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ABSTRACT

In this study of constructed dialogue in natural conversations involving four American women, attention is drawn to how reporting speakers make use of different quotative forms to introduce utterances represented with direct speech forms. There is an attempt to account for the functions of such quotative forms in terms of discourse structure and the interpersonal relationships of the participants. In one closely-examined narrative, the present tense forms of several quotatives (is, says, goes, and be like) are used to introduce constructed dialogue which seems to be that part of the narrative that the speaker intends to foreground, while the past tense is reserved for background details which set the stage for the drama. Furthermore, be like is reserved for one character, and appears to be used to mark the nearness of the character to the source of the narrative. That be like is a marker of closeness to the source of a telling may be further supported by the fact that be like occurs with greater frequency as a quotative with reports attributed to first person speakers than third person speakers.

Another feature of constructed dialogue which is analyzed is the use of zero-quotative. This term is used to refer to the absence of both an introducing verb and attributed speaker before direct speech forms. Zero-quotatives appear to be favored when the omission of a quotative may serve some dramatic effect, such as being an iconic representation of one
aspect of the reported interaction. Zero-quotatives also are favored at sites where the participants display strong convergence behavior. At such sites, although the constructed utterances are referentially attributed to only one of the speakers, the absence of a quotative allows the speakers to avoid explicitly attributing the utterances to either speaker, thus allowing them to stress their similarity by constructing utterances which may be spoken by either. Where direct speech forms appearing without a quotative must be referentially attributed to another character, the lack of explicit attribution again allows the speakers to merge their voices to underscore their shared knowledge and experience.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

Reported speech is speech within speech, utterance within utterance, and at the same time also speech about speech, utterance about utterance (Voloshinov, 1986, p. 115).

Traditional grammarians typically describe reports of speech by assuming the existence of a derivational relationship between what they consider to be the two main modes of report available: direct and indirect discourse. Those who work in the literary realm have largely been absorbed with the verification of whose voice is being represented within the reported discourse. Notions such as bivocality and multivocality have been proposed to account for the presence of the author's, the narrator's, and the character's voice. In the study of everyday spoken discourse, much less attention has been paid to whose voice is being represented. While not a major issue of the literary study of reported discourse, a recent concern in spoken discourse is whether or not reports of other persons' speech should be treated as verbatim. For reasons to be explored in Chapters 2 and 4, I will generally treat reports of other persons' talk by using the term "constructed dialogue."
In this study of constructed dialogue in conversational interaction, I will draw attention to how reporting speakers introduce the constructed dialogue with different quotative forms. I will attempt to account for the functions of such forms in terms of discourse organization and the interpersonal relationships of the participants.

Given that my analysis will be in terms of discourse organization and the interpersonal relationships of the participants, it follows that the data to be examined is taken from natural conversation settings among friends. The type of analysis to be done will be essentially descriptive in nature. I will not propose rules which account for the use of particular quotative forms in particular environments but will suggest that particular quotative forms appear to be favored at certain sites because of certain functions which the quotative forms perform.

In the rest of this chapter, I will first briefly review the account of reported speech usually given by traditional grammarians. I will then review the work of those analyzing reported discourse within the literary tradition, specifically within the area of poetics. In the following chapter I will review relevant topics and analyses in the study of discourse within conversation. Chapter 3 will present a description of the data, its collection, transcription conventions, and problems encountered in all of these areas. In Chapter 4, I will present a fine-grained analysis of the use of constructed
dialogue in the structural organization of one narrative, particularly focusing on the occurrence and function of be like in contrast to other quotative forms. In Chapter 5, I will investigate the use of zero-quotative in conjunction with constructed dialogue and attempt to present an account of how such forms must be interpreted.

GRAMMATICAL TRADITION

Grammar handbooks typically offer two ways to report an utterance: directly or indirectly. Guth (1984) gives a typical account of direct and indirect report: if the report is a reproduction of someone's exact words, then the report is direct; if the report is someone else's ideas put into the current speaker's or writer's own words, then the report is indirect. Several handbooks do nothing more than show where the quotation marks and other punctuation go when giving a direct report (Perrin, 1988; Howell & Memering, 1986; Guth, 1984; Hodges & Whitten, 1982; Watkins & Dillingham, 1982; Warriner, Mersand, Townsend & Griffith, 1973). Other handbooks mention the necessary change in tenses, pronouns, and spatial and temporal adverbs when transforming a direct quote into an indirect quote (Feigenbaum, 1985). An underlying assumption of the handbooks' rules concerning how to report discourse is that the indirect form is always based on a direct form. Furthermore, they assume that one can retrieve the direct from the indirect form by reversing the
rules. For example, Howell and Memering (1986) warn writers not to enclose in quotation marks the reported clause in the following sentence: He said that the big city was not for him or his family. The direct form of the reported clause with the proper punctuation, from which the indirect form is assumed to derive, is then given: He said, "The big city is not for me or my family" (p. 206).

The following summary of the mechanics involved in transforming direct discourse (DD) to indirect discourse (ID) is fairly representative:

1. No quotation marks and optional insertion of the conjunction that before reported declaratives;
2. Shift of personal and possessive pronouns from first or second person to third person;
3. Back-shift of verb tenses: present tense becomes past tense; past and present perfect become past perfect;
4. Conversion of deictic elements: demonstratives (this and that) and temporal and spatial adverbs;
5. Transformation of direct questions and exclamations;
6. Transformation of direct imperatives;
7. Barring of certain features like vocatives, interjections, lexical dialectal features.

(McHale, 1978, p. 251-252)

Quirk & Greenbaum (1973) mention one other type of reported speech: free indirect speech (I will refer to this type of speech as free indirect discourse (FID)). They
describe it as "a half-way stage between direct and indirect speech" and claim that it "is used extensively in narrative writing" (p. 345). Syntactically, they describe it as essentially indirect speech except that the narrator omits the reporting clause and may include features of direct speech, such as direct questions. What signals that the words are not being presented directly is the presence of a back-shift in verb tenses and adjustments to pronouns, determiners, and adverbs. As an example of free indirect speech, they present the following:

So that was their plan, was it? He well knew their tricks, and would show them a thing or two before he was finished. Thank goodness he had been alerted, and that there were still a few honest people in the world. (p. 345)

Similar to the transformations presented for deriving ID from DD are those that McHale (1978) presents for deriving FID from ID.

1. Deletion of the reporting verb of saying/thinking (though it may appear as a comment clause) and the conjunction that;
2. Retention of the shift of person and back-shift of tenses characteristic of ID;
3. Reinstatement of deictic elements of DD;
4. Reinstatement of the word order of direct questions;
5. Reinstatement of DD features such as interjections.

(p. 252)
Criticism of the Derivational Approach

As is clear from the preceding section, there is a general tendency among those describing types of reported discourse to assume a straightforward derivational relationship between the different possible forms. This approach has come in for criticism on a number of different fronts.

Banfield (1982) argues for the impossibility of there being a derivational relationship between DD and ID. She first attacks the popular notion of ID being derived from DD. One obstacle to this supposed relationship is the transformation of nouns. For instance, it isn't necessarily possible to retrieve the original utterance from an indirect report such as "Sue said that he was an idiot." The pronoun he could have as its underlying noun any number of possibilities. The transformation deriving he would have to replace the possible noun phrases of the direct version which is a violation of Chomsky's (1965) recoverability condition on deletions. A similar obstacle is presented by deictic adverbs of time and place. The problem arises because the deictics in ID refer to the quoting time and place and not to the quoted time and place (the deictic center of the quoted utterance). Wierzbicka (1974) also discusses the problems associated with pronoun shifts when attempting to derive ID from DD. An indirect report like Mary said that she was wrong would be assumed to derive from Mary said, "I am wrong".
However, an identical indirect report could be used to report Mary said, "Amy is wrong".

As McCawley (1988) has noted, there are some questions in English which can be reported, but not asked, as in *I asked Jerry what John had bought and Mary would borrow* (p. 286). The unacceptable direct question which would be derived from this indirect report is *What has John bought and will Mary borrow?* Banfield (1982) also lists some communication verbs which are appropriate only with indirect reports (p. 35). For example, "*The dealer recommended that he try the less expensive one*" could have several potential single direct speech sources or the accumulation of several different direct speech forms. Sentences of indirect discourse can also be qualified in ways that direct discourse cannot. For example, "*Marx wrote that religion lulls the people into accepting their condition, but I don't remember how he phrased it*" could not possibly be derived from direct discourse (p. 36).

Banfield also argues that DD cannot be derived from ID. One reason for this impossibility arises from the fact that DD can have expressive elements that ID cannot. For example, what would be the indirect rendering of "*He shouted, 'Christ, how it heightens the torture!'*" (p. 31)? Or, how would one account for the vocative in "*The private answered, 'Sir, I cannot carry out these orders.'*" (p. 33)? She concludes that "there is no straightforward, regular syntactic relation between the two types of quotation" (p. 37).
LITERARY TRADITION

Thus far I have concentrated on the grammatical analysis of reported speech and the essentially syntactic arguments for or against the relationships between the different forms. There is, however, a quite different approach possible to the study of reported discourse. For those working in the literary realm there are several overlapping taxonomies for describing the forms used in reporting speech events. The modes of report are usually placed along a continuum ranging from greater narrator interference to lesser narrator interference (Leech and Short, 1981), or from the purely diegetic to the purely mimetic (McHale, 1978; Rimmon-Kenan, 1983). The concepts of mimesis and diegesis date back to Plato (Prince, 1987, p. 52). With mimesis, the poet speaks as if s/he were the character, with little or no narrator interference. With diegesis, the poet speaks with his/her own voice, thus involving narratorial mediation. The notion of mimesis must be qualified, however, before any discussion of modes of report may begin. As Rimmon-Kenan (1983) writes:

no text of narrative fiction can show or imitate the action it conveys, since all such texts are made of language, and language signifies without imitating. Language can only imitate language, which is why the representation of speech comes closest to pure mimesis, but even here . . . there is a narrator who 'quotes' the characters' speech, thus reducing the directness of showing. All that a narrative can do is create an illusion, an effect, a semblance of mimesis, but it does so through diegesis. (p. 108)
Taking this perspective, one would say that the mimetic category simply functions as an end-point to the analytic continuum and is never actually instantiated in reported discourse.

Leech and Short (1981) present a scale which places the modes of report along a cline of greater to lesser narrator interference. Following is a description of their categories accompanied by examples, the first category involving the greatest amount of narrator control and the last involving the least amount.

1) Narrative report of speech acts (NRSA) - a mere report of a speech act in which the narrator does not make a commitment to giving the sense of what was said or how it was said.

(He promised to visit her again.)

2) Indirect speech (IS) - narrator expresses what was said in the narrator’s own words.

(He said that he would return there to see her the following day.)

3) Free indirect speech (FIS) - syntactically between IS and DS. Either "a free form 'purporting to be IS" or "a more indirect form masquerading as DS."

(He would come back there to see her again tomorrow.)
4) Direct speech (DS) - verbatim report of what was said.

(He said, "I'll come back here to see you again tomorrow.")

5) Free direct speech (FDS) - DS without the quotation marks and the introductory reporting clause.

(I'll come back here to see you again tomorrow.)

(Leech & Short, 1981, pp. 318-327.)

As is apparent from their descriptions of what are basically syntactic categories, Leech and Short, like the traditional grammarians, also appear to be working with some type of derivational relationship between the different modes, all of which are based on some "original" direct utterance.

McHale (1978) discusses the weaknesses of the traditional grammatical description of reported description. The assumption that ID and FID are derived from some original direct utterance is totally without basis when discussing fiction where

there is no direct 'original' prior to or behind an instance of ID or FID; the supposedly 'derived' utterances are not versions of anything, but themselves the 'originals' in that they give as much as the reader will ever learn of 'what was really said'. (p. 256)

McHale suggests that in order to account for the relationships among the types of reported discourse, categories of literary representation should be brought to the forefront and syntactic categories pushed back. Following are categories and examples of each presented by McHale which may be placed
on a scale from the purely diegetic to the purely mimetic'. The scale is not meant to be exhaustive, but a starting point.

i) Diegetic summary - involving only the bare report that a speech event has occurred, without any specification of what was said or how it was said.

When Charley got a little gin inside of him he started telling war yarns for the first time in his life. (Big Money, 295.)

ii) Summary, less 'purely' diegetic - summary which to some degree represents, not merely gives notice of, a speech event in that it names the topics of conversation.

He stayed till late in the evening telling them about miraculous conversions of unbelievers, extreme unction on the firing line, a vision of the young Christ he'd seen walking among the wounded in a dressing station during a gasattack. (1919, 219.)

iii) Indirect content-paraphrase - this type corresponds to the common characterization of ID as the paraphrase of the content of a speech event, without regard to the style or form of the supposed 'original' utterance.

The waiter told him that Carranza's troops had lost Torreon and that Villa and Zapata were closing in on the Federal District. (42nd Parallel, 320.)

iv) Indirect discourse, mimetic to some degree - this type of ID gives the illusion of 'preserving' or
'reproducing' aspects of the style of an utterance, above and beyond the mere report of its content.

Joe said a hell of a lot of good it'd do him, his home was in Washington, D.C. (1919, 26.)

v) Free indirect discourse - not only grammatically intermediate between ID and DD, but also mimetically intermediate. FID may, in fact, be mimetic to almost any degree short of 'pure' mimesis.

Why the hell shouldn't they know, weren't they off'n her and out to see the goddam town and he'd better come along. (1919, 43-44.)

vi) Direct discourse - the most purely mimetic type of report, though of course with the reservation that this 'purity' is a novelistic illusion; all novelistic dialogue is conventionalized or stylized to some degree.

Fred Summers said, "Fellers, this war's the most gigantic cockeyed graft of the century and me for it and the cross red nurses." (1919, 191.)

vii) Free direct discourse - nothing more than DD shorn of its conventional orthographic cues.

Fainy's head suddenly got very light. Bright boy, that's me, ambition and literary taste ...Gee, I must finish Looking Backward ...and jez, I like reading fine, an' I could run a linotype or set up print if anybody'd let me. Fifteen bucks a week ...pretty soft, ten dollars' raise. (42nd Parallel, 22.)

(McHale, 1978, pp. 258-260)
Choices and Effects of Modes of Reported Speech

Others have proposed similar scales or continua, but rather than dwell on lists of category types, I would now like to consider the different functions of these various reporting formats with a view toward determining what is gained by using one mode of reported discourse rather than another and what functions are exclusive to the particular modes of discourse. Most of the work answers these questions in terms of what FID can communicate that either DD or ID cannot. The most common functional distinction among the three modes is that DD allows the character’s voice to be heard with a minimum of interference by the narrator, ID is the exclusive voice of the narrator, and FID allows for both the character’s and the narrator’s voices to be heard. Various functions can then be served by this bivocal or polyvocal effect.

Before discussing the possible bivocal or polyvocal effect of FID, it should be noted that Sternberg (1982) argues that all modes of reported discourse are multivoiced. Sternberg convincingly refutes the accepted view that DD echoes the voice of the reported speaker while routing the voice of the reporting speaker, and that ID mutes the voice of the reported speaker while giving voice only to the reporting speaker. I shall reconsider these issues after first describing the standard approach to voice in reported discourse.
The traditional view that DD and ID are univocal while FID is bivocal or polyvocal may be represented by Guiraud (1971). Guiraud (pp. 82-83) writes that language has a dual function: that of objectively indicating the object that the speaker is talking about (the predicative function) and that of expressing the feelings and emotions of the speaking subject (the locutive function). For every instance of reported discourse, whether it be DD, ID, or FID, there are two speakers (primary and secondary or reporter and reportee) and two speaking situations. In other words, there is the potential for two locutive messages and two predicative messages. The result of the syntax of ID which subordinates the secondary speaker’s statement is that the secondary speaker's statement is "of a purely predicative type and implies no locutive message. For the latter is linked to the voice of the speaker, and the secondary speaker does not participate in the communication: he has no voice" (p. 84). Only the locutive message of the primary speaker is present.

With DD the primary speaker lends his/her voice to the secondary speaker effecting the preservation of the secondary speaker’s locutive message, but in doing so loses his/her own voice. The primary speaker "loses the capacity to express the emotions and feelings that he experiences himself with regard to both the statement and the secondary speaker" (Guiraud, 1971, p. 84). So again one of the locutive messages of the reported discourse is lost.
FID allows both locutive messages to be retained. For example, by reporting the words in indirect style (changing the pronouns and verb tenses), which allows for the primary speaker's locutive message to come through, but by using the vocabulary of the secondary speaker, both the primary and secondary speakers' voices can be represented. In conversation, Guiraud suggests that FID can be achieved by the primary speaker uttering the secondary speaker's statement but in a tone of voice which expresses the primary speaker's feelings toward the statement.

Banfield (1982) also holds to the notion that only the reporting speaker's voice can be heard in ID because "the grammar does not allow one speaker to 'express' another's state" (p. 62). The grammar she is referring to is one in which there is a distinction drawn between E(xpression)s and S(entence)s. Expressive elements (e.g. exclamatory constructions, repetitions and hesitations, incomplete sentences, direct addresses, dialect usages) may be contained in Es but not Ss. And for every E there can only be one SELF, that is only one voice can be heard. The quoted clause in ID is an S and so cannot contain expressive elements attributed to the quoted speaker. The E which frames the quoted clause can, on the other hand, contain expressive elements, but those elements must be attributed to the quoting speaker. In indirect speech the "quoting speaker interprets the content of the quoted speech in a propositional (S) form, removing all
traces of the quoted speaker’s expression or translating them into a descriptive form” (p. 62). The quoted clause of DD is an E itself which results in the capacity of DD to represent the expressive elements attributed to the quoted Speaker. That is, DD is composed of two Es, each E with its own voice. Only one voice can be represented in each E; the voice of the quoting Speaker cannot be represented within the quoted clause. The quoted E has its own Speaker.

Although the syntax of ID and DD is usually held as evidence that either the reporter’s or reportee’s voice is exclusively being represented, Sternberg (1982) claims that in fact both perspectives are present in either mode. ID, which syntactically eliminates the reportee’s perspective, does not eliminate the reportee altogether, because the range of information reported is always constrained to some degree by the reportee. The syntax of indirect reporting also does not preclude a verbatim report of the reportee’s words with the exception of mechanical shifts to the frame (i.e. deictic shifts). An indirect report such as "She said that she would start making everybody call him that in Houston" may very well be based on an original statement (supposing that there is indeed an original utterance) of "I’ll start making everybody call him that in Houston." The point is that nothing in the grammar rules out the possibility that an indirect report may express the same fidelity to the original utterance (save for the deictic shifts) as a direct report.
The duality of perspectives can also not be escaped with DD. Bakhtin (1981, p. 340) writes "that the speech of another, once enclosed in a context, is - no matter how accurately transmitted - always subject to certain semantic changes." He continues, "Given the appropriate methods for framing, one may bring about fundamental changes even in another's utterance accurately quoted" (p. 340). Voloshinov (1986) also describes the interference of the author or narrator's voice with the voice to which the direct discourse is attributed. The author/narrator can so describe a character that any utterances attributed to him/her may have cast upon them "heavy shadows" (p. 134). For example, if lying is a trait of a character, then any of his/her utterances will be colored.

Sternberg discusses the impossibility of removing an element of one context into another context without changing the removed element. Because the reporter must inevitably recontextualize the quote, the reporter's perspective is never muted. The quoted portion is extracted from a "self-contained whole" to become "part of the framing whole" (Sternberg, 1982, p. 75). What distinguishes Sternberg from Banfield on the point of DD and double voicing is Sternberg's insistence that within the quoted clause both the quoted and quoting speakers' voices are present. What in the end differentiates DD from other types of report is its double-centered deictic structure. The confusion regarding DD, according to
Sternberg, is equating deictic and communicative autonomy. Sternberg writes:

From the fact that the inset is deictically independent of the frame, it does not follow that the inset enjoys the communicative independence or inviolability distinctive of any normal speech-event, including the very one it represents. For once framed, an utterance becomes penetrable, manipulable, and hence essentially ambiguous out of context, even in all that concerns deictic features. (pp. 110-111)

While most controversy has been occasioned by the distinction between direct and indirect discourse, the claimed bivocality of FID is not an issue which has gone unchallenged. Jesperson (1924) and Cohn (1966) argue that FID is from the point of view of the narrator, while Banfield (1978, 1982) believes that only the character's viewpoint is represented (again one SELF per E). Most others feel that both the character's and the narrator's viewpoints are represented, while Ginsberg (1982) claims that FID is unique in that it represents an utterance in which no one's voice is heard.

Jesperson (1924) divides indirect discourse into two types: dependent and represented speech. The former term refers to the type of reported discourse more familiarly known as indirect discourse. He labels it dependent because of its syntactic dependence on a reporting verb of saying/thinking. The main syntactic difference between the two types of indirect discourse, according to Jesperson, is that represented speech may contain emotional elements, questions, and commands, similar to DD. He writes:
It is chiefly used in long connected narratives where the relation of happenings in the exterior world is interrupted . . . by a report of what the person mentioned was saying or thinking at the time, as if these sayings or thoughts were the immediate continuation of the outward happenings. (p. 291)

It would appear then that Jesperson would consider that the speaker of FID is the narrator who wishes to represent speech or thought in a way similar to how the narrator is representing other events.

Cohn (1966) argues that the narrator is unobtrusively present in this style of report, which she appropriately refers to as narrated monologue. The use of spatial and temporal markers of direct discourse is taken as evidence that the viewpoint is located within the character's psyche (p. 105). Because the sentences of narrated monologue appear with the same person and tense of simple narration, "inner and outer world become one, eliminating explicit distance between the narrator and his creature" (p. 99). The narrator "is, in a sense, the imitator of his character's silent utterances" (p. 110). From this perspective, there is only the narrator's voice.

Banfield (1978, 1982), believing that the style in question represents consciousness as well as speech, favors the term represented speech and thought. In contrast to Cohn, she argues that the use of represented speech and thought is a device whereby the author can erase the presence of the narrator, leaving only the representation of speech (verbal or preverbal) of the character. Essential to her argument is the
distinction drawn between SPEAKER and SELF. The SPEAKER is defined as the referent of the first person pronoun and may be coreferential with the SELF in first person discourse. SELF is defined as "the consciousness to whom all expressive elements are ascribed" (1978, p. 299). The SELF is also associated with point of view. The SELF is coreferential with the third person in represented speech and thought. A sentence does not have a Speaker unless there are syntactic signs of a first person. Since, Banfield argues, sentences of represented speech and thought do not have such signs of a first person, there is no SPEAKER (which she equates with the narrator). Because these sentences are speakerless or narratorless, they present the point of view of the character only. She writes: "consciousness in this style is represented unmediated by any judging point of view. No one speaks in represented Es, although in them speech may be represented" (1982, p. 97). Thus, there are arguments for only a single voice in the form known as free indirect discourse (FID). There are, however, many more arguments against such a view.

The most popular characterization of FID is that it represents both the point of view of the narrator and the character. Voloshinov (1986) writes that quasi-direct discourse "expresses an active orientation ... that imposes upon the reported utterance its own accents, which collide and interfere with the accents in the reported utterance" (p.
Both the "character's accents" and the "author's accents" are combined "within the confines of one and the same linguistic construction" (p. 155).

Pascal (1977) writes that in FID we hear "a dual voice, which through vocabulary, sentence structure, and intonation subtly fuses the two voices of the character and the narrator" (p. 26). The narrator doesn't necessarily mimic the character's thoughts since what FID represents may be a "condensation, an ordering of what goes on in the mind of the character" (p. 26). But even if the mimicry were complete, the narrator would not disappear. Pascal writes:

... the narrator is always effectively present in free indirect speech, even if only through the syntax of the passage, the shape and relationship of sentences, and the structure and design of a story... Above all, perhaps, as the agency that brings multiple and complex events into relationship with one another and leads them to an end that establishes, even if without explicit comment, an all-embracing meaning. (p. 137)

Sternberg (1982), like Pascal, argues that the sentences of FID are never narratorless. Because interior monologue (or FID) is representative of the thoughts of a character which may or may not be verbal, the narrator's presence is especially essential since these thoughts are put into words. As readers, we are not presented with thoughts in a preverbal stage; we are presented with a linguistic rendering of the thoughts. The narrator must be present to represent these thoughts. Sternberg writes:

Interior monologue is typical of narrative rather than drama or film precisely because a narrator's intervention is necessary in order to lay open and give physical shape to the unuttered. (pp. 79-80)
In no way can interior monologue be presented without intervention; there is no physical matter to be reproduced.

What are the signals that what is being presented is something other than pure narration or direct discourse? As McHale writes, we can't discuss the functions of FID unless the reader realizes that it is something different than pure narration or direct discourse. Some of the types of signals identified and described by McHale (1978) are (1) grammatical, (2) contextual, and (3) idiomatic.

(1) Several grammatical signals may indicate that a point of view different than the narrator's is being represented. They include the presence of non-modal conditionals, adverbials expressing certainty or doubt, and spatial and temporal terms which are oriented toward the character's deictic center, rather than to the deictic center of the narrator (p. 265). Sentences like "She ought to have known better than to ever believe him" or "Maybe she could begin to believe him now" would seem anomalous in pure narrative. The narrator in such sentences is limiting his/her point to some extent to that of the character.

(2) Sentences near DD or ID sentences may be interpreted as FID. If a particular character is brought into focus in context, then FID sentences may be more readily attributed to the character (p. 268). For example, in the following extract from 1919, the reader's attention is directed to Maiden Evelina before the FID begins.
The Maiden Evelina used to go into Miss Mathilda's room when she was out and look at herself for a long time in the lookingglass. Her hair wasn't mousy, it was quite fair if only they would let her have it curly instead of in pigtails and even if her eyes weren't blue like George's they had little green specks in them. Her forehead was noble. (1919, p. 109)

(3) If the idiom or register being used appears to be one that the narrator is not in the habit of using, then the FID sentence may be attributed to a character for which the idiom or register would be appropriate (p. 270).

If the effect of FID is bivocality, then what functions may be served? Nearly everyone (Ron, 1981; Cohn, 1966; McHale, 1978; Rimmon-Kenan, 1983) who writes about FID mentions the possibility for irony or empathy.

Cohn (1966) writes about the possibility of achieving either a lyric or an ironic effect with narrated monologue, or FID. She writes that the mimetic quality of the form allows for "fusion with the subject, in which the actor identifies with, 'becomes' the person he imitates; or distance from the subject, a mock-identification that leads to caricature" (p. 111). Sometimes, it is not apparent which possibility should be inferred. That ambiguity itself may be the desired effect of FID.

Rimmon-Kenan (1983) discusses using the sentences of FID to determine the implied author's (or, perhaps, narrator's)
attitude toward the character(s) in question. By using the character's idiom or by presenting information from the character's point of view, the narrator seems to be aligning with the character. But because the narrator has always a distinct presence from the character, a distancing effect may be created. Like Cohn, Rimmon-Kenan suggests that ambiguity between the two possibilities, irony and empathy, may be the most interesting result of FID.

Both Rimmon-Kenan and McHale list the representation of stream-of-consciousness as one of FID's functions. McHale (1978) writes:

there is clearly one area where the empathetic function of FID and its function as strictly objective report must converge, where the only access to the utterance to be reported is through a kind of empathy, i.e., when FID serves as the vehicle of the stream-of-consciousness. (p. 276)

Banfield (1978) disagrees that FID achieves an ironic effect. She explains that for irony to be present within a sentence, two contrasting points of view would have to be represented within it (p. 311). Her position, as discussed above, is that the sentences of represented speech and thought only represent the point of view of the character. Thus, there is no possibility for contrasting points of view within the same sentence. The interpretation of a sentence as ironic must come from somewhere else in the text other than the sentence. She writes:
With irony, we have passed beyond the jurisdiction of grammar and hence, of what in narrative linguistics can comment on directly. But it should be stressed that the dual voice theory is not one which continues on where a linguistically based theory must stop. Rather, it is one which pronounces itself on the basis of unsupported linguistic assumptions and then retreats into the imprecise language of literary criticism when a counter-theory undercuts these assumptions. (p. 222)

Banfield (1982) also claims that FID is an "exclusively literary device" (p. 68). As mentioned earlier, Guiraud (1971) shows how FID can be achieved in conversation with intonation. Pascal (1977) writes that he himself uses FID in nonliterary writing and also cites its presence in historical and biographical writing. McHale mentions that it has been in common use in newspaper writing.

Polanyi (1982) also presents evidence from a conversational narrative which disproves Banfield's claim. When a presenting a narrative, a storyteller may merge her voice with the voice of one of the characters in the story. She writes:

these mergers of perspective, both in oral stories and literary texts, are symptomatic of the difficulties narrators face in encoding several levels of information simultaneously and should thus properly be seen as solutions of problems of reporting encountered by storytellers, regardless of medium or artistic intent. (pp. 155-156)

She cites an example from a conversation which involves a report about a movie plot. The line is "And he was telling Dolly, I don't want Dolly" (p. 159). Polanyi suspects that this style may be mainly used where there are three situational levels. She suggests that perhaps by using FID in
the above communicative event, a speaker is allowed to both
tell a story directly as if she were a character in the movie
while simultaneously making it clear that she is reporting
what was actually experienced.

SUMMARY

From previous studies of reported discourse which have
mainly focused on written representations, there is no clear
consensus on how to describe and analyze the range of ways in
which one individual may report another's speech or thought.
One might suspect that this lack of consensus may reflect the
disparate nature of the data under consideration and also the
different critical domains of interest among the writers
concerned. Among those who focus exclusively on the syntactic
representation "on the page," of whom Banfield (1982) and
Partee (1973) are primary examples, there is virtually no
interest or concern in the nature of the voice or voices
articulating those sentences on the page. From such a
perspective, it is presumably easier to attribute a single
narrating voice and proceed to analyze the internal structure
of what is presented, linguistically, by that voice. There is
also a natural tendency to isolate and study in detail
sentence-level fragments of the literary data under scrutiny
and to attribute other claimed effects to contextual factors
not directly represented in the particular sentence structures
being analyzed.
On the other hand, there are those such as Cohn (1966) and Sternberg (1982) whose interests extend to the reader's experience and interpretation of what is encountered "on the page." Indeed both these writers are widely quoted in studies on the oral performance of literature where the need for the actual articulation of written lines of reported discourse focuses a great deal of attention on what kind of "voice" is to be attributed to particular sentences of the literary narrative (cf. Hopkins, 1991, for a review). Consequently, the potential for double-voicing of narrator and reported character becomes a salient issue for such analysts and their descriptive frameworks reflect such concerns. This approach is also less concerned with the structure of single sentences and more absorbed with how a character's represented speech is designed to reveal attitude and intention or even how the narrating character's attitude to the reported character's words may be interpreted.

Given that the data to be investigated in the present study will be approached from a perspective which has more in common with that involved in determining how the reporter represents more than just a reportee's words and thoughts, I shall be more inclined to follow the tradition that identifies double-voicing in reported discourse and attempts to account for ironic effects present in the data being investigated. I shall also look quite exclusively at the occurrence of reported discourse in spoken language data within
conversational settings and will consequently move on, in the next chapter, to a review of how those working in conversation analysis have approached the study of reported discourse.
Note
1. The examples used by McHale are drawn from John Dos Passos's *U.S.A.* trilogy, the single volume Modern Library Edition.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter, the data which generated the discussion concerning the verification of the voice being represented in reported discourse was from written texts. Reported discourse has also been examined in the domain of conversational analysis. Because the nature of conversational data necessarily differs in some respects from that of literary data, the analysis of the types of data also differs. However, as will be noted in greater detail in this chapter and in Chapter 4, representations of reported discourse, whether they occur in written or spoken texts, are constructed.

In this chapter, I will first define and describe what is meant by 'conversation' and then turn to a discussion of relevant topics within conversation analysis, such as turn-taking, adjacency pairs, and preference structure. I'll also mention how conversational data is approached by social psychologists, specifically with regard to accommodation theory and Brown and Levinson's (1978) work concerning "face." Then, I'll discuss work concerning reported speech in conversation. In particular, I will mention Clark and Gerrig's (1990) work addressing quotations as demonstrations which includes suggested functions of quotations, Tannen's

CONVERSATION

Instead of building theories based on an analysis of literary data, conversation analysts examine naturally occurring conversations. A general definition of conversation is given by Levinson (1983):

that familiar predominant kind of talk in which two or more participants freely alternate in speaking, which generally occurs outside specific institutional settings like religious services, law courts, classrooms and the like. (p. 284)

Bublitz (1988) offers three defining features of conversation: spontaneity, reciprocity, and informality (pp. 9-10). Spontaneity refers to the participants not having pre-planned their contributions. Reciprocity refers to the same rights and obligations being granted to each participant, thus eliminating, for example, teacher-student discourse in classrooms from the definition of conversation. Informality refers to the participants being on relatively equal footing; they have no need to be self-conscious about their talk. Using these defining criteria, it can be seen that conversational data is strikingly different from literary data. Although the process of reading written discourse is also an interactive process, the interaction is on a different plane than is the case with conversation.
CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

Conversation analysis (CA) grew out of the field of ethnomethodology, the study of the "participants' own methods of production and interpretation of social interaction" (Levinson, 1983, p. 295). Heritage (1984) writes that "[a]t its most basic, the objective [of CA] is to describe the procedures and expectations in terms of which speakers produce their own behavior and interpret the behavior of others" (p. 241).

Conversation analysts, like grammarians, propose rules which function to account for regularities of behavior. An important difference exists, however, between conversational rules and grammatical rules: conversational rules are a matter of choice while grammatical rules are not (Taylor and Cameron, 1987). For example, one doesn't choose to follow the subjacency principle, but one may choose not to return a greeting. Another difference between the two types of rules is that conversational rules may change as the conversational context changes, while grammatical rules apply in any context. Conversationalists expect their behavior to be interpreted as produced with the relevant rules in mind whether they choose to follow or flout it. That is, they assume that their co-conversationalists, also being oriented towards the rule, will interpret their behavior as either conforming or not. If the behavior does not conform to the rule, there exists an account
for the lack of conformity. Taylor and Cameron (1987) in discussing the accountability of rules explain:

My behavior is designed in light of what I expect your reaction to it will be: i.e. you will react to it as conforming to the relevant rule or as in violation of it, thereby leading you to draw certain conclusions as to why I violated the rule. (p. 103).

The co-interactants may not be able to state a rule in the way linguists do, but that they are orienting their behavior towards the rule is evidenced by the interaction itself. Conversation analysts look to the conversation itself to suggest categories of analysis.

To illustrate the kind of methodology employed by conversation analysts, I'll briefly mention three topics that conversation analysts have examined in depth: turn-taking, adjacency pairs, and preference structure.

**Turn-taking**

Perhaps the most obvious quality of conversation is that participants take turns. Turn-taking is usually taken for granted without questioning what rules govern it. How does the turn-taking in a conversation in American English proceed so that there is so little overlap and so few gaps? Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) attempt to spell out the rules for turn-taking. They argue that a turn-taking mechanism assigns turns to conversation participants. Sharrock and Anderson (1986) write that this turn-taking mechanism is not being offered as an astonishing revelation, "but precisely
what it is, an obvious and central fact about conversation and, therefore, as something which must play a central and consequential role in organizing conversation" (p. 71). The rules may be compared to those of a marketplace where a commodity such as "the floor" is traded, offered, bid for, or taken over, and where the structure of the interaction is regarded as an "exchange" which involves the participants in "negotiation." The turns consist of units which are syntactic units such as sentences or noun phrases. At the end of each unit, there is the potential for a change in speakers. Where this potential exists is referred to as a transition relevance place (TRP). The rules for the turn-taking system are as follows:

(1) For any turn, at the initial transition-relevance place of an initial turn-constructional unit:

(a) If the turn-so-far is so constructed as to involve the use of a 'current speaker selects next' technique, then the party so selected has the right and is obliged to take next turn to speak; no others have such rights or obligations, and transfer occurs at that place.

(b) If the turn-so-far is so constructed as not to involve the use of 'current speaker selects next' technique, then self-selection for next speakership may, but need not, be instituted;
first starter acquires rights to a turn, and transfer occurs at that place.

(c) If the turn-so-far is so constructed as not to involve the use of 'current speaker selects next' technique, then current speaker may, but need not continue, unless another self-selects.

2. If, at the initial transition-relevance place of an initial turn-constructional unit, neither la nor lb has operated, and, following the provision of lc, current has continued, then the rule-set a-c reapplies at the next transition-relevance place, and recursively at each next transition-relevance place, until transfer is effected.

(Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974, p. 704)

These rules do not dictate what co-interactants do in a conversation, but are presented as "a formulation of the norms speakers and hearers 'orient' to in the management of the process of holding, securing, and giving up 'the floor' in conversation" (Taylor & Cameron, 1987, p. 108). By orienting to the norms, conversation may proceed in orderly fashion, without speakers overlapping their contributions excessively and without long, unexplainable pauses.

The rules also predict when an overlap might take place: (1) a non-current speaker may be anticipating a TRP and may self-select before the current speaker has indeed reached the
TRP or (2) two speakers may self-select simultaneously. The following is an example of overlap where a non-current speaker anticipates a TRP:

"A: What's yer name again please [sir, 
B: [F. T. Galloway]

(Sacks, Scheglof & Anderson, 1974, p. 708)

Here B expects that A will stop speaking after "please" and provides an answer to A’s question before A has finished. An example of two speakers simultaneously self-selecting follows:

"Mike: I know who d' guy is. =
Vic: = [He's ba::d.
James: = [You know the gu:y?"

(Sacks, Scheglof & Anderson, 1974, p. 707)

The rules also predict that pauses which occur after the current speaker has selected the next speaker will be significant. An example drawn from Atkinson and Drew (1979) illustrates the participants' orientation to the rules:

"A: Is there something bothering you or not? 

(1.0)
A: Yes or no 

(1.5)
A: Eh? 
B: No."

(Atkinson & Drew, 1979, p. 52)

In A's first turn, A selects a next speaker (B). That B fails to take the next turn results in a reduced repetition of the
original question. After B fails to respond again after being selected as the next speaker, A once again gives an abbreviated version of the question, letting B know that B's lack of response is being noted and that a reply is expected.

**Adjacency pairs**

Related to the turn-taking mechanism are adjacency pairs. A speaker cannot use just any utterance to select the next speaker. As Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) note, adjacency pair first parts are used to accomplish next selection. These first parts may be questions, offers, assessments, greetings, etc. Taylor and Cameron (1987) write that the principles on which CA are based are "most usefully and obviously employed" in the notion of the adjacency pair (p. 109). Adjacency pairs are characterized by Schegloff and Sacks along the following lines:

adjacency pairs are sequences of two utterances that are:

(i) adjacent

(ii) produced by different speakers

(iii) ordered as a first part and a second part

(iv) typed, so that a particular first part requires a particular second (or range of second parts) - e.g. offers require acceptances or rejections, greetings require greetings, and so on
and there is a rule governing the use of adjacency pairs, namely:

Having produced a first part of some pair, current speaker must stop speaking, and next speaker must produce at that point a second part to the same pair

(Levinson, 1983, pp. 304-5).

Again, the adjacency pair rule doesn't determine a conversation participant's behavior, but rather the rule is a norm to which the participants are oriented. When a first pair part is not followed by a relevant second pair part, the interactants will account for its absence. Heritage (1984) writes:

When the relevant 'next' occurs, it is characteristically treated as requiring no special explanation: a relevantly produced next action is specifically non-accountable. ... When the relevanced or appropriate 'next' does not occur however, the matter is . . . specially accountable. In such circumstances, accounts may be offered by the party whose conduct has not met the relevant expectation. Or, alternatively, the conduct may become the object of special inferences and thus be explained by invoking aspects of the circumstances of the action, or the role identity, personality, goals, motives, etc. of the breaching party. 253)

An example provided by Levinson (1983) illustrates the adjacency pair structure:

C: So I was wondering would you be in your office on Monday (.) by any chance?

(2.0)

C: Probably not

R: Hmm yes=
C: You would?
R: Ya
C: So if we came by could you give us ten minutes of your time? (p. 320)

C expects a response to C's question; a response is due. When it is not forthcoming, C interprets the silence as a negative response. That is, C accounts for the silence. C appears to believe that a lack of response following a request should be interpreted as a refusal. The next section offers an explanation for C's assumption.

Preference structure

Referring to the previous example, C assumes that a lack of response following a request conveys a refusal. The notion of preference structures may explain this inference made by C. Not all responses which are made relevant by a first pair part (such as a request) are equal; some are preferred. Though there appears to be some confusion over the notion of preference (see Taylor and Cameron, 1987; Bilmes, 1988; Levinson, 1983), most writers are quick to assert that preference is not a psychological term. It does not refer to the conversation participants' personal preferences. Rather it refers to the structure of preferred and dispreferred responses. Following a request, for example, either an acceptance or a refusal are relevant responses. However, one may be preferred. Bilmes (1988) writes:
When the first item is not followed by a relevant reply, the preferred response is absent in a special way. In a sense, it is 'more absent' than the other items in the set. From its absence, one may infer that some other item in the set is covertly present. From the absence of acceptance, one may infer refusal. (p. 166)

During the silence that follows C's request in the example above, an acceptance is more absent than a refusal. An acceptance is the preferred response; in its absence, C infers that a refusal is present.

Another example may further illustrate the structure.

Ch: Can I go down an see 'im
(2.0)
() (1.8)
C'mo::n
(1.5)
Come'n te see 'im
(1.6)
C'mo::n
M: No:::
(Levinson, 1983, p. 335)

The absence of a reply is interpreted by the child as a refusal; an acceptance is more absent than a refusal. A trickier child might have taken the lack of response as an acceptance but would have, in all likelihood, been quickly corrected.
Pomerantz (1984) discusses preference structure in terms of first assessment/second assessment adjacency pairs. An initial assessment makes relevant a second assessment. The provider of the second assessment may either agree or disagree with the prior speaker's assessment. However, the initial assessment may invite one over the other. The assessment which appears to be invited is called a preferred next action and the other, a dispreferred next action. The turn which contains the preferred next action is organized differently from the one which contains the dispreferred next action. Pomerantz writes, "In general, agreement turns/sequences are structured so as to maximize occurrences of stated agreements and disagreement turn/sequences so as to minimize occurrences of stated disagreements" (p. 64). Levinson (1983) presents the following features of dispreferred seconds (only some of which are relevant for the initial assessment/second assessment adjacency pair):

(a) delays: (i) by pause before delivery, (ii) by the use of a preface (see (b)), (iii) by displacement over a number of turns via use of repair initiators or insertion sequences

(b) prefaces: (i) the use of markers or announcers of dispreferreeds like Uh and Well, (ii) the production of token agreements before disagreements, (iii) the use of appreciations if relevant . . ., (iv) the use of apologies if relevant . . ., ((v) the use of
qualifiers . . ., (vi) hesitation in various forms, including self-editing

(c) accounts: carefully formulated explanations for why the (dispreferred) act is being done

(d) declination component: of a form suited to the nature of the first part of the pair, but characteristically indirect or mitigated. (pp. 334-5)

The following example is one among several presented by Pomerantz (1984) which gives support to her argument. In this example, the dispreferred second occurs with a weak token agreement followed by a weak disagreement.

W: . . . The-the way I feel about it i:s, that as long as she cooperates, an'-an' she believe:ves that she's running my li:fe, or, you know, or directing it one way or anothuh, and she feels happy about it, I do whatever I please (h)any (h)wa(h) HHH! [( )

L: [Yeah.

L: We::ll - eh-that's true: - I mean eh-that's alright, -- uhh-ut uh, ez long ez you do:::. But h-it's eh-to me:::, -- after anyone . . . (p. 74)

The dispreferred second is marked with delays, with the use of markers (Well and uh), with a token agreement, and with the use of qualifiers (But h-it’s eh-to me:::).

These same dispreferred markers occur with the other dispreferred seconds of adjacency pairs, such as agreeing with
a speaker's self-deprecation or refusing an invitation. The notion of preference illustrates how conversational rules shape a conversation (Taylor and Cameron, 1987). Conversation participants show their awareness of the preference structure even if they do not perform the preferred action. For example, if an invitation is rejected, interactants still show an awareness that acceptance is the preferred response by marking the dispreferred response with those markers mentioned above. In other words, conversation participants show an orientation to the preference structure and they operate with the expectation that their interactants have a similar orientation.

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

As has been seen, Pomerantz focuses on the organizational structure of the conversation when discussing the notion of adjacency pairs and preference. The rules that she claims interactants are oriented to were formulated after observing the structure of the conversation itself. Emphasis is placed on the sequence of the interactants' utterances. Emphasis could however be placed on the interactional needs and goals of the participants. The focus would then be on how the negotiated relationship between the participants shapes the conversation. An approach of this type is taken by social psychologists.
Allport (1985) writes that social psychologists "attempt to understand and explain how the thought, feeling, and behavior of individuals are influenced by the actual, imagined, or implied presence of others" (p. 3). Since language is a social tool, its use has been given attention (however limited) by social psychologists. To illustrate social psychology's emphasis on the social interaction between the conversation participants rather than on the organizational structure of the conversation, I'll briefly discuss the topic of convergence.

When two people talk, who already like each other or hope to like each other, they tend to begin to sound more like each other. Either one or both the interactants modify their speaking style to sound more like their interlocutor. This convergent behavior is called "interpersonal accommodation" (Fishman and Giles, 1978, p. 389). Convergence is defined as "a linguistic strategy whereby individuals adapt to each other's speech by means of a wide range of linguistic features, including speech rates, pauses and utterance length, pronunciations and so on" (Giles, Mulac, Bradac, and Johnson, 1987, p. 14). (Speakers can also diverge from one another by accentuating the differences in speaking style between them.) Accommodation theory has its roots in the research done with similarity-attraction. The research suggests that the more similar one person becomes to another, the more likely the latter will like the former. One way a person can become more
like another is through speech style. If dissimilarities between two persons can be reduced in part by either one or both speakers accommodating the speech style of the other, then the greater is the likelihood that one or both speakers will be perceived favorably. Accommodation theory also suggests that the greater a person's need to be liked, the greater will be the tendency for that person to converge.

Brown and Levinson (1978) view conversation as being shaped by the sociological needs of its participants. These needs are reflected in the interaction. They believe that "patterns of message construction, or 'ways of putting things', or simply language usage, are part of the very stuff that social relationships are made of..." (p. 60). They also write that since interaction is simultaneously the "expression of social relationships" and "crucially built out of strategic language use," the construction of messages is "the key locus of the interface of language and society" (p. 61). They argue that all conversation is shaped by the interactants overriding concern with face, "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself" (p. 66). Face can be lost, enhanced, or maintained. Generally, interactants work together to maintain or enhance their own face, while simultaneously protecting the face of their interlocutor. Brown and Levinson suggest that face is composed of two aspects: positive face and negative face. Negative face is "the want of every 'competent adult member'
that his actions be unimpeded by others" (p. 67). Positive face is "the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others" (p. 67). Certain kinds of acts intrinsically threaten face. For example, requests impinge upon the hearer's negative face, the desire that the hearer's actions be unimpeded. If a speaker making the request is attending to the negative face wants of the hearer, the speaker may soften the request by, for example, giving the hearer a way out or by apologizing for the intrusion on the hearer's time, etc. When the speaker shows such attention and regard for the hearer's negative face, the speaker is said to be showing negative politeness.

With this notion of face and politeness, one can approach the structure of an adjacency pair from a different angle. For example, why do disagreements with assessments occur with the markers mentioned above? Brown and Levinson would attribute the structure of these pairs to the desire of the interactants to preserve face, both their own and each other's. Positive politeness is concerned with showing that the hearer's wants are desirable. One way to show desirability is to communicate that the speaker's wants are similar to those of the hearer's. Stressing common ground is a means to express the similarity in wants. If common ground is being stressed, then the speaker would not want to disagree with the interlocutor. "The desire to agree or appear to agree with H[earer] leads . . . to mechanisms for pretending
to agree, instances of 'token' agreement" (Brown and Levinson, 1978, p. 118). So the example given above by Pomerantz and shown here again would be accounted for by claiming that L is being mindful of W's positive face.

W: . . . The-the way I feel about it i:s, that as long as she cooperates, an'-an' she believes that she's running my li:fe, or, you know, or directing it one way or anothuh, and she feels happy about it, I do whatever I please (h)any (h)wa(h) HHH! [( )

L: [Yeah.

L: W::ill - eh-that's true: - I mean eh-that's alright, -- uhb-ut uh, ez long ez you do:::. But h-it's-eh-to me:::, -- after anyone . . .

(Pomerantz, 1984, p. 74)

L shows positive politeness by showing reluctance to disagree with W. Even if disagreement must occur, L can indicate the desire that W's positive face be satisfied by not baldly disagreeing.

DISCOURSE MARKERS

As was noted above, one feature of a dispreferred response are prefases to the response which may include such items as well. Such an item is commonly called a discourse marker. Discourse markers have been defined as "sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk" (Schiffrin, 1987, p. 31) and as "linguistic expression[s] that [are] used
to signal the relation of an utterance to the immediate context" (Redeker, 1990, p. 372).

In his discussion of discourse markers, Schourup (1982) suggests that a discourse marker "mediates in a specific way between the covert thinking of conversants and what they do in the way of talk and other external behaviors" (p. 2). He suggests that in a conversation between two speakers there is a private world (the mind of each speaker himself or herself), an other world (the mind of the interlocutor) and a shared world (the interaction between the private and other worlds). He suggests that discourse markers belong to the class of evincives, "a linguistic item that indicates that at the moment at which it is said the speaker is engaged in, or has just been engaged in, thinking; the evincive item indicates that this thinking is now occurring or has just now occurred but does not completely specify its content" (p. 14).

Schourup examines the function of one such marker, *like*, in the context of constructed dialogue. He suggests that the overall evincive use of *like* is to indicate that there may exist a discrepancy between what is in the private world (what is meant) and what is in the shared world (what is said) (p. 31). For example, *like* introducing direct speech forms may indicate that there may be a discrepancy between what the speaker is reporting as having been said and what was actually said. He suggests that *like* may be used by some speakers to indicate that what is to follow in direct speech forms is
actually an approximation of what was thought ("internal speaker reactions" (p. 33)) rather than what was said. He writes that since "speakers are aware of the inexact nature of retrospective quotations. . . it is perfectly appropriate to indicate that what the speaker reports as having occurred is only like what may have actually been said" (p. 35).

Well is another discourse marker discussed in the context of direct speech forms. The evincive use suggested for well is to make explicit the fact that the current speaker is now examining the contents of the private world with the intentions that the addressee will make some inferences from this explicitness (Schourup, 1982, p. 49). For example, by bracketing a topic shift with well, speakers indicate that they realize that they are shifting the topic and that they expect the addressees to ascribe a motive to the shift (getting back to the business at hand, for example) (p. 53). Well is observed to frequently be the initial word of a direct speech form. For example:

"... and she goes "Well if my check's big enough I'll buy ya an eight- or a twelve pack ... " (p. 24)

In direct speech forms, well, which is attributed to the reported speaker, "invokes a situation in which the quoted speaker may be seen as having spoken out of some then-current consideration and thereby situates the quotation as an integral part of some nonpresent situation" (p. 51).
While many discourse markers have been examined by Schourup, Schiffrin and others, some forms, such as really, have received little attention, especially in terms of constructed dialogue. I will attempt to describe, in Chapter 3, some of the environments in which these forms occur, with particular reference to reported discourse in conversation.

QUOTATIONS AS DEMONSTRATIONS

Clark and Gerrig (1990) suggest that instances of reported speech in direct speech forms should be treated as demonstrations. Most language theories hold that all language use is descriptive. Clark and Gerrig write that "[t]he prototypical quotation is a demonstration of what a person did in saying something" (p. 769). Demonstrations are classified as nonserious actions, which are actions that are not literally occurring. Nonserious actions are "transformations of serious actions" (p. 766). They are patterned on a serious activity but are not interpreted as serious actions. For example, imitating someone's limp is a nonserious action. While it is patterned on a serious action, the demonstration does not receive the same interpretation as the actual limp. Similarly, when a person presents a quotation, the person is not intending that the utterance be interpreted as actually occurring in the current situation, but is only a demonstration of a speech event.
Demonstrations also depict rather than describe their referents. Furthermore, they selectively depict particular aspects of the referent. The person demonstrating the limp may not be attempting to imitate every aspect of the original limp, but only what the demonstrator considers the significant aspects. Whenever an aspect is marked, that aspect is intended to be identified as nonincidental (p. 774). With regard to quotations, aspects of the referent which can be marked include register, voice pitch, voice quality, and emotional state.

Quotations can also depict nonlinguistic actions. The verb "to go" usually introduces such actions. For example——

When you've finished, just go [belch] and I'll know you've had enough (p. 781).

Clark and Gerrig suggest particular functions served by quotations such as avoiding responsibility for the content of a quotation, showing solidarity, and dramatizing an event. Below, each of these functions will be discussed.

Displacement of responsibility

Clark and Gerrig (1990) suggest that when speakers describe (e.g. with indirect speech), they take full responsibility for their wording. When constructing quotations, responsibility for the depicted aspects lies with the source speaker.
Wierzbicka (1974) also argues that a reporting speaker escapes responsibility for the content of the report by placing the utterance in direct speech forms. She writes that the speaker of the quotative sentence "does something that enables the hearer to see for himself what it [the content] is, that is to say, in a way, he shows this content" (p. 282). By showing rather than describing the content, the speaker avoids taking responsibility for the quote.

Brenneis (1986) mentions reported (or direct) speech as an example of the indirection of language. By indirection he is referring to meaning which lies outside as well as within a text. In particular, "indirection implies something about the speaker's stance vis-a-vis his or her message" (p. 341). Brenneis writes that indirection usually allows the speaker to take less than full responsibility for what is said. Voice-centered indirection depends upon hearers not being clear about who is responsible for the message presented by the speaker. One type of voice-centered indirection is "ventriloquism through reported speech" (p. 343). Because the reported utterance is heard from the mouth of the reporting speaker rather than from that of the reported speaker, the hearer may be unclear about who is actually responsible for the content of the message.

Brody's (1991) discussion of the function of constructed dialogue in Tojolab'al women's conversation is an excellent example of quotations being used to displace responsibility.
At issue during the conversation is whether the women present are traditionally Tojolab'al or are striving to assimilate into the Ladino world. A sign of their allegiance to the Tojolab'al culture is raising their children to speak Tojolab'al rather than Spanish. The samples of constructed dialogue are from a section of the conversation in which the participants are involved in teasing talk. As Clark and Gerrig (1990) as well as Brody note, teasing talk is a non-serious activity. This type of talk creates ambiguity; as Brody (1991) writes, "the question arises whether the talk is only playful or if it could also be serious" (p. 8). Because of the ambiguity which arises with this type of talk, the conversation participants are able to question one another's allegiance to their culture while, at the same time, being mindful of the value that culture places on community cohesion.

During the teasing talk, one of the women asks the child of another woman if the child knows Tojolab'al. Since the child is too young to speak, the question is being indirectly asked of the child's mother. The mother, in turn, answers the question by constructing dialogue which she attributes to her child. By communicating indirectly through the child, the women are able to displace responsibility for what is being said. Through this indirection, as well as through the ambiguity involved in the teasing talk, the women are able to criticize one another while appearing to be cooperative.
Solidarity

Another function of quotations is solidarity (Clark and Gerrig, 1990). Since speakers only selectively depict aspects of an action with a quotation, the assumption is that they expect their addressees to share the background knowledge necessary to interpret the quotation. Such an assumption shows solidarity, as Brown and Levinson (1978) have also argued because the less explanation that accompanies a report, the greater the indication that the reporter expects to share "common ground" with the listener. There is a general notion that economy in message-structure and an absence of elaborate description will reflect social closeness which also occurs in the work of Givon (1980) and Haiman (1983). As Haiman (1983) argues, "the social distance between interlocutors corresponds to the length of the message, referential content being equal" (p. 783). As I will attempt to show in Chapter 5, the greater the social solidarity between interlocutors, the more reduced will be the forms used to introduce reports of direct speech or quotations.

Dramatization

Another function of quotations suggested by Clark and Gerrig (1990) is to allow the addressees to directly experience the depicted event. As they point out, by including direct speech in their reports, speakers "can do with quotations anything that a professional actor would do on stage" (p. 776). Also by having the action, verbal or non-
verbal, demonstrated for them, the addressees can, in a sense, "see for themselves" the source event. Similarly, Tannen (1986) suggests that constructing dialogue (her terminology will be discussed below along with more discussion of the dramatizing function of direct speech forms) is a way for conversationalists to move from being simply a narrator of an event to dramatizing an event. Constructing dialogue is a means to involve the co-conversationalists in a narrative.

Wierzbicka (1974) also emphasizes the "theatrical, playful, imaginary character" (p. 272) of reported speech. She writes:

The person who reports another's words by quoting them, temporarily assumes the role of that other person, 'plays his part', that is to say, imagines himself as the other person and for a moment behaves in accordance with the counterfactual assumption (p. 272).

So, the speaker of a quotative sentence pretends to be another person (the person being quoted) as that person utters the quotative sentence.

Clark and Gerrig (1990) do not suggest that quotations are verbatim reproductions of an original event. They specifically point out the unlikelihood of a verbatim rendering of a speech event. They emphasize that their description of quotation as demonstration eliminates the need for thinking of quotation in terms of being verbatim or not. Only particular aspects of the referent are depicted; the speaker, the one doing the demonstration, decides which aspects are incidental and which are nonincidental and merit
being marked. The issue of a verbatim reproduction seems especially irrelevant given that nonlinguistic actions can be quoted.

One other aspect of the dramatic use of direct speech forms in reported discourse has been noted by Bauman (1977, 1986) in his analysis of spoken discourse as verbal art. Bauman points out that, on many occasions, the dramatic climax of much storytelling is presented in the form of a direct quotation. As I will argue in Chapter 4, there appears to be a quite elaborate structure of staging involved in verbal reports of past conversations which not only dramatizes the events but also marks particular moments within those events via direct speech forms.

CONSTRUCTED DIALOGUE

Tannen (1986, 1989) also denies that direct speech forms occurring in conversation are direct quotes or direct reports of prior speech events. One obvious basis for this claim concerns the well-documented limitations of human memory (See Hjelmquist, 1984; Hjelmquist and Gidlund, 1985 for research concerning recall of conversation). Another reason for avoiding the term "direct speech" is a result of the recontextualization of reported speech. When reporting speech, the reporting speaker appropriates the words attributed to the reported speaker (Tannen 1989). Along the same line, Sternberg (1982) writes:
What the traditional view overlooks is, first of all, the extent to which the very structure of report gives rise to contextual clash or friction between the reporting and the reported speech-events. For reported discourse yokes together two (or more) speech-events that are by nature removed from each other in time and place and state of affairs, in the identity of the participants, in their characters, outlooks, interpersonal relations. . . . Owing to these inherent and often deliberately activated and patterned discrepancies, the frame not simply introduces and incorporates the displaced quote, but always colors and comments on it by way of implicit opposition. (p. 72)

The recontextualization of the quote, whether reported verbatim (however unlikely) or not prevents the repeated utterance from being accurately labeled a direct quote.

Tannen prefers the term "constructed dialogue" to emphasize the role played by the reporting speaker. Often what are presented in direct speech forms are utterances which the reporting speaker clearly indicates were never spoken by anyone. The reporting speaker clearly constructs the utterances for dramatic purposes. Tannen (1989) offers several examples of such constructed dialogue (pp. 110-119). The dialogue may be clearly marked as something that was not said ("You can't say, ". . . " (p. 110), as an example of a general phenomenon, as an utterance attributed to several speakers, as a representation of thought attributed to the reporting speaker or to others, or as an utterance attributed to a nonhuman speaker. Dialogue attributed to a character in a narrative may also be constructed by a listener of the narrative who clearly cannot be directly reporting a prior speech event. In Chapter 4, I will present examples from my data which illustrate that much of what appears in direct
speech forms was clearly never spoken by anyone. I will attempt to show that speakers construct dialogue within reported discourse in conversation just as a novelist can construct dialogue for fictional characters.

SPEAKER ROLES

Bublitz (1988) approaches conversation analysis by describing the way participants in friendly everyday conversation "behave towards each other when establishing and maintaining a continuous and smooth flow of conversation" (p. 1). He suggests that the "essential characteristic"(p. 264) of everyday conversation is the endeavor for "agreement, consent, conformance and endorsement" in the areas of social intercourse and level of content (p. 264). The topical behavior of the speakers leads Bublitz to define major speaker roles in the following manner:

Primary speaker - "MAKES A MAJOR SPEAKING CONTRIBUTION TO THE TOPIC, typically by performing speech acts such as TELLING, REPORTING, ARGUING etc. and who typically performs the topical actions such as INTODUCING A TOPIC, CLOSING A TOPIC etc.

Secondary speaker - "MAKES A MINOR SPEAKER CONTRIBUTION TO THE TOPIC, typically by performing speech acts such as AGREEING, SUPPORTING, APPROVING, DOUBTING, INQUIRING etc., thus STATING A POSITION and MANIFESTING AN
ATTITUDE, and who typically refrains from performing topical actions". (p. 161)
The preferred activity of the secondary speaker is to support the primary speaker. Bublitz lists several categories of support including: readopting or repeating, evaluating or declaring one's attitude, and completing, supplementing, or paraphrasing. Although Bublitz's analysis doesn't include mention of direct speech forms, I will use the categories of completions, supplements, and paraphrases in a later chapter to organize my data. Here, I will present examples offered by Bublitz to illustrate the categories.

A secondary speaker may show support for the primary speaker by completing an utterance begun by the primary speaker. The following extract is an example:

C you didn't have capital gains but of course you did have [uh]::

a death du*ties*

C *death* du#ties#

a #m#

(Bublitz, 1988, p. 238)
The secondary speaker anticipates what will be said and "'takes the words out of the primary speaker's mouth'" (p. 239). The effect is two speakers making one speaker contribution. The secondary speaker shows support by offering words, the form of which is somewhat determined by what was begun by the primary speaker.
Another category of support is supplementing, which involves coordinate expressions. The following is an example:

C  <...> we sort of saw each other once or twice to sort of . clear the air ( - laughs) and tie up the loose ends
b  *( - giggles) - divide the records ( -- . giggles)*
C  *and the dictionaries .*<...>

(Bublitz, 1988, p. 242)

Here b shows support for C by supplementing C's utterance, by adding a line which could have been said by C. The coordinate nature of the supplement allows the primary speaker to "express or, at least, suggest (and pretend) that not only both their (coordinated) contributions, but also their assumptions, assessments and attitudes run parallel" (p. 243).

Another category of support is paraphrasing. By paraphrasing the primary speaker, the secondary speaker reflects the point of view of the primary speaker. Again, the contribution made by the secondary speaker might have been made by the primary speaker. The following is an example:

D  funny thing is that when Elsie's reminiscing about her . teenage . childhood ---she must have been such a pain in the neck to her mum and vice versa
C  oh we were all hell

(Bublitz, 1988, p. 245)
These three categories, as well as others, are a means of support, the preferred activity of a secondary speaker. Bublitz offers an explanation for the seldom occurrence of a nonsupportive contribution made by the secondary speaker. To not support is an action which, like other dispreferred actions, requires explanation and justification which requires "a great deal of (verbal) energy which normally cannot be mustered from the position of the secondary speaker role" (p. 258). When a primary speaker is presented with a response by the secondary speaker which is dispreferred, the primary speaker usually allows the secondary speaker to take the primary speaker role to explain and justify the secondary speaker's action.

In Chapter 5, I will make use of the terms "primary speaker" and "secondary speaker" while discussing the supportive and accommodating behavior of the participants. I will also note that, in some cases, this separation of speaker roles into primary and secondary is not as clear-cut as it at first seems.

As in any study of conversation, this investigation faced some problems with regard to the nature of the data. As many conversation analysts have observed, the choice of spoken data for analysis, the transcribed record of that data, and decisions about the category assignment of various forms all raise problematic issues that have a bearing on the way the actual conversation is represented. In the following chapter,
I will explore some of these issues and make clear how decisions regarding certain problematic forms were arrived at.
DESCRIPTION OF DATA

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I would like to describe the manner in which the data was collected, the participants involved in the conversations, and my transcription conventions. I will also explore some of the specific problems I encountered when transcribing constructed dialogue represented with direct speech forms. In doing so, I will give some idea of the type of conversational data that will be analyzed in the following chapters.

COLLECTION OF THE DATA

Although there is little consensus as to the type of data which is most suitable for conversation analysis, the (dis)advantages of each type are largely agreed upon. For example, conversations taken from literary material will likely be more compressed and more characterized by conflict than routine conversations (McLaughlin, 1984). Because of differences in form and content from natural conversations, data from literary materials, such as those appearing in Chapter 1, are, by and large, considered unsuitable for the description of conversational structure.

Hypothetical examples of conversation, examples conjured up by the analyst, are another data type used by those making claims about the nature of conversation including Grice (1975)
and Searle (1975). However, their success rests largely on the "simplicity and broad applicability" of their constructs which have little to do with their hypothetical examples (McLaughlin, 1984, p. 238). Researchers who base their analyses on the facts of their own intuition run the risk of having in their minds facts different from those of other language users.

To solve the problem of possible idiosyncratic intuitions, a researcher may elicit desired data from a pool of subjects. For example, a researcher may ask the subjects to recall a particular interaction or to role play a particular event. While the type of data elicited by this method is probably more natural than that found in literary conversations, and while this method prevents the researchers from having to rely on their own experience, other problems arise. One problem with elicited data is the inclination for subjects to try to make themselves look good. For example, subjects may tend to use more formal English if they know that their speech is being paid particular attention (cf. Labov, 1972). To solve the problems which accompany the other data types, researchers can simply tape-record natural conversations. The data on which my analysis is based is from such conversations. To characterize natural conversation, Stubbs (1983) uses the terms "spontaneous," "unplanned" and "casual" as opposed to "artificial," "contrived," "invented" and "hypothetical" (p. 33). This data type is not without its
own drawbacks, including extraneous noise, self-conscious speakers, and "performing" speakers. Natural conversations may be gathered in either natural or controlled settings. I will now briefly describe the sessions during which data was gathered for this study.

My data was collected on four different occasions. During the first recording, four speakers, Kim, Sara, Maya and myself (appearing in the data as Toni), participated in the conversation. On the following three occasions, for reasons to be explained, only Sara and Maya participated.

The first recording was made at a dinner party being held to celebrate Kim's 21st birthday. My intention was to record a natural conversation in a natural setting. The tape-recorder was placed unobtrusively on a chair in a corner about two feet away from the table. I had been granted the participants' permission to record the dinner conversation; however, Sara did not realize that the tape-recorder was on until it switched off after completing one side of the tape. As the quality of the recording shows, much distracting activity (from a transcriber's point of view) was occurring simultaneously with the conversation. A television movie blares in the background, eating noises abound, and chairs scrape across the floor as we move from the table to the kitchen to the table again. After listening to the recording of this conversation, I decided to focus on these speakers' use of constructed dialogue since it occurred in abundance in
their talk. Because Sara and Maya did the most talking on the first tape and because Kim was less available for taping, the second recording involved only Sara and Maya. (I came into the room where they were talking and spoke to them a couple of times but my speech is not included in the data transcribed from this session.) The recording was made at my apartment. Sara came to the apartment, at which Maya also lived, for the express purpose of being recorded. However, Sara frequented our apartment in the evening after work to catch up on the news with Maya, so the occasion was not unusual. Neither speaker was aware that I was examining constructed dialogue as it appeared in their speech.

Because the quality of the second recording was worse than that of the first (large segments are unintelligible), the next two recordings were made on the university campus in a sound-proof room designed for recording. I made a choice to increase the artificiality of the setting in exchange for an increase in the quality of the recording. It is worth mentioning again that the speakers habitually got together to talk and, as is apparent from the data collected, they do not appear to feel uncomfortable in the recording room. Although a few references are made to the setting - playing with and blowing into the microphone, talking about a dentist chair seen in a neighboring room, complaining about not being able to smoke, and praising the carpet - the speakers appear to
become involved in their conversation and less aware of their surroundings.

During these last two sessions, I supplied the participants with a list of topics. The topics which were designed to elicit reports of speech events included: movies I’ve seen recently, recent arguments I’ve had (or wish I’d had), job interviews, telephone conversations, lies I’ve told recently, and recent interactions with co-workers, classmates, bosses, or teachers. Maya and Sara were told that the topics were intended to elicit talk that would be used as examples of natural American English to foreign students on campus. They, however, suspected that I was particularly interested in their talk. The speakers occasionally examined the listed topics, but, by and large, they spoke on topics that were relevant to them at the time, a notion which is supported by the extracts in the Appendix.

Though the settings did become increasingly more artificial, I do not believe that the artificiality of the conversation rose to the same degree. Nor do I believe, based on my knowledge of their speaking behavior in other settings, that the speakers felt like they were performing. I believe that the data itself shows that the speakers were having typical conversations.
THE PARTICIPANTS

The speakers appearing in the transcripts are four American women. Sara, 20, is from Mississippi; Kim, 21, is from Connecticut; Maya, 23, is from Oklahoma; Toni, 27, is from Illinois. Kim and Toni are college students, Sara has a day job, and Maya is an on-again off-again college student. Kim and Sara have known each other the longest. They met when they were both freshmen living in the dorm. Later, after Sara left school, they began sharing an apartment and are best friends. Maya met Sara and Kim about nine months before the first recording. She became friends with both of them and lived in their apartment for a short time. I met Maya about two months prior to the first recording and knew Sara and Kim largely through her (though I had met Sara previously through another mutual friend). Maya and I had been sharing our apartment for about one month.

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

All transcriptions are necessarily selective in the features of the interaction they attempt to capture (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984). It would be impossible to represent all facets of a conversation with a written transcription. Each transcription reflects to some degree the interests of its analyst. Because my chief interest in the analysis of my data was the form and function of constructed dialogue, I took special pains to transcribe the features which came into play
at these sites. For example, I clearly mark direct speech forms by placing a colon before them and enclosing them with quotations marks. Also, if the speaker modifies her speech quality to utter the words appearing in direct speech forms, the voice quality is indicated in parentheses.

By the same token, because my chief interests did not lie elsewhere, I ignored some features of the conversation which another transcriber with another set of interests would have undoubtedly included. For example, I do not indicate pause lengths because I do not think my analysis would be especially enhanced by a consideration of them. I also do not indicate laughter though not because I think that it is a trivial feature of these conversations. I do not indicate laughter largely because of its pervasiveness. The speakers are clearly having a good time during most of the conversations (though the transcripts will show that serious and, perhaps, painful topics are also covered). Being aware of the inherent bias of this transcript as well as any other, take note that the following notations are used.

: Precedes direct speech forms.

" Enclose direct speech forms.

0 Indicates that the constructed dialogue in direct speech forms are not attributed to a speaker.

(An example from the data may help to illustrate the notation used to transcribe direct speech forms:
Mom goes: "Ah see anyone you know there?" 0: "No thank God")

? Indicates rising intonation.

aaa Repeated letters indicate that a sound was drawn out.

CAP Capital letters which are not turn-initial or constructed utterance-initial indicate an increase in volume.

/ Indicates overlapped speech.

- Dashes are used to indicate slight breaks. They are also intended to help the reader follow the transcript.

= Indicate that no pause occurred between change in speakers. The sign is also used to mark a single turn when that turn is necessarily broken on the page of transcript because of the representation of overlapped talk.

_ Underlining is used to draw attention during the analysis of some feature of the data (e.g. she's like: "Well ...")

() In parentheses I indicate two types of features of the interaction. Parentheses may enclose highly relevant non-speaking activity (e.g. a hand gesture). Parentheses may also enclose voice quality (e.g. nasal, falsetto).
VOICE QUALITY

If a speaker marks a shift away from the speaker's voice as narrator with a shift in voice quality, the shift is noted in parentheses. For example, if Sara shifts from her normal voice quality (modal voice) to a falsetto voice quality, the technical notation (falsetto) will appear before the direct speech forms. The terms for the types of voice quality are taken from Laver (1980, pp. 109-135). I will give a brief description of each of the types of voice quality that are included in the data.

**falsetto** - fundamental frequency tends to be considerably higher than in one's normal voice resulting in a higher pitch

**whisper** - voicelessness resulting in hushed sounds

**creaky voice** - low fundamental frequency and "an effect of continual, separate taps in rapid sequence" (Laver, 1980, p. 124).

**harsh voice** - boosting some of the features of modal voice, resulting in a rough or strident auditory effect

**breathy voice** - inefficient vibration of vocal folds; sighing effect

**nasal voice** - produced with airflow through the nasal cavity
PROBLEMATIC ISSUES DURING THE TRANSCRIPTION

Some subjective decisions concerning the transcription of the data surrounding and including constructed dialogue had to be made. I will briefly discuss some of the problems encountered during the transcription. At the same time, I will give some idea of the type of data that I gathered and analyzed.

I chose to put beginning and end quotes around the constructed dialogue. Usually deciding when the dialogue began and ended was not difficult. For example, in the following extract during Sara’s discussion of a movie, she uses direct speech forms which she attributes to a character in the movie (he).

[1] Sara: It was so - it was stupid - I mean he’s like: "I gotta get rid of her" and then he felt bad about it and then he found the lord

The referent of I switches from being the speaker, Sara, to the character who utters the constructed line. The referent of he becomes the referent of I within the quotes and then becomes the referent of he again.

Even without switches in referents as in extract [1], most of the dialogue is clearly marked with pauses, voice quality modifications, or contextual cues. However, two discourse markers, you know and really, were especially
problematic when transcribing the conversation. I will briefly discuss the nature of the problems associated with each of these discourse markers and present examples illustrating the transcription decisions I made. The examples will also be a sampling of the type of data to be presented in the next two chapters.

You know

As discussed in Chapter 2, discourse markers can be described as "sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk" (Schiffrin, 1987, p. 31) or indicators of the conversants' covert thinking (Schourup, 1982) or as expressions which are "used to signal the relation of an utterance to the immediate context" (Redeker, 1990, p. 372). The evincive meaning which Schourup posits for you know is that the speaker who utters you know expects no significant discrepancy between what is in the speaker's head and the current listener's head with respect to what is being said (p. 74). However, it is uttered in those cases in which the speaker is uncertain about whether the listener is following what the speaker is trying to say. The speaker expects that the listener would understand what is in the speaker's head, but the speaker isn't sure that she is making herself clear in the current interaction. As one might expect, you know often occurs at hesitation and repair sites, where the speaker is obviously having problems generating the message to be
understood. The following example from Schourup illustrates the marker:

[2] They have nice dresses in there. They may not be nice—[you know] like—so nice but they have nice dresses. (Schourup, 1982, p. 88).

Apparently, the speaker is trying to express the idea that the dresses in question are "nice enough." The speaker appears to be attempting to make sure that the addressee understands that the speaker does not think the dresses are extremely nice but just nice. By using you know, the speaker calls attention to the fact that s/he is hoping that the addressee follows her meaning.

The problem with you know arose in the transcription process when the discourse marker occurred at sites involving direct speech forms where there is the presence of two voices, those of the current speaker and the reported speaker in the constructed situation. The question is - To which speaker should you know be attributed? Is it that the current speaker wants to make sure that her addressee is following her, or is it that the current speaker is representing the constructed speaker as wanting to make sure that his/her addressee is following him/her? I'll first show an example from my data for which the problem was solved by appealing to the intonational pattern of the utterance. I'll transcribe the
extract in two different ways to illustrate the available transcription choices. In the following extract, Maya is reporting how she felt on a dance floor of a bar in Houston (away from her usual hangout).

[3a] Maya: I was like: "Ok - well - I need to bounce cause I'm in Houston cause you know you want to fit in"

[3b] Maya: I was like: "Ok - well - I need to bounce cause I'm in Houston" cause - you know you want to fit in

By transcribing the extract as in [3a], one must assume that Maya was addressing herself when saying you know because the context makes it clear that the direct speech forms represent thought rather than speech. As mentioned in Chapter 2, be like often signals that thought, not speech, is being represented. By transcribing the extract as in [3b], one must assume that Maya is addressing her current interlocutors. In this example, you know is said by Maya with falling intonation which indicates to me as a listener that she is addressing her current interlocutors, not the representation of herself within the constructed situation. The entire clause cause you know you want to fit in appears to be an appeal to her addressees to understand why she felt compelled to dance a particular way. If you know were said with rising intonation,
that would indicate to me that she is trying to convey that she was reminding herself why she felt it necessary to bounce instead of shuffle on the dance floor. So because of the intonational patterns of the utterance, I chose the [b] transcription. With this transcription, you know, which is attributed to Maya as the current speaker, allows the extract to read as Maya seeking understanding from her current addressees (those of us at the dinner party).

When you know occurs after a quotative site (e.g. she's like, he said), deciding to whom to attribute the discourse marker was more difficult. The decision at this site again involves whether to attribute you know to the current speaker or the speaker in the constructed situation. One possibility was to consider you know to be an utterance-initial particle (Bauman, 1986; Redeker, 1990; Schourup, 1982) of the same type as, for example, well. Because of its several utterance-initial uses (with quotations, responses to questions, exclamations, topic-shifts) well appears to "contextualize the quotation with respect to the quoted speaker's situation of utterance" (Schourup, 1982, p. 52). In the following example from my data, well is attributed to each of the reported speakers.

[4] Maya: Yeah she said: "Well at least she wasn't goodlooking" and I's like: "Well are you sure you prefer that to him fucking someone he
knows?" and she's: "Well I don't know - well at least she's not goodlooking"

Because of its numerous utterance-initial uses, a speaker may use well to signal the beginning of an utterance that is attributable to a speaker in the constructed situation.

Is you know another means that the current speaker has available to contextualize the constructed utterance? Does you know situate the utterance in the constructed world by conveying that the speaker of the constructed utterance is making sure that his/her addressee is following her? An alternative analysis of the marker is provided by Redeker (1990) who considers you know to be a "comment clause" which is "clearly the current speaker's own addition" (p. 374). In this case, you know would be excluded from the constructed utterance. The two transcription options are presented below. In both of the pairs of examples, [a] shows you know attributed to the reporting speaker and [b] to the reported speaker.

[5a] Sara: She's like you know: "I even heard what you said about my socks"

[5b] Sara: She's like: "You know - I even heard what you said about my socks"
[6a] Maya: She said you know: "I only smoke three cigarettes a day now" you know just out of the blue

[6b] Maya: She said: "You know I only smoke three cigarettes a day now" you know just out of the blue

In these extracts, intonational patterns did not offer clues to how the data should be transcribed. If the intonational pattern had been rising, my tendency would have been to include you know as part of the constructed utterance. Such intonation was not present here, however. With some reservation, I decided to transcribe the turns as in the [a] options above, that is, attributing you know to the current speaker. After listening to segments of the recording several times, I decided that you know is serving, more than likely, as an appeal made by the current speaker to her addressee. So, in most cases in which you know occurs in the environment of direct speech forms, I excluded the marker from the constructed utterance, attributing it to the current speaker. I included you know as part of the constructed utterance only when it is uttered with rising intonation. So while cautioning the reader that this attribution of the discourse marker isn’t necessarily that which was intended by the speaker, I can offer that this attribution was made consistently.
Really

A discourse marker which has received little attention is really. Really is usually described as being an intensifier (Greenbaum, 1969). The utterance - this is really good - illustrates the use of really being used as an intensifier, in this case, to intensify good. Greenbaum (1969) also discusses the disjunctive (lacking integration within the clause) use of really which works to make "explicit the speaker's view that the statement being made is true" (p. 144). The utterance - really this is good - illustrates the disjunctive use of really. With really the speaker is underscoring the truth of this is good. Stenstrom (1986) suggests that this traditional view of really either as an intensifier or as a reflection of the speaker's view toward the entire statement misses several of its uses, especially conversational uses.

Stenstrom proposes three speech-specific uses of really: as a "re-opener," as a "continuer" and as a "planner" (p. 150). As a "re-opener," the user of really reacts to an informative statement or reacts to the response to a question. Spoken with a falling-rising or rising tone, really would signal surprise and would call for a confirmation of the truth of the message. The following extract is an example from my data of really used as a re-opener:

[7] Sara: Apparently Mark is like: "Man you need to trash him"
Maya: Really? I didn’t hear that part.
Sara: Well that’s what Don was tellin Alan last night: "You need to trash him . . ."
Maya: Oh **really**
Sara: I was like: "Gee I think he’s really cute" -
Alan was like: (creaky voice) "Gross /that’s/
grotesque=
Maya: /**really**/
Sara: = - you would" - 0: "Yes I would"

Maya does not appear to be asking Sara for confirmation of the truth of her report (if she is, she doesn’t receive it) but simply showing interest in what Sara is saying.

Even this expanded description of the functions of **really** in conversation omits one use of **really** which appears frequently in my data and which had to be taken into consideration while I was transcribing the data in order to decide what should go within sets of quotation marks. This use of **really** seems to be similar to its function as a reflection of the speaker’s view towards an entire utterance. Greenbaum (1969) suggests that the speaker uses it to make explicit that s/he believes that the statement being made by him/her is true. In this data, however, the speaker appears to use **really** to make explicit that she believes that the statement which has just been uttered by the previous speaker is true. The speaker appears to use **really** to show support of her co-conversationalist. The following extract illustrates **really** being used in utterance initial position. Maya and Sara are making disparaging remarks about an acquaintance who
has complained about his inability to meet people in Baton Rouge.

[10] Maya:  What do you expect when you’re balding and wearing polyester and working at a taxi company

Sara:  Really and wearing little ankle boots kinda things

With really Sara seems to affirm Maya’s description of the character being discussed. She shows her agreement with Maya and then supplements the description of the unpopular character which is in keeping with the negative tone begun by Maya.

Really also makes agreement explicit in the following extract. Sara and Maya are discussing in jest the possibility of Sara stealing the carpet from the room in which they are being recorded.

[11] Sara:  I could take the carpet out of this room and put it into my room at my house

Maya:  Hey yeah I’m sure they won’t notice

Sara:  Really I’ll just fold it up and tuck it under my shirt
Again Sara shows her agreement with Maya’s ironic statement that the theft of the carpet will not be noticed and then elaborates on how the theft could go unobserved.

In extracts [10] and [11], really appears to function in the same way that yeah can. For example, in the following extract, yeah appears to do the same work that really does in the previous examples. Maya and Sara are talking about the inevitability of lying.

[12] Sara: -No cuz it just happens
      Maya: Yeah you just kinda go: "Whoops"

In extract [12], with yeah Maya indicates her agreement with Sara’s statement about lying and then dramatizes how easily and unexpectedly a lie can be told. Really and yeah appear to be interchangeable at these sites.

Really appears to be functioning similarly when it occurs near zero-quotative sites (those sites, marked by 0, where direct speech forms have neither an introducing verb (e.g. says) nor an attributed speaker). At such sites, I had to consider if it was possible to interpret really as being said by the reported speaker. That is, is there ambiguity concerning the attribution of really as there is with you know? I decided that really should not be interpreted and transcribed as being spoken by the reported speaker; really is always said in the voice of the reporting speaker (Maya or
Sara) at these sites. An example of really occurring near direct speech forms follows. Sara has just told Maya that a few nights earlier she nearly fell in a bar. Maya tells her that she should have pretended to do it on purpose.

[13] Maya: Save face if you can't save your ass - might as well
Sara: Really
Maya: Hit the ground - wipe yourself off and look at everybody: "That's exactly how I wanted that to look"
Sara: 0: "Now that I have your attention"
Maya: Really 0: "Now that I have your attention"
Sara: 0: "I'd like to sell you some Encyclopedia Brittanicas"
Maya: 0: "Have you ever thought about owning your own carpet cleaning unit?"

The first instance of really in Sara's first turn appears to be operating both as a 'continuer' and as a marker of support for what Maya has said. With the second instance of really, Maya shows her agreement with (perhaps approval of) Sara's continuance of the constructed dialogue begun by Maya. Maya's support of Sara's contribution to the imagined dialogue is further reinforced by her repetition of Sara's constructed line. There seems to be no question whatsoever whether to
include *really* as part of the direct speech forms. Neither the functions mentioned by Greenbaum and Stenstrom nor the supportive function which I’ve suggested would motivate the placement of *really* within the quotation marks. It is not the reported speaker of the lines of constructed dialogue who is saying *really*, but rather Maya who is saying it to show her support of Sara for her part in their joint construction of dialogue.

Another example follows in which *really* also appears to mark support of the preceding speaker’s contribution to the construction of dialogue. The speakers are discussing the age of an acquaintance’s girlfriend. Sara reports a conversation in which she was told the age and then both she and Maya construct a response to the information.

[14] Sara: . . . He’s like: "She just turned eighteen"
0: "Oh boy"

Maya: 0: "Fuckin A - you got some legal stuff now - huh Mike?"

Sara: **Really** uh 0: "So uh you’re not datin the jailbait anymore I see"

*Really* again appears to mark Sara’s support for the direction in which Maya has taken the constructed dialogue (or attitude). She follows up her marker of support with a paraphrase of Maya’s previous construction.
In the next extract, really also appears to show support for the previous speaker's constructed line. In extract [15], Maya is describing her mood when she is awakened on particular mornings.

[15] Maya: . . . 0: "Good morning Maya" (harsh voice) 0: "Fuck you"
Sara: Really (harsh voice) 0: "Eat me and die"
Maya: Really (harsh voice) 0: "I wish you would fall over"
Sara: =(harsh voice) 0: "Heretic" really "I wish you would fall down the steps"

As in the previous examples, following really is a continuance of the constructed dialogue. In this extract, the speakers supplement what has been previously said. It should be noted that as mentioned in Chapter 2, Bublitz (1998) suggests that repetitions, paraphrases, and supplements are indicative of supportive behavior. So, at these sites where really occurs near direct speech forms, I made the decision to exclude really from the direct speech forms, attributing the marker to the reporting rather than the reported speaker. Really is a part of the interaction taking place between Maya and Sara during the taped conversation and not part of the constructed interaction being reported.
At these sites involving direct speech forms, *yeah* also seems to be interchangeable with *really*. Notice the similarity of the following extract to the ones that have come before. Maya and Sara are constructing a response to Sara's mother which had begun with a reassurance that the bar that Sara frequents is an acceptable place. However, where we enter the conversation in extract [16], the tone of the response changes.

[16] Maya: 0: "Everybody shares a stool - every person on earth"

Sara: 0: "And sit on each other's laps and slide their hands between each other's legs"

Maya: =0: "And go: 'Whoo whoo whoo'"

Sara: *Yeah* 0: "Whooga whooga whooga"

As in extract [14] involving *really*, Sara first shows support for Maya's previous construction with *yeah* and then constructs a paraphrase of that construction. Again, *yeah* appears to be properly transcribed by attributing it to Sara as an element of her interaction with Maya, rather than to the imaginary persons going *whooga whooga whooga*. 
NATURE OF THE CONVERSATIONALISTS INTERACTION

As may have been noticed from the data extracts in the previous sections, the speakers appear to identify with one another to a great extent. This identification is achieved with the use of what Tannen calls 'involvement strategies' (1984, 1989). Involvement strategies are related to Brown and Levinson's (1988) notion of positive face wants, those needs associated with being appreciated and feeling accepted as part of a community. These needs must be balanced with the needs of an individual to maintain a separate identity. Tannen uses the term 'considerateness' to describe the conversational behavior with which a conversationalist shows respect for the co-conversationalist's needs as an individual.

Involvement strategies include talking about personal topics, shifting topics abruptly, telling stories, and shifting voice quality or amplitude. These and two additional strategies - repetition and dialogue (discussed in detail by Tannen (1989)) - are frequently used by these speakers to achieve involvement.

Repetition is a "resource by which conversationalists together create a discourse, a relationship, and a world" (p. 97). Tannen suggests several functions of repetition, including participation, humor (achieved with a slight variation of the original), and appreciation (savoring a line). The following extract illustrates the interpersonal
involvement achieved with repetition. The joint construction of imaginary dialogue also adds to the involvement.

[17] Sara: Kim said that he prayed every night
Maya: Uh-hm prayed for peace well it’s a good line anyway
Sara: Oh really
Maya: /0: "I prayed about you every night"/
Sara: /0: "I prayed about you"/ 0: "Hey I’ll talk to you"
Maya: 0: "Put a ring on me hey oooh I’m yours - no problem"
Sara: 0: "Now that you found the lord"
Maya: 0: "Now that you found the lord"
Sara: 0: "What are we waiting for?"
Maya: 0: "And the power of prayer"
Sara: 0: "The power of prayer"

The joint construction of this imaginary response to an estranged boyfriend’s admission that he prayed for a reunion clearly demonstrates the rapport which can be achieved with repetition and constructed dialogue. However, the involvement they achieve with one another does not appear to be at the expense of their needs as individuals. First, these needs are met in part by their joint effort to separate themselves from other members of their social circle (they jointly ridicule
most members as in extract [17]). Much of their interaction, too, has as an underlying theme their separateness from society at large. The following extract may illustrate this point as well as illustrate the use of several involvement strategies. First, Maya uses a narrative to illustrate her dread of stinging caterpillars. Second, the topic is of a personal nature (Maya says prior to this extract that she has been having nightmares about them). Third, one means that she uses to dramatize her story is direct speech forms which are representative of her thought. This representation of thought, which contains repetition, is further marked by a shift in voice quality.

[18] Maya: I was sitting at the bus stop the other day and I purposely don't sit under the little hut because they're up in there you know so I sat out in the sun on the curb so I can see you know - I'm on this island of cement and I can see anything dark crawling and this woman was sitting across from me and she kept looking at me real fucked up so I was like developing a hate for her even though I don't know her and I see this caterpillar drop behind her and start like squiggling its way up to her and I'm just like: (whispering) "Should I tell her or should I not? Should I tell her?" I
sat there for like five minutes and watched it get up to her shoe and I decided I can't tell her - I gotta see what happens and I think if like you do something mean to somebody like that it'll come back on you so I was sure I'll get covered in - I was like waiting cause I saw it crawl by her shoe - you know just kinda inch its way out of my view and I was like: "Oh shit - it's going in her sock - Ahhhh!" - but then it like inches out the other side you know - didn't touch her at all -

I would draw attention to this woman was looking at me real fucked up so I was like developing a hate for her even though I don't know her. The fact that this statement can go without elaboration suggests, first of all, that Sara knows what she means, and, second, that what she means is that persons like her (and Sara) often get looked at real fucked up. The implication is that they look and act different from other people, represented here by this woman. It appears that they satisfy their needs to be both a part of a group and a separate individual by emphasizing their separateness from others.

I would suggest that their separate identities are also retained in spite of their highly involved interaction by the very nature of this involvement. For example, although Maya’s
participation is perhaps most characterized by identification with her co-conversationalist(s), her separate identity is in no way hidden or put aside. Upon hearing the taped-recordings or reading the transcripts, one cannot deny that her voice as a separate individual not only is heard but heard loudly.

SUMMARY

In this chapter we have seen some samples of the data, aspects of which will be analyzed in the following two chapters. I also have mentioned some of the problematic issues encountered during the process of transcribing the data surrounding and included within the constructed dialogue. As mentioned during the description of the transcription conventions that I followed, a 0 is used to mark that an utterance represented with direct speech forms has no attributed speaker or quotative. An in-depth analysis of the functions which appear to be performed with this "zero-quotative" will be presented in Chapter 5.
INTRODUCTION

Having established some conventions for the representation of constructed dialogue forms in conversation, I would now like to describe, in some detail, some functional aspects of both constructed dialogue and the introductory quotatives which accompany it. I propose that speakers who frequently construct dialogue from either past or hypothetical speech events have an elaborate way of doing so. I also suggest that the speakers' decision to represent speech in either direct or indirect forms and the speakers' choice of quotative are meaningful. I do not claim that they are consciously deciding to represent speech events in direct or indirect speech or that they are consciously deciding to use a particular quotative (or to not use a quotative), but I do suggest that the choices made have a function. The quotative be like, in particular, will be examined closely.

CONSTRUCTED DIALOGUE

As I noted in Chapter 2, I will borrow Tannen's (1986) term "constructed dialogue" to capture the fact that a particular type of conversational report can include fragments of speech which have all the formal markings of direct, or quoted, speech, but which were (in all likelihood) not actually uttered by the person(s) they are attributed to. In
Chapter 2, I listed types of examples offered by Tannen (1986, 1989) to argue that utterances presented in direct speech forms are clearly marked as never having been spoken by anyone. For example, the dialogue may be clearly marked as something that was not said, as an example of a general phenomenon, as an utterance attributed to several speakers, as a representation of thought, as a construction by a listener, or as an utterance attributed to a nonhuman speaker. I would now like to present examples from my data which clearly illustrate that the dialogue presented in direct speech forms is indeed constructed rather than reported verbatim from a previous conversation.

The first examples illustrate dialogue which is constructed to represent something that was not said. In extract [1], the speaker is explaining that because she cannot tell her parents that she drinks at bars, she is left with an explanation that she cannot offer because it lacks credibility.

[1] Sara: What do you tell them? "Well I was just sitting in this bar and this band was playing and I'm just sitting there"

Because the utterance represents something that Sara cannot say, the utterance must be constructed rather than reported.
Extract [2] also is an example of a speaker representing in direct speech forms something that clearly wasn’t said.

[2] Sara: I always wanted to ask him: "So what happened to your fuck?"

Note that your does not have as its referent Maya, the person to whom Sara is talking in the current (reporting) situation but to the referent of him. Sara indicates that the constructed utterance is not a question she has asked but only one that she would like to ask. The direct speech forms are not to be taken as reported speech but as constructed dialogue.

In extract [3], both speakers construct dialogue for a character which the first speaker marks as being constructed by asking her interlocutors to "imagine" Jimmy in bed.

[3] Maya: Jimmy is such a granny - can you imagine him in bed - (falsetto) 0: "Let’s put some nice paper towels down"
Sara: (falsetto) 0: "Get a bottle of Chloraseptic"
Maya: (falsetto) 0: "Could you get that 409 - could you kinda swab the tip of your penis before I put it in my mouth?"
Again note that the deictic features of direct speech are preserved, with the reference of *you* and *my* necessarily interpreted in terms of the imaginary conversation. Maya and Sara are in no way indicating that they have overheard Jimmy’s bedroom talk and are now reporting it. Rather than reporting a past speech event, the speakers create a caricature of a person they both know by constructing dialogue attributed to him.

The following extract again illustrates that the speaker does not intend to be interpreted as directly reporting speech. In extract [4], Maya attributes words to a character who is trying to explain to his girlfriend why he cheated on her.


Again, the referent of *I* must be interpreted, not in terms of the current interaction between Maya and Sara, but in terms of the constructed situation involving the boyfriend and girlfriend. Of course, Maya is not intending the listeners of her narrative to believe that the boyfriend actually said *blah blah blah*. Instead, Maya sums up her attitude towards the type of excuses he might have presented by not giving them the weight of being actually spoken by her. Each of the extracts [1] through [4] has clear indications that the speaker does not intend the dialogue to be interpreted as direct reports of
past speech events even though the dialogue is represented with direct speech forms.

Further support for the argument that dialogue may be more accurately described as constructed rather than directly reported is that the dialogue may be offered as an instantiation of a repeated occurrence. In the following example, Maya is complaining about a character's propensity to assume she knows everything about everything.

Maya: you know how she automatically knows all this stuff about every category? Anything you can bring up she knows a whole lot about it even though she doesn't know what she's talking about she'll say: (falsetto) "Oh well it seems to me it would be like this"

Maya appears to be representing a line of dialogue as a line of which she has heard some variation repeatedly. Also, the vague referents it and this signal that the utterance is not a report but a construction of a type of utterance. Note that the referent of me should not be interpreted as the current speaker (Maya) but as the character in the constructed situation.

Another indicator that utterances appearing in direct speech forms are constructed rather than reported is that the
dialogue may be attributed to more than one speaker. Extract [6] is such an example.

[6] Maya: a lot of people are left behind by themselves and like: "Ah boy - I'm awful lonely"

It would be safe to assume that Maya isn't reporting an utterance which she heard "a lot of people" say in unison. She is constructing dialogue to generally represent what the people who are left behind might say or think.

Extract [7] is another example of a line of dialogue attributed to more than one speaker. The topic of conversation has been one character's lack of popularity. The consensus has been that the only reason to have this particular character around is for sex. In extract [7], Maya claims that even people who are having sexual relations with him don't like him.

[7] Maya: Even some people who are fuckin him are like: "Get outta my face"

Again, Maya, rather than reporting what she heard said by "some people who are fuckin him", is constructing dialogue which she attributes to those persons. Both this extract and extract [6] also illustrate that what is represented with direct speech forms is probably a representation of attitude
rather than speech. Get outta my face is a common expression of attitude meaning "leave me alone." The following extract illustrates a speaker representing her thoughts in direct speech forms. In extract [8], Maya is telling about the girlfriend's reaction to her boyfriend cheating on her.

[8] Maya: Yeah she said: "Well at least she wasn't goodlooking" and I's like: "Well are you sure you prefer that to him fucking someone he knows?" and she's: "Well I don't know - well at least she's not goodlooking" and I was like: "Ooooo she ain't real happy with this at all"

The last line which Maya attributes to herself, "Ooooo she ain't real happy with this at all", is clearly Maya's expression of what she represents as her thoughts at the time of the interaction. That it is not intended as a representation of what she said is evidenced by the shift in referents from you to she. The girlfriend, whom Maya has been addressing within this represented event, is clearly not addressed in this final constructed line. It would appear that Maya is addressing herself (in her mind) in this line and, while doing so, refers to the girlfriend as she rather than you.
In the next example, Maya again represents her thoughts in direct speech forms. Maya has been describing her attempt to avoid being unexpectedly assaulted by stinging caterpillars. During the event which she is describing, she notices one such caterpillar approaching an unsuspecting stranger sitting near her.

[9] Maya: I'm just like: (whispering) "Should I tell her or should I not? Should I tell her?"

Again, in extract [9], it would appear that it is Maya's thinking rather than her speech that is being represented with the direct speech forms since there is no one present in the represented event other than the woman who is the referent of her (who would not be directly addressed as her).

Direct speech forms also occur after a quotative which explicitly indicates that the utterance represents thought or attitude rather than speech. For example, in extract [10], Maya indicates that she is representing her thoughts.

[10] Maya: I thought: "Hmm you know that's an amazing amount of will power coming from Kim"

Direct speech forms can even be used to represent the attitude being expressed by a facial expression. In extract
[11], Sara is representing her father's attitude as is conveyed by his look of disbelief.

[11] Sara: My dad's looking at me like: "Yeah right uh-huh"

Sara is clearly not reporting a line which was spoken by her dad but is constructing with direct speech forms his attitude towards her.

Further support for the notion of dialogue being constructed is that dialogue may be constructed by an active listener to the description of an event. In the following extract, Sara is reporting a telephone conversation with a former friend during which Maya was not present.

[12] Sara: - and I said: "Well I'll call you some other time" and she's like: "Yeah right" and I'm like: "Don't start it - don't honey - don't -

Maya: "Don't throw attitude"

Sara: "Don't throw attitude and don't start and don't call me up and say 'Yeah right' at me"

Sara's second turn in this interaction uses an expression provided in the current context by Maya and hence quite unlikely to have been what was actually said in the reported
interaction. Several other examples of completions by a second speakers will be presented in Chapter 5.

Yet another environment in which it is clear that dialogue is being constructed rather than reported is where speech is attributed to nonhuman speakers (or human speakers too young to speak as in Brody (1991)). In extract [13], the dialogue is attributed to two dogs trapped in cages in a pet store.

[13] Maya: They all look weird — they’re like: "Oh I’m real worried about my cage — I don’t think I get enough room — oh stop biting my ear" and the other guy’s: "Oh I’m always sad I think maybe if I chew on your ear I’ll feel better"

All the preceding examples illustrate the fitness of the term ‘constructed dialogue’ for what participants in conversation do when they represent speech. Though the deictic features of direct speech are preserved in the representations, it would be a serious mistake to treat such forms as ‘direct’, or ‘quoted’, speech when they are being used for purposes clearly unconnected to verbatim reporting.
As can be seen from the data, one of the most salient quotatives used by the speakers is \textit{be like}. Schourup's (1982) discussion of quotative \textit{like} is but part of his broader analysis of \textit{like} as a discourse marker, discussed in Chapter 2. Schourup reports the use of \textit{be like} as a common quotative in data gathered among younger speakers in Central Ohio in the early eighties. He also reports that the users of the quotative indicated that the quotative was used to introduce thought or attitude rather than speech. The evincive meaning of \textit{like} (to indicate a possible minor unspecified discrepancy between what is said and what is meant) would seem to be appropriate as a introducer of thought, especially if the character to whom the thought is attributed is someone other than the speaker. He suggests that the extension of \textit{be like} from an introducer of thought to an introducer of speech is reasonable given that "[s]peakers are aware of the inexact nature of retrospective quotations" (p. 35). As an introducer of thought or speech, \textit{be like} may indicate that the utterance which is to follow is being presented as only roughly similar to what was actually said or thought.

Tannen (1986) also mentions the use of quotative \textit{be like}. She found that \textit{be like} introduced eight percent of the lines of dialogue in the English spoken stories she examined. Like Schourup (1982), she suggests that the lines introduced by \textit{be like} represent the "kind of thing that character was saying or
thinking" (p. 321). Again in Talking Voices (1989), Tannen writes that the quotative introduces what the attributed speaker "appeared to have felt like" (p. 115). So, both Tannen and Schourup emphasize the use of be like to introduce thought represented in direct speech forms. Tannen (1986) also suggests in passing that if one were to imagine a continuum of introducing devices with graphic verbs of telling (e.g. groaned, whined) at one end and no introducer at all (zero-quotative) at the other, be like would fall near the no introducer end, "depending for effect on the way the dialogue is voiced" (p. 324). Towards the end of this chapter, I will offer a further explanation for this placement of be like toward the zero-quotative end of the continuum.

Although Underhill (1988) doesn't mention the quotative use of like, she discusses the marker's use as a means to focus attention on what is said. He claims that "it functions with great reliability as a marker of new information and focus" (p. 234). In the following example presented by Underhill, like does not have a for example or approximately meaning as it may in other environments.


Student: Change mine to Wednesday. I'll do it like twelve to one.

(Underhill, 1988, p. 245)
Because the exam is mutually known to be an hour long, specifying the time twelve to one is not meant to convey approximateness. That is, the student is not using like to convey that the student will take the exam at some time around twelve to some time around one. Like is used rather to bring the time into focus since the schedule is being changed.

Meehan (1991), like Schourup and Tannen, writes that the apparent use of quotative be like is to introduce "reflections of feelings" (p. 48). In the examples that she encountered, be like introduces "very emotive" (p. 48) utterances. She extends Underhill's (1988) analysis of like as a marker of focus to quotative be like, claiming that its function is "to focus on the highlighted information expressed in the quote" (p. 48).

Blyth, Recktenwald and Wang (1990) also agree with Underhill that like serves as a focus marker. However, as they hint, so apparently do other quotatives. Unlike Schourup (1982), Tannen (1986, 1989), and Meehan (1991) who emphasize the function of be like as an indicator that what follows is a representation of thought or attitude, Blyth, Recktenwald and Wang note the common use of quotative be like to introduce both inner monologue (thoughts and attitude) and speech. They claim that only be like may introduce either type of construction represented in direct speech forms. For example, think prefaces only inner monologue, while say prefaces only representations of speech. As will be discussed in some
detail i... the following chapter, representations of thought or speech also may occur without a quotative (or with zero-quotative).

In my data, *be like* introduces a much greater percentage of the constructed utterances than that noted by Tannen (1986) in her data. An examination of the data presented in the Appendix, which can be taken as representative of the speakers' typical behavior, revealed that the speakers use *be like* to introduce about 36 percent of the constructed utterances. However, when a speaker is constructing dialogue which is attributed to herself, the percentage of instances of *be like* increases to 60 percent. The only quotative to be used more than *be like* in general is zero-quotative (no introducing verb and no attributed speaker), which will be discussed in Chapter 5. When a quotative is used (i.e. excluding zero-quotative), *be like* is the quotative of choice 71 percent of the time, occurring approximately 65 percent of the time with third person and approximately 80 percent of the time with first persons speakers. This data, then, is quite unlike the data examined by Blyth, Recktenwald and Wang (1990), in which *be like* did not often introduce representations of speech or thought of third persons (singular or plural). It has been suggested that quotative *be like* is a phenomenon found mainly in the speech of younger speakers (Schourup, 1982; Tannen, 1986; Blyth, Recktenwald & Wang, 1990). Perhaps that explains the lack of interest in this quite common (if my data is any
indication) quotative. Interest has generally lain in quantifying its occurrence within groups distinguishable on sociolinguistic criteria rather than attempting to account for its function. As we've seen, the only function that has been suggested for be like is to perhaps mark that what follows is to be interpreted as constructed thought or attitude rather than speech. In extracts [7] -[9] presented earlier, be like also appears to serve this function for the speakers in this data.

But as was noted by Blyth, Recktenwald and Wang and as might be suggested by the frequency with which be like is used as a quotative in my data, be like may also introduce representations of speech as well as attitude. This broadening of the use of the quotative be like may have resulted in the "pragmatic unmarking" (Fleischman, 1990, p. 54) of be like as a marker of attitude for these speakers. That is, because these speakers use be like as a quotative so much, it no longer marks that what follows is attitude. It appears that this function of be like is frequently served by just + be like when the speakers are using direct speech forms to represent what appears to be clearly intended as attitude. Below are several examples of just being used in conjunction with be like to introduce expressions of attitude.

[15] Sara: . . . they were just like: "Doobie doo."
[16] Sara: I'm just like: "Oooo"
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[17] Maya: ... I’m just like: "Ooo gross"

[18] Sara: it seems to me you know how she’s always really anti-reality and just like: "I don’t wanna know reality"

[19] Maya: ... is real hard if you’re addicted so I’m just like: "Hmmm"

[20] Maya: He’s just like: "And me and me and I can just press a button"

[21] Sara: I used to hear them on the phone - I can just - I’d just sit there and listen to them and just like: (harsh voice) "Ugh God"

[22] Sara: We were just like: (harsh voice) "Whooaa"

Just + be like is also occasionally used to introduce what is apparently constructed speech, but it is much more frequently used to introduce represented thought. It could be that just is being used to mark that what follows is not to be taken as reported speech. Since in this data the speakers appear to use be like to introduce constructed dialogue as well as constructed attitude, just + be like may be serving the function that be like formerly did.

Given that be like functions to introduce representations of speech, I would now like to examine whether be like occurs in free distribution with other quotatives at such sites or if it has other particular functions. Blyth, Recktenwald and Wang note be like (and go) differ from verbs of saying such as
say, tell, or ask in that be like is restricted to introducing
direct speech forms and may not be used to introduce indirect
speech reports. For example, one cannot say "and he was like
that he was sorry."

Furthermore, when reporting a previous speech event, some
verb forms appear to be reserved for reported speech while
others are used for constructed dialogue (which is introduced
in the examples below with be like). For example, in extract
[23], the reporting speaker uses ask in the past tense to
report what she had said and be like in the present tense to
introduce the constructed dialogue form.

[23] Maya: I asked her what you all had done to her and
she's like: "Nothing"

A similar pattern can be observed in extract [24] where
the reported speech event is first established by a past tense
verb (called) and each speaker's constructed dialogue is
introduced by a present tense version of be like.

[24] Sara: she called me the other night and - uh - she's
like: (falsetto) "So hey whatcha doin'?" and
I'm like: "Oh I'm sittin' here watchin' TV"
The preference for using past tense for the background reported events extends to summarized reports, while using the present tense of be like as introducer seems to allow the reporter to embellish on what was actually said, as for example in extract [25].

[25] Maya: she’s called me twice and I wasn’t at home and she got all pissed off because I wasn’t at home and I’m like: "Well - contrary to what you might believe I’m not superglued to the receiver waiting for you to call - vibrator in hand"

That constructed dialogue is used for dramatic effect is well-established (Tannen, 1986; Schiffrin, 1981; Chafe, 1982). As noted by Schiffrin (1981), switches in tense are also used for dramatic effect. The co-occurrence of both of these dramatic devices would indicate that the speaker is putting the representations of speech into focus. Below an extended piece of discourse will be analyzed in which be like in the present tense, as well as other present tense quotatives, appear to focus the listeners' attention on certain aspects of the narrative. Before presenting the narrative, I would like to mention more about focus in terms of 'staging'.
STAGING

The concept of "staging" has been in use by discourse analysts for some time, but has typically been restricted to descriptions of the effects of different types of thematization in sentence and clause structure (e.g., Grimes, 1975; Clements, 1979). Brown & Yule (1983) extended the use of the term "staging" to the analysis of longer stretches of spoken and written text where the actual structure of the discourse seems to be organized in such a way that a specific setting or frame of reference is established as background in order that a particular topical contribution can be given warranted prominence in the foreground. In the conventions of English letter-writing, those structural aspects of background setting and foreground announcement are fairly clear and generally recognized (cf. Brown & Yule, 1983). However, in the less conventionally predetermined flow of everyday conversation between friends, the staging, or the organization of what is a necessary setting for a particular topical contribution to be relevantly in the foreground, has to be accomplished on-line and without substantially interrupting the flow. We may recognize the processes of staging taking place in a conversation more often in their breakdown or failure than in their accomplishment. Successful accomplishment will tend to go unnoticed as part of the flow of ordinary conversation. However, there are some speakers who start on a topic, backtrack to establish an appropriate
setting, get tied up in remembering the details of the setting, and often have to ask *eh where was I?*, and get a reminder, in order to return to their original topic. Very young speakers often present the opposite problem, embarking on some personally absorbing topical contribution without first having established some common ground via staging, and forcing their listeners to inquire about time, place, etc., in order to make sense of what is being talked about (cf. Brinton & Fujiki, 1989).

It may be that the term "failure" is too strong for such phenomena and that it would be more appropriate to talk in terms of different qualities of staging, such as poor or inadequate (given the needs of the interlocutors), excessive or overelaborate (and hence tedious for a particular audience), and so on, making the analysis dependent on the recognition of certain aesthetic or rhetorical properties which are valued (or not) by those taking part in the speech event, rather than being tied to objective or definable linguistic properties in the structure of the discourse.

In the analysis of the following narrative, I shall attempt to show that when those who are recounting speech events involving others take the part of the other(s), they use the available range of reporting devices to mark the relative dramatic status of the various elements in the reported event.
THE NARRATIVE

In extract [26], Sara begins the narrative and then backtracks to make sure that her listeners are with her.

[26] Sara: You know what Don - this was what I was laughing about on the phone when I was laughing real hard - last night - Alan met Don and was talking to him - and Don calls Bob 'puppy' - I don't know if you all knew that -

Kim: M-hm
Maya: No

As can be seen in extract [26], when Sara begins her turn, she seems to have a topic in mind (you know what Don -), but interrupts herself to establish a setting from which the new topic can emerge. The staging process used here seems to be tied to establishing the source of the information to be presented, in addition to the more general staging function of establishing some (quite specific) common ground. The first element is effectively answering the implicit question 'How do you know these things?' by establishing a connection I - phone - Alan - Alan - talk - Don, which will be the nominal source of the speaker's knowledge of the events and speech of both Alan and Don. I shall return to the structural impact, on this speaker's topic organization, of her care in marking the source of information presented, but first, like this speaker,
we have to deal with the negative response to her attempt to establish as common ground an aspect of Don's relationship with Bob. By the end of this extended turn at talk, this speaker's topic will emerge as having to do with 'Don's treatment of Bob', so it seems important that the speaker do some initial staging to introduce (if not already known to the listeners) one aspect of how Don treats Bob. The speaker continues as in extract [27].

[27] Sara: Don calls Bob 'puppy' and eh - Alan's like: "You really ought to call him 'Bobo'" and he said Don fell out /laughing/= Maya: /oh my god/
Sara: =and he's like: "Oh really? Why?" and Alan told him the story about Bobo - Bobo the clown and all - everything that goes on - like just some of the stuff that goes on in B___ and how the B___ people think about it - and he said Don was just falling out - and so anyway

The major function of this part of the speaker's account seems to be the establishment of a world of reference in which others such as Alan, as well as Don, make Bob a figure of derision and actually set out to humiliate him. It also establishes some form of collusion between Alan and Don wherein they both share a joke concerning Bob, a situation
which will be repeated in another form later in the speaker's recounting or events. It is clear that, for this speaker, the sharing of the joke is the important feature of this part of her reported conversation with Alan because other details of that part of the conversation are made very vague (and all - everything that goes on - like just some of the stuff) and pushed into the background.

There is also a very marked difference in the way various items of the reported conversation are presented in this extract. The reporting verb told is used to summarize least important material; the verb said, in the past tense only, is used to attribute descriptions of salient events to the reported speaker; more dramatically, the construction is like, in the present tense, is used to introduce constructed dialogue and create the impression of a two line conversation as the highlighted part of this reported interaction between Alan and Don. Figure 1 shows the stage management effect of the different reporting verbs as an arrangement from the rear (at left) to the front (at right) of the metaphorical stage.

The pattern discernible in Figure 1 seems to associate present tense reporting structures with constructed dialogue while the past tense of the reporting verb said is kept for reported speech concerning actual physical events. This pattern is even more apparent in the speaker's presentation of her major topical contribution, to which she returns, having
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported Events</th>
<th>Reported Speech</th>
<th>Constructed Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alan's like: &quot;You really ought to call him 'Bobo'&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>and he said Don fell out laughing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>and he's like: &quot;Oh really? Why?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>and Alan told the story about Bobo, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>and he said Don was just falling out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
marked off the 'Bobo' part with a clear indicator of return-to-topic in \textit{and so anyway} (cf. Levinson, 1983).

I will present the continuation of this speaker's account as extract [28], analyzed in Figure 2, using the same division of background/reported speech events and foreground/constructed dialogue to illustrate one important aspect of the structural organization behind this speaker's presentation of her topic.

[28] Sara: he said he was standing there and he was just out dancing around on the edge of the dance floor and Don who looks real Butch but is this major Nellie Queen comes running up to him and goes: "Now just nod your head - nod your head" - and Bob was standing over there watching with this horrified - Alan said he had this totally horrified look on his face - and uh - Don goes: "Nod your head - nod your head" and so Alan's like: "Oh okay" and he says: "Now take your hands and go like this" and so Alan did like that (holding hands about ten inches apart) and then he's: "Okay now nod again - okay okay thanks" and um - um he just like took off and then Bob came haulin' ass over there and goes: "Man I can't believe he asked you that - I can't believe he asked
you that" and Alan's like: "What?" and he says: "Did he just ask you how big your dick was?" and Alan is like: "Yeah"

As shown in Figure 2, the purely physical events which are narrated (simple past tenses) by the speaker, without any overt indication of the source of the information (i.e., no reporting verb), are in the left hand column. In the center column, there are two examples of reported speech, both tied to said, and employing durative aspect marking to establish states or descriptive settings as background for those events which are represented in the right hand column or, in theatrical terms, at the front of the stage. All these front stage events are represented via present tense verb forms, even the introductory characterization of Don in the scene. Beyond this introduction of Don, the present tense markers of report are extremely brief and seem to have restricted uses for different characters in the scene. The form be like is used here exclusively for Alan's contributions whereas goes, says, and is are used for the others' contributions.

What emerges in the far right column of Figure 2 as the constructed dialogue of this reporter can, in fact, be read as a script for three players quite independent of all the stage directions present in the rest of Figure 2.
he said he was standing there and he was just out dancing, etc.

and Don . . . goes: "Now just nod your head - nod your head"

and Bob was standing over there watching with this horrified - Alan said he had this totally horrified look on his face

and uh Don goes: "Nod your head - nod your head"

and so Alan's like: "Oh okay"

and he says: "Now take your hands and go like this"

and then he's: "Okay now nod again - okay okay thanks"

and um - um he just like took off and then Bob came haulin ass over there

and goes: "Man I can't believe he asked you that - I can't believe he asked you that"

and Alan's like: "What?"

and he says: "Did he just ask you how big your dick was?"

and Alan is like: "Yeah"
Immediately after the last line of Sara's turn, illustrated in Figure 2, another speaker offers a continuation of the final piece of constructed dialogue, with an imitated lower pitch male voice, "it's this big", as shown in extract [29]. Initially the next speaker (Maya) appears to be linking her turn very closely with the previous speaker's topic by providing a possible additional line of dialogue. However, when Maya continues, she shifts the topic slightly to focus on Bob as a topic entity. This would be a natural next move, in conversational terms, but Sara is clearly not finished with her speaker's topic and returns to the previous event time to spell out, though marked as hearsay, what must have transpired in a side stage scene prior to the events presented in Figure 2. Sara then goes on to make explicit, and reinforce with repetition, the interpretation of events which she thinks is appropriate.

What this does illustrate is the risk inherent in using an indirect means, via the constructed dramatization of events, to express speaker's topic. The listener(s) may enjoy the theater and may even show involvement in the constructed scene by anticipating a next line of dialogue, yet not interpret the events as the speaker intended. The speaker may then have to make that interpretation explicit, as illustrated in extract [29].
"It's this big" - I told Liz that I - I call him Son of Gumbi and she said she'll start making everybody call him that in H__ - she cracked up - she bought me a beer - "Yeah he kinda does look like Play-Doh doesn't he?" and I'm like: "Yeah".

Applying he told Bob: "I'm gonna go ask him how big his dick is - I think he's cute"

Really? oh - oh

Just to wreck Bob's nerves

Oh okay I thought maybe he really thought he was cute

Oh no - just to wreck Bob

Well that's kinda sad

Worthy of note in extract [29] is Maya's use, in her first turn, of the three types of structure, already identified in Figure 2, in order to create the staging for her topical contribution. After the initial use of constructed dialogue as the connection to the previous speaker's turn, Maya uses past tense reporting verbs (I told Liz; she said) to create background via reported speech, past tense physical action verbs for reported events (cracked up; bought), and finally constructed dialogue for the interaction. While Maya uses I'm like to introduce her own constructed dialogue contribution, she uses no reporting verb form at all to introduce the other
speaker's contribution, relying on a recognition of the already salient current agent of action (Liz) and a voice quality shift to determine speaker identification.

When Sara, in her first turn in extract [29], returns to the scene of her previous report, she produces a form of constructed dialogue marked with a reporting verb (*told*) which is neither lexically (verb choice) nor morphologically (tense choice) similar to those used earlier. This sample of constructed dialogue, it would seem, must have a different status than those observed earlier. There is, of course, a major marker of status shift in thematic position within this utterance. The use of *apparently*, described by Chafe (1986) as an indicator of hearsay, marks a shift out of the chain of report (Alan to Sara, Sara to group) because neither Alan nor Sara could have been present for this dialogue. Thus, although it is presented in the form of constructed dialogue, this dramatic event is situated off on side stage as a possible version of a background event and marked as such via *apparently* and the introducing verb form.

Having described in detail the elements contributing to the staging of this speaker's topic in one fragment of conversational discourse, we can list the features which characterize the relative status of those elements in Figure 3, which also attempts to capture the front stage (on the right) versus rear stage (on the left) position of those elements.
**Time 1**

**Sara to Group**

Past Tense

Punctual Aspect

Physical Actions

"told"

**Time 3**

**Don and Bob to Alan**

Present Tense

Punctual Aspect

Dialogue

"says/ is like/ is/ goes"

**Time 2**

**Alan to Sara**

Past Tense

Durative Aspect

States

"said"

**Time 4**

**Don to Bob**

"Apparently" +

Past Tense

Punctual Aspect

Dialogue

"told"
BE LIKE AS A MARKER OF PERSPECTIVE

The question which was raised earlier was whether \textbf{be like}, when it is used to introduce representations of speech, appears to be in free distribution with other quotatives. As we can see from the narrative above, the present tense forms of several quotatives -- \textit{is}, \textit{says}, \textit{goes}, and \textbf{be like}, as well as zero-quotative -- are used to introduce the constructed dialogue which seems to be that part of the narrative that Sara intends to foreground, while the past tense is reserved for background details which set the stage for the drama. It would seem, from our data, that there is a preference for using \textit{said} to introduce reported speech in the narrative, while the several different forms in the (historical) present tense are used simply to accompany indications of character shift. Though \textbf{be like} is but one of the quotatives involved in this foregrounding function, it does appear to be used to "track" a particular participant or character (Fleischman, 1990, p. 81). As was noted earlier, \textbf{be like} is used consistently to introduce Alan's and only Alan's constructed dialogue. Recall that Sara credits Alan with being the source of the narrative when she was establishing its setting. It might be the case, then, that \textbf{be like} in narratives of this type, in which a speaker constructs dialogue for several characters, marks whose point of view is being represented. In the narrative above, perhaps \textbf{be like} is reserved for Alan's
That *be like* functions to mark whose point of view is being represented may be further supported by the fact that *be like* appears to occur with greater frequency as a quotative with first person speakers than third person speakers. The prominence with which speakers in my data present *their* perspectives and *their* roles in the events would suggest that they are foregrounding their own points of view, or egos, over others. This would be in marked contrast to the findings of Fleischman (1990), who suggests that first person speakers, in order to be polite ("do not foreground ego" (p. 84)), try to avoid self-quotation. When narrators must "resort" to self-quotation, she suggests that they tend to "soft-pedal" them (p. 85). It is no surprise that my data, which is dominated by speakers' self-attributions of attitudes as well as speech, produced a quite different finding. Much of my data involves speakers reporting experiences through the filter of their own perspective and, consequently, it is the experiencer's point of view that is typically the dominant source of what is being reported. The quotative *be like* is used to mark that experiencing point of view more than any other. *Be like* would in that case signal the closeness of the constructed dialogue to its attributed speaker. If this is the case, then *be like* may indeed be placed on the continuum of quotatives close to the zero-quotative end as Tannen (1986) suggests.
For as we will see in the next chapter, zero-quotative is another marker of closeness.
INTRODUCTION

A feature of constructed dialogue (or, as will be seen, constructed attitude) which seems to have been virtually ignored is that it may appear without a quotative. That is, constructed dialogue may appear without an introducing verb or attributed speaker. The following example from the conversational data from the B-K conversation presented in Craig and Tracy's *Conversation Coherence* (1983) illustrates the phenomenon:

[1] K: -Yes. I have that same problem. I finally resorted to saying ((louder, mock exasperation)) "Dad? What do you want." ((high pitch, comical)) "I don't need anything." (p. 305)

The first bit of dialogue is introduced and attributed to the reporting speaker/character, while the second bit of dialogue ("I don't need anything") has no introductory quotative, nor is the attributed speaker identified. Despite the extensive, fine-grained analysis which this conversation received, by several different investigators in the volume edited by Craig and Tracy (1983), no attention was devoted to this aspect of how conversational participants represent previous conversational interactions. In this section, I would like to
focus on this little studied feature of reported discourse and try to identify the distribution and favored situations of use of what can be described as "zero quotative."

One researcher who has commented on the occurrence in conversations of direct speech forms with zero quotative is Deborah Tannen. Tannen (1986) reports that in the conversational stories she examined, dialogue was presented without a quotative about 26 percent of the time (more often even than in the American novel she examined where the conventions of written speech would aid a reader to make proper speaker attributions). Speakers mark dialogue, the writes, "by changing their voices to take on the characters' voices" (p. 319) This effect was obviously noted by the transcriber of the data presented in extract [1] where the paralinguistic shifts of the two speaking voices are marked in parentheses. Tannen illustrates the ability of a speaker to represent several characters with the following story about a hospital emergency room in which the narrator shifts voice quality, amplitude, prosody and pacing to represent different characters:

[2] They come bustin' through the door -
    blood is everywhere
    on the walls
    everywhere
    (raised pitch) It's okay Billy
it's okay
we're gonna make it
(normal voice) What's the hell wrong with you ... (p. 319)

By shifting vocal quality, the narrator conveys that the line It's okay Bill is attributed to a different speaker than the line What's the hell wrong with you.

Apart from Tannen pointing out that 'unintroduced dialogue' (in her terms) is quite common, scant attention has been paid to this feature of conversational report. In the following sections, the occurrence of unintroduced dialogue, or what I shall refer to as direct speech forms which appear with 'zero-quotative' (marked in the text as 0) will be described in a range of situations. In some of these sites, zero-quotatives appear to be optional; for example, be like appears to also be available at these sites. At other sites, however, the zero-quotative seems to be the most favored. I will attempt to explain why zero-quotatives appear to be favored at these sites by describing what the absence of a quotative appears to allow a speaker/narrator to do.

STRUCTURALLY DETERMINED ATTRIBUTION

A speaker's report of a conversation involving two characters may explicitly mark which character is speaking at each turn. In [3], Maya is narrating an interaction she had
with an older man who owns apartments across the street from where she currently lives. Maya uses the quotative be like to introduce the lines of constructed dialogue. The speaker also indicates a shift in character voices by speaking with a strong Southern accent when she takes the role of the older man.

[3] Maya: . . . and he's like: "Know anybody who wants an apartment?" I was like: "Maybe" and he's like: "How about one seventy five for an efficiency?" and I was like: "Well let me see it" and he's like: "Ok"

In extract [3], it is worth noting that the use of a quotative allows the reporting speaker to use different tenses for both speakers, with the narrator maintaining past tense forms for introducing lines of dialogue attributed to herself and present tense forms for the other participants' introductory quotatives. Thus, extract [3] presents an example of a reported conversation in which there are many markers used to identify the participant structure: different pronouns (I - he); different tenses in the quotative (past - present); different voice quality indicators; different speech acts (more questions from one, more answers from the other). This elaborate marking of the turn-taking in a reported conversation is, however, the exception rather than the rule
in much of the data investigated here. For example, the conventional turn-taking structure can be taken advantage of to attribute constructed dialogue to a character even where a quotative does not appear (where the speakers use zero-quotatives). In extract [4], the speaker, Sara, reports a recent telephone conversation with her father who is making sure she isn't upset after having been refused for a job.

[4] Sara: . . . my dad called to to to make it better - I was like: "Dad I'm over it" (falsetto) 0: "Uhh well your mother said you were upset"

The turn-taking structure allows the statement following the bit of dialogue attributed to Sara to be attributed to her father despite the absence of an introductory quotative. Of course, the referential term Dad and the deictic your in your mother, also contribute to the ease with which the words are attributed by a listener to the correct character. A similar example follows in which Maya is reporting an interaction with her friend Al who has decided that her dislike of a former mutual friend is warranted.

[5] Maya: . . . Al comes up 0: "Jesus Maya you were right - she's a complete boob" 0: "Yes yes she is - thank you - score one for me"
Again, the turn-taking structure allows for the assumption that immediately following a statement addressed to one character (especially when that character is the reporting speaker) will be a statement by that character in response.

In extract [6], the speaker reports a previous interaction involving Maya and another character, Jan.

[6] Maya: . . . she was on the bus the same time I was and she's like: "Oh there's that guy - wow I know him!" 0: "How?" 0: "Oh I really can't get into it like in a five minute conversation"

In [6], a question (How?) following a statement attributed to one character (Jan) must be attributed to the other character (Maya). The turn-taking structure also allows for a response to the question to be attributed to the other character (Jan). So without the explicit markings that appeared in extract [3], constructed dialogue can still be attributed to the appropriate character. The previous examples also illustrate that the unintroduced dialogue (the zero-quotatives) may be attributed either to the reporting speaker's character within the report or to another character involved in the reported interaction. The following two extracts contain further examples of zero-quotatives introducing responses to questions. Again the conventional turn-taking structure of
English allows for the bits of dialogue to be attributed to the appropriate character.

[7] Sara: . . . Mom goes: "Ah see anyone you know there?" 0: "No thank God"

[8] Sara: . . . he's like: "Do you know anybody who would be into that?" 0: "No I sure don't - everybody I know wants sex"

In both extracts [7] and [8], the negative response with zero-quotative is immediately recognizable as an answer, hence attributable to the reporting speaker, following the polar question from another identified character. In extract [9] below, the reporting speaker is recounting a conversation with her mother and initially attributes the wh-question to her mother while presenting her response with zero-quotative. Once this interactive pattern of mother-asking, reporter-responding is established, then the next question-answer sequence between the same two participants can be reported with zero-quotatives for both turns.

[9] Sara: . . . she's like: (falsetto) "So what time did you get in?" We got in like at two-thirty - (falsetto) 0: "Well I got home around a little after one" cause they sleep like the dead - they don't hear us come in anyway and
uh so (falsetto) 0: "Did you all have a nice time?"  (falsetto) 0: "Yeah"

In all these cases, extracts [7] - [9], the structurally determined attribution is accomplished in much the same way as lines of dialogue in written fiction are attributed in sequence to two characters. Extract [10], from Robbins (1980), illustrates the familiar structure.

[10] "You’re turning me in, then?"
   "I don’t know. It depends. Are you really going to use the rest of your dynamite?"
   "It’s likely."
   "Why?"
   "Because that’s what I do." (p. 74)

While spoken reports of interactions do not have the punctuation and separate lineation of the written mode to indicate different voices, they do seem to share the dramatic effect of having the characters' words directly expressed rather than summarized or reported in indirect speech forms (Tannen, 1986; Wolfson, 1982). It may be that reporters of spoken interaction use zero quotatives for the same dramatic purpose, and avoid the clear indications of reporter presence which necessarily come with other quotatives such as say, go and be like.
ZERO-QUOTATIVES AND DRAMATIC EFFECT

The avoidance of a quotative may be used to achieve a dramatic effect which may not be achieved with the presence of a quotative. At certain sites zero-quotatives appear to be reflect the urgency of the interaction being reported. Extract [11] is an example.

[11] Maya: . . . she comes over and she’s like: "I ran over here" and I’m like: "Why?" 0: "I’m not gonna go with Sara because you’re upset with me"

This example begins to suggest something which may be accomplished only with zero-quotatives. The characters in this narrative are Maya and Leon who are very good friends. Leon (who is also friends with Sara) and Maya have had an argument over the telephone in which Maya accused Leon of not being a very good friend as of late. We enter the reported interaction at [11] where Maya is telling Sara about Leon’s desperation to make up with her. While the final turn in this sequence can be attributed to Leon on the basis of the turn-taking sequence as described above, the absence of a quotative allows Maya to illustrate Leon’s urgency to make things right again. The use of a zero-quotative in the report of this interaction can be viewed as an iconic representation of one aspect of that interaction. In his discussion of the
iconicity of linguistic distance, Haiman (1983) proposes that the linguistic distance between two expressions can be defined as the "number of syllables (or even the number of seconds) between them" (p. 781). In this case, the absence of any elements creating linguistic distance (i.e. zero quotative) is a reflection of the absence of any temporal distance between the end of Maya's question (Why?) and the onset of Leon's response (I'm not gonna go with Sara because you're upset with me). In Maya's version of the reported event, she uses the zero-quotative option (and not, for example, a fuller quotative such as "she immediately said") to dramatically demonstrate the urgency with which Leon attempts to make sure that Maya will not be upset with her.

This dramatization of an event through direct speech forms with zero-quotative is also present in Maya's description of scenarios where no specific interacting characters are introduced, as can be illustrated in extract (12).

[12] Maya: Yeah in my apartment I would have to buy like four boxes of maxi pads and lick and stick em all to all the windows to get even the slightest greyness in the house - it's kinda like Sunny Brook Farm in there in the morning - you can't sleep - it makes me angry and I'll pile things over my face and then I can't
breathe and then I get real pissed and I wake up and have a glorious morning — 0: "Good morning Maya" (harsh voice) 0: "Fuck you"

In keeping with the sunny, "glorious morning" scenario, Maya first produces the automatic Good morning greeting, attributed to no one in particular (hence zero-quotative), but then immediately produces the rapid response, again as an automatic response (with zero-quotative) to show how "pissed" she is in the morning when the sun is shining in her bedroom.

Another example may go further to illustrate the dramatic effects achieved by a speaker who avoids using a quotative. Maya is reporting an interaction involving herself and Ellen, an on-again-off-again friend.

[13] Maya: . . . but I got really mad at her once and I like picked her up by her collar at the bar and pushed her over the couch and so now if I start to get mad she hurries up and fixes it . . . - I'm like: "LOOK don't you" (falsetto) 0: "No no no - I don't mean it - I don't mean it"

The absence of a quotative following the dialogue attributed to Maya allows the speaker to dramatically illustrate the speed with which Ellen "hurries up and fixes" their
difficulties. If Maya had chosen to introduce the last line of dialogue with, for example, be like, the urgency which she apparently desires to display would be diminished. Maya’s construction of the interaction again contains a reflection of a crucial aspect of her version of the interaction itself. The distance between the two expressions which is diminished by the use of a zero-quotative corresponds to Ellen’s attempt (according to Maya) to prevent a rift from appearing between her and Maya.

GIVING VOICE TO ATTITUDE

The dramatic presentation of a character’s words may also be the motivation for the occurrence of direct speech forms with zero-quotative within reports where no actual interaction or dialogue is being reported. At these sites the term "constructed dialogue" may not be quite appropriate. The speaker at these sites does not appear to be constructing a situation in which two or more characters are involved in a dialogue. The only person who hears these expressions of attitude is the interlocutor in the current interaction (either Maya or Sara during their taped conversation). It also seems that the speaker is doing more than representing an unspoken thought with direct speech forms. Rather, it appears that the speaker expresses her attitude or the attitude of another character, where attitude may be defined as thought with emotion. In many cases, the speaker has already
described her thoughts in regard to a specific topic before representing her attitude in direct speech forms. It appears that she takes advantage of the dramatic effect of the direct speech forms to give emotion to her thoughts, or, as I will call it, to construct her attitude.

The expression of attitude with direct speech forms is discussed by Tannen (1986), Underhill (1988), and Schourup (1982) as being conveyed by the use of the quotative be like. Direct speech forms which are used to dramatically express attitude may also appear without quotatives (with zero-quotative). A noticeable feature of the examples to follow is a marked voice quality shift on the speaker's part. Such voice quality shifts provide paralinguistic cues that the speaker has moved to another voice, distinct from the narrative voice, to give dramatic expression to the attitude being conveyed. In extract [14], Sara expresses her reluctance to give Leon one of her kittens because of Leon's thoughtless (if not cruel) treatment of the kittens. After expressing her lack of trust in Leon, she constructs an utterance which gives dramatic expression to her attitude.

[14] Sara: I don't know - I wouldn't trust her with one of the kittens cause she would break one of them's neck (creaky voice) 0: "Would you quit doing that to that kitten?"
The constructed utterance *Would you quit doing that to that kitten?* is marked by Sara with a shift in voice quality to indicate a shift from the narrative voice.

In extract [15], Sara expresses her distaste for one aspect of the relationship between her roommate and her roommate's boyfriend.

[15] Sara: . . . he comes into the door and like she flies into his arms. . . . (harsh voice ) 0: "Would you stop that?"

Sara does not appear to be describing a situation in which she asks her roommate and her boyfriend to stop being so melodramatic. Instead she is dramatically expressing her own private reaction toward their behavior by presenting it in direct speech form.

A similar example follows in which again Sara constructs her attitude toward the same characters as above. Lying in her own bed, Sara reports that she can hear the sounds made in the other bedroom and expresses her lack of appreciation for the noise, producing an immediate negative reaction to the reported *yes* sounds. Once again, it is a personal reaction that is being reported and not something that was actually said as part of a dialogue.
[16] Sara: . . . and you got the kittens mewing on this side and Kim and Mike mewing through the wall over there: (breathy voice) "Oh yes oh yes"
  0: "Oh no I gotta go to work tomorrow"

In the following example, Sara has been telling Maya that she intends to tell Kim what she honestly thinks about Kim’s decision to get married. We enter the dialogue in extract [17] where she is guessing what the results of her honesty will be. Again she appears to be expressing her attitude rather than constructing dialogue.

[17] Sara: I’m probably not gonna be in her wedding but then but - (creaky voice) 0: "You’re selling out - I hate it"

In extract [17], Sara is not reporting an interaction in which she uttered the constructed line (You’re selling out - I hate it). She says a few turns earlier that she intends very soon to tell Kim that she thinks she is "selling out." She conveys to Maya, at this point, her disappointment in Kim’s decision through a dramatic expression of attitude.

In the following example, Sara combines constructed attitude with a statement conveying the same feeling.
[18] Sara: . . . And then - and now that she's gonna marry Mike I mean - I don't like him at all - (creaky voice) 0: "I don't like you at all"

It would appear that Sara expresses her attitude in direct speech forms to emphasize that attitude, and, in doing so, does not use an introductory quotative such as be like.

In the preceding examples the attitude being conveyed is the speaker's. As with be like, however, the speaker may also express another character's attitude with this form. In extract [19], Sara is explaining to Maya that Kim is "peeved" at her because Sara left their apartment right before the pizzas that Kim was making were finished.

[19] Sara: She's kinda peeved at me now - (nasal voice) 0: "I was makin pizza for you"

Sara indicates a shift in voice (from her voice as narrator to Kim's voice) with a shift in voice quality. As in extract [18], Sara states the character's feelings (in the previous example, it was her own feelings) and then, in direct speech forms, dramatically expresses those feelings.

Extract [20] is another example of a speaker constructing attitude which must be attributed to another character.
[20] Maya: . . . Now she’s got like this big project you know - this big reason to live - a baby - I just (breathy voice) 0: "Make myself worthwhile - let’s have a bambino"

With a shift in voice quality, Maya indicates that the expression of attitude which appears in direct speech forms is to be attributed to Kim (whose voice is often indicated by both Maya and Sara by a shift to a breathy quality). Though this attitude is attributed to Kim, Maya also conveys her own attitude towards Kim’s decision to marry and have a baby. That is, Maya superimposes her reporting voice and Kim’s voice. While the breathy voice is attributed to Kim, the overriding sentiment expressed by the construction is Maya’s disapproval of her estimation of Kim’s way of thinking. More examples like this will appear in a later section in which the speakers merge their voices to become the (parodied) voice of a character.

A double-voiced effect is not only available with zero-quotatives. This effect can also be achieved in constructed dialogue (attitude) which is introduced by a quotative such as be like. In the following extract, Maya clearly superimposes her voice over the voice of the character to which the dialogue is attributed.
Maya's attitude towards the character represented is conveyed by the utterance which she constructs for the character. Her feelings about the worthlessness of the character's excuses are expressed by her dismissal of what he might have said and her substitution of *blah blah blah*. Through the superimposition of her own voice as the narrator over the character's voice, Maya is able to convey her attitude towards the character while constructing dialogue for him.

**SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR WITH ZERO-QUOTATIVES (TWO-WAY CONVERGENCE)**

In the examples of the previous sections, the discussion of zero-quotatives has concentrated on quotatives occurring within a single speaker's report or construction. In this section, I will examine zero-quotatives that immediately follow the previous speaker's turn. In the following examples, the constructed dialogue (or attitude), which is being zero-introduced by one speaker immediately following a turn by the previous speaker, is being attributed to the previous speaker. At these sites, the constructed dialogue (or attitude) is always zero-introduced. Zero-quotatives appear to be a means to intensify the involvement between the interactants. Extract [22] illustrates the phenomenon:
[22] Sara: Kim does that a lot too - she’s like: "Every little thing da da da da - I hate it when you do that - I hate it" - I’m like: "Let me sit you down and tell you a few home truths"

Maya: 0: "Let me get down to the basics for you"

Since Maya was not present during the reported interaction, her direct speech forms are clearly not recalled fragments of what was said, but represent purely constructed echoes of what Sara produces as her reported expression. The line constructed by Maya must be attributed to Sara. Bublitz’s (1988) descriptions of primary and secondary speakers discussed earlier may be useful at this point. In extract [22], Sara would be called the primary speaker since she is performing the topical action, and Maya, the secondary speaker. Maya, in her role of secondary speaker, shows supportive behavior of the primary speaker by paraphrasing her. Bublitz writes that by paraphrasing, the secondary speaker reflects the primary speaker’s point of view. Maya shows her support and understanding of Sara by echoing her attitude in paraphrase, and with a syntactically parallel structure.

In extract [23], Maya is describing her evil mood when she is awakened in the morning because the sun is shining in her face. Her constructed dialogue is followed by a paraphrase which is zero-introduced by Sara.
In Maya's first turn in extract [23] she constructs an imaginary exchange to dramatically illustrate her awful mood. Again by taking advantage of the turn-taking structure, the first line of dialogue appearing with zero-quotative *Good morning Maya* may be attributed to whoever wakes her up and the unintroduced response may be attributed to Maya. She also indicates a change in speakers with a shift in voice quality. In the next line, Sara paraphrases Maya's response while also echoing the voice quality used by Maya in the previous turn. The speakers then continue jointly constructing with zero-quotatives Maya's range of possible responses to the greeting. Sara's second contribution repeats Maya's preceding utterance (*I wish you would fall over*) and adds a variation. By speaking with the same voice quality and keeping her lines of
constructed dialogue similar in content and form, Sara echoes Maya.

Other examples of paraphrasing are illustrated in extracts [24] and [25].

[24] Sara: I got up at nine and Kim slept till like twelve-thirty - I'm like: (harsh voice) "Get up - get up you heathen"

Maya: 0: "Get out now - get out of my bed"

[25] Sara: . . . he's like: "Oh I forgot - I was standing out back and Ellen was talking to me and that song came on and she's like: 'Come dance come dance' and so I was gonna go dance with her but then I saw you and I started dancing with you - I guess she's probably mad at me" - and I'm going: "If you're looking for sympathy you're looking at the wrong person"

Maya: Yeah 0: "You're talking to the wrong carbon unit"

In both extracts, Maya paraphrases with syntactically parallel structures the constructed dialogue (or attitude) attributed to Sara in Sara's previous turn.

Another means of supporting a primary speaker is by supplementing what she has said. Supplements, according to Bublitz (1988), "are in the primary speaker's interest and
conform to their assumptions and attitudes" (p. 243). In the following extract, Sara is explaining to Maya how she knows the age of a particular acquaintance of theirs. Since she is relaying information that is new to Maya, it is obvious that Maya is echoing Sara's constructed attitude.

[26] Sara: Yeah cause she came to Bucky's Bar. He's like: "She just turned eighteen" - 0: "Oh boy"

Maya: 0: "Fuckin A - you got some legal stuff now - huh Mike?"

The constructed dialogue that Sara attributes to Mike (he) is followed by a dramatic expression of attitude attributed to Sara. Maya again echoes Sara's attitude by constructing an utterance that conforms to the attitude expressed by Sara.

Completing what the primary speaker begins is a third way to show support or involvement. When a secondary speaker completes what the primary speaker begins, Bublitz writes that "the secondary speaker not only refrains from contributing a new proposition, but he does not even use his own words, because the form presented is triggered off and determined by the unfinished preceding contributions, and is thus predictable" (p. 240). The following extracts are examples of completion.
[27] Maya:  . . . No she's like (falsetto): "Houston is like" it's all this - "Utopia and I'm so popular there and everybody really loves me" and I keep tellin her=

Sara:  =0: "Huh-uh baby"

[28] Sara:  . . . and I was like: "Well if you feel inspired just go and" you know "paint something on those jeans" and she's like: "I'm gonna paint the word carpet muncher across the cuff" - I'm like=

Maya:  =0: "Oh thanks . . . With a hyphen or without?"

[29] Sara:  . . . She's like: "Well my body is doing all that funky stuff you do when you ovulate" - I was like: "Ahhh well you know"=

Maya:  =0: "You know that also goes with pregnancy"

In examples [27] through [29], the secondary speaker completes the turn begun by the primary speaker by constructing a line of dialogue attributed to the primary speaker. In the first two examples, the secondary speaker appears to complete the turn before the primary speaker has a chance to. The secondary speaker appears to be anticipating the primary speaker's response to the extent that she feels able to complete the response for her. In extract [29], though Sara has begun the construction of her response, Maya repeats the
last words spoken by Sara (you know) and continues to complete the response. Completions of the primary speaker's turn by constructing dialogue for her would seem to show even stronger support or involvement than completions which do not involve constructed dialogue (or attitude). Not only are the words which are spoken by the secondary speaker predicted by the primary speaker, as Bublitz points out, but these words are also attributed to the primary speaker.

Although Bublitz (1988) doesn't talk about supportive contributions in such terms, "accommodation" seems to be what is at issue. It appears that the secondary speaker is converging toward the primary speaker. Brown and Levinson (1978) write that where a speaker

"is trying to stress common ground that he shares with [a hearer], we would expect him to make only the minimal adjustment in point of view when reporting; that is, we would expect him to assume that [the hearer's] point of view is his, or his is [the hearer's]. (p. 122)

By paraphrasing, supplementing or completing the primary speaker's contribution, the secondary speaker appears to make no adjustment to the point of view expressed. She seems to be communicating to the primary speaker that she so thoroughly understands and supports her that she can speak with the primary speaker's voice in words and structures almost identical to those of the primary speaker. It is, however, important to note that in these data the secondary speaker does not directly repeat the primary speaker's words. Indeed, further examples illustrate that rather than the secondary
speaker accommodating the primary speaker to the point of losing her own voice, she may be attempting to share the primary speaker's role. That is, the secondary speaker may do more than simply echo the primary speaker's constructed dialogue (or attitude); she may retain a separate identity although her constructions must be referentially attributed to the primary speaker. The speakers appear to blend their voices so that the voice becomes not one or the other of them but both at once.

The following examples in which the primary speaker incorporates the contributions of the secondary speaker provide illustrations that neither speaker gives up her voice.

[30] Sara: . . . and she was like: "Oh I was just wonderin if you wanted to see a movie or something" and I was like: "Umm well really I can't tonight" and she - and I said: "Well I'll call you some other time" and she's like: "Yeah right" and I'm like: "Don't start it - don't - honey don't="

Maya: =0: "Don't throw attitude"

Sara: 0: "Don't throw attitude and don't start and don't call me up and say: 'Yeah right' at me"

In extract [30], Sara reports a conversation she had over the phone with a former friend. Both sides of the dialogue are
introduced with quotatives (either be like or say). In the last constructed line of Sara’s first turn, she begins to construct a response to the other character’s show of attitude (conveyed by her "Yeah right"). Sara appears to be searching for the right words to convey her own attitude in response to the character as Maya completes the line for her ("Don’t throw attitude"). Sara then incorporates Maya’s completion, legitimizing Maya’s action of constructing dialogue for her. That is, Maya accommodates to Sara’s voice by completing a line of constructed dialogue (or attitude) which is attributed to Sara, while Sara accommodates to Maya by repeating the offered line.

In the following example, Sara reports a conversation she had with her father over the telephone. Again, Maya completes a line of dialogue which is attributed to Sara.

[31] Sara: My dad called — did I tell you my dad called? My dad called to to to make it better — I was like: "Dad I’m over it" (falsetto) 0: "Uhh well your mother said you were upset" I’s like: "Uh="

Maya: =0: "Well I was upset then"=

Sara: =0: "But I was upset when I talked to her"

Without a hesitation, Sara repeats the line which was constructed by Maya. Again, the message appears to be that
both speakers believe that they share knowledge to the extent that they can put words into each other's mouth, which, in turn, will be readily accepted and incorporated.

Extract [32] illustrates a completion by Maya of constructed dialogue attributed to Sara and a paraphrase of that bit of dialogue by Sara. We enter the conversation where Sara is reporting an interaction with a former friend who appears to have been concerned with her sexual abilities.

[32] Sara: . . . but she used to ask me that - she's like: "Well I'm better than Bob huh?" I's like=

Maya: =0: "Well let's see. You're using completely different equipment"

Sara: 0: "Ok well considering you have different plumbing than he's got"

Maya completes Sara's turn by constructing an utterance attributed to Sara. Sara then echoes in paraphrase and with a syntactically parallel structure the attitude expressed in the prior utterance. Zero-quotatives at these sites allow the speakers to avoid explicitly attributing constructed dialogue (or attitude) to either speaker. In these examples the form of the quotative be like which would have to be used in the zero-quotative position would be you're like. But, using you're like, which is virtually absent in this database, would
fail to capture the fact that the speaker who is completing the other speaker’s utterance would have also said or felt the same thing. The lack of a quotative appears to be a way for the speakers to intensify the involvement of their interaction. Zero-quotatives allow the speakers to stress their similarity and shared knowledge by constructing dialogue which, though it is structurally attributed to a sole speaker, may be spoken by either speaker.

In the following example, Maya who appears to be the secondary speaker completes Sara’s previous turn. However, the dialogue which she constructs, though it must be attributed to Sara, is of such a nature that Maya, and not Sara, must be its author. Maya has graphic knowledge of this topic that Sara does not. The result is that Maya’s voice is also heard in this response that must be referentially attributed to Sara.

[33] Sara: . . . she was talking about her tits being real firm and I’m like=

Maya: =0: "Yep you’re knocked up and they’ll get firm and they’ll get bigger and milk will come out of three or four holes in each one just kinda haphazardly -yep"

This example illustrates that Maya is not simply converging toward Sara and losing her own voice in the process. She puts
words into Sara’s mouth (as a result of the referential attribution of the constructed dialogue) which could only have come out of her own. The following example of a supplement also illustrates that the secondary speaker does not accommodate the primary speaker to the point of losing her own voice. Again, while the constructed dialogue must be attributed to Sara, Maya retains her voice.

[34] Sara: Yeah yeah I always wanted to ask him: "So what happened to your fuck?"
Maya: Really 0: "The fat bitch with the nose ring"
Sara: 0: "The fat bitch who dances like this"
Maya: 0: "Who almost broke my ankle in Bucky’s Bar?"
Sara: 0: "Who broke my friend Maya’s ankle?"

This example makes clear that Maya, the secondary speaker, is not only speaking in Sara’s voice, but is adding her own. Her line "Who almost broke my ankle in Bucky’s Bar?" is said in her own voice; it was her ankle, not Sara’s, that was almost broken, which is evidenced by the following line by Sara. Also the incorporation of Maya’s contributed bit about the broken ankle into Sara’s next turn, also points to the fact that while the lines are attributed to a single speaker, both of the speaker’s voices are heard. So, it may be more appropriate to describe the speakers as sharing the role of
primary speaker, rather than that only the secondary speaker is accommodating the primary speaker.

Further support that both speakers retain their voices rather than one speaker losing hers in the attempt to accommodate the other is illustrated by the following example in which one speaker changes the tone of the constructed dialogue to such an extent that the topic begun by the other speaker changes. Since, by Bublitz's definition, a secondary speaker does not perform topical actions, what may at first appear to be supportive behavior by the secondary speaker may actually serve to blur the distinction between primary and secondary speakers. When two speakers jointly construct "a voice" in a reported interaction, there may no longer be one primary speaker. The following extract begins with concern being shown by Sara's mother about the kind of bars that Sara frequents and continues with a process of joint construction of Sara's response to her mother.

[35] Sara: Yeah she knows I go to Bucky's Bar because I've told her about Bucky's - she thinks it's the dive from hell - 0: "All those homosexual people in there" 0: "Well you know they are nicer people - they're better people than everybody here so"

Maya: 0: "So that's alright and they all share stools in there Mom"
Sara:  Yeah
Maya:  0: "Everybody shares a stool - every person on earth"
Sara:  0: "And sit on each other's laps and slide their hands between each other's legs"
Maya:  =0: "And go: 'Whoo whoo whoo'"

Maya shifts the tone of the constructed dialogue from one in which Sara tries to reassure her mother that the people in the bar "are better people than everybody here" to one which is designed to confirm Sara's mother's worst fears. The way in which this is done is reminiscent of what Sperber and Wilson (1981) describe as "echoic mention" for ironic effect. Maya produces her first turn, with zero quotative, as an echoic mention of Sara's reassuring utterance that the bar in question is alright, yet adds a detail ("they all share stools") that is ambiguous between a reassuring fact (i.e. the people are friendly) and something not so reassuring (i.e. the people are really friendly). As the two speakers jointly construct the continuing response to "Mom," the initially reassuring content of the utterances gives way to details designed to be the opposite of reassuring, creating a strongly ironic effect. Thus, in [35], the voice replying to "Mom" is essentially Sara's, with Maya nominally contributing lines for that replying voice. However, the irony in the replying voice is introduced by Maya and taken up by Sara, with the result
that each speaker has accommodated to the other’s contribution in the construction of the replying voice.

MERGING VOICES TO REPRESENT THE VOICE OF ANOTHER CHARACTER

Not only do these speakers freely speak for one another, but they also may freely speak for another character. Zero-quotative is strongly favored at these sites where the constructed dialogue or attitude is attributed to another character. Either speaker at these sites can begin the direct speech forms (either to construct dialogue or attitude).

In extracts [36] and [37], Maya and Sara construct dialogue (or attitude) for the same character, Al. In extract [36], Maya describes Al’s reaction to a former friend. Sara echoes the attitude attributed by Maya to Al.

[36] Maya: He walked by and Al went: "Oooo charming"
Sara: 0: "Pretty"
Maya: 0: "It’s my dude"

All three expressions occurring in direct speech forms are attributed to Al. Either speaker may construct Al’s attitude, whether she was present for the reported interaction or not.

In extract [37], Sara is reporting an interaction that took place involving Al (he), Ellen (she) and herself. She constructs attitude attributed to Al which is echoed by Maya.
[37] Sara: And he looked at me like: "Thanks!"
Maya: /0: "I'd love to talk to you but"
Sara: 0: "But she's there"
Maya: 0: "But she's here and I don't have my Lysol"

Maya constructs attitude for Al even though she wasn't present for the reported interaction. It appears that these speakers can freely construct attitude for a character whom they believe they know well.

In extract [38], Ellen is again the topic. Maya has been discussing the relationship between Ellen and a character who Maya and Sara believe to be Ellen's only friend. She constructs an interaction between the two characters in which Ellen asks her friend why, in effect, he is her only friend. Sara and Maya then construct a response to the dialogue attributed to Ellen.

[38] Maya: And she can also tell him: "Everybody in the world is evil except for me and you - tell me why that is - tell me why I'm such a good person and people do such bad things to me"
Sara: 0: "Cause everybody in the world is a sadist and=
Maya: =0: "You're a masochist"
Sara: 0: "And you're just a fucked up"=
Maya: =0: "Cause you’re the scapegoat of the world
Ellen - we’re /all bad people and you’re/
Sara: /0: "We’re all out to get you"/
Maya: =the prototype human being that was turned off
the assembly line and we’re all fuck ups that
were thrown out the back window"

Though the constructed response to the call for an explanation
may be structurally attributed to the him in the first turn,
the sarcastic response is obviously not one that would be made
by Ellen’s friend. The two speakers jointly construct this
response which expresses the attitude shared by them. Because
Maya and Sara know they share the same attitude towards Ellen,
they can direct at her a set of zero-marked constructed
responses which are attributed to a sole speaker.

In the next extract, Maya reports that Kim’s boyfriend
claimed to have prayed every night until a reconciliation
between them took place. Maya, after suggesting that the
claim is a "good line," dramatically constructs the utterance
in direct speech forms. The line which is zero-introduced may
be attributed to Kim’s boyfriend or anyone who would use such
a line. Sara and Maya jointly construct a response to the
line.
[39] Sara: Kim said that he prayed every night
Maya: Uh-hm prayed for peace well it’s a good line anyway
Sara: Oh really
Maya: 0: "I prayed about you every night"
> Sara: 0: "I prayed about you" 0: "Hey I’ll talk to you"
Maya: 0: "Put a ring on me hey oooh I’m yours - no problem"
Sara: 0: "Now that you found the lord"
Maya: 0: "Now that you found the lord"
Sara: 0: "What are we waiting for?"
Maya: 0: "And the power of prayer"
Sara: 0: "The power of prayer"

Notice that in the line of the extract marked with an arrow that Sara both repeats the I prayed about you line and constructs a response to the line. This bit of dialogue must be attributed to two different characters (similar to Maya’s construction earlier - 0: "Good morning Maya" (harsh voice) 0: "Fuck you"). The I in "I prayed about you" becomes the you in "Hey I’ll talk to you" and the you becomes the I. Though neither is introduced with a quotative, the turn-taking structure allows for the switch in character voices. After Sara begins in this turn to give voice to a character responding to the "line", she and Maya jointly construct the
response by repeating, paraphrasing and supplementing each other.

In extract [40], Sara reports her desire to tell Kim's boyfriend that Kim is pregnant. She creates a scenario in which she does tell him and describes what his response would be.

[40] Sara: . . . I'm tempted to tell him: "Did you know your girlfriend's pregnant?" just to watch his eyes bug out of his head
Maya: Watch him go: (low pitch) "Huh?"
Sara: (low pitch) 0: "It's not mine"

Maya echoes in syntactically parallel verbal terms the physical response (watch his eyes bug out of his head) which Sara predicts that the boyfriend would have. That is, watching his eyes bug out of his head is roughly equivalent to watching him go: (low pitch) "Huh?" Sara then, while maintaining the feature of low pitch, constructs another line for the character. By echoing the voice quality and using a zero-quotative, Sara joins Maya in creating a voice for the boyfriend.

In extract [41], the speaker who describes a situation also constructs the first line of dialogue for the character.
Maya clearly marks that the dialogue which follows is constructed by asking her listeners to "imagine" Jimmy in bed. Then she marks a change from her voice to that of Jimmy by a shift in voice quality, as well as an accent shift. She and Sara jointly construct Jimmy's side of a dialogue in bed. They merge their voices to become the parodied voice of Jimmy.

In the following example, the first speaker describes a situation and then the following speaker constructs the first line of dialogue within that situation. Sara has been telling Maya that one of their mutual friends decided to change her life after having "found the Lord" as she was coming down from tripping.

Sara: They'd just come down from tripping and I think they decided they were going to hell in a handbasket
Maya: (falsetto) 0: "Okay I’ve had too many chemicals and now Satan - Lucifer will come for me"

Sara: 0: "My defenses are weakened and Satan will send his demons to possess me"

Maya: 0: "And I’ll have to sign a contract and I’ll have to write it in blood"

Maya indicates by speaking with a voice quality that differs from her usual that the words she is speaking are not to be attributed to herself but rather to the character mentioned previously by Sara. What Maya seems to do is construct a parody of what the character might have said (to herself) in this situation and Sara continues the parodied fear of satanic possession. Sara’s paraphrase of Maya’s first line is followed by a further construction by Maya which, like the previous two constructions, also has a compound sentence structure. As in the previous example, the use of zero-quotative before lines of constructed dialogue (or attitude) attributed to another character appears to allow the two speakers to merge their voices to speak in the (parodied) voice of that character.

The merging of the speakers’ voices to become the voice of a character seems to confirm the extent of the speakers’ shared knowledge and experience. Not only does each speaker know the other well enough that they can merge their voices to
become the single voice of both, but they also share extensive knowledge of persons in their social circle. They both appear to accept the fact that they know these persons equally well. Given a situation in which one of these persons is involved, either speaker can begin to construct dialogue (or attitude) for the character whether she establishes the setting or not. The two speakers can then merge their own voices to become the voice of the character. The fact that the character's voice is often parodied indicates that the speakers not only know the character equally well but that they also apparently share the same judgement of the character (a further indication of the sameness or similarity of the speakers). Furthermore, as mentioned in a previous section, a speaker can superimpose her voice over the voice of a character. One way of achieving this quality of double-voicedness is with parody. That is, in the previous examples, not only is the character's voice heard, but also the merged voices of the two speakers.

WHERE ZERO-QUOTATIVES ARE DISFAVORED

Throughout this chapter, I have focused on sites where zero-quotatives appear to be favored before direct speech forms used as constructed dialogue. There is one site, however, at which zero-quotatives appear to be highly disfavored. At such a site, the constructed dialogue is always introduced with a quotative. In the following extract,
a constructed utterance is attributed to another speaker within the scenario created by constructed dialogue.

[43] Sara: . . . he's like: "Oh I forgot - I was standing out back and Ellen was talking to me and that song came one and she's like: 'Come dance come dance' and so I was gonna go dance with her but then I saw you and I started dancing with you - I guess she's probably mad at me"

Within the constructed dialogue which Sara attributes to he is constructed dialogue which the he attributes to she. This constructed utterance ('Come dance come dance') is introduced by the quotative be like. It appears that a constructed utterance which appears within the current of ongoing constructed dialogue must be introduced with a quotative. If a quotative had not been used at this site, attribution of the utterance would be difficult to make.

Extract [44] is another example of a constructed utterance within constructed dialogue. Again, the constructed utterance spoken by a character other than the reporting speaker within the scenario created by the constructed dialogue is introduced with a quotative.
[44] Sara: . . . and I said: "Well I’ll call you some other time" and she’s like: "Yeah right" and I’m like: "Don’t start it - don’t - honey don’t="

Maya: =0: "Don’t throw attitude"

Sara: 0: "Don’t throw attitude and don’t start and don’t call me up and say: ‘Yeah right’ at me"

The speaker of the dialogue begun in Sara’s last turn is Sara herself. Within this dialogue attributed to Sara is an utterance attributed to Ellen and introduced with say.

In extract [45], Maya and Sara jointly construct a response to Sara’s mother. During the construction of the response, Maya gives voice to the people from the bar that she and Sara are describing.

[45] Maya: 0: "Everybody shares a stool - every person on earth"

Sara: 0: "And sit on each other’s laps and slide their hands between each other’s legs”=

Maya: =0: "And go: ‘Whoo whoo whoo’"

The sounds attributed to the people at the bar (Whoo whoo whoo) are introduced with the quotative go.

In extract [46], Sara is reporting a conversation she had with Lea. Within the dialogue that is attributed to Lea
(she), a constructed utterance is attributed to another character. Again, this constructed utterance is introduced with a quotative, be like.

[46] Sara: . . . she's like you know: "He talks to me on Thursday night and I go home with him and on Friday I see him and he's just like: 'Hey' and and" you know "I sit there every day and is he gonna call and he never calls . . ."

These examples indicate that zero-quotatives are strongly disfavored where an utterance is being constructed within a constructed utterance.

SUMMARY

In summary, zero-quotatives appear to be optional at some sites, favored at others, and strongly disfavored at still others. Zero-quotative appears to intensify the involvement achieved, in part, with the involvement strategies mentioned in Chapter 3. The lack of explicit attribution with direct speech forms both reflects and calls for involvement between the interactants. From my data, it would appear that a quotative must occur before a constructed utterance which is contained within another constructed utterance, as in the previous section. It appears that zero-quotatives are optional where, by taking advantage of the conventional turn-
taking structure, constructed dialogue can be attributed to the appropriate character. Zero-quotatives also appear to be optional when a speaker is clearly constructing attitude. As noted in the last chapter, be like also frequently occurs with such constructed utterances.

Zero-quotatives appear to be favored when the omission of a quotative may serve some dramatic effect, such as in the examples in which the use of a zero-quotative in the report of an interaction is an iconic representation of one aspect of that interaction (e.g. urgency). Zero-quotatives also are favored at sites where the conversation participants display strong convergence behavior. At these sites, zero-quotative appears to make even stronger the involvement which results from the production of direct speech forms in general. The absence of a quotative allows the speakers to avoid explicitly attributing constructed dialogue (or attitude) to either speaker. Although the constructed utterances are structurally attributed to a sole speaker, the lack of explicit attribution allows the speakers to stress their similarity by constructing utterances which may be spoken by either speaker. When the speakers use zero-quotatives to construct dialogue (or attitude) which must be attributed to another character, the lack of explicit attribution again allows the speakers to merge their voices, but, in this case, to represent another character. Merging their voices to become that of a character appears to be another means for the speakers to underscore
their sameness. Their shared knowledge and experience allows them to not only speak for each other, but also, for persons in their social circle.
CONCLUSION

There has been no attempt here to generalize the findings from this data to natural conversations at large. This data is perhaps somewhat particular, given the age range of the all-female participants. The data is also defined by the fact that the participants are intimate familiars, where perhaps the exchange of information is of less importance than it would be in conversations among, for example, professional colleagues or between social unequals. The participants in this study devote little conversational work to the exchange of information. In fact, I've attempted to show in the analysis the extent to which the participants underscore their shared knowledge and experience. It would appear that part of what they share is the high value placed on being entertained and entertaining during the course of a conversation. And, one popular means to achieve entertainment for these participants is to dramatize their talk by using direct speech forms to represent past interactions or to represent what they apparently intend to be the essence of a character. This is not to say that the participants do not discuss serious topics; indeed, one session between Maya and Sara is quite emotionally charged during the earnest discussion of the pregnancy of Sara's roommate. But even during this discussion they dramatize their feelings towards the dilemma with direct speech forms. With more light-hearted topics, they obviously are simply having fun playing word games with the knowledge.
they share about other people or about each other, bringing into focus their closeness and their shared distance from certain others. And, part of what determines their closeness, their similarities to one another and their distance, their dissimilarities to others is the type of topics which they address. Unselfconsciously, they discuss with gusto what may once have been taboo subjects for young women (see, for example, the sample data from Session 2 in the Appendix). Given the particularities of this data, then, I have not made broad generalizations to other discourse types.

However, given the limited attention that has been paid to discourse features examined in this study, the possibility that similar features characterize, in part, other discourse types cannot be dismissed. For example, it is worth noting again that what I’ve referred to as zero-quotative appeared in the conversation data presented in Craig and Tracy’s (1983) *Conversational Coherence* but was ignored despite the extensive, fine-grained analysis which the conversation received. It may be the case that other discourse data may be marked to varying degrees by the features described here.

Future investigations might explore the use of the discourse features described here in other discourse types to see if such features function similarly. Or, if these features do not occur, investigations might be made to determine if other discourse features fulfill the functions attributed to the features described here. Tannen (1986)
notes the common use of both *be like* and zero-quotative and suggests their position on a continuum; however, the continuum appears to be the result of speculation, not consistent analytical study. Future studies might explore, for example, whether or not each speaker has his/her own particular continuum from which the speaker chooses a quotative as a result of a consideration of speaking conditions (e.g. intimacy of the interactants).

There is also clearly a need for further study of the ways in which speakers organize what they have to report in order to make those reports entertaining. As a discipline, linguistics has tended to take an extremely literal and formal approach to the nature of language. With its emphasis on the formal features, mainstream linguistics has ignored the fact that speakers, in addition to acquiring syntax and phonology, acquire a means of making sense of the world and, I would suggest, making fun of it. The vitality of most language in use does not seem to survive the analytic dissection carried out much of the time in formal linguistics. I hope that I have managed to emphasize some of the vitality in the language use of the speakers in my study and would trust that the type of analysis presented here, combining formal and functional criteria, will become more common in the future and allow us to see language fulfilling its vital role in human affairs rather than as a lifeless object reduced by our own self-imposed analytic constraints.
Note

1. I have judged *comes up* to not be a quotative but, rather, a verb of motion followed by a zero-quotative site. This judgment is supported by the appearance of verbs of motion followed by a quotative. The following extracts are such examples:

[a] she comes over and she's like: "I ran over here"
[b] he walked by and said: "Haaaa"
[c] they do come back and go: "Maan"
[d] Don who looks real butch but is this major nellie queen comes runnin up and goes: "Now just nod your head - nod your head"
[e] Bob came haulin ass over there and goes: "Man I can't believe he asked you that"
[f] She comes up to you and says: "Hey Maya"

So it would appear that in extract [5], *comes up*, rather than functioning as a quotative as *go may*, is followed by a zero-quotative site.

2. Recall from the discussion of represented speech and thought in Chapter One that a clue that what one is reading is intended to be interpreted as the represented speech or thought of a character rather than as the voice of the narrator are words like *imagine* or *thought* or
decide. Maya here similarly appears to signal that she is about to construct dialogue for Jimmy with `imagine`, although it is she (and then Sara) who is imaging and not Jimmy.
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APPENDIX

Included in this Appendix are samples of transcribed discourse from each of the four occasions when interactions were recorded. These extended transcriptions are intended to provide a general impression of the nature of the interactions involved and to provide larger contextual settings for many of the smaller extracts used in the discussion and analysis presented in Chapters 3, 4, and 5.
DATA SET 1 (SAMPLE)

Sara: You know what Don - this was what I was laughin about on the phone when I was laughing real hard - last night - Alan met Don and was talking to him - and Don calls Bob 'puppy' - I don't know if you all knew that -

Kim: M-hm

Maya: No

Sara: Don calls Bob 'puppy' and uh - Alan's like: "You really ought to call him 'Bobo'" and he said Don fell out /laughing/ and he's like: "Oh really? Why?" and Alan=

Maya: /Oh my God/

Sara: told him the story about Bobo - Bobo the clown and all - everything that goes on - like just some of the stuff that goes on in B____ and how the B_____ people think about it - and he said Don was just falling out - and so anyway - he said he was standing there and he was just out dancing around on the edge of the dance floor and Don who looks real Butch but is this major Nellie Queen comes running up to him and goes: "Now just nod your head - nod your head" - and Bob was standing over there watching with this horrified - Alan said he had this totally horrified look on his face - and
uh - Don goes: "Nod your head - nod your head" and so Alan's like: "Oh okay" and he says: "Now take your hands and go like this" and so Alan did like that (holding hands about ten inches apart) and then he's: "Okay now nod again - okay okay thanks" and um - um he just like took off and then Bob came haulin' ass over there and goes: "Man I can't believe he asked you that - I can't believe he asked you that" and Alan's like: "What?" and he says: "Did he just ask you how big your dick was?" and Alan is like: "Yeah"

Maya: 0: "It's this big" - I told Liz that I - I call him Son of Gumbi and she said she'll start making everybody call him that in Houston - she cracked up - she bought me a beer - 0: "Yeah he kinda does look like Play-Doh doesn't he?" and I'm like: "Yeah"

Sara: Apparently he told Bob: "I'm gonna go ask him how big his dick is - I think he's cute"

Maya: Really? Uh oh

Sara: Just to wreck Bob's nerves

Maya: Oh okay I thought maybe he really thought he was cute

Sara: Oh no - just to wreck Bob

Maya: Well that's kinda sad
Sara: Oh I bet - /Alan’s terrified - he’s like/: "Uhh
Nellie=
Toni: /Why would that bother Bob?/
Sara: =Queen!
Maya: Really? I still’ve never met this person
Kim: Yeah but you saw him
Sara: You’ve seen him
Maya: I’ve seen him but he really hasn’t stood out in my
mind - whoever he is
Toni: Why would that bother Bob?
Sara: Why?
Maya: Bob’s like - his slave
Sara: Don acolyte
Kim: Bob wants to be Don
Maya: He’s a Don-wannabe
Kim: He doesn’t wanna be like Don=
Maya: =He chokes his chicken at night and goes: "Oh
please please" - /he’s so/ excited about him it’s
sick
Sara: /he uh/
Kim: That’s why he doesn’t have
Sara: He uh told - he said - Alan said - yeah Bob had
told him that: "Oh yeah - Don and I are gettin
along really well tonight" and uh - Alan’s talkin
to Don and he’s like: "Bob says you’re gettin
along really well tonight" and apparently - Don was
like: "Well I just told him to bite my ass about ten minutes ago - I guess you can call that getting along real well"

Maya: Well you have to get mighty close to bite somebody's ass

Sara: Bite my ass

Kim: Sign of true friendship - now the question is - did Bob

Maya: Noo - he wanted to real bad though

Sara: Uh - he got the true story about the Ministry thing from - from Don last night - Alan told me - told me and Jim today and we were both just like - every - apparently everybody at Ministry hated him
Sara: And she's like: "Well" you know - "I'm still having those problems"

Maya: Yeah and she tells me about her stool and I don't care=

Sara: 0: "I got this runny stool" and I'm like: "Yeah and I had runny eggs for breakfast this morning so shut up bitch"

Maya: Oh God - I just don't want to hear about her butthole

Sara: She called me the other night and -uh - she's like: (falsetto) "So hey whatcha doin?" and I'm like: "Oh I'm sittin here watchin TV" - Kim and I were - that's the night we took Leon over to Port Allen and I was like: "I'm about to pick up Leon" and Kim was sittin there and she was like: "Oh I was just wonderin if you wanted to see a movie or something" and I was like: "Umm well really I can't tonight" and she - and I said: "Well I'll call you some other time" and she's like: "Yeah right" and I'm like: "Don't start it - don't - honey - don't"

Maya: 0: "Don't throw attitude"

Sara: 0: "Don't throw attitude and don't start and don't call me up and say 'Yeah right' at me"
Maya: She called me the other day and I haven't been calling her because I just don't want to deal with her but every time I see her I'm nice to her - it's not like I'm mean and she was tellin me how she was so disappointed in B-- - she had moved down here with so many high hopes and and so so many people she wanted to get to know and they turned out to all be jerks and she's like: "Like you - you were supposed to be" - you know - "a really good friend of mine and interested in being my close friend"=

Sara: = (falsetto) 0: "And you turned out to be this walking talking rectum and I just can't stand it and everybody here is just so fucked up" - I'm like: "Yeah well and /you're not"/

Maya: /She's normal/ yeah she's fine - you know - just totally obsessed with her anus and running around whining about how wonderful they are and how shitty the earth is so=

Sara: =M-hm=

Maya: =I just told her not - I asked her to not lay guilt on me - (falsetto) 0: "Oh I'm not - I'm not" and I go: "Ellen you don't even know what you do" and she gets mad if I get defensive with her but I got really mad at her once and I like picked her up by her collar at the bar and pushed her over the couch
and so now if I start to get made she hurries up
and fixes it=

Sara:  = (falsetto) 0: "Oh I'm sorry=

Maya: = I'm like: "LOOK don't you" (falsetto) 0: "No no
no - I don't mean it - I don't mean it" like I'll
come to her house and beat her up - knock on the
door with five knuckles (knocking sounds)
(whispering) 0: "Let me in"
DATA SET 3 (SAMPLE)

Sara: That's how Stacy found the lord
Maya: Yeah - is it? - she hallucinated?
Sara: Well no
Maya: Oh they were tripping
Sara: She hallucinated a little too often I think and it scared her
Maya: They were tripping when they had that realization about the lord weren't they?
Sara: Yeah
Maya: That's pretty nice
Sara: Well no no they'd just come down from tripping and I think they decided they were going to hell in a handbasket
Maya: (falsetto) 0: "OK I've had too many chemicals and now Satan - Lucifer will come for me"
Sara: 0: "My defenses are weakened and Satan will send his demons to possess me"
Maya: 0: "And I'll have to sign a contract and I'll have to write it in blood"
Sara: Yep - Kim still hasn't gone to get a pregnancy test yet - she's at least three three weeks plus late now
Maya: She's pregnant
Sara: And she won't talk about it - everytime I bring it up she's just like: "Well" and she says like well she doesn't say anything about it to Mike I'm tempted to tell him: "Did you know your girlfriend's pregnant?" just to watch his eyes bug out of his head

Maya: Watch him go: (low pitch) "Huh?"

Sara: (low pitch) 0: "It's not mine"

Maya: I hope she's not but I'm pretty sure

Sara: I hope he doesn't dump her when she is

Maya: I really don't think he will - I don't know if he'll marry her but I don't think he'll dump her - I think he'll strongly suggest that she get an abortion and even if she decides to have it I don't think he'll dump her cause I mean he's like whined over her and lost weight over her and you know and is even thinking about the lord because of her I think maybe

Sara: Is he thinking about the lord?

Maya: A little bit

Sara: Is he gonna find the lord?

Maya: No but he prayed every night while they were apart and and he prayed for peace and he got it so

Sara: Are you serious? Who told you that?

Maya: Kim

Sara: Kim said that he prayed every night
Maya: Uh-hm prayed for peace well it's a good line anyway
Sara: Oh really
Maya: /0: "I prayed about you every night"/
Sara: /0: "I prayed about you"/ 0: "Hey I'll talk to you"
Maya: 0: "Put a ring on me hey oooh I'm yours - no problem"
Sara: 0: "Now that you found the lord"
Maya: 0: "Now that you found the lord"
Sara: 0: "What are we waiting for?"
Maya: 0: "And the power of prayer"
Sara: 0: "The power of prayer"
Maya: I don't know he's he's they're such an odd couple you know
Sara: I think the reason they get along so well is that they're both completely melodramatic - I used to hear them on the phone - I can just I'd just sit there and listen to them and just like: (harsh voice) "Ugh god"
Maya: She's like: (breathy voice) "We're both alike we're both absolutely alike we're both so mushy" - I's like: "Better you than me"
Sara: She's in there and she's like: (breathy voice) "I love you Mike" - I'm like: (harsh voice) "Ugh ugh gag a maggot"
Maya: And then you projectile yak across the living room
Sara: I ralph across the living room - he comes into the door and like she flies into his arms

Maya: Glues herself to him

Sara: (harsh voice) 0: "Would you stop that?"

Maya: I hate being there when they’re fucking because I mean

Sara: Oh oh god
DATA SET 4 (SAMPLE)

Maya: Who have I told a lie to recently? I can’t even remember stuff like that cuz=

Sara: =No cuz it just happens

Maya: Yeah you just kinda go: "Whoops"

Sara: Unless it’s a really really big one like us getting home and my mom asked me - she went to bed when we went out Friday night and my mom went to bed when we left - we left at like ten-thirty - my mom’s going to bed so the next morning she’s like: (falsetto) "So what time did you get in?" We got in like at two-thirty - (falsetto) 0: "Well I got home around a little after one" cause they sleep like the dead - they don’t hear us come in anyway and uh so (falsetto) 0: "Did you all have a nice time?" (falsetto) 0: "Yeah"

Maya: Does she know where you all go?

Sara: Yeah she knew we went out to a bar

Maya: Oh did she?

Sara: Yeah I think my mom thinks - well she doesn’t think I should drink and I don’t think my dad cares one way or the other as long as he doesn’t know about it - as long as it doesn’t get thrown in his face like I don’t get picked up for a DWI or=

Maya: =Throw up on his shoes
Sara: Or throw up on his shoes or come home and stuff - I get up the next morning - I'm like: "Hey dad - how ya doin?" Of course I get up - that means I have to get up at nine or so the next morning you know Saturday /morning/- my=

Maya: /Yeah/

Sara: =mom came in there and like peeked in on us which means I'm supposed to get up and I got up at nine and Kim slept til like twelve-thirty - I'm like: (harsh voice) "Get up - get up you heathen"

Maya: 0: "Get out now - get out of that bed" - did she go to church with you?

Sara: Yes she did

Maya: Wow what time was church if she slept that long?

Sara: Oh no that was Sunday morning was church - I was talking about Saturday morning

Maya: Ooh oh okay I was confused

Sara: Yeah Sunday I got up about an hour before she did - my mom was like (stuttering - unintelligible) do - you know - what do you tell - what do you tell them? 0: "Well I was just sitting in this bar and this band was playing and I'm just sitting there"

Maya: Yeah

Sara: My dad's looking at me like: "Yeah right uh-huh" - Mom goes: "Ah see anyone you know there?" 0: "No thank God"
Maya: 0: "No thank the Lord - in Vicksburg - I did not" - I mean - what would - she - okay - it'd just be the drinking that would bother her? She wouldn't be like=

Sara: =No if I was - you know - sucking dick in the bathroom=

Maya: =Well well that would disturb almost any patron as well as a parent

Sara: Really

Maya: But I don't know

Sara: It's strange me being in a bar - she doesn't mind - she knows I go to bars

Maya: Does she?

Sara: Yeah she know I go to Bucky's Bar because I've told her about Bucky's - she thinks it's the dive from hell - 0: "All those homosexual people in there"

0: "Well you know they are nicer people - they're better people than everybody here so"

Maya: 0: "So that's alright and they all share stools in there Mom"

Sara: Yeah

Maya: 0: "Everybody shares a stool - every person on earth"

Sara: 0: "And sit on each other's laps and slide their hands between each other's legs"=

Maya: =0: "And go: 'Whoo whoo whoo'"
Sara: Yeah. 0: "'Whooga whooga whooga'"

Maya: It seems like I haven't been there in a long time but -wait- have I gone recently? Man

Sara: Everybody - you said you went out for a little while Saturday

Maya: Yeah that's right - I forgot
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