RESEARCH PLAN

1. Principal investigator (PI), project title, site of research, date of research plan

PI: Professor Jan K. Lindström

Project title: Emergent Clausal Syntax for Conversation: Swedish in a cross-language comparison

Site of research: University of Helsinki; Dept. of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian and Scandinavian Studies

Date of research plan: September 26, 2017

2. Rationale in brief

Language has been conceptualized as a hierarchical self-contained structure since the classical lectures by Saussure (1959), and taken to its extreme in the algorithms that generate correct syntax in the transformational/minimalist tradition. As an alternative, theories of continuous emergence (Hopper 1998) and inherent dialogicity (Linell 2009, DuBois 2014) have been developed during the last three decades. Syntax is the prime ground of methodological clashes between these standpoints. The current project targets syntactic subordination as emergent in conversation, and perhaps a category that turns out to be yet further evidence of the “written-language bias” in theoretical linguistics (cf. Linell 2005). By focusing on complex syntax, the project aims to disclose the real-time and contextually contingent nature of language. Instead of accepting that there has to be a mental model that produces recursive units and units-within-units, such as subordinate clauses embedded in main clauses, the project aims to demonstrate how a complex clause/sentence is a product of an incremental and occasionally collaborative build-up process in dialogically organized interaction. Through this empirical effort, the project’s ambition is to renew the understanding of complex syntax as a dialogically resonant phenomenon, to extend the scope of structural phenomena hitherto studied within analyses of human social interaction, and to open up new avenues of research for second language learning and training.

In order to substantiate dialogic theories, linguists need to accumulate systematic findings across several languages (e.g. Günthner et al. 2014). The current project starts this endeavor by looking at subordination and clause combining, consisting of two major components: a) a study of Swedish talk-in-interaction and b) a comparative study involving Estonian, French, and Hebrew with international sister projects. Hence, the project is a part of the coordinated effort by researchers in four countries – Finland, Israel, Sweden, and Switzerland. These partners have sketched the comparative design together and they are Prof. Leelo Keevallik (Linköping University), Prof. Yael Maschler (Haifa University) and Prof. Simona Pekarek Doehler (Neuchâtel University) with their respective research teams. All partners have applied for similar funding in their respective countries (Prof. Maschler with a granted project from the Israel Scientific Foundation in August 2016), and are committed to bilateral mobility programs for postdoctoral researchers in the projects. In our cooperation we will engage in cross-linguistic and cross-cultural pragmatic research, with a typological ambition (within the limits of the languages represented), as the languages to be examined belong to four different (sub-)families and are diverse in various regards, such as word order and case marking. Our analyses take the micro-level of linguistic and interactional processes as its starting point. They will proceed according to time-tested conversation analytic discovery principles (Schegloff 2007, Stivers & Sidnell 2013), closely studying participants’ turn-construction and the recipients’ subsequent understandings in video-recorded interaction. The discovered complex clausal patterns that have sedimented in specific interactional tasks in each language will then be juxtaposed to structurally and functionally comparable ones in the other languages, potentially revealing similarities and discrepancies.

The basic tenet is that the primordial site of language use is everyday conversation (Schegloff 2006) and that “grammars code best what speakers do most” (DuBois 1985). New dialogical research paradigms have arisen that no longer see grammar from a “bird’s-eye view”, but rather as a locally sensitive, usage-based, temporally unfolding resource for social action. As a consequence of this new conceptualization, grammar has begun to be studied in its natural ecology, i.e. talk-in-interaction, and in relation to embodied semiotic resources, in particular gaze and gesture but also the moving body.
Owing to thriving research in the field of Interactional Linguistics (Selting & Couper-Kuhlen 2001), we are beginning to have a robust understanding of how specific linguistic constructions function as resources for social interaction in a growing number of languages, among them English (Hopper & Thompson 2008), German (Auer 2005), French (Pekarek Doehler et al. 2015), Swedish (Lindström 2006), Finnish (Helasvuo 2014), Hebrew (Maschler 2009, 2012), Estonian (Keevallik 2006), and Japanese (Couper-Kuhlen & Ono 2007). These studies show that interactional use shapes grammar, which thus is understood as a continually evolving and emergent set of constructional patterns, rather than an autonomous system of abstract rules.

The planned project will expand the field of comparative conversation analysis (Sidnell 2007) and connects to the newly established field, pragmatic typology, which investigates “the typology of systems of language use and the principles that shape them” (Dingemanse et al. 2014). There is evidence that different languages, although deploying different structural resources, reflect some basic contingencies of social interaction in similar ways (Stivers et al. 2009, Fox et al. 2010), e.g. turn-taking (Sacks et al. 1974), action projection and expansion (Auer 2005), self-repair (Schegloff et al. 1977). On the other hand, it is not necessarily the case that social actions are identical or identically distributed across all cultures. Grammars constrain or have particular affordances for specific aspects of actions accomplished in different societies, such as taking a particular epistemic stance towards what is being expressed (Hakulinen & Sorjonen 2011). The project’s **scientific impact** is heightened through its strive to methodological renewal; with an inspiration from work within pragmatic typology (Dingemanse et al. 2016), the project implements coding techniques which aim at operationalizing key features of online syntactic emergence in a multimodal interactional setting. Hence, the project offers a precedent for systematic cross-linguistic comparison of complex grammar-in-interaction, and thereby extends current discussions on possible interactional motivations for the constituency of grammatical constructions. The project’s ambition is to heighten its **impact beyond basic scientific research** towards applied research through an experimental sub-project on emergent online syntactic practices with L2 learners.

The research topic proposed here emerges organically from the senior participants’ prior work. The PI of the project applied here, prof. Lindström, has extensively studied Swedish turn-organization (Lindström 2006), and analyzed the interactional emergence of verb-first declarative clauses as well as adverbial and imperative clauses (Lindström et al. 2017); he has worked systematically with syntactic and pragmatic language comparison and language contact (Auer & Lindström 2016). He has had a long-term cooperation with Keevallik (e.g. 2006, 2008) who has analyzed embodied behavior in multimodal units (Keevallik 2013). Lindström has also, in collaboration with the partners Maschler and Pekarek Doehler edited a special issue of *Journal of Pragmatics* (n:o 106) in 2016 on clauses or clausal fragments communicating negative epistemic claims (such as ‘I don’t know/understand/remember’) across several languages. All four senior partners are presently editing a book-length volume on emergent clause-combining patterns with contributions from researchers working on different languages (Keevallik et al. in prep.).

### 3. Scientific objectives and expected impact

#### 3 A: Scientific objectives

Clause construction is a classical topic of linguistic inquiry, as clauses are regarded as the basic units of grammar and also the building blocks of discourse (Thompson & Couper-Kuhlen 2005). In traditional syntactic approaches, complex clausal structures have been regarded as bi-clausal units in which one of the clauses (“the dependent clause”) is embedded as one of the arguments of the main verb, or modifies one of the nominal constituents. However, investigations into actual language use in social interaction prove that this conceptualization can be problematic. A “dependent” clause may actually be the more prominent one in interaction, while the “main” clause may function as a routinized formulaic fragment, a projecting construction foreshadowing certain types of action- or turn-trajectories to come, and/or a discourse marker (e.g. Thompson 2002, Hopper and Thompson 2008, Maschler 2009, Lindström, (Keevallik 2013, Mondada 2014).
Maschler, and Pekarek Doehler 2016). The “dependent” clause may not be syntactically integrated into any “main” clause, or it may be sequentially rather than grammatically embedded (e.g. Wide 2014, Günthner 2015, Lindström, Lindholm, and Laury 2016). Furthermore, real-time production of language very regularly manifests incrementally, that is, bit-by-bit emerging grammar, including incrementally emergent complex syntactic patterns; the increments themselves offer a means by which speakers respond to local contingencies of social interaction (Couper-Kuhlen and Ono 2007, Clift 2007, Pekarek Doehler, De Stefani and Horlacher 2015). Finally, some recent evidence suggests that speakers’ use of grammar is tightly related to their deployment of embodied resources, like gaze, gesture and bodily movements (Keevallik 2013, Mondada 2014), and that the combination of verbal and embodied resources results in complex multimodal meaning-conveying gestalts. This interplay between multimodal resources in the emergence of complex clausal structures still needs to be identified and detailed.

Given the above, the objectives, both regarding component A (a study of Swedish) and component B (cross-language comparison), of the proposed project are as follows:

- **To scrutinize emergence in interaction:** How is the production of complex clausal structures contingent on micro-events in social interaction, such as displays of (mis)understanding by the recipient, overlapping talk, the interlocutor’s gaze and gesture? What do such contingencies tell us about the intersubjective emergence of grammatical structures and their projective or retrospective potential? Are the structures realized as a single prosodic-syntactic unit, or is the realization incremental, possibly resulting in grammatically “canonical” and less canonical entities? Are there any common tendencies or systematic differences across the languages?

- **To analyze turn and action design:** Are there interactional/pragmatic functions that are typically associated with specific complex clausal patterns, such as expressing epistemic stance, producing opinion talk, focusing the “new” against the “given”? What is the contribution of complex clausal patterns to action design in a cross-linguistic perspective, such as distributing practical tasks between the participants (see Couper-Kuhlen and Etelämäki 2014 on Finnish and English)?

- **To detail component linguistic resources:** How are the interactional purposes, for which the constructions are employed, reflected in the constituency of the constructions across the languages? For instance, do we find “equivalent” lexical items appearing in the constructions studied? How does this contribute to theories of grammaticization beyond word and phrase level (Hopper 1998, Brinton 2008)?

- **To study discourse vs. grammatical motivation:** What does the cross-linguistic evidence tell us about the possible interactional (rather than language-system driven) motivation for the grammatical structures studied? How can this enhance our understanding of grammar as a dialogical vs. abstract or cognitive phenomenon?

- **To compare L1 and L2 production:** How do the contingencies of online syntactic, emergent verbal processing play out in advanced-level L2 output in comparison with first-language speakers’ practices? Are L2 speakers more oriented to producing correct, maximally coherent clausal combinations (as textbook examples) while L1 speakers arrive at complex structures with the deployment of routinized chunks of part-constructions? Or do complex clausal/sentential constructions emerge through different kinds of structural chunking with L1 and L2 speakers respectively?

Given the large potential scope of the topics, the project must be narrowed in to cover certain well-motivated structures in order to allow in-depth analyses. Hence, the project targets structures that are associated with the predicate verb and its core arguments, and studies thus especially the deployment of complement and relative clauses and variations of cleft structures (which in Swedish connect with complements and relative clauses). What is not included is somewhat more peripheral verbal
complements, adverbial clauses. The structures to be studied offer a fruitful basis for comparative research. Firstly, they showcase a difference as regards their formal fixedness: complement and relative clauses are less fixed in terms of their constituency (with at most the complementizer/relativizer being obligatory), whereas clefts have more obligatory parts (such as at least one complementizer/relativizer, a copula, and an additional lexeme, such as the “equivalent” of English *it* or *what*). Secondly, while complement and relative clauses display considerable cross-linguistic similarity in terms of syntax and lexis, cleft structures are more varied and they are distributed differently in languages (also in our limited set), thus offering an opportunity for functional comparison across various dimensions of structural diversity. By making systematic comparisons, the project brings more focus to clause-level cross-linguistic investigations, which have a predecessor in the studies presented in, e.g. Laury (2008) and Laury & Suzuki (2011). We also envision cutting-edge inquiry as to the interdependence of grammar and embodied behavior (Streeck et al. 2011), which would provide crucial clues for understanding language within the ecology of multimodal communication.

To illustrate the aimed subprojects 1 and 2 on the above-mentioned topics, examples are presented from a pilot study and collection of complement and relative clauses and clefts in Swedish talk-in-interaction. Additionally, the subproject 3 that focuses L2 output is presented.

**Subproject 1: Complement clauses and their variations**

Following international trends, Swedish complement clause structures, and in particular complementizers, have been subject to a number of studies. The general complementizer *att* ‘that’ has been recognized as a central tying, but not necessarily subordinating, resource in interactional use (Anward 2003). Especially studies on Finland Swedish have shown that *att* links turn expansions and increments (Lehti-Eklund 2002), a function with parallels in Finnish and Estonian (Keevallik 2008), and should thus be studied from the perspective of language contact. Language contact may also play a role in the Finland Swedish use of *att* as a marker of an indirect question (which, different from standard grammar, retains the syntax of a direct question): *Jag visste inte att ville jag bli polis* ‘I didn’t know that did I want to be a policeman (i.e. if I wanted to be…)’ – a clause-combining pattern which has not been investigated previously. The complementizer is also involved in longer fixed strings, as in *Det är bara det att*…, lit. ‘It’s only that (thing) that…’, which regularly projects a constraint or reservation (Lehti-Eklund 2002). These kinds of semi-fixed structures are of interest comparatively, but also for an accurate language theory.

There is a characteristic Scandinavian use of “**intertwined clauses**” (Sw. *satsfläta*), which in Swedish often involves complement clauses but also adverbial and relative clauses, e.g. *Henne tror jag inte att du har talat med* ‘Her, I don’t think, that you have talked with’. This construction has been studied in formal grammar as a case of unbounded dependency or with reference to information structure. From an interactional point of view, the construction allows the speaker to start with a prominent first referent, then to add a short epistemic-evaluative positioning clause that is, eventually, syntactically combined with a finalizing complement clause. Below is an example of this construction (bolded third line) in an interactional setting:

1. A:  *Hur långt e hon gången med de då hörro:¿*
   How long has she come with that, say?
   Well, she has probably erm bled a couple of days, like.
3. T- *tredje dan tror ja de e ida¿*
   The third day, I think, it is today.

The intertwined clausal construction is typical of evaluative or epistemic positioning actions. It yields both initial-constituent focus and epistemic modification in one grammatically coherent package, without elements of initial or final extraposition. Formal variations of intertwined clauses are many and their interactional functions have not been researched.
In sum, considering the various emergent complement clause structures, there is currently a need for a systematization of the patterns, filling in all the gaps (different “matrix” verbs, various temporal organizations), and a theoretical synthesis that accounts for temporal emergence and dialogical resonance. Time is also ripe for considering whether or how these tight syntactic constructions are shaped by embodied behavior, and how they feature in conversational turn-taking, turn projection, and turn expansion. As a side-effect, the scrutiny of complements will contribute to knowledge on the conjunction–pragmatic marker continuum, a central word class issue that has hitherto been solved with an obvious written-language bias.

Subproject 2: Relative clauses and cleft constructions

Relative clauses are a common resource for expanding noun phrases in Swedish, and they both are firmly established grammatical concepts. This “given” status of them may be one reason for the very scant attention to the uses of relative clauses in talk-in-interaction. However, because of their structurally expanding potential, relative clauses are an intriguing object of study from the point of view of emergent syntax. An illuminating case is the use of incremented relative clauses in the following extract, the beginning of a talk show as the studio guests are presented by the host (H).

```
1 H: Och Lars Anrell från tv fyra
    And Lars Anrell from TV four

2 (0.2)

3 A: Hello hello
    Hej

4 H: >Hejsan hejsan< som e Hallbergs spökspanare idag,
    Hello hello, who is Hallberg’s ghost today,

5 Och Susanne Ljung, en gammal veteran i kretsen.
    And Susanne Ljung, an old veteran in the company.

6 L: Hi

7 H: .hh::: som va me (.) förmodligen i den första spenatrion nånsin.
    .hh::: who was with us probably in the first ever spy trio.
```

The host presents the name of the guest (Lars Anrell) in a separate turn at first, followed by a reciprocal greeting sequence; then, he adds a relative clause to his second pair-part turn (l. 4), making it a syntactically, although not sequentially, fitted continuation of the NP in the first line. In the subsequent presentation of another guest (Susanne Ljung), he uses a similar kind of incrementing strategy again (l. 7), this time adding a relative clause to fit an NP with an appositional expansion. Such incrementing and sequence-crossing expanding potentials of relative clauses warrant a detailed study of their use in spoken interaction (cf. Clift 2007 on English).

Cleft constructions involve some extended uses of complement and relative clauses in Swedish. This is an area of research that is more pronounced in some grammatical traditions, such as Romance and Germanic linguistics. Swedish IT- and WH-clefts have only been studied from the point of view of formal grammar and in written language (Johansson 2002). The constructions have been explained by information structure: what is given, what is new, what is presupposed, what is focused on. As regards interactional Swedish, Linell (2011) briefly notes that both cleft-structures have responsive as well as projecting qualities: IT-clefts, like *Det var Krister som hade skrivit det* ‘It was Krister who had written it’, allow the speaker to respond to a situation in which a piece of information is lacking (who was the writer?) by building on common knowledge (something was written); WH-clefts, again, offer an initial constructional segment (cleft clause) which projects central information in the ensuing cleft constituent. Such information can, for example, stand in contrast to what was previously said, as in the following extract from the pilot collection. Speaker A adds a critical remark to an otherwise positive assessment of a singer, Lisa Ekdahl. The negated cleft clause *Va ja inte gillar* ‘What I don’t like’ in line 5 marks a contrast to preceding discourse and simultaneously projects a continuation which should specify something about the contrast.
A: Lisa Ekdahl (. ) ja tycker egentligen de e rätt bra.
Lisa Ekdahl (.) I think that it's quite good actually
B: Ja de här e mycke bra (. ) De e jazzigt bra
Yes this is very good (.) It's good in a jazzy way
A: Mm (.) väldigt eh snyggt också snyggt ljud,
Mm (.) very um nice, nice sound too,
B: Många eh (. ) duktiga (. ) va heter de musiker (. )
Many um (.) good (.) how do you say, musicians (.)
A: Va ja inte gillar e hennes nasala röst som e lite för jobbig
What I don't like is her nasal voice which is a bit irritating

The above observations have to be substantiated by further research, which is crucial for developing an adequate understanding of how complex cleft structures work in real-time interaction.

In sum, both relative clauses and cleft structures warrant a close examination in Swedish talk-in-interaction, in which they have not been analyzed in any depth. Clefts may prove to be a fruitful object of cross-language comparison. We know very little about their use in real-time interaction beyond early work on English (Hopper 2004), and they have different distributions in the compared languages: IT clefts are frequent in Swedish while WH clefts are typical of French and Hebrew; further, all clefts are rare in Estonian.

Subproject 3: Experimental comparative study of L1 and L2 production
Research on advanced L2 proficiency shows that the mastery of grammatical structures is a late phenomenon, and the longer and more complex clausal utterances are, the higher a risk for grammatical mistakes (e.g. Forsberg Lundell et al. 2014). Such complexities may consist of the deployment of subordinate clauses, the construction of information structure in theme and rhyme-relations, and discontinuities between clausal constructional parts in the flow of talk. Since the complex syntactic patterns that are focused in the project have with these kinds of phenomena to do, it is relevant to explore how the same syntactic patterns turn out in L2 production. The questions hereby regard a) frequency of syntactic structures, b) constructional correctness, and c) constructional deployment. As regards a), it will be examined whether certain constructional patterns, for example cleft structures, distribute differently in L2 production than in L1 use. The second point b) involves an analysis of grammatical correctness in the constructions that L2 speakers are targeting and possible crucial processing difficulties. Lastly, c) addresses the aspect of constructional emergence in L2 talk: do L2 speakers process complex syntactic entities differently from L1 speakers as regards, for example, chunking, incrementing and linking of constructional parts in complex configurations that may involve discontinuities (pauses, hesitations) both in L1 and L2 production?

An experimental set-up is designed in order to control the setting for production. Two kinds of conversational interactions will be video recorded with groups of L2 speakers and control groups with L1 speakers. The subjects are university students; the L2 speakers are students of Swedish who, in the Finnish educational paradigm, can be considered to have an advanced-level non-native proficiency or are on their way to reach that level (cf. Bartning & Schlyter 2004); the L1 (native) speakers are university students of Swedish and humanities. Both groups of speakers are involved in group discussions in which their task is, in interaction with other participants, to discuss and evaluate a series of music pieces from different genres (Conversation 1) or different kinds of works of visual art (Conversation 2). To control the settings, the conversations will be moderated with a fixed set of questions to the subjects, the goal of which is to generate descriptive and opinion talk.

In addition to the ambition of generating new comparative knowledge of L1 and L2 production of complex syntactic structures in the flow of talk-in-interaction, the sub-project aims at extending the use of this experimental material in cross-disciplinary research. Hence, the evaluations of pieces of art will be analyzed in cooperation with scholars working within research on musicology and visual arts. It will also be considered whether the experimental set-up can be designed into a pedagogical product with applications for language teaching or as a diagnostic instrument. Ideally, the project can inform about
how L2 production of complex syntactic patterns can be attuned closer to the practices used in L1 processing of similar complex structures.

As regards **scientific impact**, this project constitutes basic research with significance for the following:

- **Generation of new knowledge**: Understanding the temporal nature of dialogic multimodal communication, exploring the relationship between syntax and other semiotic systems, with possible reverberations for language learning and teaching. Centrally, the results of the project will generate new knowledge of complex syntactic structures in Swedish (as well as Estonian, Hebrew and French).

- **Conceptual renewal**: Conceptualization of complex syntax as a dialogic phenomenon subject to interactional contingencies and inherently tied to social action; counterbalancing abstract computational models of grammar.

- **Theoretical renewal**: Developing dialogical theories of language, based on the empirical observation of participant behavior; counterbalancing linguistics as a field of cognitive psychology.

- **Methodological renewal**: By applying coding schemes for linguistic and embodied detail, the micro-level observations are systematized for comparative pragmatic research beyond what is normal in CA-based research. New kinds of experimental methods are used in the analysis of L2 production involving spoken interaction and complex syntactic structures.

- **Renewal of analytic scope**: Within the newly emerging fields of comparative CA and pragmatic typology, the project will take first steps in targeting core syntax and exploring related tendencies of grammaticization; by extension, the resulting connections between syntactic resources and social action can be probed for their universality.

### 3 B: Effects and impact beyond academia

The value of the research carried out in the project is enhanced by possible applications:

- Providing data and results that are beneficial in teaching language for interaction rather than language as structure – an approach that is more relevant in various practically oriented segments of society. Some aspects of e.g. subordinate word order in Swedish, have so far been emblematic of limited proficiency or immigrant varieties, suggesting a necessity for improved pedagogy.

- Providing data and results for language teaching which is oriented to the recognition of similarities and differences between languages in spoken usage.

- Providing a pedagogical instrument for practicing/diagnosing L2 learners’ abilities to process complex syntactic structures in their oral use in a more naturalistic way, learning from how L1 speakers arrive at complex syntactic structures in online interactional talk.

- Providing knowledge for professional training in certain fields of arts (visual arts and music) about how opinion and conceptualizations of art works can be communicated as an intersubjective experience.

The research results have the potential of societal impact in the long run, as our understanding of complex structures of conversational language increases. This then enables the production of more accurate teaching material (textbook dialogue and exercise), testing and training instruments and a re-evaluation of didactics in Swedish as a second language – a central subject in the Finnish school system in which it is a mandatory subject, and good skills of which are demanded of state officials.
3 C: Publication plan
Publications will be made available in Open Access repositories, making full use of the options offered by services like Research Gate. The results will be published in high-ranked international journals, such as Studies in Language, Journal of Pragmatics, Language, but also maintaining connections to the Scandinavian and domestic research community through, e.g. Språk och stil and Folkmålsstudier. Funds are applied for the possibility to pay fees for Gold open access wherever this is offered as an option. A project webpage will be actively maintained and advertised via professional networks, providing a forum for dissemination, with links to activities, online articles and working papers. An edited volume presenting the most central results of the project and the Estonian, French and Hebrew sister projects will be produced at the end of the funding period. The project also aims to write popular scientific articles in order to increase public understanding of language as a vehicle for social action as well as of the differences in the cultural practices.

4. Research methods and material, support from research environment

Methods. Following micro-analytic discovery methods, the interactional data will be mined for patterns of clause combining, probing the limits of each focus construction by close inspection of boundary and deviant cases. Individual instances will be categorized into case collections, containing both video clips and transcripts that reflect the moment-to-moment emergence and calibration of multimodal action. The subsequent functional analysis will be grounded in the recipients’ observable interactional orientation to the focus structures. As a result, the interdependent organization of grammatical practices and sequential action will be determined in each language. At the second comparative stage, the functions revealed in one language will be explored in the corpora of the other, possibly disclosing commonalities, differential constructional distributions and alternative grammatical structures that accomplish (partially) similar tasks. The analysis will thus proceed in a spiral of form>function>form. Comparative work involves 1) discussion of transcription and hands-on analysis of video data, 2) functional analysis of multimodal social action in order to establish cross-linguistic coding schemes, and 3) collaborative writing of joint papers.

The project will renew comparative interaction research and research on multimodal interaction by combining CA with an extended methodology involving systematic coding techniques. Our aim is an integrated analysis of syntactic, sequential, prosodic and embodied patterns connected to the production of the scrutinized linguistic structures. When coding, focus will be directed to questions of the following type: what is the sequential and epistemic status of the focused conversational turn, what kind of social action does it, what kind of syntactic configurations does it display, what kind of syntactic boundaries are identified, where are prosodic boundaries placed, what is observable in visual embodied behavior in relation to grammatical/prosodic boundaries, do (and where do) pauses, discontinuities and overlapping speech by others occur, how is the turn responded to? The results of this coding will give a fine-tuned qualitative and quantitative orientation of the richness of details in the data.

Material. As the conversational archive for Swedish in Helsinki has been newly refreshed, especially through the infrastructure at the Finnish Centre of Excellence in Research on Intersubjectivity in Interaction, the project plans to reuse these existing recordings to a high degree. Two new additional datasets will be collected: comparative set-ups of L1 and L2 conversations on art for the subproject 3; further, the postgraduate student’s doctoral project collects conversations between artists and art professionals. A comparative core corpus of existing data is compiled for the purposes of research with the international partners: 10 hours of casual conversation in each language, with good camera views capturing embodied behavior and good sound quality enabling visual and prosodic analysis. This data on Swedish is presently being transcribed and follows the standard conversation analytic practices (e.g. Stivers & Sidnell 2013). Nonverbal behavior involving gaze, gesture, posture, and surrounding objects will be coded only in segments containing the grammatical target structures,
using ELAN software. The recordings and transcripts will be archived on password-protected servers, and relevant data segments will be anonymized for presentation purposes. For future research, the materials will be housed at the limited-access storages provided by FIN-CLARIN in Helsinki as a part of the Language Bank of Finland (see Data management plan).

A critical point of success is the inter-locking collaboration with the partner teams in Linköping, Neuchâtel and Haifa. It is a paramount asset for the project that it is genuinely internationally rooted with sister projects dealing with the same analytic focus but representing different languages and cultures. It is expectable that this set-up will generate compelling results in a comparative perspective. It is critical that we identify data and cases which are as comparable as possible, e.g. as regards genre, participant relations and recording settings. Bi-annual data-driven workshops with the partners are scheduled in order to secure success on this point. There will probably also be differences in to what degree a certain structure, say, WH-clefts, occurs in the different language data. If there are considerable differences in frequencies, this may drive us towards comparing those languages in which a specific construction is more prevalent. Again, data coordination during the partner workshops is a quality control mechanism that will help us steer our research on paths where we have the most likely chances to be analytically successful, and redirect the focus in cases where a preliminary vision of comparability seems less fruitful. As regards coding techniques, it is essential that a detailed written manual is produced and that coding consistency between the different projects is regularly controlled.

Support. The project’s research will contribute to the Helsinki University strategic research area “The human mind in the changing world”, as well as to the thematic focus area “Mind in change”. Further, the research contributes directly to the Faculty of Arts’ focus area “Interaction”. Building on the tradition of the Finnish Centre of Excellence in Research on Intersubjectivity in Interaction (2012-2017), the project benefits of the support of this vivid multidisciplinary research community.

5. Ethical issues
This project follows the ethical guidelines of the University of Helsinki and the Academy of Finland guidelines of research ethics. The data that is going to be used is collected by taking into account the informed consent by the research subjects, whose anonymity will be secured throughout the research process and in the storage of data. Participants in recordings have given their written consent to participate in the study. Personal and identifiable items like personal names and locations are changed in the transcripts. Participation in the project is voluntary, and it is possible for the research subjects to opt out at any later stage of research. The data is managed confidentially, and the project will not deal with personal background data of the subjects. In publishing research results, the project will follow the principles for responsible scientific conduct as defined by the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity (www.tenk.fi).

6. Implementation: schedule, budget, distribution of work
The project is planned to run for 4 years (1.9.2018–31.8.2022) and mobilizes a postgraduate (Sara Rönnqvist) and a postdoctoral researcher (Eveliina Tolvanen) with salary costs, and a PI (Jan Lindström) with working hours within his professorship on the project. The research is scheduled as shown in the table below, involving an analysis of Swedish (Component A) and a comparison with the partners (Component B).

Video conferencing and shared Dropboxes will be used for the regular exchange of progress reports. The international partner teams will meet semi-annually for extended workshops where the milestones of data collection, grammatical-interactional-multimodal coding, and theoretical modelling will be secured with the assistance of invited experts. Participation in two major international conferences every year will provide further arenas for developing, testing, and disseminating ideas. People outside the project, also involving other fields than linguistics, will be encouraged to collaborate to increase overall impact.
### Component (A) – Analysis of Swedish

**2018-19**
- Coding of construction-types in the data: complements and relative clauses with variants, clefts with variants, compensatory constructions
- Identification of most frequent verbs in clefts and complement taking predicates
- Initial analysis in view of establishment of excerpt collections
- Refining of multi-modal transcripts in the relevant data excerpts
- Entering observations in the project-specific coding scheme
- Collection and processing of L2 material and professional interaction on art

**2020**
- Collection-based analysis and refinement of collections
- Writing up of publications on selected aspects of each of the clause-combining types and their variants
- Comparative analysis of L1 and L2 production

**2021**
- Continuation of collection-based analysis
- Writing up of further publications on Swedish
- Testing and designing the experimental component as an L2 teaching/diagnosting instrument

**2022**
- Completion of collection-based analysis
- Completion of doctoral thesis
- Writing up of publications on Swedish

### Component (B) – Cross-linguistic comparison

**2018-19**
- Exploratory data-sessions with the partner project teams
- Identification of convergences in previous research conducted by the different project teams on the constructions at hand
- Identification of initial candidates (grammatical formats & sequential locations) for comparison across languages
- Post-doc mobility
- Postgraduate-student training with partners
- Controls of coding consistency across projects

**2020**
- Refinement of candidates for comparison across languages
- Controls of coding consistency across projects
- Start of comparative work across the languages studied, based on selected constructions in specific sequential environments
- Post-doc mobility
- Postgraduate-student training with partners

**2021**
- Systematic comparative work, extension to a larger set of constructions in specific sequential environments
- Writing up of joint publications with other projects on focal aspects of comparison
- Post-doc mobility
- Postgraduate-student training with partners

**2022**
- Cross-linguistic comparison - Writing up of joint publications with other projects
- Discussion of theoretical implications – writing up of a seminal paper on emergence in grammar in a cross language, multimodal perspective
- Submission of a book proposal on the issue (book to be finalized after project end)

---

The graduate student and postdoc are the central cost and research-generating investment; both will work 100% in the project and are responsible for the study of Swedish. Prof. Jan Lindström has the overall scientific and administrative responsibility for the Helsinki project, acting as a supervisor for Rönqvist and Tolvanen. He will also coordinate the research on the comparative component and conduct own research on Swedish for the project within his professorship with estimated 15%/year (240 working hrs/year).

During the first half a year (2018), funds are applied for a research assistant who will collect and transcribe the experimental material for the L2 subproject. The postdoctoral researcher is hired for a standard three-year period (2019-2021) which coincides with the finalization of her present duties up to 2019. Funds are reserved for semi-annual partner workshops as well as for international conferences (‘travel’). In addition, funds for postdoctoral mobility are reserved for 2019–2021 (two annual 4-week periods à 1500 €) to be taken place at the partner universities (Linköping, Neuchâtel, Haifa) (‘other costs’). The postgraduate student is expected to seek travel funds from sources specially directed to junior researchers, for example, the HU doctoral program. For scientific publishing, funds are applied for open access publishing (‘services’); a sum of ca 500€/year is reserved for hiring server space from the University of Helsinki IT services for the data collection. The planned new data collection can be carried out with existing equipment or material supplied by current data collecting projects.

### 7. Research team and collaborative partners

In order to fulfill the aims of the project, the team members must share a fundamental understanding of the qualitative research process, and be able to uncover grammatical, interactional, and embodied features of complex clause production at a fine-tuned level of native competence. The PI Lindström has
a documented interest in comparative linguistics and variational pragmatics, in developing language theory on an interactional basis, and has major international collaboration experience. He has also gained profound experience as an academic leader and as a leader of research projects, more recently in the Finnish Center of Excellence in Research on Intersubjectivity in Interaction (intersubjectivity.fi) and the research program Interaction and Variation in Pluricentric Languages (su.se/svefler/ivip). Postgraduate student Rönnqvist has initiated her doctoral project under the supervision of Lindström in 2017 on conversations about works of visual arts; she is presently training herself especially for multimodal interaction analysis, e.g. in a course at Linköping university under the training of prof. Keevallik (and Mathias Broth). Analyzing and comparing L2 production with L1 practices is a scientifically new achievement for the research team, thus adding to the breadth of the researchers’ competences; however, Lindström has a solid long-term experience of teaching Swedish language skills at the university level and his home department can boast a long tradition of Swedish L2 research.

The project is essentially international, featuring close collaboration between four countries, Finland, Israel, Switzerland, and Sweden with additional close ties to Estonia. The collaborative partners represent the absolute top in the study of grammar and interaction in their respective languages. The partners also contribute with partly complementary expertise: Lindström is an expert on grammar in conversation, construction grammar, conversation analysis and pragmatic variation; Keevallik is one of the leading researchers within the analysis of linguistic and embodied resources in social interaction; Maschler has specialized in grammaticalization and emergent grammar in interaction; Pekarek Doehler is an expert on the multi-semiotic nature of temporally unfolding interaction and L2 research. The project’s cooperation with Keevallik builds on a two-decade long tradition of contacts between the University of Helsinki and the spoken interaction researchers at Linköping University. New intensive cooperation will be established with Haifa University and the University of Neuchâtel, both of these collaborations have been deepened through Maschler’s and Pekarek Doehler’s respective visits at the Center of Excellence in Helsinki. While the prospective partners have collaborated in conference panel organization (e.g. IPrA 2013, ICCA 2014, IPrA 2015, IPrA 2017) and joint volumes (e.g. in Auer & Maschler 2016; Lindström, Maschler & Pekarek Doehler 2016), the four-piece partnership is a new constellation on this level.

Through the project, the University of Helsinki will reinforce its leading position in interactional linguistics in Finland and Scandinavia, building on the rich legacy of the Finnish Center of Excellence in Research on Intersubjectivity in Interaction, and featuring close ties with Turku, Oulu, Uppsala, Gothenburg and Stockholm; at the latter, cooperation with the program on Swedish as a pluricentric language (led by Prof. Norrby) will be essential.

8. Research careers and researcher training

Prof. Lindström will act as the supervisor responsible for the postgraduate and postdoctoral researchers in the research team. The postgraduate and postdoc will have the opportunity of working in the active and internationally acknowledged research environment at the Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian and Scandinavian Studies and the Helsinki University research community for interaction research that involves cross-disciplinary collaboration between linguists, social scientists, speech scientists and pedagogics. The postgraduate and postdoc will receive cross-linguistic research training in the workshops taking place with the Swedish, Swiss and Israeli partners, and the senior and junior researchers involved in them. This cooperation is planned to result in joint publications across members of the partner projects, which enhances prospects of international careers. Additionally, the postdoc researcher is expected to pay two annual four-week visits at the partner sites in order to further international experience and research skills. The postgraduate student will gain uniquely important training in multimodal analysis in Linköping, syntactic emergence and grammaticalization in Haifa,
and interaction-oriented L2 research in Neuchâtel. At the completion of the project, the postgraduate student will submit her doctoral thesis for a pre-examination for doctoral degree.

The promotion of equality in the project is based on the Academy of Finland Equality Plan. The project accommodates for parental leaves according to the Finnish law and the Academy of Finland regulations. Further, the reconciliation of work and family is also facilitated within the project, for example, by planning work schedules so that they allow working in distance and by having regular activities to take place during office hours (between 9 and 17).

9. Mobility plan for the funding period
The project takes seriously the mobility plan for the postdoctoral researcher, who is expected to pay two annual four-week visits at the partner sites in Linköping, Neuchâtel and Haifa during her employment in the project (invitations appended). During these visits, the PD will attain a more in-depth understanding of the data used in the partner projects, and simultaneously, the visits will advance the understanding of the language-specific aspects of the Swedish data. The specific affordances of the partner sites are the following: under the supervision of prof. Keevallik in Linköping, the PD will receive training in analyzing embodied and prosodic aspects of conversational interaction; under the supervision of prof. Yael Maschler in Haifa, the PD will be trained in analyzing degrees of constructional emergence with reference to grammaticalization research; under the supervision of prof. Pekarek Doehler in Neuchâtel, the PD can consolidate her skills in multimodal interactional linguistic analysis with a special focus on L2 learning and production. The postgraduate student is encouraged to visit these sites and enroll to courses that deal with the thematic fields, making use of the good postgraduate educational connections especially with the Linköping University. Overall, the visits provide excellent opportunities to identify comparative phenomena in the datasets and to work on joint publications with the researchers occupied with Estonian, French and Hebrew.

The Helsinki project is committed to welcome postdoctoral visitors to work with the local team, providing a unique site for interactional linguistic research and researcher training, as there is a sizeable and active multidisciplinary research community working under the methodological umbrella of Conversation Analysis (covering linguistics, social sciences, speech sciences, pedagogics, etc.).
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