ‘a rock’ results in the third and final intertextual quotation, this one supplied by Luke, who contributes with the now familiar quotation, “I got a rock.” The entire sequence ends with laughter from each of the family members, indicating that the conflict has been resolved.

In this section, I have shown how intertextual quotation can function as pragmatic strategies of rekeying, reframing or team-building. In this case-study family, intertextual quotation has been established over time as a practice associated with a play frame, and one which is strongly associated with shared laughter. The examples presented in this section suggest that this association is exploited in non-humorous sequences of parenting work and displays of authority. Rekeying into a humorous tone is a strategy for resolving conflict (Aronsson 2006), and Tannen (2006) notes that even children can accomplish such rekeying, ultimately realigning parents - a phenomenon that example 9 has illustrated.

Intertextual quotation both reflects and establishes common ground among the family members. They each have access to a shared history, one that includes not only the reception of

media, but also the practice of subsequently referring to their common media reception in the form of intertextual quotation. This discursive inclusion of post-media reception references confirms and makes salient the family's common ground. Responses such as repetition and laughter support and ratify intertextual quotation, such that both discursive binding and social bonding occur. It is, perhaps, the binding-and-bonding nature of intertextual quotation that would suggest it to be a hallmark of interaction among such intimate social groups as families.

7. Discussion

This chapter represents a study of the intersection of family interaction, media texts, and intertextuality. It considers intertextual quotation, i.e., the appropriation of media texts, as a form of intertextuality across communicative events. Fundamentally a form of repetition, intertextual quotation is a function of the invocation of prior, public texts. The research presented in this chapter thus contributes to repetition scholarship by focussing on a specific form of intertextual repetition (Gordon 2003), where public texts are integrated into private discourse.

Intertextuality of this kind can be compared to Spitulnik's (1997) "social circulation of media discourse." (p. 161) In her study of the appropriation of radio/broadcast discourse in Zambia, Spitulnik concluded that "people's active engagements with mass media, along with the social circulation of media discourse and its intertextual connections, are key components in the construction and integration of communities." (p. 161) Among the features of media discourse which most reliably predicted subsequent appropriation and circulation was prominence by repetition, contributing to what Bauman and Briggs (1990: 74) identified as "prepared-for detachability."

In this chapter, examples of intertextual quotation illustrated the active engagement with mass media in the form of television, video and film. The members of the case-study family were shown to appropriate bits of media texts through the process of intertextual quotation for the purpose of assuming an evaluative stance, showing interactive or supportive alignment, or for rekeying or reframing interactions. Significantly, the choice of media texts appropriated for these purposes can be considered predictable in that each of the intertextual quotations exemplified persistent repetition in the source. In this way, they become "kernel phrases," (Tannen 1987) thereby achieving discursive prominence. Their status as repeated phrases facilitates and encourages their subsequent appropriation, which in turn ratifies the original persistent repetition.

Similar to the social circulation of media discourse, intertextual quotation serves a binding function. Even when intertextual quotation reflects a move towards disalignment or disaffiliation, as in example 9, it is nevertheless a function of common ground, requiring a shared history of media-based activity. One thing we often do with others, particularly family members, is watch television or films, and subsequently we secure these activities as common ground through talk. On the one hand, this common ground alone binds people; on the other hand, subsequent discursive references build upon that shared history, such that binding on a discursive level can contribute to bonding on a social one. If such discursive references are supported and ratified via interlocutor repetition, both binding and bonding occur, and a social practice, Spitulnik's social circulation, is established.

This chapter has illustrated how one family interacts with media, appropriating source texts for various conversational goals. It has contributed to a better understanding of the role of public media in private domains, and, ultimately, it has illuminated how families employ media texts as communicative resources. The data and analyses presented in this chapter have revealed the process of active intake of media and creative application in subsequent interaction, suggesting that families (and, by extension, perhaps other social constellations) can trade on media as common ground for communicative and social purposes.

References

- Aronsson, Karen. 2006. "Commentary 1. Doing family: An interactive accomplishment." *Text & Talk* 26 (4/5): 619–626
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bauman, Richard, and Briggs, Charles L. 1990. "Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 59-88.
- Becker, Alton. L. 1994. "Repetition and otherness: An essay." In *Repetition in Discourse: Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Volume Two*, Barbara. Johnstone (ed.), 162–175. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Boxer, Diana, & Cortes-Conde, Florencia. 1997. "From bonding to biting: Conversational joking and identity display." *Journal of Pragmatics* 27 (3): 275-294.
- Clark, Herbert. H. 1996. *Using language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, Paul. 1987. Po-faced receipts of teases. *Linguistics* 25: 219-253.
- Eisenberg, Ann R. 1986. "Teasing: Verbal play in two Mexicano homes." In *Language Socialization Across Cultures: Studies in the Social and Cultural Foundations of Language*, Bambi Schieffelin & Elinor Ochs (eds.), 182-198. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Falk, Jane. 1979. *The Conversational Duet*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University.
- Garfinkel, Harold. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Garrod, Simon & Pickering, Michael. 2004. "Why is conversation so easy?" *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 8 (1): 8-11.
- Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame analysis*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodwin, Charles and Heritage, John. 1990. "Conversation Analysis." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 283-307.
- Goodwin, Marjorie. 2006. "Participation, affect, and trajectory in family directive/response sequences." *Text & Talk* 26 (4/5): 515–543.
- Gordon, Cynthia. 2003. "Aligning as a team: Forms of conjoined participation in (stepfamily) interaction." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 36 (4): 395–431.
- Gordon, Cynthia. 2009. *Making Meanings, Creating Family*. New York: OUP.
- Graumann, Carl F. 1989. "Perspective setting and taking in verbal interaction." In *Language Processing in Social Context*, Rainer Dietrich & Carl F. Graumann (eds.), 95-122. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: CUP.

- Günthner, Susanne. 1996. Zwischen Scherz und Schmerz. Frotzelaktivitäten in Alltagsinteraktionen. In *Scherzkommunikation*, Helga Kotthoff (ed.), 81-108. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Johnstone, Barbara. (ed). 1994. "Repetition in discourse: A dialogue." In *Repetition in Discourse: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, Barbara. Johnstone (ed.), 1-20. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Kangasharju, Helena. 1996. "Aligning as a team in multiparty conversation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 26: 291–319.
- Karttunen, Lauri. and Peters, Stanley. 1979. "Conventional implicatures in Montague Grammar". In *Syntax and Semantics 11: Presupposition*, Choon-Kyu Oh and David Dineen (eds), 1-56. New York: Academic Press.
- Keppler, Angela. 1994. *Tischgespräche. Über Formen kommunikativer Vergemeinschaftung am Beispiel der Konversation in Familien*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Kristeva, Julia. 1980. "Word, dialogue and novel." In *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, L. S. Roudiez (ed.), T. Gora, A. Jardine, and L. S. Roudiez (trans.), 64–91. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lerner, Gene. H. 1987. *Collaborative Turn Sequences: Sentence Construction and Social Action*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Irvine.
- Lewis, David. 1969. *Convention*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Lytra, Vally. 2007. "Teasing in contact encounters: Frames, participant positions and responses." *Multilingua* 26: 381-408.
- McCarthy, John. 1990. "Formalization of Two Puzzles Involving Knowledge." In *Formalizing Common Sense*, Vladimir Lifschitz (ed.), 158-166. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Co.
- Milroy, Lesley and Muysken, Pieter. 1995. *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Norrick, Neal. 1987. "Functions of repetitions in conversation." *Text* 7 (3): 245-264.
- Norrick, Neal. 1993. *Conversational Joking. Humour in Everyday Talk*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Pickering, Michael and Garrod, Simon. 2006. "Alignment as the basis for successful communication." *Research on Language and Computation* 4: 203-228.
- Rampton, Ben. 1995. *Crossing. Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Sarangi, Srikant. 2006. "Editorial: Advances in family interaction." *Text & Talk* 26 (4/5): 403–405.
- Sperber, Dan and Wilson, Deidre. 1981. Irony and the use-mention distinction. In *Radical Pragmatics*, Peter Cole (ed.), 295-318. Academic Press: New York.
- Spitulnik, Debra. 1997. "The social circulation of media discourse and the mediation of communities." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 6 (2): 161-187.

- Stalnaker, Robert. 1978. "Assertion." In *Pragmatics: Syntax and Semantics Volume 9*, Peter Cole (ed.), 78-95. New York: Academic Press.
- Stalnaker, Robert. 2002. "Common Ground." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25: 701-21.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1987. "Repetition in conversation: Towards a poetics of talk." *Language* 63 (3): 574-605.
- Tannen, Deborah. 2006. "Intertextuality in action: Reframing family arguments in public and private." *Text & Talk* 26: 597– 617.
- Tannen, Deborah. 2007. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Tovares, Alla V. 2006. "Public medium, private talk: Gossip about a TV show as 'quotidian hermeneutics'." *Text & Talk* 26 (4/5): 463-491.
- Watts, Richard. 1991. *Power in Family Discourse*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.

Transcription conventions

she' s out.	falling tone in the preceding element; suggesting finality
oh yeah?	rising tone in the preceding element; cf. yes-no question intonation
so,	level, continuing intonation; suggesting non-finality
bu- but	a cutoff or truncated intonation unit
DAMN	high pitch and a rise in volume
no:	preceding sound is lengthened
(.)	short pause
(2.0)	longer, timed pauses in seconds
[and so-]	overlapping talk
[WHY] her?	
and=	latching
=then	
{laughs}	para- and non-verbal behaviour and contextual information