Ja, goed idee! Arranging joint future activities as a 'Big Package' in Dutch phone conversations

by

Geertruida W. de Rooij

A thesis

presented to the University of Waterloo

in fulfillment of the

thesis requirement for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

German

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2025

© Geertruida W. de Rooij 2025

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

Abstract

Arrangement-making is an important part of daily life and even a simple get-together may require a longer stretch of such preparatory talk. Using the method of conversation analysis and building on Heritage and Clayman's (2024) work on arrangement-making packages in English, this thesis analyzes the way arrangements are made in spontaneous Dutch telephone conversations. This research places itself in the context of work on longer stretches of talk, also known as long sequences (Sacks, 1995) or big packages (Jefferson, 1988). The analysis first takes a broad perspective of the arrangement-making package as a whole, concentrating on the boundaries that set it apart from the conversation in which it is embedded. For the beginning of the arrangement-making process, some of the ways in which participants signal shared knowledge, for example through discourse particles, are explored, while at the end of the package, some practices for confirming the agreed upon plan or for postponing the final arrangements to a later time are addressed. Subsequently, the analysis zooms in on a specific linguistic resource, *anders dan* 'otherwise', and its role in the body of the package. I show that this adverbial expression is found both in extended turns and at the beginning of a new turn. In the latter position, it can serve to propose an alternative to an arrangement solution being pursued, allowing for closure of the arrangement-making segment or package. Data are from the *Corpus Gesproken Nederlands* (Corpus of Spoken Dutch).

Acknowledgements

First of all, I want to thank my thesis supervisor, Dr. Emma Betz, for her guidance and encouragement during this project. She taught me the discipline of being precise and paying attention to detail, all while inspiring me with her enthusiasm for her field of research. Thank you for your time, your patience and for the wonderful conversations.

Thank you to my readers, Dr. Grit Liebscher and Dr. Ann Marie Rasmussen, for their helpful comments and pertinent questions during my defense, and for their support as mentor and graduate officer during the research and writing of this thesis.

I am thankful to the other faculty and staff of the department of Germanic and Slavic Studies, who create such a supportive and positive community for learning and research.

To my fellow graduate students over the years, thank you for the company and encouragement during many meetings and writing sessions, virtual or other. The process was more pleasant for going through it together.

Lastly, I want to thank my friends and family, and especially my husband Ken and our children, who helped me to keep this project going, were patient with me and pitched in with whatever needed doing while I was writing. Without your love and support I would not have been able to complete this thesis.

Dedication

I dedicate this thesis to my parents, Dik and Corry de Rooij, who always encouraged and supported me in my studies and life choices, wherever they took me.

Table of Contents

Author's Declaration ii

Abstract iii

Acknowledgements iv

Dedication v

List of Transcript Excerpts viii

1 Introduction 1

2 Context 5

2.1 Conversation Analysis 5

2.2 Long sequences 5

2.3 On proposals 6

2.4 On particles 9

2.5 On deontics 10

3 Methodology 11

3.1 Choice of topic 11

3.2 Conversation Analysis 12

3.3 Corpora and data selection 13

3.4 Classification and building collections, existing frameworks and the challenges of applying them 16

3.4.1 Couper-Kuhlen's typology: agent and beneficiary of future action 16

3.4.2 Building my collection 17

3.4.3 Observations in my data and change of focus 19

3.4.4 Heritage and Clayman's stages of arrangement-making: activity, location, timing 19

3.5 Targeted search in the corpus 20

3.6 Methodological limitations and challenges 20

3.6.1 Recording method: enforced cut-off after 10 minutes, minimum duration 20

3.6.2 Lack of continuity 23

3.7 Chapter summary 23

4 Arrangement-making sequences 25

4.1 Introduction 25

4.2 General arrangement sequence 25

4.3 Generalities of arrangement-making....30
4.4 Analysis of an arrangement-making package....32
4.5 Chapter summary....47
5 Some elements of arrangement-making packages....48
5.1 Analysis of arrangement-making elements....48
5.1.1 Launch....48
5.1.1.1 Launch of previously discussed arrangements....50
5.1.2 Closing....57
5.1.2.1 Closings containing a favourable assessment....57
5.1.2.2 Moving away from arrangement-making into new topics....66
5.1.2.3 Arrangements under time pressure....66
5.1.3 Putting the finalizing of the arrangement on hold....70
5.2 Chapter summary....73
6 Proposing an alternative to solve an impasse: the case of ANDERS DAN....76
6.1 Introduction....76
6.2 ANDERS DAN and some of its uses....76
6.2.1 ANDERS DAN to introduce a solution....77
6.2.2 ANDERS DAN to introduce a hypothetical undesirable consequence....80
6.2.3 Commonalities of ANDERS DAN in extended turns....82
6.3 ANDERS DAN to propose an alternative, making closure possible....85
6.4 Chapter summary....95
7 Conclusion....97
7.1 Findings....97
7.2 Contribution....99
7.3 For further research....100
References....102
Appendix 1 Transcription symbols....109
Appendix 2 Extended transcripts....111

List of Transcript Excerpts

Excerpt 1 CGN fn008160 (casino) 3:09-3:18 1
Excerpt 2 CGN fn008370 (evening stroll) 9:06-9:13 7
Excerpt 3 CGN fn008070 (deadline) 5:14 - 5:27 18
Excerpt 4 CGN fn008280 (visit) 9:24 - 9:45 20
Excerpt 5 CGN fn008000 (movie) 4:26 - 4:28 22
Excerpt 6 CGN fn008220 (metadata) 6:28 - 6:41 22
Excerpt 7 CGN fn008000 (movie night) 4:00 - 4:31 26
Excerpt 8 CGN fn008100 (Madeira) 1:07 - 1:23 33
Excerpt 9 CGN fn008100 (Madeira) 2:28 - 2:39 35
Excerpt 10 CGN fn008100 (Madeira) 3:14-3:41 36
Excerpt 11 CGN fn008100 (Madeira) 3:57 - 4:36 39
Excerpt 12 CGN fn008100 (Madeira) 5:36 - 5:51 42
Excerpt 13 CGN fn008100 (Madeira) 8:22 - 8:30 43
Excerpt 14 CGN fn008100 (Madeira) 9:11-9:47 44
Excerpt 15 CGN fn008160 (casino) 2:54 -3:22 48
Excerpt 16 CGN fn008280 (visit) 8:06 - 8:19 51
Excerpt 17 CGN fn008350 (darts) 1:00 - 1:21 52
Excerpt 18 CGN fn008160 (oral exam) 0:52-1:00 54
Excerpt 19 CGN fn008350 (oeuvre) 4:11 - 4:42 55
Excerpt 20 CGN fn008160 (casino) 3.38 - 4:12 57
Excerpt 21 CGN fn008280 (visit) 8:52 - 9:16 61
Excerpt 22 CGN fn008350 (oeuvre) 5:03 - 5:23 63
Excerpt 23 CGN fn008350 (oeuvre) 5:47 - 6:01 64
Excerpt 24 CGN fn008280 (visit) 9:14 - 9:16 66
Excerpt 25 CGN fn008370 (evening stroll) 8:52 - 9:46 67
Excerpt 26 CGN fn008350 (darts) 2:35-2:53 70
Excerpt 27 CGN fn008350 (darts) 3:21-3:46 71
Excerpt 28 CGN fn008330 (box) 3:14-4:15 78
Excerpt 29 CGN fn008330 (box) 4:38 - 5:00 80
Excerpt 30 CGN fn008280 (visit) 7:58 - 8:07 83
Excerpt 31 CGN fn008050 (Sunday) 06:56 - 7:43 85
Excerpt 32 CGN fn006726 (time to meet) 4:18-4:42 91
Excerpt 33 CGN fn008045 (invitation) 7:51 - 7:59 94

1 Introduction

Weet je al of dat je zondag uh komt?
Hé maar kunnen wij nog trouwens uh mondeling uh oefenen met Engels?
Ik kan natuurlijk wel met die film naar jouw kant op komen,

'Do you know yet if you are uh coming on Sunday?'
'Hey, by the way, can we uh practice for my oral exam for uh English yet?'
'I could of course come over to your place with that movie.'

These are some of the ways in which people launch an arrangement-making sequence in conversation in every-day settings. But how are such turns recognizable as starting something larger, rather than, say, asking for a simple agreement or confirmation? And where does the conversation go from there? What factors need to be decided on to make the plan that was put in motion a reality? There is time and place, but for some arrangements, such as a vacation plan, there are many more things to be discussed and settled. How do people negotiate these factors? Sometimes, a plan is just an idea and the details need to be worked out later. How do speakers bring these partially formed arrangements up, and how do they put them off for later?

In this thesis, I will answer some of these questions by analyzing Dutch phone conversations. Excerpt 1[1] is taken from one such conversation. Michelle (MIC) is asking her brother Frank (FRA) what he would like to do on his birthday, as a gift from her. She makes some suggestions, he makes a counterproposal and Michelle accepts. Some of the details of this plan are hammered out in the following conversation, and some, like the exact timing, are put off to a later time (for a detailed analysis, see section 5.1.1)

Excerpt 1 CGN fn008160 (casino) 3:09-3:18

48	MIC:	ik	dacht	misschien	kunnen	we	een	keertje	samen	iets	uh
		I	*thought*	*maybe*	*can*	*we*	*a*	*time*	*together*	*something*	*uh*

I thought maybe we could go and do something together sometime

[1] For transcription symbols, please see Appendix 1.

49 gaan doen dat we naar de film gaan of uh w-wil je naar
go do that we to a movie go or uh w-want you to
go to a movie or d-do you want to go to

50 [de efteling]
the ((place name))
the Efteling (an amusement park)

51 FRA: [nee nee nee hol]land casino↑ want ik word acht↑tien
no no no holland casino because I become eighteen
No, no, no, Holland Casino, because I'm turning eighteen

52 MIC: ↑OH dat is leu:k dat doen we
oh that is fun that do we
Oh, that's fun, we'll do that

Since making an arrangement tends to involve multi-step decisions, the stretches of talk constituting an arrangement-making can be fairly long, sometimes taking more than one conversation. This kind of 'big package' (Sacks, 1995[2]; Jefferson, 1998; Heritage & Clayman, 2024) has not received much attention in conversation analysis, most research being done on more localized phenomena, for example how proposals are formed, without discussing the full wider context (Heritage & Clayman, 2024). It is more difficult to describe these longer sequences, because they tend to be quite flexible and diverse in their realization, and describing how they fit in one package and are more than just a series of short sequences is challenging (Sacks, 1995, p. 354). Since Sacks made these observations, only a few studies on longer sequences have been published (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1987; Jefferson, 1998; Mazeland, 2019; Heritage & Clayman, 2024) and this "line of research [...] has remained underdeveloped to the present time" (Heritage & Clayman, 2024, p. 281). My thesis will contribute to filling in these gaps.

In my thesis, I look at the details of how Dutch speakers make arrangements in phone conversations. These conversations are taken from the *Corpus Gesproken Nederlands* (Corpus of Spoken Dutch) and involve family, friends and colleagues. I analyze, specifically, the way the arrangement-making sequences are started and ended to determine how

[2] I purposefully list the work of Harvey Sacks, who is one of the founders of the field of conversation analysis, first here, because the 1995 publication is an edited collection of lectures that Sacks gave in the 1960s and 70s. The lecture on long sequences, which inspired later work in the field, is from April 1971.

people make visible to each other the activity they are launching/ending. I also show how, within these longer stretches of talk, people move from one stage of the arrangement-making to the next in a systematic fashion, deciding on, for example, place, time, and manner of the joint activity they are planning. I compared my findings to the framework that Heritage and Clayman (2024) propose for phone conversations in British and American English.

In Chapter 2, I give a very brief history of the field of conversation analysis and a more detailed overview of the research that has informed my understanding of the subject of 'big packages', that is, longer stretches of talk that have an internal organization and emerge as a coherent activity. I summarize important research in a number of other concepts that enter into my analysis, for example on proposals, and on how the dimension of deontics, (i.e., the rights one person has to determine the future actions of another) enters into action formation. I also discuss existing research on Dutch particles, the 'little words' that contribute to the 'flavour' of an utterance and are essential in structuring conversations.

In Chapter 3, I describe how I chose my subject, where I found my data and how I built a sample corpus for my research. I explain how I built a collection of candidate instances (extracts that are possible examples for my focus phenomenon) and how what I found in my data led me, in an iterative process, to adjust the course of my research and sharpen the boundaries of my focus phenomenon. I also explain two existing frameworks for proposal-style sequences and arrangement-making sequences, of which I retained one.

Chapter 4 is the first analysis chapter. I introduce the framework presented by Heritage and Clayman (2024) and other research on arrangement-making. I analyze in detail an arrangement-making package that takes up almost the full 10 minutes of a conversation in my corpus, illustrating some of the key stages and the ways in which they are negotiated by the participants.

I dive deeper into the sequential characteristics of the arrangement-making package in Chapter 5. Here I unpack systematicities in the launching of these arrangement-making efforts and in the way in which they are closed. I pay attention to how participants refer to,

or invoke, previous unfinished/pending arrangements and how they can defer the final decisions about a current arrangement to a later time.

Chapter 6 is a more in-depth analysis of one particular linguistic resource (i.e., a word, group of words, a syntactic construction, prosodic feature etc.) that I encountered in my data. I examine the adverbial combination *anders dan,* which sometimes is translatable by 'otherwise', that seems to have a context-specific use in arrangement-making sequences. I look at where it occurs in conversations in general, how it is understood by co-participants, and what its particular systematic function might be in arrangement-making.

In Chapter 7, I discuss my results and the contributions that my research makes to studying spoken interaction more generally and 'big packages' in particular. I point to possible applications in second/foreign language teaching and also outline avenues for further research.

In Appendix 1, I present a list of transcription conventions and symbols, and Appendix 2 contains more extended transcriptions for some conversations of which only fragments were presented in the analysis chapters.

2 Context

2.1 Conversation Analysis

The field of Conversation Analysis (CA) emerged from reseach areas in the fields of sociology and anthropology interested in the every-day, publicly visible methods people use in interaction to make sense of their worlds and to engage in joint action. Harvey Sacks, whose lectures from the 1964 to 1972 have been recorded in writing, edited and published in several volumes in 1995 (Sacks, 1995), together with Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson were the first to attempt a systematic analysis of the organization of human conversation (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974), in which turn-taking is the central mechanism. Their work, for example on conversation openings (Schegloff, 1979, 1986), closings (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), and sequencing in interaction (e.g. Jefferson, 1972; Schegloff, 2007) forms the basis for CA-analyses until this day (see Sidnell & Stivers, 2012; Robinson et al., 2024). As the object of analysis consists of audio and video data, transcription is an important part of CA. The transcription system developed by Jefferson (see, for example, Clift et al., 2024) is one of the main conventions for transcribing recorded data. It allows for highly detailed notation of hesitations, pauses, overlap and intonation, thus reflecting the conversation analytic assumption of "order at all points" (Sacks, 1984, p. 22), i.e., that every detail (at any level) in interaction can possibly be significant for interactants in making sense of an(other's) action, a sequence, a larger activity.

2.2 Long sequences

Much research in CA has focused on phenomena that are localizable within a turn or sequence, specifically adjacency pairs (as one pervasive type of sequence), for example mutual greetings or question and answer pairs. The arrangement of adjacency pairs sequences into larger series to accomplish an activity has generally received less attention (Mazeland, 2021). Sacks addressed "big packages" in a lecture on long sequences (1995), and noted that these are more than a series of short sequences, but that they hold together in a certain way, as a larger whole. Jefferson, in the context of troubles-talk, described a 'package' as a "series of recurrent, positioned elements which could be grouped into a

rough segmental order" (1988, p. 418). Schegloff describes sequence organization, from turns and adjacency pairs, to expansions and sequences of sequences (Schegloff, 2007). What unifies these sequences of sequences is that each sequence builds on the outcome of the previous one (Schegloff, 2007; Mazeland, 2021). Mazeland, working with Dutch data, refers to goal-oriented stretches of talk, where participants cooperate to reach a certain outcome, as 'activities' (2019, 2021) and argues that both the opening and closing sequences of the activity are designed to demarcate the activity from what came before and/or what follows (2021). Mazeland notes that even simple activities, such as arranging a time to meet up, "may require a series of multiple, often expanded adjacency-pair sequences" (2021, p. 39). Heritage and Clayman use the term 'package' in their article on arrangement-making (2024). They characterize the essential elements of the arrangement-making process, describe the order in which they occur in conversations, and point to some of the ways in which they may be connected and integrated. Their analysis inspired the orientation of my research, as it mirrorred many points I had encountered in my data. A more in-depth discussion of their findings is included in sections 3.4.4 and 4.3.

2.3 On proposals

In arrangement making, proposals are one of the principal means by which participants in a conversation launch joint arrangement-making projects (Heritage & Clayman, 2024). Heritage and Clayman (2024) use the term proposal for a wider range of actions than some other authors. In this, they follow the practice of Houtkoop-Steenstra, who conducted pioneering work on proposals in phone conversations in Dutch (1987, 1990). She applied the term proposal to a wider range of actions "such as requests, offers, invitations, suggestions, etc. which have as their preferred answer an acceptance" (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1990, p. 111), and looked specifically at how proposals are responded to (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1987) as well as how they can be motivated or supported with accounts to promote their acceptance (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1990). Houtkoop-Steenstra described how, in Dutch, a "weak" acceptance response (such as *ja* 'yes') is not sufficient, and a more extended acceptance is needed (such as *is goed* "is good"). When the latter is not provided right away, this will lead to a pursuit for such an extended acceptance (1987).

In Excerpt 2, we see an example of a proposal with an immediate extended acceptance[3].

Excerpt 2 CGN fn008370 (evening stroll) 9:06-9:13

06 SAN: heb jij trouwens nog zin om uh nog een avondwandeling
have you by-the-way PRT liking to uh PRT an evening-stroll
by the way, do you maybe feel like

07 ofzo te gaan maken? gewoon lekker nog even d'ruit? .h
or-so to go make simply nicely PRT a-moment out
going for an evening stroll or so. Just to enjoy getting out for a bit?

08 EDW: ja is goed
yes is good
Yeah, sure

A narrower definition of proposal was advanced by Couper-Kuhlen (2014). She proposed a typology to distinguish between requests, offers, proposals and suggestions by referring to the notions of beneficiary and agent in relation to the speaker and recipient. In her narrower definition, a proposal expresses a future action to be jointly executed by the speaker and the recipient, for the benefit of both, whereas a request, for example, is a future action to be executed by the recipient for the benefit of the speaker. Clayman and Heritage (2014) addressed the notion of benefit and made a distinction between benefactive status, that is, the objective benefit being derived from an action, and benefactive stance, referring to the benefits expressed or conveyed by the speaker. It is, however, not always easy to interpret who is the beneficiary, for example when an announcement is formatted as a request, but treated as an offer by the recipient (Clayman & Heritage, 2014, p. 80). Objective benefits, and thus the benefactive status of participants, is difficult to ascertain, unless explicitly addressed (and thus brought to the conversational surface) by the interactants. Conversation analysts, therefore, concern themselves mostly with benefactive *stance* and trace how this is indexed by speakers through different verbal, vocal and embodied resources, which are then available for analysis.

Research has revealed that there are disctinctions in the way proposals and requests are expressed in face-to-face interaction versus those made during telephone conversations.

[3] This Excerpt will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 5, section 5.1.2.3, as Excerpt 25

Kendrick & Drew (2016) described a continuum of recruitment (ways in which assistance is offered or requested) in face-to-face situations that includes - and highlights the importance of - embodied language. Interactions on the telephone are different, of course, because they lack the immediate and shared embodied context. As Heritage (2016) puts forward, here-and-now recruitment may be "fundamentally distinct from distal, delayed action cooperation, largely because the wordless acts of assistance in recruitment contexts are difficult, if not impossible to achieve in the context of actions to be undertaken in the future" (p. 30). Other findings from face-to-face interaction do carry over into remote conversations, however. Curl (2006) found that trouble-tellings give rise to offers of assistance; Kendrick & Drew (2016) also noted that in in-person setting, offers are systematically made after reports of trouble by others.

The question on how proposals are formed is intimately linked to how they are recognized as proposals by the coparticipant(s) in the conversation. The former is referred to as action formation, the latter as action ascription. Deppermann and Haugh (2022) sketch the evolution of the concept of action ascription and the ways in which it may be empirically traced in CA – and what its challenges are. They conclude that action ascription – the way in which participants recognize/interpret what is being said as a proposal, for example – has not yet been well defined in conversation analytic work. Action ascription is a crucial part of interaction, as speakers need to interpret what is being said by their co-participant(s) and how to respond, while considering any relevant contextual information (including the larger action context and interactional and relationship history). Considering that, in conversation, the gaps between the end of one turn and the start of the next are 'measured' by participants (i.e., are given meaning) in milliseconds, speakers are actively interpreting what is being said and forming the response turn while the previous participant is still speaking (Levinson, 2013). Action ascription is therefore a fast and efficient process, but it is not yet clear what the full range of resources are that speakers use to do this important work. In recent work, Stivers, Rossi and Chalfoun (2023) present a conceptual model of action ascription, bringing together sequential context, dedicated design and multiple indicators that come into play at different parts of the turn (beginning, middle and

end). The category "multiple indicators" includes, among other things, facial expression, prosody, particles, word choice, and grammar. The use of particles will be particularly important in my research.

2.4 On particles

Dutch is a language that is rich in particles and they are especially common in spoken language. Particles in general present a challenge for second-language learners and for translators (see Foolen, 2011). With modal particles, for example, speakers of Dutch add nuance to their propositions (such as epistemic or affective stances) that are not always easy to render lexically in another language, but that provide crucial information that recipients orient to in their responses. Dutch conversation analysts tend to add footnotes explaining their approximate meaning, sometimes declaring them "untranslatable" (Seuren & Huiskes, 2017:194, on *wel*). Research in the wider field of pragmatics has, however, provided highly detailed and useful descriptions of Dutch particles in different positions in the sentence. Van der Wouden and Foolen (2011, 2021), for example, describe different modal particles, their placement and their function in the left periphery (before the finite verb) and in the right periphery (at the end of a sentence). Within CA, there are many articles on Dutch discourse markers, which are cited where relevant throughout my analysis. A comparison with research on different kinds of particles or discourse markers in German (Egbert, 2003; Betz & Golato, 2008; Golato & Betz, 2008; Deppermann, 2009; Deppermann & Helmer 2013; Golato, 2018) often proves fruitful in describing and analyzing Dutch particles. However, it is important to note that findings on one language are not necessarily valid for another, even between closely related languages as German and Dutch, whether on the subject of particles or any other part of conversation analysis. For any cited research, I have indicated the language of the data on which it was based. Some wider concepts used in conversation analysis are more generally applicable, but may be expressed with different linguistic or embodied means in different languages. One of these concepts that is important in arrangement-making, is deontics.

2.5 On deontics

The notions of deontic status and deontic stance relate to the authority or right that a person has (status), or claims in the moment (stance), to determine the future action(s) of others (Stevanovic & Peräkylä, 2012; Couper-Kuhlen & Thompson, 2022). This is especially relevant for an analysis of suggestions and proposals, because by suggesting or proposing a course of action, a speaker claims the right to influence or determine another person's actions. Deontic *status* refers to the relative authority level of the participants, which can be symmetrical, e.g., in the case of siblings or friends, or asymmetrical, e.g., in the case of parent and child. In situations where there is no clear/externally determined difference in authority (such as among friends or siblings), who has the right to determine a future action will be negotiated during the conversation (Couper-Kuhlen & Thompson, 2022). A person can then display a deontic *stance*: through their words and actions they cast themselves in an authority role in a particular moment, regarding a particular topic or issue, for example by giving the coparticipant directions or advice.

3 Methodology

3.1 Choice of topic

The inspiration for my first steps into the present research lies in personal experience with the expression of politeness in different languages. At one point, I had the occasion to learn the Pular language as spoken in Guinea. I was surprised that requests were made with a simple imperative verb form, without any modal particles or addition of *please*. At first, I perceived these requests as impolite, and in return, my attempts to use patterns such as 'could you do X' where met with a response such as 'do you want me to do it or not?' - I had obviously selected a format that was unexpected for my addressee and led to mild confusion. However, there were clearly ways to express politeness or respect, for example in different verbs being used to address elderly persons: The common morning greeting meaning 'Did you wake up in peace' is *A finii e jam?* , but when addressing someone deserving respect, one uses *On belike e jam?* Besides the pronoun *a* (informal) versus *on* (formal), the verb selected is different.

Additionally, in my experience as a translator, I noticed on different occasions that even when translating from English and Dutch, that is, between closely related Germanic languages, politeness is communicated differently. The word *please* is used much less in Dutch than in English, and it is routinely omitted when translating, for example, instructions. My first research idea was, therefore, to look at politeness and its expression in Dutch as compared to other languages (and there is recent research attempting to capture cross-linguistic differences in the grammar of requesting/instructing and possible connections to notions of politeness, e.g., Zinken, 2016; Ogiermann & Blitvich, 2019).

Having been introduced to the field of Conversation Analysis by Dr. Betz, I immediately found it a fascinating way to approach language and to research its use in interaction. I started reading CA research into requests and the wider concept of recruitment (Kendrick & Drew, 2016; Floyd et al., 2019), which covers "the various ways in which one person can ask for, seek, or solicit help from another, including giving indirect and perhaps embodied indications of their need for assistance, as well as another's anticipation of someone's

need for help and their offering or giving that help without being asked, without their help having been solicited." (Kendrick & Drew, 2016, p. 2). The concept of recruitment is inherently linked to here-and-now matters in face-to-face interaction. As I had only access to telephone data, that is, contexts in which interactants had remote access to each other (see below), a shift in focus to remote requests and offers was necessary. Starting from Couper-Kuhlen's typology of requests, offers, proposals and suggestions, I decided to limit my research to the latter three, which are less well understood compared to requests and where the beneficiary is the recipient (see section 3.4.1). I also decided to work cross-linguistically (Clift & Mandelbaum, 2024, p. 162), comparing the way these actions are expressed in English to the way they are formatted and become recognizable in Dutch. After engaging with the data, my focus shifted and narrowed further, as I describe in section 3.4.3 below.

3.2 Conversation Analysis

The overarching theory and method in which my research is situated is Conversation Analysis. At the cross-roads of sociology and linguistics, its object of study is spontaneous talk-in-interaction. In Conversation Analysis, interactions in different contexts (institutional, business, educational, social) are analyzed, considering all aspects that are expressed by language or action (gaze, gestures, positioning). From the earliest studies, research pioneers such as Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson found that every-day conversations are remarkably systematic (in, e.g., the organization of turn-taking) and that recurring patterns can be identified (e.g., in how turns are built, in the sequencing of actions, in the timing of qualitatively different responses) (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). They also found that by studying spoken language in minute detail, with all the pauses, hesitations and repetitions, even those elements carried meaning. Sacks states that if we figure there is "order at all points" in the way humans behave, "then it really [does] not matter very much what it is that we look at, if we look at it carefully enough" (1984, p. 23). Contributions that are normatively, i.e., by written standards, ‘ungrammatical’ (e.g., incomplete sentences) are still understood by recipients and responded to efficiently. In fact, incomplete utterances can often be shown to be 'designedly' so, used as a

systematic resource for a particular communicative cause (see, e.g., Koshik, 2002; Raymond, 2004; Wang, 2023). It is for these reasons that no detail is dismissed as irrelevant at the outset; consequently, transcriptions are not 'cleaned up' but rather capture pauses, multiple starts, overlaps, intonation and, in case of video data, gestures, posture, and gaze.

3.3 Corpora and data selection

Given that its subject is the organization of talk-in-interaction, research in the field of Conversation Analysis relies "on 'naturally occurring social interactions,' which are the routine social engagements of participants who organize their encounters for all practical purposes" (Hoey & Webb, 2024, p. 52). These interactions are recorded, ideally in a way in which the researcher's presence do not influence the activity (Hoey & Webb, 2024). Having started my research in Canada during the Covid pandemic, the collection of a corpus of authentic spoken Dutch data was difficult. This is why I looked for existing recordings that were available to researchers or the public. The *Instituut voor de Nederlandse Taal* (Institute for the Dutch language) hosts several corpora on their website (https://taalmaterialen.ivdnt.org/). I initially looked for video data. The IFA Dialogue Video Corpus contains conversations that were recorded in a studio (Van Son et al., 2008), with no other activity occurring (such as having a meal or playing a game). While the conversations were spontaneous in the sense that the topics and structure were not predetermined, they were staged in another sense: They did not represent the broad range of actions people carry out together in their every-day social lives, and they were less likely to contain offers, proposals and suggestions; in fact, the first few recordings I reviewed contained mostly story telling sequences. No other Dutch video corpora are publicly available. I therefore decided to rely on audio-only data, for which the *Corpus Gesproken Nederlands* is an extensive source.

The *Corpus Gesproken Nederlands* (CGN, Corpus Spoken Dutch) is also available via the *Instituut voor de Nederlandse Taal*. The establishment of the corpus was financed by the Dutch and the Flemish government and with three main motivations: most prominently, for

the development of Dutch language and speech technology, but also for linguistic research into spoken Dutch and for educational purposes, specifically Dutch language teaching (Van Eerten, 2007). The corpus was recorded between 1998 and 2003 and this collection of data was led by several Dutch and Flemish universities (Van Eerten, 2007). It includes audio recordings of spoken language in a range of settings, from persons reading aloud to classroom interactions to face-to-face conversations and interviews. In total, there are 15 types of spoken language settings (Van Eerten, 2007). In the corpus structure, these are represented by 'components' and distinguished by a letter. However, as audio-recordings of face-to-face interactions would lack the visual context, and thus present incomplete information for analysis (Hoey & Webb, 2024), I limited myself to spontaneous *telephone* conversations. There are two categories of such telephone interactions in the corpus, and based on word count, they make up around 23% of the corpus (Instituut voor de Nederlandse Taal, n.d.). The only distinction between the two subcorpora of phone conversation is the way in which they were recorded, either via a switchboard (Component C), with a fixed cut-off after ten minutes (announced automatically 30 seconds before), or via a recording device (Component D), where the conversations can vary in length from 2.5 minutes to 15 minutes. The conversations are all every-day interactions between family members and friends, with participants from Belgium (40%) and the Netherlands (60%) (Instituut voor de Nederlandse Taal n.d.). These conversations are therefore informal and don't follow any typical routine (i.e., have no pre-set structure or topics or agenda items), as might be the case for telephone interactions in a business or institutional context.

The two subcorpora contain 985 recorded telephone conversations with a total of 2,062,004 words (Instituut voor de Nederlandse Taal n.d.). In order to obtain a manageable initial sample, I randomly selected every 10th conversation. For component C, the conversations recorded via switchboard, this meant 38 conversations (amounting to a total of 5 hours and 52 min). When I started listening to conversations from component D (those recorded with a recording device), I realized that these conversations were not complete, as the beginnings and ends of the conversations were not recorded. Since this would limit the context of any instances I collected, I decided to only rely on the fully recorded

conversations from component C. As a result, my data is limited to speakers from the Netherlands, as all data from Belgium are in component D. My initial sample corpus was just under 6 hours.

The metadata provided with the corpus identify the participants by number. Other information on the participants include age, gender, the relationship between participants, information on first, home and work languages spoken by the participants, information on birth, residence and work locations and regions, educational background and occupation. As far as possible, the researchers strove to achieve a balanced composition of male and female, younger and older speakers, different regions of origin and different levels of education (Instituut voor de Nederlandse Taal n.d.).

In order to make it easier for readers to follow the analysis (and for myself to keep track of participants), I assigned proper person names to the participants; these are pseudonyms. In keeping with good data management practices and Canadian ethics guidelines, when names (of persons and places) appear in the recordings, I have changed those as well to make it less likely that participants can be identified. An effort was made to choose names with the same number of syllables and similar stress pattern (Clift et al., 2024). Exceptions are names of large cities (Amsterdam, Nijmegen, Utrecht) and well-known, larger institutions (e.g., *de Efteling*, an amusement park; *Max Planck*, which is the Max Planck Institute in Nijmegen, a research institute). For smaller towns, I chose towns in the same general area.

I transcribed the relevant parts of the data (see below for additional detail on how I built my collection) using the Jeffersonian notation (Jefferson, 2004; Clift et al., 2024; see also Appendix 1). The choice for this transcription standard over, for example GAT 2, (Selting et al., 2011) was guided by common practice in the conversation analytic community in the Netherlands, where Jeffersonian transcription is the standard (Mazeland, 2003, 2006). The basic transcriptions provided with the corpus needed to be adapted to fit the Jefferson notation and significantly refined by careful and repeated listening to the audio recordings. Additionally, two lines of English translation were added for the purposes of presenting

extracts in this thesis: a gloss, i.e., word-for-word translation reflecting the exact structure of the original Dutch; and an idiomatic translation. When there is only one line, the gloss is the same as the idiomatic translation and only the gloss line is provided. When needed for proper comprehension of the Dutch word forms, any grammatical features were added in the gloss, and these follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules (Max Planck Institute, 2008).

3.4 Classification and building collections, existing frameworks and the challenges of applying them

3.4.1 Couper-Kuhlen's typology: agent and beneficiary of future action

In selecting instances for my initial, broad collection instances of proposals, offers, and suggestions, I looked for the features that Couper-Kuhlen (2014) used to delineate her research into "an extended family of initiating actions in conversation that involve the speaker attempting to bring about some future action, event or situation" (p. 624). These are: (a) the action or event to be accomplished is in the future; (b) in these action, deontic rights come into play and (c) the preferred response is an acceptance or agreement (Couper-Kuhlen, 2014, p. 624). Deontic rights (see section 2.5).refer to a participant's right to determine the future actions of others (Stevanovic & Peräkylä, 2012), for example, a parent has stronger deontic rights than a child, a supervisor has stronger deontic rights than an employee. A preferred response, in CA, does not relate to a personal preference connected to a cognitive or affective state, but rather to a structural relationship of the two parts of an action sequence (Schegloff, 2007, p. 60). For example, if someone proposes to go to a concert of an artist that I don't really want to attend, I will design my response in a way that expresses hesitation and apology, which are the design features of a (socially) dispreferred response. Couper-Kuhlen discusses requests, proposals, offers, and suggestions as actions that can be distinguished from the angle of agency and benefit: Who is the agent of the future action and who will derive benefit from it? Table 1 shows the resulting typology (Couper-Kuhlen, 2014, p. 634).

	Agent of future action	Beneficiary of future action
Request	Other	Self
Proposal	Self & Other	Self & Other
Offer	Self	Other
Suggestion	Other	Other

Table 1: "Distinctive dimensions of Proposals, Offers, Requests and Suggestions" after Couper-Kuhlen (2014, p. 634)

Working with English data, Couper-Kuhlen found that certain grammatical forms were used more frequently with certain categories and that there was little overlap. My initial intention was to see if these seemingly clear-cut distinctions can be found in Dutch as well.

3.4.2 Building my collection

I started building my collection by looking for action over form. That is, I collected all instances that related to future actions to be done by the speaker, the recipient or both. From the 38 conversations in my sample corpus, 27 contained one or more instances of such (formulations of) future actions. I logged these in an Excel sheet, noting the participants' ID numbers, age, gender and relationship to each other. The stages of inspecting the data and making initial analytic observations I describe below did not necessarily occur consecutively, but rather in a more circular, recurrent fashion. In order to "unlock the data" (Clift & Mandelbaum, 2024, p. 154), I noted (in different stages) potentially significant linguistic and other formal characteristics related to syntax and morphology (verb modality, grammatical subject, sentence type), aspects of the verb phrase (including presence of modal verbs), the presence of modal particles, sequential context. I also tried to categorize the instances as 'proposals', 'offers' or 'suggestions'. In practice, I found that this classification, attractive and clear-cut as it seems based on Couper-Kuhlen (2014), was often difficult to apply. For example, it is not always clear who the beneficiary is of a future action, either due to ambiguity as to what constitutes the perceived or real benefit, or due to lack of context (Clayman & Heritage, 2014). For

example, in Excerpt 3, Brooke (BRO) and Amelia (AME) discuss when they should make the next phone call for the research project.

Excerpt 3 CGN fn008070 (deadline) 5:14 - 5:27

01 AME: hé uhm voordat we voordat ie hier opeens de verbinding
hey uhm before we before it here suddenly the connection
Hey, before we – before the connection is suddenly

02 verbreekt ha[ha wan]neer doen wij ons derde gesprek?
breaks.off haha when do we our third conversation
broken off haha When do we do our third conversation?

03 BRO: [mm-mm]

04 BRO: .h uh: ja↓

05 AME: ook zometeen of uh
also right-away or uh

06 BRO: misschien is dat wel een goed idee want ik heb
maybe is that PTL a good idea because I have
Maybe that is actually a good idea because I

07 inmiddels begrepen dat de deadline aanstaande vrijdag is
by-now understood that the deadline this-coming friday is
understand now that the deadline is this coming Friday.

Brooke is the main participant in the data collection project, so when Amelia helps her complete the required number of calls, Brooke is the benificiary. However, Amelia is the person bringing up the timing of the call. Amelia is also the person and giving an option for the timing. Later in the sequence, it becomes apparent that this timing works well for her, as she wants to watch a tv show later in the evening, and she also does not want to defer it to the next day. If Brooke agrees with the timing that is convenient for Amelia, does that make Amelia the beneficiary of Brooke's willingness to work with Amelia's schedule? In this context, it is difficult to decide, based on Couper-Kuhlen's framework, whether in line 5 Amelia produces a suggestion (Brooke is agent and beneficiary), a request (Brooke is agent, Amelia is beneficiary) or a proposal (Brooke and Amelia are joint agents and joint beneficiaries). The fact that Amelia frames the question in line 2 as a joint project favours an interpretation as a proposal. But that is based only on the agent of the future action (*wij* 'we') and not on the notion of beneficiary and benefactor.

3.4.3 Observations in my data and change of focus

Another difficulty that I encountered in the analysis and coding of different aspects of the data was related to the large number of offer-, proposal- and suggestion-type actions that followed each other in certain conversations. In an attempt to classify the context of my examples, I described these sequences initially as 'making plans' and 'making decisions' and noted that they formed extended stretches of interaction. In these conversations, it was difficult to isolate and describe each offer or proposal or suggestion separately. They seemed to fit the phenomenon of larger interconnected 'sequences of sequences' as described by Schegloff (2007, p. 195), where a number of separate sequences are connected by a tighter relationship than in other successions of sequences, and amount to a larger coherent activity. Schegloff describes different types of relationships, for example where one sequence implements a stage of an action, is closed, and then the subsequent sequence implements a next step or stage in the same course of action (Schegloff, 2007, p. 213). This seemed to describe what I was seeing in my own data. I started to map out the longer sequences, marking the progress of the negotiations surrounding the proposals, suggestions and offers.

3.4.4 Heritage and Clayman's stages of arrangement-making: activity, location, timing

Later in my research, I came across Heritage and Clayman's article on arrangement making (2024), which offers a framework for analysing lengthy stretches of interaction that seemed to align quite closely to my observations and offered a principled way to capture the complexity of the actions I was interested in. Heritage and Clayman use the term 'big package' of talk, a concept first introduced by Sacks in 1971 in his *Lectures on Conversation* (see Sacks, 1995) and also applied by Jefferson in the analysis of troubles-tellings (1988). At this stage in my research, I decided to concentrate on these longer stretches of talk in which participants make arrangements. They occurred in 14 conversations, containing 16 distinct arrangement-making activities. The resulting analyses are presented in Chapters 4 and 5.

3.5 Targeted search in the corpus

When building my main collection, I did not search for specific words or expressions initially. However, during a data session in which I discussed my work with other researchers, I struggled to explain the meaning and function of the adverbial combination *anders dan* that appeared in combination with a bare imperative (without a modal particle) in an arrangement-making sequence. This aroused my interest in the function of *anders dan*, and its possible contribution to structuring arrangement-making sequences. I set out to find more instances of it in my existing collection, but I did not find many that occurred in the same context. Trying to understand what its function might be, I searched for other occurrences in the larger CGN (phone conversations only) and built a small collection to analyse. The results of this analysis are found in Chapter 6.

3.6 Methodological limitations and challenges

3.6.1 Recording method: enforced cut-off after 10 minutes, minimum duration

The corpus I used for my work has limited information about the data collection protocols. I was not able to find information on the instructions that research participants in the study were given. However, some information can be deduced from the conversations themselves. The maximum duration of the recorded phone calls is 10 minutes, which is enforced by an automatic disconnection of the call. Thirty seconds before this happens, a pre-recorded voice announces “You have talked for almost 10 minutes. The connection will be cut in 30 seconds.” This announcement interrupts the flow of the conversation and leads to hurried closings (See also section 5.1.2.3). Excerpt 4 shows how a topic (talk about a vacation) is cut short after the automated announcement.

Excerpt 4 CGN fn008280 (visit) 9:24 - 9:45

```
01  NEL:  dus [dat ]  was echt   fantastisch
           so   that   was really fantastic

02  IRI:       [°ja°]
                yes
```

03 AUT: u heeft bijna tien minuten gesprok[en]
you have almost ten minutes spoken
You have spoken for almost ten minutes

04 IRI: [oké.]

05 AUT: de verbinding wordt over dertig seconden verbro[ken
the connection will be in thirty seconds broken
the call will be disconnected in thirty seconds

06 IRI: [nou
PRT
Well,

07 dan zijn ze inderdaad onverbiddelijk
then are they indeed unrelenting
then they are indeed unrelenting.

08 NEL: ja.
yes

10 IRI: dus ik moet uh toch nog een uh nog een nieuw gesprek deze week
so I must uh PRT yet a uh yet a new conversation this week
So, I still need to (do) a uh a new conversation yet this week,

11 dus ik bel [jou woen]sdag of donderdag ofzo is dat goed?
so I call you wednesday or thursday or so is that good
so I'll call you Wednesday or Thursday or so, is that okay?

12 NEL: [nog ee-]
yet a
one m-

13 NEL: ja_ ja da's prima.
yes yes that's fine

14 IRI: oké↓↑

After a comment about the (placement of the) automated announcement (line 6-7), Iris moves right away towards closing by accounting (line 10) and arranging for the next phone call (lines 11, 13), and then initiating the closing sequence (line 14). The conversation continues for another 8 lines, which contain greetings and appreciations for the call (not shown).

There is a fair amount of talk about the recording situation in the phone conversations, from which I learned that the recruited participants were instructed to talk for a minimum duration of five minutes to several different interlocutors. Some participants display an understanding that they have to fill the full ten minutes. The fact that the conversation needs to have a minimum length can be crucial in shaping the conversation: It may lead to a topic switch after an arrangement-making is finished, just to fill the time until the

minimum talking time has been reached. Excerpt 5 shows that interactants sometimes make this explicit.

Excerpt 5 CGN fn008000 (movie) 4:26 - 4:28

```
01  WIL:  vind 'k wel gezellig↑.
          find I PRT  pleasant
          I'd enjoy ((it))

02  COR:  nou↓  is goed↑
          well  is good
          Well, that's good

03  WIL:  leu[k   ]
          nice

04  COR:     [maar] we moeten nog   effe           doorpraten   dus
             but    we must   still a-little-while keep-talking then
             but we'll have to keep talking for a bit then
```

This exchange is taken from a conversation[4] between two friends, and it concludes an arrangement-making package. Cora (COR) will go to Wilma's (WIL) place to watch a movie, but they first need to fill the required 10 minutes (in their interpretation of the instructions), which leads to the blocking of a move into conversation closing (line 4), which is projectable after line 3, and a topic switch in line 4. Cora and Wilma continue to talk for almost 5 minutes, until the automated cut-off announcement, after which Cora reconfirms the arrangement they reached earlier.

Participants also mention having to pre-select who they are going to call, for example 'my male conversation partner' (in recording fn008160, not transcribed). The caller is always the person participating in the data collection project, and they need to make three calls to each conversation partner. Participants regularly refer to 'the next call', 'the last call' or 'the third call'. In Excerpt 6, both the number of partners and the number of calls is made explicit by Gerard (GER) in lines 2 and 3.

Excerpt 6 CGN fn008220 (metadata) 6:28 - 6:41

```
01  GER:  ja  uh waar  we mee  bezig    zijn.
          yes uh where we with occupied are.
          Yes, what we are doing (now)
```

[4] A larger excerpt of the conversation is discussed as Excerpt 7 on page 26.

02 uh wat ik ook nog een vraag had uh die uh tweemaal drie
uh what I also yet a question had uh those uh twice three
uh what I also had (as) a question yet uh those three

03 telefoongesprekken dat is maar twee personen
phone conversations that is only two persons
phone conversations twice, that is only two persons

04 maar ik ga ook nog met meerdere personen een bandje opnemen
but I go also yet with multiple persons a tape record
but I'm also going to record a tape with multiple persons yet

05 dat weet je hè?
that know you PRT
You know that, right?

06 JOC: ja ja.
yes yes

3.6.2 Lack of continuity

As the corpus I base my research on is a random sample from a larger corpus, and the larger corpus was also not designed to capture interactional histories (that is, to document interactions between the same persons over time), there is no continuity of conversations between participants. Occasionally, participants refer to earlier or future conversation. In those cases, I identified and listened to the other conversations between the same participants that are part of the larger corpus. However, as there are a maximum of three conversations with the same pairing, the past conversations referred to by participants were not necessarily (in fact usually not) recorded. Listening to the recorded interactional history, when available, was sometimes helpful in gaining more context. When this is the case, I mention it in the analysis (Chapters 4-6).

3.7 Chapter summary

The research I report on in this thesis was conducted using the conversational analytic method (Robinson et al., 2024), guided by frameworks proposed in current research in the field. The approach was data-driven, based on a sample corpus of spontaneous telephone conversations extracted from the Corpus of Spoken Dutch, which is available to researchers through the Institute for the Dutch Language. The sample corpus contained approximately 6 hours of recorded audio.

Listening to the recordings, I noted any parts that could be considered an offer, proposal or suggestion. For relevant passages, the available transcripts were checked against the recordings and significantly expanded using Jeffersonian CA transcription.

In a first stage, the relevant passages were coded for grammatical form, type of action (broadly conceived as offer, suggestion, proposal), specific sequential context, and general interactional and topical context. Based on observations in my data, namely that offers, suggestions and proposals were often found in clusters, I narrowed my focus to these longer sequences. During further analysis, I attempted to test the existing frameworks (created on the basis of English data) for validity in Dutch data, with the goal of discovering patterns that emerged from the data. I specifically relied on the work of Heritage and Clayman (2024) on arrangement-making packages. The following chapters describe this work and report my findings on Dutch.

4 Arrangement-making sequences

4.1 Introduction

Arrangements are an important aspect of human communication, where we try to coordinate our lives with those of others. Whether it is going out for coffee with a friend or organizing a wedding reception for a hundred people, we make small and big arrangements all the time. Some emerge spontaneously during a conversation and are settled in a few turns, others take place over multiple conversations. In my data, which consists of telephone conversations with two participants, I have found a variety of arrangement-making sequences. Due to the nature of the corpus, there is often no continuity in conversations (see section 3.6.2). For some pairs of participants, only a single conversation is present in the corpus, which means that we may only have access to a partial arrangement-making. Sometimes, the plan is already partially settled before the recorded conversation takes place, and only some details are discussed. Other times, the plan is launched in the conversation to which we have access but not fully formed before the conversation ends. However, observing how participants bring up a partially formed plan or put off a final decision on arrangments are interesting points in themselves, because we can trace interactional history or orientation to the future in the minute details of the exchange at hand.

4.2 General arrangement sequence

First, I'd like to present and discuss a fairly straightforward arrangement sequence that includes the main points that have been shown to be part of an arrangement (Heritage & Clayman 2024): activity, timing and location.

In Excerpt 7 below, we see how an offer leads to an arrangement between two friends. From context clues, it is clear this conversation takes place in the evening. Earlier in the conversation, Cora (COR) has talked about two movies she rented and given a synopsis of both. Just preceding this excerpt, Wilma (WIL) has shared that her boyfriend, who was supposed to visit on the day of the call, has car trouble and will instead come a day later.

This leads Cora to commiserate in line 7, and after both participants move to a topic closing in lines 8 and 9, Cora starts formulating a possible alternative plan to fill Wilma's evening (lines 10-13).

Excerpt 7 CGN fn008000 (movie night) 4:00 - 4:31

07 COR: ↑jeetje.
oh my

08 WIL: du[s:.
so

09 COR: [ja↓ .h
yeah

10 nou ja en ik kan natu- ik kan natuurlijk ja 'k heb
well yeah and I can of-c I can of-course yeah I have
Well, yeah and I could of c- I could of course yeah I don't

11 eigenlijk niks te doen↑↓ (.)
PRT nothing to do
really have anything to do

12 k kan natuurlijk wel met die film naar jouw kant op kome,
I can of-course PRT with that movie to your direction on come
I could of course come over to your place with that movie

13 as je 'm wil [zien,
if you it want-to see
if you want to see it

14 WIL: [nu ?
now

15 COR: ja ik wee niet als je niet uh als je [geen zin hebt
yes I know not if you not uh if you no desire have
Yes, I dunno, if you don't uh if you don't feel like it

16 WIL: [welke film?
which movie

17 COR: ja die chocolat↑ 'k weet niet of je 't wil,
yeah that ((movie name)) I know not if you it want
Yeah, that Chocolat, I don't know if you want to

18 WIL: ja maar vond je 'm wel echt leuk dan
yeah but found you it PRT really nice then
Yeah, but did you actually like it then?

19 COR: ik heb 'm nog niet gezien.
I have it yet not seen
I haven't seen it yet

20 WIL: oh, oh kom maar dan.
oh oh come PRT then
Oh, oh then do come

21 COR: j[a?
yeah?

22 WIL: [ik vind 't prim[a
I find it fine
That's fine

23 COR: [oké. nou ja ik bedoel als je vroeg wil
okay well yeah I mean if you early want-to
Okay, well yeah, I mean, if you want to

24 slapen of zo dan [uh
sleep or so then uh
go to sleep early or so then eh

25 WIL: [nou nee ik kan wel even opblijven
well no I can PRT a-while stay-up
Well no, I can stay up for a while

26 COR: oh ja nee ja 'k [weet niet.
oh yes no yes I know not
Oh yeah, well yeah I don't know

27 WIL: [vind 'k wel gezellig.
find I PRT cozy
I'd actually enjoy that

28 COR: nou goed
well good

29 WIL: leu[k.
fun

30 COR: [maar we moeten nog effe doorpraten dus
but we must yet while talk-on so
But we do have to keep talking for a while yet

With *nou ja* ('well yes', line 10) Cora signals that she's giving up the former topic completely (Mazeland, 2016) and then she embarks on a new topic (Golato, 2018). After a few false starts that project an offer or proposal, she leads with an account in line 11-12 ('I don't really have anything to do') before offering to go over to Wilma's with 'that' movie. The formulation with *ik kan* (I can) projects this as something Cora will do; this use of the modal construction aligns with what Curl (2006) noticed for interactionally-generated offers in English that are responsive to, and propose to solve, overt problems (in this case, Wilma's evening plans having been cancelled), namely that they are formulated grammatically with

the foregrounding of the profferer (statements or questions in the first person). However, with the addition of 'if you want to see it', she gives Wilma a choice to turn the offer down. This launches an arrangement-making sequence in which the timing, the exact activity and the place are proposed and agreed upon. Cora's initial proposition contains all these elements implicitly:

- the timing is this evening (signalled by 'I don't really have anything to do' and the prior talk in which it became evident that Wilma's plan for the evening is cancelled);
- the activity is watching 'that movie';
- the place is at Wilma's, since Cora offers to 'come over to your place'.

Instead of an acceptance or rejection, what follows is a inserted expansion of two other-initiated repairs (line 14 and 16) to clarify the details of Cora's proposal, first regarding the timing in line 14-15, then which movie in line 16-17. Each time Cora responds, she adds a comment that is very similar to what Schegloff calls 'candidate "excuses"' that accompany requests (2007, p. 83). By doing this, she seems to interpret the repair not only as a request for clarification but as hedging, which is common before a dispreferred response (a rejection in this case). Wilma's 'objection' to the plan (line 18) *ja maar vond je 'm dan wel echt leuk dan* ('yes, but did you actually really like it then') could be both a wish to not 'force' Cora to watch the movie again or an request for information to help her decide if she wants to see the movie. As soon as Cora tells Wilma she hasn't seen it yet (which she had mentioned before, but she also had given a fairly lengthy description of the plot), Wilma accepts. She starts her turn with a change-of-state token (*oh*; Heritage, 1984; Seuren, 2019), and then circles back to Cora's offer to 'come' by using the same verb in an imperative form softened by the modal particle *maar*: *kom maar dan* ('do come then'). The use of *dan* ('then') signals that the acceptance is a logic consequence of what preceded (Mazeland, 2019, 2021), namely the information that Cora has not seen the movie either. This turn and the next few follow the common pattern for acceptance of proposals in Dutch that was already outlined by Houtkoop-Steenstra (1987): after a proposal, the recipient accepts it (line 20), the proposer requests confirmation of the acceptance (line 21), the

recipient provides this confirmation (line 22) and the proposer acknowledges it (line 23 *oké*). The sequence could be closed here, but Cora raises another candidate excuse in line 23-24, which seems to connect to/be motivated by a comment by Wilma, earlier in the conversation, that she is tired. In line 25, Wilma assures Cora that she can stay up a little longer (to watch the movie) and after another expression of uncertainty by Cora in line 26, Wilma gives a positive evaluative assessment: *ik vind 't wel gezellig* ('I'd enjoy it') (line 27). Cora receives this with a *nou goed* ('well, good') (line 28), followed by Wilma's third part confirmation of *leuk* ('fun') (line 29). The plan is now treated as finalized and in line 30, Cora switches the topic, saying that they have to keep the conversation going (to reach a minimal length and thus make it count for the study). At the end of the conversation, Cora starts the pre-closure sequence by saying that she'll be over soon, reconfirming the plan that was arranged in Excerpt 7.

In this example, we see how participants in an arrangement sequence can move from the joint project launch (Cora's proposal in line 12-13) to a mutual acceptance of the plan in a fairly straightforward manner. Wilma accepts the proposal as is (after a few repairs) and the only "negotiation" that takes place seems to ascertain that they will both enjoy the proposed movie night. It is essentially one sequence with a pre-expansion (line 10-11 *'k heb eigenlijk niks te doen* 'actually, I don't really have anything to do') and several insert expansions between the offer (first pair part) and acceptance (second pair part). The first two expansions (lines 14-15 and 16-17) are "post-first insert expansions" (Schegloff, 2007, p. 100), other-initiated repair sequences that deal with the understanding of the first pair part. However, repair sequences can also serve as a "pre-rejection" (Schegloff, 2007, p. 102), which may explain why Cora, besides closing each repair sequence, adds an 'out' for Wilma to reject the offer. The third expansion (lines 18-19) can be considered a pre-second insert expansion, which serves to gather more information before producing the second-pair part of the base first pair part. In this case, Wilma asks if Cora liked the movie, likely for her sake, but also to minimize the imposition on Cora for having to watch it a second time. Once it's clear that Cora has not watched the movie yet either, Wilma produces the second pair part, accepting the proposal. This is followed by the closing of

the sequence: after Wilma addresses any lingering concerns expressed by Cora, Cora moves to close the topic and Wilma goes along, not offering any new contributions (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973).

4.3 Generalities of arrangement-making

Not all arrangement sequences are this straightforward, however, and many extend beyond a single expanded sequence. Even though in CA the focus of research is often pairs of turns focused on adjacency pairs, longer stretches of talk have been given attention as well. Sacks (1995) already mentioned "long sequences" as something that merits more examination and hinted at principled ways to approach them. They have since been qualified as a 'big package' (Jefferson, 1988 on trouble tellings; Heritage & Clayman, 2024 on arrangement making), 'sequences of sequences' (Schegloff, 2007) or 'activities' (Mazeland, 2019, 2021). All of these studies show that there are stretches of talk that participants orient to as leading to a certain goal, for example arranging a meeting (Mazeland, 2019, 2021). Inside these larger stretches of talk, individual sequences can be thought of as building blocks with which a larger structure is assembled. The mortar that holds them together are "particular ties of relevance" (Schegloff, 2007, p. 195) that are tighter than those between separate topics. The relationships between the sequences in a series of sequences can be of several types, but the one that is most relevant to my data is where sequences follow each other as subsequent steps that build on each other in an unfolding activity (Schegloff, 2007). Within these larger units, participants may move to a new component without fully closing the former, and then perform a full closing at the end of the full sequence.

Heritage and Clayman (2024) apply these insights specifically to arrangement-making sequences and find evidence of recurring elements in what they term an *arrangement-making package*. This arrangement package starts with an initial proposal of a joint future project. They use the term "proposal" in a broad, general way, in line with the work by Houtkoop-Steenstra (1987, 1990), as opposed to the delimited definition of the action of proposing presented by Couper-Kuhlen (2014). Once this joint project, be it a joint activity,

passing something to the other party or any situation that requires logistic coordination, is accepted by both parties, elements of the project, such as the specific location, time and manner are negotiated. Often, one factor is decided and agreed upon before moving to the next. At the end of the arrangement-making package, the whole package organization is closed. This can lead to a topic switch or a move to close the conversation itself. Typically, one or more of three types of arrangements need to be made: timing, location and manner. The proposal launch may include one of these, or the activity may inherently dictate, for example, the location (e.g., going to see a show). In my data, several arrangement-making sequences were launched by referring to an activity that had been partially planned before the recorded, current conversation. Some conversations also contain more than one arrangement-making sequence that are unrelated (except for having the same participants making them). As Heritage and Clayman (2024) discuss, the length and complexity of arrangement-making sequences can vary considerably. However, they all share the characteristic of being "a bilateral enterprise in which (...) the parties have a mutual interest in arriving at a workable outcome" (Heritage & Clayman, 2024, p. 298). This type of arrangement-making seems to occur much more frequently in telephone conversations than in face-to-face situations (Heritage & Clayman, 2024). In this chapter, I propose to show that the findings Heritage and Clayman (2024) report for English data are also valid for Dutch arrangement making. I will further rely on the important pioneering work on Dutch remote proposals by Houtkoop-Steenstra (1987, 1990) and on Mazeland's (2019, 2021) work on series of sequences. In Chapter 5, I will look more closely at the launch and closure of arrangement-making packages. Additionally, I will endeavour to clarify how participants bring up plans that have been partially arranged previously and which are being finalized in the current conversation, that is, which verbal resources they recurrently employ to connect to prior encounters and arrangements. In Chapter 6, I will focus on a particular linguistic resource, *anders dan* and its meaning and function in different positions, including in the closing phase of arrangement-making packages.

4.4 Analysis of an arrangement-making package

The longest arrangement-making package in my data is a conversation between two friends (Ria, 64 and Ans, 65) who are planning a trip to Madeira. The proposal for this joint activity has occurred much earlier[5]. The arrangement-making launch is therefore not present. This conversation shows the final part of the arrangement making, where essential elements are either decided upon or reiterated, such as exact location (town, hotel, kind of rooms), the means to get there (from which airport, which travel company), the exact dates and the person that will take care of the booking. There are only a few minutes dedicated to subjects that are not directly related to this trip. One is a side-sequence related to the timing of doing the booking, the other is at the very end of the conversation, just before the farewells, where the closing section seems to turns one participants' attention away from the main topic of the conversation to the weather, which will be relevant for the imminent future after the phone call is ended. After sketching an outline of the conversation, I will discuss in more detail some of the key sequences that show a clear progression through the stages of arrangement-making, as well as how each is confirmed before moving on to the next.

Ria and Ans start reporting to each other what they have found out about price differences when flying out of different airports than Schiphol Airport in Amsterdam. Ultimately, they decide to fly out of Amsterdam (manner). This is the first step that is arranged. They then discuss how they will get to the airport, as it may be in the middle of the night. The final decision on this sequence is postponed, as something that can be figured out at a later date. The next step involves making a final choice of the hotel they will stay at (place). The options are known to both and they reach a final decision on this step. They agree that they should book soon. After reconfirming the dates, which clearly had been decided on previously (time), they discuss and decide who will do the booking at a travel agency and when (also place and time, but related to the finalizing of the plan involving a third party).

[5] In an earlier recorded conversation in the CGN corpus between the same participants (fn008099), the plan is already in place and different destinations, hotels and travel companies are discussed, as well as the plan to inquire after prices in Germany. In that conversation, flying from Düsseldorf is qualified by Ans as much less busy than Schiphol and no difference in distance (presumably from their homes to the airport).

This is the "first end" of the arrangement making, with Ans (who will do the booking) confirming to call back with the details. Now that an immediate plan of action is in place, they discuss another topic. However, the booking is brought up again and they discuss and agree on some sub-categories of place (what kind of rooms) and manner (which travel company) that Ans will take into account during the booking. The arrangement-making package ends with a re-commitment by Ans to call back to confirm the details, which will allow Ria to move to a next related action, namely taking out a cancellation insurance.

Taking a closer look at the data, I will show how the different parts of the arrangement-making are initiated and closed. Excerpt 8 is the conclusion of the discussion on airports of departure. Both Ans and Ria have talked to others and made inquiries to see if it would be cheaper to leave from Germany or Belgium, instead of the Netherlands. At this point in the conversation, they come to a conclusion: now that the Euro has been introduced[6], there is not much price difference anymore between different countries. After Ans signals the end of her telling with *en uh* ('and uh', Schegloff, 2009) in line 7, Ria signals with *nou* ('well', line 8) that she's ready to move to a next step (Mazeland, 2016): making a decision. She proposes to simply leave from Schiphol in Amsterdam. She does this with 'I think that we' and uses the tag *hè* ('isn't it') to request alignment from Ans, presuming a mutually shared perspective (Mazeland & Plug, 2010).

Excerpt 8 CGN fn008100 (Madeira) 1:07 - 1:23

01	RIA:	maar dat is nu allemaal niet [meer zo
		but that is now all not anymore like-that
		But all that is now not like that anymore
02	ANS:	[met de euro nee
		with the euro no
03		dat zei mijn buurvrouw ook
		that said my neighbour also
		That's what my neighbour said as well
04	RIA:	j[a

[6] The recordings were made between 1998 and 2003. The Euro was introduced as a physical currency in 2002.

05 ANS: [ze zegt dat is met die euro zo weggetrokke allemaal,
she says that is with that euro just pulled away all
She says that with that euro that has all disappeared

06 RIA: ja:_

07 ANS: .hh en uh:m
.hh and uh:m

08 RIA: nou_ ik denk dat we dan gewoon via Schiphol↑ [gaan hè?
well I think that we then simply via Schiphol go right
Well, I think we'll just go via Schiphol then, right?

09 ANS: [nou ik denk 't
well I think it

10 eer[lijk gezegd ook]
honestly said too
Well, honestly, I think so, too

11 RIA: [vin je niet?]
find you not
Don't you think so?

12 ANS: ja ↑hoor_
yes PTC
Yes, that's right

13 RIA: dan zijn we van heel die heisa af,
then are we with whole that rigmarole done
Then we are done with that whole rigamarole

14 ANS: j[a:_

15 RIA: [hoeft Harry ook niet helemaal op en neer, u:h_
needs Harry also not completely up and down u:h
(then) Harry doesn't need to go all the way back and forth either u'

16 ANS: nee.
no

17 RIA: ja.
yes.

18 ANS: 't is alleen waarschijnlijk een ongelukkige tijd
it is only probably an inconvenient time
'Only, it's probably at an inconvenient time

19 maar daar zien we ook wel een oplossing voor te vinde
but there see we also PTCT a solution for to find
but we'll surely find a solution for that as well

In line 9 and 10, Ans does align with Ria's proposal. Ria asks for reconfirmation in line 11 (in overlap) and Ans reconfirms with *ja hoor*. Besides answering the request for confirmation,

the use of *ja hoor* indexes an orientation to the larger course of action and willingness to move it forward (Mazeland & Plug, 2010). Ria offers a two-part account in support of the decision, in line 13 and 15, and Ans aligns herself with these accounts in line 14 and 16. Note that *nee* ('no', line 16) is considered an aligning and confirming answer in Dutch, as it corresponds to the polarity of the statement from line 15 *hoeft Harry ook* ***niet*** *helemaal op en neer* ('Harry also wo**n't** have to go all the way back and forth') (Mazeland & Plug, 2010). Ria does another confirmation with *ja* (line 17), which concludes the first part of the arrangement. The sequence is subsequently expanded when Ans mentions they may need to leave at an inconvenient time (line 18), but waves it aside immediately by saying they'll find a solution for that (line 19). This does lead to a discussion of the different options that would be available to get to the airport in the middle of the night. That side sequence is closed at the beginning of Excerpt 9.

Lines 1, 2 and the beginning of line 3 of Excerpt 9 close the travel-to-the-airport topic. After a very short pause, and signaling a return to an earlier matter with the resuming sequential conjunction *maar* (Mazeland & Huiskes, 2001), Ria introduces the next subject to be decided on in their larger travel plans: which hotel will they stay at (line 3 in Excerpt 9).

Excerpt 9 CGN fn008100 (Madeira) 2:28 - 2:39

01 RIA: da's g [denk ik geen enkel punt
that's n- think I no single point
that's n- I don't think that's an issue at all

02 ANS: [dus dat is eigenlijk van later zorg
so that is really of later worry
so that is really something to worry about later

03 RIA: ja (.) maar jij bent toch ook voor miramar want
yes but you are PTC also for ((name)) because
But you favour Miramar as well, don't you, because

04 daarom heb ik die dinge: [uh]
that's why I those things uh
that's why I ((sent)) those things,

05 ANS: [nou]
well

06 RIA: een beetje ik heb niet alles gekopi[eerd]
a bit I have not everything copied
a few, I did not photocopy everything

07 ANS: ['t maakt]
it makes

08 niet zoveel uit maar hm [hm]((clears throat))
no so much out but
It doesn't make that much of a difference but

09 RIA: [nee]
no

10 ANS: ik denk dat miramar iets gunstiger li:gt
I think that ((hotel name)) somewhat more-convenient lies
I think the location of Miramar is a little more convenient.

Ans had mentioned the name of this hotel almost 2 minutes earlier, and Ria refers to the information she sent Ans (for which Ans thanks her at the very beginning of the conversation, not shown). In that sense, this is a resumption of a prior topic. Ria launches the topic by asking Ans' opinion: *you favour Miramar as well don't you* (line 4). She designs the turn in a way that signals that she expects Ans to be in agreement. Both the use of *toch*, which even in the mid-field, though slightly more speaker-oriented than in the right periphery, signals expected agreement (Van der Wouden & Foolen, 2011) and *ook* ('also', 'too') point to this expectation of alignment. Ans doesn't express agreement per se and starts by saying that it doesn't make much difference, but that Miramar might be in a better location (lines 8 and 10). This is followed by a discussion of the pros and cons of Miramar and one other venue (2:39-3:14, not shown).

In Excerpt 10, the friends move to a decision on the hotel. Ria first gives an account (lines 3-4) and then formulates a suggestion in lines 3-5. She introduces the account with *nou*, signalling a next-step in the decision-making process (Mazeland, 2016).

Excerpt 10 CGN fn008100 (Madeira) 3:14-3:41

01 ANS: dus i- elke keer als 'k 't lees denk ik ja 't lijkt me toch
so I- every time when I it read think I yeah it seems me PRT
So I- every time I read it, I think yeah, it really does seem

02 eigenlijk wel s- ja_
really PRT s- yeah
like s- yeah

03 RIA: ja mir- nou we zijn eerst uh als eerst zo'n beetje op da
yes mir- now we are first uh as first such a bit at that
well Mir- well we were first uh at first kind of came up with that

04 miramar [gekomme] volgens mij=
((hotel name)) [come.PTCP according-to me
Miramar, I believe

03 ANS: [ja:_]
yes

04 RIA: =dus misschien is dat dan uh
so maybe is that then uh
so maybe that's then uh

05 ANS: j[a:_]
yeah

06 RIA: [wat] we ↑kieze moete_
what we choose must
what we should choose

07 ANS: [ja?.]
yep

08 RIA: [.h] ja en dan moeten we nu wel gaan boeken
yes and then must we now PTC go book
Yes and then we really should go and book now

09 ANS: ja. [zal ik dan]
shall I then
Yes. How about I then

10 RIA: [want zo ben] ik ook wel uh hahahaha straks zijn we
because so am I also PTC uh hahahaha soon are we
because that's me! if not we might be

11 te laat,=
too late
too late

12 ANS: =ja ↑daarom.
yes that's why

13 RIA: 😊uh ha😊[7]

14 ANS: .h verleden week was 't [nog] dus (.) plaatse allemaal
last week was it yet so places all
Last week there was still a lot of space (available)

15 RIA: [.h]

16 RIA: ja?
yes?

[7] The smiley-face icons are used to indicate a smiley voice

17 ANS: bij miramar j[a↑↓]
at ((hotel name)) yes

18 RIA: [ja ja]
yes yes

19 [ja want jij:] want we hebben toch wel dezelfde datum nu=
yes because you because we have PRT PRT the-same date now
yes, because you, because we do have the same date

20 ANS: [dat was]
that was

21 RIA: =uh te pak[ken hè?]
uh to take PRT
in mind now, right?

22 ANS: [d r i e]ëntwintig september hè
twenty three september PRT
September twenty third, right?

23 RIA: ja.
yes

The suggestion in lines 4 and 6 is introduced with *dus* (‘so’) and *dan* (‘then’) as a logical conclusion from what preceded. Ria also uses the word *misschien* ('maybe') and the plural first pronoun *we*, framing it as a possible joint decision. Ans agrees with a simple *ja* (line 7). Ria sees this as enough confirmation and moves quickly on to concluding that they should book soon (line 8). Ans seems to be on board, because even though she only assents with simply *ja* in line 9, she starts to offer to take care of the booking. This happens in overlap with Ria’s account of the reason for the need to book soon in lines 10-11 and Ria does not acknowledge Ans' offer. She does not even seems to hear it, as she later (Excerpt 11, line 7) asks who should do the booking. In order to get the booking right, they then launch into a side sequence to make sure they are both looking at the same dates. As this is just a reconfirmation of dates they already decided on at an earlier time, I do not include them here.

Lines 1-6 of Excerpt 11 are the end of the date discussion and in line 7, Ria brings the discussion back to the booking by asking who should take care of it (making it clear that she did not register Ans’ earlier start of the offer). Ans offers to do the booking (line 8), using

the same formulation *zal ik* ('shall I') and Ria immediately accepts (line 10) with 'yes' and an explicit repeat of the verb with an emphasized 'you'.

Excerpt 11 CGN fn008100 (Madeira) 3:57 - 4:36

01 RIA: dan komen we op een woensdag terug (0.1) klopt dat?
then come we on a wednesday back (0.1) is-right that
Then we come back on a Wednesday, is that right?'

02 °kan ik tell[en?]°
can I count
Am I counting right?

03 ANS: [dat] uh dat zal wel.
that uh that will PRT
I uh I guess so

04 RIA: acht negen [tien.
eight nine ten

05 ANS: [ik geloof 't wel ja.
I believe it PRT yes
I do believe so

06 RIA: ja: zoiets ja.
yes something-like-it yes
Yes, something like that'

07 RIA: .h wie boekt er?
who books PRT
Who is going to book'

08 ANS: zal ik dat doen hier [in] druten?=
shall I that do here in ((town name))
How about I do that here in Druten?

09 RIA: [uh]

10 RIA: =ja. boek jij maa:r_
yes. book you PRT
Yes, you (go ahead and) book

11 ANS: en dan hoor ik wel even hoe dat met uh betalingen allemaal
and then hear I PRT PRT how that with uh payments all
and then I will hear find out how it all will work with the payments and such

12 gaat en dan uh
goes and then uh
and then uh

13 RIA: ja. want dan moeten we wel uh waarschijnlijk meteen
yes. because then must we PRT uh probably immediately
Yes, because then we will probably need to make a

14 aanbetalen hè,
make-a-deposit PRT
deposit right away, right?.

15 ANS: j-waarschijnlijk wel [maar] dat is e- o- in ie-
y-probably PRT but that is e- o- in a-

16 RIA: [ja]

17 RIA: maar als je dat meteen laat horen 'k heb nu
but if you that immediately let hear I have now
But if you let (me) know that right away, I now have

18 vakantiegeld dus hup [ha ha ha]
vacation money so hop ha ha ha
vacation pay so hop ha ha ha

19 ANS: [.h ha vind ik ook] ja ja
find I also
ha, I agree, my, my

20 RIA: ja. ha ha
yes ha ha

21 ANS: nou is oké↑ [dan zorg ik] vandaag- ik zal=
well is okay then take-care I today- I will
Well, that's good. Then I'll make sure today- I will

22 RIA: [dan wordt t meteen over-]
then is it immediately
then it will be transf- immediately

23 ANS: =je vanavond terugbellen om te bevestige, dat het gelukt↑
you tonight call-back in-order to confirm that it succeeded
call you back tonight to confirm that it has worked out

24 is als je vanavond thuis bent,
is if you tonight home are
if you're home tonight.

25 RIA: ja: je hoeft je niet te haasten als het jou
yes you need you not to hurry if it you
Yes. You don't need to hurry if it

26 nie[t uitkomt vandaag]
not suits today
doesn't work for you today'

27 ANS: [nee nee: maar] morgen ben ik uh ook weer foetsjie
no no but tomorrow am I uh also again gone
No, no, but tomorrow I am gone again

28 en woe[nsdag] ben [ik foe]tsjie en [ja:]
and wednesday am i gone and yeah
and Wednesday I'll be gone and yeah'

29 RIA: [ja] [ja] [oh↑] oh↑

30 ANS gister was ik in harderwijk
yesterday was I in ((town name))
Yesterday, I was in Harderwijk

In line 11, Ans continues her turn from line 8 with *en dan* ('and then'), outlining what she'll do at the time of the booking (get information about the price). Both presume that they will have to make a deposit and Ria promises to pay Ans back as soon as she hears back. In line 21 Ans reconfirms the outlined course of action (do the booking and ask about/make the deposit) with *nou is ok* ('well that's okay'). Both closing the planning stage (*is ok*) (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1987) and projecting the next step (*nou*) (Mazeland, 2016, 2019): she promises to call back that evening to confirm that everything is settled (lines 23-24). After Ria tells her it doesn't have to be done today (line 25-26), Ans starts telling that she is gone the rest of the week. She ends her turn in line 28 with *en ja* ('and yes') before seguing into a new topic, and it seems that *en ja* as a discourse marker works the same way in Dutch as *und ja* in similar environments in German (Auer, 2021), that is, as a turn-exiting device and topic closer. Ria's response with *oh* indexes that she receives Ans' statement that she will be gone so much in the coming days as unexpected news (Seuren, 2019). Ans then starts explaining all the work involved in moving her mother from the town of *Harderwijk* (line 30) to a new place.

In the stretch of talk between Excerpt 11 and Excerpt 12, Ans reports on the work involved with moving her mother. Even though the travel arrangement seems to be closed with Ans' offer to book the trip and then call Ria back to confirm, Ria re-opens the topic after Ans has discussed all the work to be done with the move, including packing and unpacking her

mothers' clothes. She mentions the type of acrylic fabric that most of the clothes are made of, which both declare terrible to wear, but easy to maintain (line 1). After Ria gives one more (negative) evaluation of the fabric in line 2, she returns, in the same turn, to the earlier topic of booking their trip with an inbreath and *maar luister* 'but listen'. She starts giving Ans some additional instructions related to the last topic, namely the booking itself. Ria mentions the seats on the plane (line 4), Ans introduces the location of the room in the hotel (line 10), for which in Dutch she uses the same word *plaats* (which can mean, among other things, seating or location), making this a logical transition.

Excerpt 12 CGN fn008100 (Madeira) 5:36 - 5:51

01 ANS: dus uh daar daar heb ik bijna niets aan te strijken
so uh that that heve I almost nothing at to iron
So uh I - I hardly have to do any ironing for that'

02 RIA: en dat zweet nog ook
and that sweat yet too
And it (the type of fabric) makes you sweat as well'

03 .h maar luister, jij let ook een beetje
but listen you pay-attention also a bit
But listen, you will pay some attention

04 op de plaatsen hè, [in] het vlieg[tuig]=
to the seats right, in the airplane
to the seats, right?, In the airplane

05 ANS: [.h] [ja.]

06 RIA: =ah ja doe ook maar we gaan gewoon daarnaartoe en uh
ah well do also PTC we go simply there-to and uh
Ah well, whatever, we 'll just go there and uh

07 hup [’t lijkt]
hop it seems

08 ANS: [ja.]

09 RIA: [’t lijkt me on- nog s-]
it seems to me ev- yet s-((still?))
It s(till) seems to me yet

10 ANS: [ja: en vooral ook de] plaatsen in ’t hotel zelf
yes and especially also the spaces in the hotel itself
Yes and also especially the spaces in the hotel itself

11 dat zal ik me even goed laten voorlichten
that shall I me PRT good let inform
I will definitely ask for information

This leads to an anticipated appreciation of sitting on a balcony with ocean views, followed by a discussion of which travel company to book with (general consensus: whatever is cheapest) and any extra fees related to the booking (not shown). Other topics discussed include travel and cancellation insurance, and whether they can use their debit card on location (last part shown in Excerpt 13, line 1). After these topics, where the decisions are all confirmed by Ans with a simple 'yes', Ria produces an evaluative assessment of the plan as a whole (that is, of all its elements) as something to look forward to in line 1 - 2. This is the first time such an evaluation appears in the conversation. It seems that now that the plan is agreed upon and settled, it is real enough to start treating it as a future reality and start anticipating its realization. Ans agrees in overlap, and again in line 5, adding that for her, the enjoyment of a trip is contingent on everything having been well-prepared.

Excerpt 13 CGN fn008100 (Madeira) 8:22 - 8:30

01 RIA: maar in portugal gaat dat allemaal wel
but in portugal goes that all PRT
But in portugal that all does work.

02 .h ↑nou 'k heb er zin↑ in_
well I have there liking in
Well I look forward to it.'

03 't lijkt [mij] eerlijk gezegd uh
it seems me honestly said uh
'It honestly seems to me uh'

04 ANS: [↑ja.]
yes

05 ANS: ja: als 't zo voorbereid ik moet me altijd goed voorbereiden zo'n
yes if it so prepared I must me always good prepare such a
Yes, if it's prepared like this- I always need to be well prepared

06 beetje
bit
kind of'

07 RIA: ja.
yes

What follows is a side-sequence in which Ria and Ans discuss how neither of them feels like they can just drop everything and go like some people might do. After this topical excursion, Ria returns to the arrangement with another evaluation in Excerpt 14, line 3 and then circles back to the material that she sent to Ans, which was mentioned at the very beginning of the conversation.

Excerpt 14 CGN fn008100 (Madeira) 9:11-9:47

01 RIA: zit niet in mijn uh in mijn karaktertje
is not in my uh in my character.DIM
That's not in my - in my character

02 ANS: nee.
no

03 RIA: .h dus wat dat betreft uh nou ik vind 't hartstikke leuk dus=
so what that concerns uh PRT I find it super fun so
So anyway uh. Well I think it's great so

04 ANS: [goed zo_]
all-right

05 RIA: =[uh] ik dacht ik kopieer 't ik heb er nog meer ligge
uh I thought I copy it I have there yet more lying
Uh I thought "I'll copy it", I still have some others here,

06 [maar we zien elkaar] voor die tijd nog [wel,]
but we see each-other before that time yet PRT
but we'll certainly see each other yet before that time

07 ANS: [ja, maar da's leuk.] [da's] heel leuk
yes but that's nice that's very nice

08 da was heel attent van uh gerard uh ge[mert ((sniffing in))]
that was very thoughtful of uh ((name)) ((town/name))

09 RIA: [ja:.]
yes

10 da doen ze heel aardig en al die reisbu[reaus]
that do they very kindly and all those travel agencies
Yes, they do a nice job and all those travel agencies

11 AUT: [u heeft] bijna
you have almost

12 tien minuten gesproken. de verbinding wordt over dertig seconden
ten minutes spoken the connection will be in thirty seconds

13 [verbroken]
disconnected.
You have spoken for almost ten minutes. You will be disconnected in thirty seconds.

14 ANS: [oh jee]
oh my

15 RIA: .h hu((laughing))

16 RIA: nou ans, [we worden d'r weer ui-]
PRT (name) we will be there again ou-
Well Ans, we'll be (kicked) out again

17 ANS: [nou goed .h ik be-]
PRT good I ca-
Well, ok, I'll ca-

18 RIA: dat was 't laatste telefoongesprek
that was the last phone conversation

19 ANS: ja.
yes

20 RIA: met uh de universitei[t dan]
with uh the university then

21 ANS: [nou 't was] een kleine moeite ja.
PRT it was a small effort yes
Well, it was indeed my pleasure.

22 RIA: ja ja: ja
yes ye:s yes

23 ANS: maar ik bel jou terug als alles uh als ik 't kan bevestigen
but I call you back when all uh when I it can confirm
but I'll call you back when everything - uh when I can confirm

24 alle[maal maar dan uh]
all but then uh
all of it, but then uh

25 RIA: [ja prima want dan ga] ik ook meteen achter [dat]=
yes great because then go I also immediately after that
'Yes, great, because then I will get onto that

26 ANS: [ja]
yes

27 RIA: =annuleren aan en zo
cancelling and so
cancellation and other stuff right away'

28 ANS: 't is nou wel ineens snertweer buite (.) hè,
It is PRT PRT suddenly nasty weather outside (.) isn't it
'Now it's suddenly nasty weather outside, isn't it?'

29 RIA: ja↑↓
yes

Ans, in turn, positively evaluates the fact that Ria sent her the information and/or the information itself (line 7), as well as the effort that the travel agency put into it (line 8). In overlap with Ans' first evaluation, Ria mentions that they will see each other 'before that time', that is, before the trip (line 6). During Ria's alignment with Ans' second evaluation

(line 9-10), an automated announcement about the imminent cut-off of the connection interrupts her. In line 17, Ans starts saying that she'll call at the same time that Ria announces this is the last phone call for the study (line 18 and 20). Ans joins that topic and then moves back to the next and last step closing the arrangement topic, by repeating what she expressed at the end of the first section of the arrangement-making in line 21-23 of Excerpt 11: *ik zal je vanavond terugbellen om te bevestigen dat het gelukt is* ('I will call you back tonight to confirm that it has been done') versus *maar ik bel jou terug als alles uh als ik 't kan bevestigen allemaal* ('but I'll call you back when everything uh when I can confirm it all'). We see that after the resumptive *maar* (line 23; Mazeland & Huiskes, 2001), Ans recycles *terugbellen* (‘call back’) and *bevestigen* (‘confirm’), reconfirming the plan that they agreed on earlier in the conversation, effectively initiating the conversation closing (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Ria confirms here with *ja prima* ('yes great', line 25), doing more than a simple 'yes', which fits with the final agreement with a proposal (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1987). Ria continues her turn indicating that this will allow her to move to a next step, that of arranging for a cancellation insurance 'and such'. Ans interprets this as the end of the topic and switches to a comment about the weather that has just turned ugly (line 28). We can’t know if this is because she happens to just now look out of the window, but it does show that she is turning her attention away from the current conversation to the wider world. The remaining few turns are dedicated to this topic and how it will influence both Ria's and Ans's day. They get cut off mid-sentence without any greetings having been exchanged.

The analysis of this conversation shows that the arrangement-making is a joint project, where both participants actively contribute information, opinions and proposals or suggestions. Despite its length and complexity, there is a clear progressive movement towards the accomplishment of a final arrangement. The different decisions that are made in this conversation are first discussed and then finalized. Ria is the one who initiates most of the decisions and next-sequence moves, but Ans contributes much information that she has researched, and offers to book the trip, first in overlap and unacknowledged in Excerpt 10, line 9, then as an immediate answer to Ria's question in Excerpt 11, line 8. They clearly

are in it together and both benefit from a well-arranged project. In the first part, both use primarily the first person plural ‘we’. Once Ans has offered to book the trip, she uses "I"-statements to indicate what she will do and ask about, and Ria uses "you"-statements to either ask her to do certain things or give her the freedom to do what is needed. The fact that all these future actions are verbalized shows that both parties are still very much engaged in the subsequent development and realization of the arrangement. This is also shown in the positive evaluation of the plan that follows the final arrangement discussions and the re-commitment by Ans to call Ria as soon as everything is settled.

4.5 Chapter summary

In this chapter, I have introduced the concept of arrangement-making as a package (Heritage & Clayman, 2024) or activity (Mazeland, 2019, 2021) and analyzed an example of such an extended stretch of talk. In the next chapter, I will analyze certain elements of the arrangement-making process, focussing on the beginning and the end of these sequences of sequences (Schegloff, 2007).

5 Some elements of arrangement-making packages

5.1 Analysis of arrangement-making elements

In this chapter, I will draw on other conversations from my corpus that contain arrangement-making packages in order to show systematicities in how different steps, or phases, of arrangement-making are designed and managed. I will focus on how the joint project is introduced and concluded. In two conversations, two separate arrangements are negotiated within one conversation.

5.1.1 Launch

First, I present some ways in which the arrangement-making is launched. This can be a very general proposal, as in Excerpt 15, where all parts of the activity (*what* to do, *when* to do it, *where* to go) are negotiated in a recognizable order. Michelle (MIC) asks her brother Frank (FRA) if he has thought about what she should get him for his birthday (lines 43-44). This question is a clear topic switch that she starts in line 40 in overlap with Frank's update on the soccer results in line 41.

Excerpt 15 CGN fn008160 (casino) 2:54 -3:22

36 FRA: ja ben ik weer [was] uh Gerard even
yes am I again was ((name)) PRT
'Yes, I'm back. That was Gerard.'

37 MIC: [ja]

38 FRA: ja [dus u:h]
yeah so uh

39 MIC: [o::_kay.]

40 MIC: [hé wat wil-]
hey what want
'Hey, what do (you) want

41 FRA: [ja één nul uh] Turkije staat ´t als je ´t wilt weten
yeah one zero uh Turkey stands it if you it want to know
'Yeah, it's one-zero for Turkey, in case you want to know'

(0.1)

42 MIC: oké wat wilde ik nog- oh ja we he-
okay what wanted I yet- oh yes we ha-
'okay, what did I want to- oh yes, we did-

43 MIC: heb jij nog iets bedacht voor je verJAARdag dat je
have you yet something thought-of for your birthday that you

44 wil hebbe_
want have
Have you thought of something yet for your birthday that you would like to have?

45 FRA: van↑ wie?
from who?

46 MIC: van mij↑
from me

47 FRA: U:::hm_

48 MIC: ik dacht misschien kunnen we een keertje samen iets uh
I thought maybe can we a time together something uh
I thought maybe we could go and do something together sometime

49 gaan doen dat we naar de film gaan of uh w-wil je naar
go do that we to a movie go or uh w-want you to
go to a movie or d-do you want to go to

50 [de efteling]
the efteling
the Efteling (an amusement park)

51 FRA: [nee nee nee hol]land casino↑ want ik word acht↑tien
no no no holland casino because I become eighteen
No, no, no, Holland Casino, because I'm turning eightteen

52 MIC: ↑OH dat is leu:k [dat] doen we
oh that is fun that do we
Oh, that's fun, we'll do that

53 FRA: [ja]

54 MIC: gaan we gewoon naar het caSIno_
go we simply to the casino
'We'll just go to the casino'

55 FRA: zullen we 't doen?
shall we it do
'You want to do it?'

56 MIC: ↑JA: goed i↑DEE
yes good idea

57 FRA: ja_

58 MIC: ja PRIma (.) l[euk↓
yes great, fun

Initially, Frank hesitates (line 47). Michelle then suggests, in lines 48-49, that they go 'do something together' (as opposed to her buying him a physical present), complemented by two possible activities (going to see a movie or go to an amusement park). The second activity is phrased as a question: *of uh w-wil je naar de Efteling* ('or uh do you w-want to go to the Efteling'). Frank answers this last question with a rushed triple *no*, followed by the place he does want to go: "Holland Casino"[8]. Although this seems to be dispreferred response (the preferred response, in CA terms, to a yes/no question being affirmative), he does in fact accept Michelle's proposal to do something together; the *no* is a response (second pair part) to the last question of Michelle's turn. Frank wants to go somewhere with her, just not to the place Michelle names and his elliptic answer is clear in context. Frank does provide an account: he is turning 18, which is the legal age for gambling. Michelle receives this alternative activity with *oh* (rising intonation) followed by a positive evaluation, which is a common way to express an affective stance (Seuren, 2019). She follows this with her commitment to the new plan: *dat doen we*. This is similar to the third part deontic assessment described by Seuren (2018), with which a prior turn is (also) treated as a proposal and not just an informing. The arrangement-making section (proposal launch and acceptance) is closed with a two-sequence confirmation: request for commitment (line 55) - commitment (line 56), request for confirmation (of commitment) (line 57) - confirmation of commitment (line 58).

5.1.1.1 Launch of previously discussed arrangements

A little of two-thirds (11 out of 16) of the arrangement-making packages in my data starts with a referral to a previously agreed-upon plan for which only some details (usually timing) need to be arranged yet, for example after a third party has been consulted or when a change, or adjustment, of plans is needed. In Excerpt 16, Nel (NEL) refers to a plan to visit her adult daughter Iris (IRI), mentioning she has talked about it with *vader* ('father'), referring to Iris' father and her husband. This is the first mention of the visit during this

[8] Holland Casino is a state-owned company that operates the only legal casinos in the Netherlands. At the time of this recording, there were 9 or 10 venues.

conversation; they have been discussing Iris' home renovations before this. By the way Nel refers to the town and date in line 9, without any explanation, makes it clear that she expects Iris to know where the town is and what it represents to her parents and herself (Schegloff, 1972). She is not informing Iris of their trip to Mierlo, she is using that trip as a point of reference for a visit to Iris.

Excerpt 16 CGN fn008280 (visit) 8:06 - 8:19

06 NEL: dat zal toch zeker wel,
that wil PTC certainly PTC
I'm sure it will, won't it?'

07 IRI: jawe:l↓ zal ook wel
sure will PTC PTC
'oh sure, I guess it will'

08 NEL: ja. OH↑ ik heb het nog met uh met vader d´r over
yes *oh I have it PRT with uh with father there about*
Oh I talked about it with father

09 gehad als wij: naar mierlo gaan vijf oktober vinden we het
had when we to ((town)) go five october find we it
when we go to Mierlo on October fifth we would

10 echt gezellig om dan nog even langs
really pleasant to then PRT PRT by
really enjoy to stop by then

11 te ko[men
to come

12 IRI: [oh dat is heel fijn=
oh that is very nice
'oh, I'm very glad'

13 NEL: =zul[len we]zullen we dan maar even belle?
shall we shall we then PRT PRT call
How about we give you a call then

14 IRI: [da's heel leuk]
that's very fun
That's great

15 IRI: ja.
yes

After Nel mentions speaking with Iris' father in line 8, she switches to 'we' statements, indicating with a 'when...then' construction (lines 9-11) that the plan is an add-on to an existing plan that Iris also has knowledge about (evidenced by the fact that she never

questions what they will be doing in 'Mierlo' on 'October fifth'). Iris signals receipt with oh and a positive evaluation (line 12). The arrangement sequence that follows covers the exact timing of Nel and her husband's arrival at Iris' place (see Excerpt 21).

Another example of a previously discussed arrangement is Excerpt 17, where friends Rob (ROB) and Thomas (THO) discuss the need to change the date for a previously planned evening out with (at least) two other friends. The way Rob brings this up in line 7 ('we were talking about') shows that he is coming back to an earlier conversation. The use of *maar* as a skip-connecting device (Mazeland & Huiskes, 2001) reinforces the connection Rob makes to a topic that was discussed before the story Rob just told Thomas. There is no other recording in the corpus with these two participants, but they do refer to an event they were both attending earlier that day[9]. Lines 1 - 6 reflect the end of a reported conversation between Rob and another person that happened in the absence of Thomas. We can assume that in line 7, Rob refers back to a conversation that they had in person earlier that night.

Excerpt 17 CGN fn008350 (darts) 1:00 - 1:21

```
01  THO:  had ie nog meer lulligs       uh te missen,
          had he yet more shitty-things uh to miss
          'Did he have anything else shitty to impart'

02  ROB:  nee: verder  niet=
          no:  further not
          'No, nothing else'

03  THO:  =ne[e nee
          =no   no

04  ROB:     [°nee h.h. ((chuckling)) nee h.h.°
              °no  h.h. ((chuckling)) no  h.h.°

05  THO:  .hh n[ee nee goed ja  uh perfect h. in orde   .h
          .hh n[o  no  good yes uh perfect h. all right .h

06  ROB:       [.hhh

07  ROB:  maa:r even kijken we hadden het over die   u:h darte
          but   PRT look   we had    it  about that u:h play_darts
          but let's see we were talking about that uh playing darts
```

[9] The conversation opens with Thomas asking Rob if his adrenaline level has come down yet and referring to an open mic night in which they participated.

08 met u:h .h de ondernemende jongens hè,
with uh .h the enterprising boys PRT
with uh the enterprising boys, right

09 THO: .h de ondernemende jongens ja dat uh mmm↑ dat kan
.h the enterprising boys yes that uh mmm that can
the enterprising boys, yes, that uh mmm so that can't

10 dus TOCH niet doorgaan op de dag d[ie ik] had=
PRT PRT not take_place on the day that I had
happen on the day I had planned after all

11 ROB: [↑ah]

12 THO: =ge[pland want dan] uh kan jos niet,
planned because then uh can ((person name)) not
because then Jos is not available

13 ROB: [a::::h↓]

14 ROB: oh da's jammer
oh that's pity
oh that's a shame

Thomas replies with a reprise of the (nick)name of the group, adding that the day he had planned for this meeting won't work because one of the other participants is not available (line 9-10 and 12). Rob indexes understanding of the need to talk about this and then gives an evaluative response when apprised of the reason for the change of plans, that is, after Thomas's account (line 12). After this re-launch of the planning of the meeting, the arrangement-making proceeds with Thomas ascertaining if Rob is available on one of the dates Jos has proposed instead.

Common knowledge can be limited to the activity to be planned, without specifics of timing or place. In Excerpt 18 taken from an earlier part of the same conversation as Excerpt 15, Frank asks his sister Michelle if she can help him practice for his English oral exam (line 01). The use of *trouwens* (by the way) signals that Frank refers to something that has been mentioned before, and it often occurs after a former topic has been exhausted (compare Egbert 2003 on the use of German *übrigens*). This is the case here, as the series of qualitative evaluations following the former topic (results of a soccer match) indicate an orientation to closing that subject. Additionally, Dutch speakers index with *trouwens* that they realize their turn constitutes a break with the preceding turns (Van der Wouden & Foolen, 2011). The introduction *hé maar* ('hey but') also signals a topic switch. Frank's

exams were discussed earlier in the conversation, where he names his written exams and then states that the week after, he'll have his oral exams. Since Michelle accepts his request and moves straight to addressing the timing, without any request for clarification, it is clear that this has been discussed before. Frank does frame it as a joint project by using the first person pronoun *we*.

Excerpt 18 CGN fn008160 (oral exam) 0:52-1:00

0a MIC: nou ja jammer dan
PRT yeah too_bad then
'ah well, that's too bad'

0b FRA: ja.
yes

0c MIC: nou:. mooi,=
PRT beautiful
'well, great'

0d FRA: =leuk_
nice

01 hé maa:r kunnen wij nog trouwens uh mondeling uh oefene↑ met
Hey but can we yet by-the-way uh oral uh practice with
Hey, by the way, can we yet practice my oral (exam)

02 engels?
English
for English?

03 MIC: ja tuur↑lijk.
yes of-course

04 FRA: ja?
yes?

05 MIC: zeg maar wanneer↑↓
say PTL when
'Just tell me when'

In some cases, the common knowledge assumed by one participant is not recognized right away by the other and needs 'reactivation', as is shown in Excerpt 19, which occurs towards the end of the conversation from which Excerpt 17 was taken. After verifying if they have spoken long enough to qualify for the study, they do some talking for the sake of talking (including "blah blah blah"), and after some laughter, Thomas produces a pre-closing in line 1. This is generally a sign for the other person to insert any unmentioned

mentionables (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). In this case, Rob agrees to close in line 2, but it is Thomas who signals having something else to say (line 3).

Excerpt 19 CGN fn008350 (oeuvre) 4:11 - 4:42

01 THO: goed. [we hangen ↑op_]
good we hang up
Good, we'll hang up

02 ROB: [je zult toch] ja goed zo
you will PRT yes good so
You will still Yes, all right

03 THO: ja uh nee toch even wat
yes uh no PRT PRT something
Yes uh no there is still something after all

05 ROB: n[ee↑↓]
no

04 THO: [wan]neer gaan wij uh nog wat doen?
when go we uh yet something do
when are we still going to do something?

06 ROB: ja?
yes?

07 THO: een oeuvre opbouwen of uitbouwen
an oeuvre build or expand
Build an oeuvre, or expand it

08 ROB: WAT moet ik opbouwen, een euro?
What must I expand a euro
What do I have to expand? A euro?

09 THO: een oeuvre
an oeuvre

10 ROB: oh een OEUvre
oh, an oeuvre

11 THO: ja.
yes

12 ROB: vertel.
tell
'go on!'

13 THO: nou wanneer gaan we dat uh wanneer spreken wij wat af:.
PRT when go we that uh when agree.on we something
'Well, when are we going to (do) that uh when are we going to get together'

14 Jij [en] ik.
You and I

15 ROB: [uh]

16 ↓ah ↑zo:: ja nee ik was het even helemaal kwijt waar je 't
ah so yes no I was it PRT completely lost where you it
Ah, right. Yes, no, for a moment there I had no idea what you were talking about'

17 over ha[d nee] ja natuurlijk wij moeten samen nog uh wat uh
about had no yes of-course we must together yet uh some uh
'no, yes, of course, the two of us need to

18 THO: [ja]

19 ROB: muziek instuderen ee:h ja dat kan ieder gewenst moment, uh
music practice ayh yes that can any desired moment
'practise some music yet. Uh, yeah, we can do that any time, uh

20 maar laten we daar de agenda even bijpakken want
but let we there the planner PRT get-with because
'but let's take out the planner for that because'

21 anders dan blijft dat zo'n vage afspraak
otherwise then stays that such-a vague appointment
'otherwise it will be such a vague appointment'

In line 3, Thomas signals his intention to start a new topic with a contrast marker (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973): *toch even wat*. The particle *toch*, in the left periphery of a clause, signals contrast to what precedes or is expected (in this case, the closing of the conversation) (Foolen, 1994). In line 4, Thomas produces the mentionable topic by asking 'when are we going to do something yet'. Rob responds with a continuer (line 6), indicating that he expects more information to follow. In line 7, Thomas gives a rather cryptic explanation, that Rob at first doesn't hear correctly (repair sequence lines 8-10). However, though Rob's other-initiated repair is now resolved, he indicates in line 12 that he still expects more information (*vertel* 'go on'). Thomas prefaces his response with *nou* ('well') which signals that what follows might not be a straigthforward answer (Mazeland, 2016). He starts reformulating the initial question from line 4, switching from the indefinite *wat* ('something') to the definite referent *dat* ('that (thing)'). Without finishing this question (the verb *doen* 'to do' is not produced), he then self-repairs to a different question: 'when are we going to get together', and then specifies 'you and I' (line 14). In line 16, Rob signals understanding with a change of state token *ah zo* (similar to German achso: Golato & Betz, 2008; Golato, 2010). He then verbalizes that he had no idea what Thomas was talking about, but now remembers, and again, spells out what he now understands the joint project to be. Now that the joint project has been clarified, Rob immediately moves to the next step, that is, the timing. Throughout the exchange, Thomas uses *we* to signal it's a joint endeavour,

specifying in line 14 that this 'we' refers to just Rob and him, in contrast to the earlier arrangement that included a group of friends (see Excerpt 17).

5.1.2 Closing

In the following, I will discuss the closing of arrangements. The closing of an arrangement can lead to the closing of the conversation or the introduction of a new topic. In the latter case, the arrangement is often revisited in the pre-closing (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973; Heritage & Clayman, 2024). Heritage and Clayman (2024) found that the overall arrangement closing is done by a reconfirmation sequence, which can be supplemented by other elements, such as favourable assessments and exit-related expressions that refer to the future plan that was agreed upon.

5.1.2.1 Closings containing a favourable assessment

In my data, there are several instances where the reconfirmation sequence is accompanied by a positive evaluation of the plan (Heritage & Clayman, 2024; Mazeland, 2019, 2021).

In Excerpt 20, Michelle (MIC) and Frank (FRA) conclude the arrangement of their upcoming casino visit, which was launched in Excerpt 15. In the time between the two excerpts, they have discussed, without explicitly naming the location, going to 'Holland Casino' and Michelle has mentioned having been to another location of the same chain before. Both Michelle and Frank must have had a certain location in mind all along, likely close to their home town, because in line 83, Michelle introduces the city of *Den Haag* ('The Hague') as an alternate destination. This is prompted by her proposal to execute the casino visit on the same day of the earlier arranged joint study time (launched in Excerpt 18).

Excerpt 20 CGN fn008160 (casino) 3.38 - 4:12

```
77  MIC:  maar we  kunnen ook  dat  je  dan u:h tentamen
          but  we  can    also that you then uh exam
          but we could also do it (this way) that you

78        komt voorbereiden bij mij hier↓↑
          come prepare      at  me  here
          come over here to prepare your exam

79          (.)
```

80 FRA: wat zei je sorry,
what said you sorry
'what did you say, sorry'

81 (0.1)

82 MIC: dat je je tentamen hier komt voorbereiden en dat we
that you your exam here come prepare and that we
that you come to prepare your exam here and that we

83 dan uh naar den haag gaan want daar heb je er ook
then uh to (town name) go because there have you also
then go to The Hague, because there is one there

83a een,
one
'as well'

84 FRA: ja ook holland casino_
yes also (name) casino

85 MIC: JA ja [ja.]

86 FRA: [ja] ah↑ j[a]

87 MIC: [ja] ja geen illegale °ofzo_°
yes yes no illegal-one or so
'yes, yes, not an illegal one or something'

87a °ne[e°
no

88 FRA: ☺[A:H okay. j[a.]☺
AH, okay. yes

89 MIC: [°n]ee_° (.)
no

89a maar dan kun[nen we dat toch] doen?
but then can we that PTL do
'but than we could do that, couldn't we?

90 FRA: [o↑kay_ ja]

100 nee: is perfect lijkt me leuk
no is perfect seems to me fun
'no, that's perfect, sounds like fun'

101 MIC: ja↑↓

102 FRA: ja want uh gewoon een beetje voor de lol
yes because uh just a bit for the fun

103 beetje: kijken wat er allemaal is toch?
a bit look what there all is PTL
'yes, because (it's) just for a bit of fun, to look a bit what's all there, right?'

104 MIC: ja en uh ik durf nooit wat in te zetten maar
yes and uh I dare never something to put in but
'Yes and I uh never dare to bet anything but

105 als jij dat [wel uh wel durft]vind ik 't [prima]
if you that PTL uh PTL dare find I it great
if you do dare, that's fine with me

106 FRA: ☺[hu hu: huhuhu] [.h h.]☺

107 MIC: krijg je van mij een startbedrag
get you from me a starting amount
(then) you'll get a starting sum from me

108 ☺mm hu huhu [hee]☺

109 MIC: ☺[en dan] deel ik in de winst ofzo☺
and then share I in the profit or so
and then I'll share in the profit or something

110 FRA: .hh hu j[a toch]
hu *yes PTL*
hu yes, right?

111 MIC: [vin 'k wel een] goed plan.
find I PTL a good plan
I actually think that's a good plan

112 FRA: ja [is] wel leuk om te doen ja
yes is PTL fun to do yes
Yes, that <u>will</u> be fun to do, yeah

113 MIC: [ja]
yes

114 doen we dat.=
do we that
'That's what we'll do'

115 =.h hé:_ ik kreeg trouwens een smsje van mijn voicemail
Hey I got by-the-way a text from my voicemail
'Hey, by the way, I got a text message from my voicemail'

In line 84, Frank first asks for confirmation that the location Michelle proposes is the same kind of casino he has proposed at the launch of the project. Michelle confirms this in line 85 and an offers and extra (joking) assurance of the legality of the new location in line 87, both of which are signalled as understood by Frank with *ah ja* (line 86) and *ah okay ja* (88).

In line 89, Michelle asks alignment with the proposed arrangement, referred to as *dat* 'that', in the format of a *yes/no*-declarative. She starts with *maar* 'but', signaling a return to the main sequence (after Frank's pursuit of information on the suggested location) and *dan*, which indicates she gained this understanding from prior talk. The presence of these elements (yes/no-declarative form, *maar* and *dan*) make a simple confirmation relevant and generally lead to topic closure (Seuren & Huiskes, 2017). Frank confirms with *is perfect,* followed by a positive assessment *lijkt me leuk* 'sounds like fun', which Michelle then reconfirms with *ja*. Frank then gives an account of the 'fun' he expects to experience, that is, to just have a look. Michelle shares her experience of not daring to actually gamble, but offers her brother a sum to start with (presumably as part of the birthday gift) for a share in the profits. This adds another layer to their arranged activity, but doesn't change the arrangement itself. After pronouncing this added fun as 'a good plan' in line 111, which Frank agrees with in line 11, Michelle then closes the topic of the casino visit with *doen we dat* 'That's what we'll do' (line 114) and immediately switches to a different topic in line 115. The plan is not revisited in the rest of the conversation, but they indicate they will see each other on the weekend for the family birthday celebration[10].

In the following exchange between Nel (NEL) and Iris (IRI) (end of arrangement launched in Excerpt 16), Nel has indicated she can't give an exact time that they will arrive or whether they will be there for dinner time, so they will call to let Iris know. In line 32, Iris indicates she'll plan a meal that she can easily expand. The *no* at the start of her turn is in response to Nel's statement that she cannot predict what time it will be; it therefore aligns with the negative formulation of Nel's turn.

[10] The corpus contains another recorded conversation between the same participants (fn008162), in which Michelle states the reason for calling as doing the last recorded conversation and setting a time for Frank to visit so they can go to the casino. This is immediately derailed by Frank announcing he had his first driving lesson (minimum age also 18). At the end of that conversation, Michelle concludes that they still haven't set a date, but that she'll be home (that is, at the family home) on the weekend and that they'll get out their planners then.

Excerpt 21 CGN fn008280 (visit) 8:52 - 9:16

30 IRI: of dat nog later wordt
or it yet later will-be
'or if it will be even later'

31 NEL: een happie wordt dat kan ik totaa:l nie overzien
a bite will-be that can I totally not predict
'a bite (to eat) that I can really not predict'

32 IRI: nee. nou ik maak wel iets wat ik makkelijk van
no. Well I make PTC something that I easily from

33 van vijf naar zeven uit kan breiden
from five to seven can expand
'No. Well, I'll make something that I can easily expand from from five to seven

34 NEL: ja [goed]
yes good

35 IRI: [en dan] uh dan zien we wel
and then uh then see we PTC
'and then uh then we'll see'

36 NEL: dan zien we wel. wij nemen toch in ieder geval
then see we PTC we take PTC in any case
Then we'll see. We are taking

37 de telefoon mee [dus] dan uh
the phone along so then uh
the phone along anyway, so then –'

38 IRI: [ja]

39 d' kinderen vinden het ook hartstikke gezellig als jullie
the children find it also super fun if you

40 effe komen buurten dus uh
PTC come visit so uh
'The children also love it when you stop by to catch up so uh'

41 NEL: Ja: dat- nou ik vind ´t ook gezellig
Ye:s that well I find it also fun
"Yes that – well I also enjoy it'

42 en ik ben bovendien razend benieuwd
and I am additionally enormously curious
'and besides, I can't wait (to see the changes)'

43 IRI: .h huhuhu ((laughs))

44 NEL: ((smiley voice)) .h k wil 't echt wel weer zien
I want it really PTC again see
'I really want to see it again'

45 IRI: ja [nou 't is uh] 't is een complete
yeah well it is uh it is a complete

46 NEL: ['um ((clears throat)) ja]

47 IRI: ged- gedaanteverwisseling ho[or]
met- metamorphosis PTC
'Yeah. Well, it's uh, it's a complete met- metamorphosis, I tell you'

48 NEL: [ja]

49 IRI: ja

50 NEL: nou: ontzettend leuk. wij hebben net de fotootjes
well terribly fun. We have just the photos.DIM
'Well, lovely. We just got the photos back from Luxemburg'

51 teruggehad van Luxemburg
got-back from Luxemburg

The arrangement sequence proper ends in line 36, where Nel confirms Iris' statement in line 35 that they'll 'wait and see' by echoing those words. She then gives an account for the acceptability of this "plan" by restating that they will take a mobile phone along. Iris then produces a positive evaluation (by proxy), saying the children would love to see their grandparents (lines 39 - 40), which again is partially echoed by Nel, using the same word *gezellig* 'enjoyable'. Nel adds that she is also very curious (line 42-43), referring to the earlier discussed renovations at Iris' place and after Iris' confirmation that it has been a complete overhaul, Nel closes the sequence with a last evaluation *ontzettend leuk* 'extremely pleasant', preceded by *nou*, which indicates a readiness to move the conversation to a next point (Mazeland, 2016). She switches to a totally different topic and the visit is not mentioned again. At the end of the conversation, Iris mentions calling again later that week, which is presumably before the planned visit.

Sometimes, the favourable assessment is not produced immediately after an arrangement is agreed upon, but rather after a further discussion of the activity. Excerpt 22 shows the closing of the arrangement-making itself, while Excerpt 23 forms the end of the full sequence and conversation itself. In between the participants talk in more detail about the activity they planned. Excerpt 22 is taken from the same conversation as Excerpt 17, and forms the closing of the arrangement that was launched in Excerpt 19. Thomas (THO) and Rob (ROB) are trying to find a time to get together for a music practice. Rob has proposed several evenings, but none work for Thomas.

Excerpt 22 CGN fn008350 (oeuvre) 5:03 - 5:23

165 THO: maar overdag een keer of zo?
but daytime a time or so
'but during the day some time or so'

166 ROB: overdag. kan oo[k.] dinsdagMIDdag_
daytime can too tuesday_afternoon
'during the day is also possible. Tuesday afternoon

167 THO: [ah.]

168 THO: dinsdagmiddag. Juist.
tuesday_afternoon Right

169 ROB: goed zo nou hebben we mekaar.
alright now have we each_other
'All right, now we've got each other'

170 Twee uur?
Two o'clock?

171 THO: twee uur.
two o'clock.

172 ROB: °twee uu:r_ Thomas hier. Goed zo.°
two o'clock Thomas here. All right.

173 THO: nou zeg dat uh .h is al meteen een hele afspraak
well say that uh .h is already directly a whole appointment
'Well. look at that! That uh .h is right away quite a commitment'

((9 sec. omitted, Thomas jokes about his "busy" schedule))

182 ROB: dat [is] interessant.
that is interesting

183 THO: [ja.]
yes

184 .hh goed twee uur
.hh good two o'clock

185 dan uh dan [kom ik eraan en dan uh zien we wel]
then uh then come I to_there and then uh see we PRT
'then uh then I'll come to your place and then uh we'll see

186 ROB: [en dan kom je hier en dan gaan uh]
and then come you here and then go
'and then you come here and then (we) will uh

187 rommelen we eventjes een paar cd's d'ruit.
fiddle we quickly a few cd's out_of_it
'we quickly churn out a couple of cd's'

In line 165, Thomas suggests meeting during the day. This leads to a swift determination of a day and time that suits both of them. Rob proposes a day and time in lines 166 and 170, which Thomas accepts and confirms by repeating the said day and time in lines 168 and 171, with an added *juist* 'right' in line 168. Rob reconfirms in lines 169 and 172 with *goed zo* 'all right'. From earlier in the conversation, it is clear that Rob has a paper planner out (see Excerpt 19, lines 20-21), so line 172 is him saying (at low volume) what he is writing down in his planner. This is followed by a short side sequence (omitted, see Appendix 2) where Thomas comments on this being his only appointment that week, ending with Rob evaluating that fact as 'interesting' (line 182). Thomas then reconfirms the arrangement with 'good' and a repetition of the time, followed, in overlap with Rob, of the location (Thomas going to Rob's).

This arrangement is reconfirmed during the pre-closing sequence (Excerpt 23 below). The men have discussed in more detail what they might do during their get-together. In line 201, Thomas responds positively to Rob's sharing that he has found some recorded material of the two of them playing that might works 'as a demo'.

Excerpt 23 CGN fn008350 (oeuvre) 5:47 - 6:01

201 THO: ↑oh late we daar eve naar luistere,
oh let us there PRT to listen
'Oh, let's have a listen to that'

202 ROB: maar daar kunne we naar luistere_ kunne w' ons late
but there can we to listen can we us let
'but we can listen to that, we can get

203 inspirere [en dan gaan] we weer uh=
inspire and then go we again uh
'inspiration and then we'll (play?) again

204 THO: [ja.]
yes

205 ROB: =want daar spele we namelijk ook wel es wat andere
because there play we namely also PRT PRT some other
'Because there we do also play some other

206 dinge dan alleen de: bond[11], .h
things than just the federation
things besides the federation's (pieces)'

207 THO: ja.
yes

208 ROB: en dat klinkt ook hartstikke leuk [als afwisseling].
and that sounds also extremely nice as variety
'and that sounds very nice as well, for variety's sake.

209 THO: [↑oh goed joh]
oh good PRT
'oh, that's really good'

210 ROB: ja_<

211 THO: leuk.
nice

212 ROB: goed ik zie je dinsdag.
good I see you tuesday
'Good, I'll see you on Tuesday.'

213 THO: oké. [↑jo Rob.]
okay yo ((name))

214 ROB: [groetjes] doeg.
greetings bye
'See ya, bye'

215 THO: doei.
bye

Thomas evaluates the plan to listen to the recordings (and possibly the whole get-together) as *leuk* (line 211). Rob moves to close in line 212, using *goed* 'good' followed by another element that can supplement arrangement closings, namely "exit-related expressions" that refer "to the future activity" (Heritage & Clayman, 2024, p. 294): *ik zie je dinsdag* 'I'll see you on Tuesday'. Thomas confirms his willingness to close the conversation with 'okay' in line 213. Standard greetings are exchanged (lines 214-215) and the call is ended. This excerpt shows that several supplementary elements can be present, in this case an evaluation, a reference to the future activity and a third, namely an upshot marker (*goed* 'good', line 212) (Heritage & Clayman, 2024).

[11] It is not clear what *bond* (union, federation) refers to. It may be a shortened form of *muziekbond* 'music federation', these are regional associations of amateur orchestras and (brass) bands. They also publish or select certain pieces of music that are approved for music competitions and exams of different levels. https://www.knmo.nl/bonden/

The conversation in section 4.3 also contains exit-related expression, once after the arrangement sequence proper, and then again at the end of the conversation (see Excerpt 11 lines 21-23 and Excerpt 14 line 23), that is, a promise to call back when the travel booking has been completed.

5.1.2.2 Moving away from arrangement-making into new topics

In all conversations that have been discussed so far, there is a clear topic switch or conversation closing, generally after a positive evaluation and/or upshot marker. These transitions have been signaled previously, for example Excerpt 21, line 50, reproduced below in Excerpt 24. Nel provides the positive evaluation *nou ontzettend leuk* 'well, lovely' and then continues with a topic switch.

Excerpt 24 CGN fn008280 (visit) 9:14 - 9:16

```
50  NEL:  nou: ontzettend leuk. wij hebben net  de  fotootjes
          well terribly   fun.  We  have   just the photos.DIM
          'Well, lovely. We just got the photos back from Luxemburg'

51        teruggehad van  Luxemburg
          got-back   from Luxemburg
```

5.1.2.3 Arrangements under time pressure

As mentioned before, the phone conversations in the *Corpus Gesproken Nederlands* were recorded via a switchboard and had a maximum length of 10 minutes. At the 9:30 minute time mark, an automated recording announced that there were 30 seconds left. At 10:00 minutes the call is automatically disconnected, if the participants have not hung up themselves. As previously presented in the discusion on Excerpt 19, this triggers a closing of the conversation that can include a reconfirmation of the agreement. In a situation where an arrangement-making is launched, but has not been concluded, the imminent disconnection can lead to a very quick arrangement process. This is the case in Excerpt 25. Sandra (SAN) and Edwin (EDW) are a couple, but they don't live together. Most of the conversation consists of them reporting to each other how their day went. In the sequence just preceding this extract, Edwin has been explaining that he bought a spare part for an

engine and how he has been cleaning it. In line 1, Sandra expresses her disgust with the dirty process he is describing.

Excerpt 25 CGN fn008370 (evening stroll) 8:52 - 9:46

01 SAN: °bah.° .h (0.1) ja.
yuck well

02 EDW: .h ga ik nog even verder met schoonmake:,
go I PRT PRT further with clean-INF
I'll continue cleaning for a bit

03 SAN: mm-hm↑

04 EDW: en dan eh (0.2) zal 'k voor jou ko↓ke.
and then uh shall I for you cook
And then uh shall I cook for you?

05 SAN: ((breathing in through nose)) .hhhh uh:m hhh ja:,
yes

06 heb jij trouwens nog zin om uh nog een avondwandeling
have you by-the-way PRT liking to uh PRT a evening-stroll
by the way, do you maybe feel like

07 ofzo te gaan maken? gewoon lekker nog even d'ruit? .h
or-so to go make simply nicely PRT a-moment out
going for an evening stroll or so. Just to enjoy getting out for a bit?

08 EDW: ja is goed
yes is good
Yes, sure

09 SAN: of tenminste: ja 'k wee-nie: (.1)
or at-least yeah I know-not
Or that's to say – yeah – I dunno

10 heb jij nog uh even nodig voor dat uh ding,
have you yet uh a-moment need for that uh thing
do you need some more time yet for that uh thing

11 EDW: oh je wilt nu e:h d'ruit?
oh you want now uh out
Oh, you want to go out now?

12 SAN: ja,
yes

13 (0.2)

14 EDW: nou uh dat ding is inmiddels uh op een krant uh:
now uh that thing is by-now uh on a newspaper uh
Well, that thing is by now sitting on a newspaper

15 [in de hal]
in the hall

16 REC: [u heeft bijna] tien minuten gesproken. De verbinding
you have almost ten minutes spoken. The connection
You have spoken for almost ten minutes. The call will be

17 wordt over dertig seconden verbroken.
is in thirty seconds broken
disconnected in thirty seconds.

18 EDW: oh we moeten snel wezen 😊hh😊
oh we must quick be
Oh, we need to be quick

19 SAN: 😊nou snelle (ie) dan hh😊
now fast ( ) then
Well, fast ( ) then

20 EDW: ik moet m'n aanrecht nog schoonmaken en
I must my counter yet clean and
I still need to clean my counter and

21 m'n handen wasse,
my hands wash
wash my hands

22 SAN: ja.
yes

23 EDW: dan zal ik o- me ook nog effe omkleje:,
then shall I a- me also yet a-moment change
then I'll a- also quickly change yet

24 SAN: o↓kee_
okay

25 EDW: maar dan kunnen we d'r wel uit
but then can we there PRT out
But then we can go out,

26 maar dan °moe je maar hiernaartoe kome_°
but then must you PART to-here come
but then you'll have to come over here

27 SAN: ja< dan kom ik er zo aan.
yes then come I there soon on
Yes, then I'll be there in a minute

28 EDW: ja?
yes

29 SAN: o↑kee_=
okay

```
30 EDW:  =o↑kee_
          okay

31 SAN:  doei:↑↓
         bye
```

After Edwin announces he is going to continue cleaning, he follows it with a proposal to cook dinner for Sandra, phrased as a yes/no-question. Sandra produces a very weak agreement (line 5), after a long hesitation. In Dutch, agreements to proposal consist minimally of *ja is goed* 'yes is good' or similar (such as Edwin produces in line 8) (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1987). She follows this with an additional proposal, to go for a walk together (line 6). Edwin fully accepts this immediately in line 7. Sandra then takes a step back in line 8-9, formulating a possible obstacle to this plan, asking him if he needs more time with 'that thing'. Edwin responds with a repair initiation *je wilt nu uh d'ruit* 'you want to go now', preceded by the news receipt *oh* (line 12). This signals his initial misinterpretation of the timing of the proposed walk. Sandra responds with *ja* 'yes', with rising intonation. After a pause, Edwin replies to Sandra's inquiry from line 9, indicating that he is finished cleaning 'that thing'. This is where the automated message interrupts the conversation (lines 16-17). Both Edwin and Sandra agree that they need to be fast now (lines 18 and 19). In lines 20-21 and 23, Edwin outlines what he needs to do to be ready to go out (line 25). In line 26 he suggests that for this to work out, Sandra should come to his place. Sandra confirms this with a full sentence, echoing the verb *komen* 'to come', and adding *zo* 'very soon' (line 27). Edward asks for reconfirmation in line 28, Sandra does reconfirm with *okee* 'okay' in line 29, immediately followed by Edward's *okee*. After Sandra's *doei* 'bye', they hang up.

It is of course impossible to know how the conversation would have proceeded without the time pressure. The participants seem (from the rest of the conversation) extremely comfortable with each other and both expect to spend time together that evening (since Edwin had offered to cook for Sandra). Therefore, the added proposition of going for a walk is more a timing issue then an agreement issue. This distinguishes this arrangement-making from, for example, the one in Excerpt 7, where the proposal emerges from the conversation itself and there seems to be a concern of imposing on the other person. It is

however important to recognize that outside factors, such as a minimum and maximum length of the conversation, can impact the way sequences are curtailed or extended.

5.1.3 Putting the finalizing of the arrangement on hold

In some cases, the final arrangement of a project needs to be postponed when other persons are involved. In Chapter 6, I will discuss in detail one typical expression signalling this practice, but Excerpt 26 and Excerpt 27 contain a deferral of a final arrangement taken from the conversation between Rob and Thomas, specifically a pre-closing and then the final arrangement-making closing for the arrangement that was started in Excerpt 17. In line 12 of that excerpt, Thomas indicates that the date needs to be changed, because a third person, Jos, is not available on the originally planned date. Thomas proceeds to ask Rob if he is available on the alternate dates that Jos has suggested, the ninth or the tenth. Rob first only refers to the ninth, and when Thomas indicates that there are two dates to choose from, Rob receives this as new information with *oh* (Heritage, 2018; Seuren, 2019).

Excerpt 26 CGN fn008350 (darts) 2:35-2:53

01 ROB: oh↑ negen of de tiende=
oh nine or the tenth

02 THO: =°ja °.
yes

03 ROB: ja_ staat alle TWEE nog leeg_
yes stand all two yet empty
'yes, (those) are both still open'

04 THO: kan allebei nog?
can both yet
'both are available?'

05 ROB: dus als je 't mij zo snel mogelijk laat weten dan uh_
so if you it me as quickly possible let know then uh
'so if you can let me know as soon as possible then uh'

06 THO: ja_ [ja:_ 'k zal zo u:h] jacques 'r even=
yes yes I will shortly uh ((person name)) there PRT

07 ROB: [ja_ da heb ik]
yes there have I

08 THO: =over bellen,
about call
'Yes. Yes, I will call Jacques about that in a minute'

09 ROB: die termijn heb ik nog geen afspraken ↑staan hoor.
that term have I yet no appointment standing PRT
that far out I really don't have any appointments scheduled yet

10 THO: ja. maar wat is uh wat is je voorkeur?
yes but what is uh what is your preference

11 ROB: u:::h maakt mij eigenlijk niet zoveel ui[t_
u:::h makes me really not so much out
'Uh, I don't really care either way'

12 THO: [nee?
no

13 ROB: neuh_=
naw

14 THO: =nee
no

15 ROB: tien nja nee t maakt me ECHT nie uit.
ten mwa no it make me really not out
'ten mwa no I really don't care either way

In line 3, Rob says he is available both dates, which Thomas receives with a questioning confirmation in line 4. Rob ignores the request for confirmation and moves to a pre-closing (line 5), suggesting the next step introduced by *dus* 'so', requesting Thomas to let him know as soon as possible. Thomas indicates his willingness to close by stating that he will make the next step in the arrangement-making by calling Jacques (lines 6 and 8). This person has not been introduced yet, but is apparently another participant in the planned outing, who needs to be consulted. Rob comment in line 9 seems to be a final closing to the subject, but it prompts Thomas to re-open the canvassing of the date, by inquiring after Rob's preference for one of the two dates (line 10). After Rob assert several times that he really doesn't care, the two men continue to talk about the preference of a Saturday night over a Sunday night (not shown) and come, jointly, to the conclusion that Saturday night might be the better choice.

Excerpt 27 CGN fn008350 (darts) 3:21-3:46

94 ROB: zondag heb je toch weer uh hè maandag moeten we weer werke=
sunday have you PRT again uh PRT monday must we again work
'Sunday, you have again uh, y'know, Monday we have to work again'

95 THO: =j[a

96 ROB: [enzovoort .[.h]speelt bij mij ook wel mee ja
etcetera plays for me also PRT in yeah
'etcetera, that also counts for me, yeah'

97 THO: [ja.]
yes

98 ROB: dus [uh wat dat betreft]
so uh what that regards
'so in that sense'

99 THO: ['s goed. ja. ja bij mij ook] ik heb d'r heel veel
is good. yes. yes for me also I have there very many
'Right. Yes. Yes, same for me, I have a lot -'

100 [ja.]
yes

101 ROB: [ja. h.]
yes

102 THO: u::hm goed nou ik zal daar Jacques over bellen
u::hm good well I will there ((person name)) about call
'Uhm, good. Well, I'll call Jacques about that'

103 ik denk wel dat dat uh goed is
I think PRT that that uh good is
'I do think it will be uh fine'

104 ROB: ja. [en dan hoor] ik het nog wel eve uh terug
yes and then hear I it yet PRT PRT uh back
'Yes, and then I'll hear back yet'

105 THO: [volgens mij]
according-to me
'I think so'

106 ja.
yes

107 ROB: van je
from you
'from you'

108 THO: ja. we zitten op de tijd?
yes. we sit on the time
'Yes. We reached the time?'

109 ROB: uh, oh 'k zal even kijken moment
uh, oh I will PTCK look moment
uh, oh, I will have a quick look, one moment.

109a (1.0)((rustling))

110 ja vijf minuten dus dit zou al voldoende zijn
yes five minutes so this should already sufficient be
'Yes, five minutes, so this should be sufficient already'

```
111  THO:  zijn we al      vijf minuten bezig?
           are  we already five minutes busy
           'Have we been going for five minutes already?'
```

In line 98, Rob moves, again, towards closing, using *dus* 'so' and *wat dat betreft* 'as far as that's concerned' (compare the same expression in Excerpt 14, line 3), which can be left 'dangling' as it is in both these cases. Thomas states in overlap in line 99 with *'s goed* 'is good', and an alignment with Rob's argument in line 96. In the definite ending of this arrangement-making sequence, we see a mirrorring of the earlier attempt of closing shown in Excerpt 26. In line 102, Thomas commits (again) to the next step in the arrangement-making, calling Jacques, using the almost identical wording from line 6 and 8 in Excerpt 26. He does add this time that he thinks it will be okay for Jacques as well (line 103). Rob then repeats expecting to hear back from Thomas (lines 104 and 107, see also line 5 in Excerpt 26), with Thomas confirming in lines 106 and 108. After the *ja* 'yes' confirming he'll call Rob back, Thomas continues without a bread to ask if they have spoken long enough (for the purposes of the study). This leads to a short discussion of the duration of the call and the almost closure discussed at the start of Excerpt 19.

The postponement of the final timing of the arrangement is accepted as a given by Rob, as soon as it is clear that one of the participants is not available on the original date. The subsequent arrangement-making consists of him stating his availability and leaving the rest up to his friend, who is the planner of this outing (see Excerpt 17, lines 10 and 12 'the date that I had planned').

5.2 Chapter summary

In the previous and present chapter, I have analyzed several arrangement-making packages with the goal to show the complexity and the context-dependency of these types of sequences. By referring to the reseach on English arrangement-making sequences by Heritage and Clayman (2024), I set out to find out if the same observations are valid for Dutch, adding to Mazeland's (2019, 2021) work on activities in a wider context. Within this context, I concentrated on the beginnings and endings of arrangement-making packages in order to ascertain what resources participants use to make visible, to each other, what they

are doing and how this process of opening and closing manages larger stretches of talk that consist of sequences of sequences.

I found that many of the findings of Heritage and Clayman (2024) also are valid for Dutch telephone conversations. The three topics, social activities, passing objects and the execution of requests or favours, were also found back in my data. In this chapter, I have presented mostly arrangements for social get-togethers and one request (helping to practice for an exam, see Excerpt 18), but in my data, I also encountered examples of passing on objects (see for example Excerpt 28 and Excerpt 29). Besides the openings and closings of the arrangement-making packages that I focused on in this chapter, all occurrences in my data contained a discussion of timing, in varied granularity (day, hour) (see, for example, Excerpt 28 and Excerpt 22). Place is often implied in the plan, but in Excerpt 20 there is some discussion of the location. Manner is discussed extensively in the conversation on the booking of the Madeira trip (Excerpt 8, Excerpt 12).

By concentrating on openings and closings of arrangement-making, my findings align largely with earlier work on openings and closings, and on topic changes, as noted in the analyses. Openings are often preceded by a discourse marker, such as *nou ja* (Excerpt 7), *hé* (Excerpt 15, line 40), *oh* (Excerpt 16, line 8), *maar* 'but' (Excerpt 17, line 7), etc. These are signalled throughout the analysis as markers of topic change. Several examples were presented of projects that were launched earlier (outside of my data) and revisited to finalize details, for example after input from a third party had been obtained (see Excerpt 16) or to make changes to a previously arranged plan (see Excerpt 17). This type of instance makes up about half of the cases in my data. The common knowledge that is appealed to with these project re-launches can be indexed with *nog*, *trouwens* (or both) or by using a determinant like *die* (that). Referrals to a conversation, either with a third party or a previous conversation between the same participants, are also common. In most of my data, this appeal to common knowledge on the state of an arrangement is unproblematic, that is, no repair is initiated (but not always, see Excerpt 19), and the arrangement-making follows the same pattern, in which the needed timing, place and/or manner are discussed and agreed on one by one, after which the package is closed.

Instances in which the proposal of a joint project is the reason for the call did not appear in my data. This may be influenced by the way the data was collected. Through the meta-talk by participants, it appears that many calls are made for the sake of the call, not spontaneously because something needs to be discussed or asked.

The ending of the arrangement-making also follows certain patterns that generally coincide with topic or conversation closings (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973; Schegloff 2007). A practice that occurs in about half of my instances is an expansion after the arrangement proper has been made. Once all the major factors are agreed upon, participants continue the topic by expressing satisfaction with the plan and elaborating on the activity itself. What was launched as a possible event, moves into the realm of a future reality through the arrangement-making. Participants then start treating it as an event that can now be anticipated and filled in with more details. In this case, we see two types of closings: one of the arrangement-making proper, and then a second closing after satisfaction and elaboration of the arranged event is expressed. After this second closing, a new topic can be started or the parties can move to conversation closing. See for example Excerpt 20, line 100, where the first part of Frank's turn consists of the agreement to the timing and place of a trip to the casino (*nee: is perfect* 'no is perfect') and the second part is an evaluation (*lijkt me leuk* 'sounds like fun'). This 'fun', which is now part of a planned future event, then gets discussed in more detail by both participants.

A particular kind of closing consists of putting off final arrangements to a future time, an example of which was discussed in section 5.1.3 above. As Clayman and Heritage state, "the act of deferring itself constitutes an arrangement that is subject to the same contingencies and processes of acceptance and sequence closure" (2014, p. 297). In the next chapter, I will look at how participants can present an alternative course of action when faced with an impasse, allowing to close the arrangement-making, put it on hold or move it forward.

6 Proposing an alternative to solve an impasse: the case of ANDERS DAN

6.1 Introduction

In Excerpt 27, I showed an example of an arrangement-making sequence that is put on hold until the arrangement can be finalized in a future encounter. In that instance, a temporary agreement is put in place. As the whole arrangement-making process is quite variable in the way it unfolds in a specific situation, there are different ways to defer a final decision to a later time, and for different reasons. In this chapter, I explore a particular resource interactants use to mark and manage such deferrals: the adverb combination *anders dan* in proposals that put forward an alternative to overcome an impasse in the arrangement-making. This makes the closing (for now) of an arrangement-making activity possible.

6.2 ANDERS DAN and some of its uses

Before presenting that particular use of *anders dan*, I will give a short overview of the established meanings of *anders dan* as presented in traditional grammars and dictionaries. I will then comment on some occurrences of *anders dan* in my data in an endeavour to discover some of the functions and placements of this adverb combination.

In general, *anders* expresses a sense of difference or contrast between concepts or clauses. It can be used both as an adjective and an adverb. As an adjective, it simply means 'different' and in certain combinations it corresponds to the English 'else' in expressions such as *iets anders* 'something else' or *iemand anders* 'someone else'. The conjunction *dan* means both *than* and *then*, and *anders dan* can be used to indicate the inequality of two elements, either phrases or clauses (Haeseryn et al., 1997). For example: *Deze jas is anders dan die jas* 'This coat is different from/than that coat' or *Hij loopt anders dan zijn broer* 'He walks differently than his brother'.

In this chapter, however, I will leave this comparing *anders dan* aside and concentrate on the adverb combination *anders dan* where *dan* is used as a deictic adverb (Haeseryn et al.

1997), generally translatable in English as *then*. As a discourse particle, *dan* can occur both at the beginning and end of a turn, or turn-internally (Van der Wouden & Foolen, 2011, 2021). When used at the beginning of a turn, its function can be that of a conjunctive adverb (Van der Wouden & Foolen, 2011).

Anders as an adverb has a variety of meanings. It is classified by meaning as an qualitative adverb (Haeseryn et al., 1997), and by function as an indefinite adverb (Haeseryn et al., 1997). The *Dikke Van Dale*, the most authorative dictionary of the Dutch language, lists 10 meanings (Van Dale, n.d.). Most of them include the semantic element of difference: in a different way, under different circumstances, at another time. I have, however, not found a description of the combination of *anders* and *dan* (as a deictic adverb), not in dictionaries and grammars[12], nor in articles in the CA or discourse analysis fields.

A first impression from the occurrences in my data sample is that *anders dan* does not have one single meaning or function; for that reason, I will not translate it in the analysis, and will render it as ANDERS DAN. Further analysis will have to determine if ANDERS DAN as a whole can be classified as a particle or discourse maker. However, since *dan* has been classified as such (Van der Wouden & Foolen, 2011, 2021; Foolen & Van der Wouden 2025), I will follow the approach outlined by Bolden in her article on the analysis of particles (2024) and ground my analysis in the deployment of this adverb combination, focussing on placement, prosodic realization and aspects of turn design. The scope of this chapter will not allow me do explore ANDERS DAN extensively, but I will make some observations that may help to separate a number of its functions.

6.2.1 ANDERS DAN to introduce a solution

In my collection, I found that ANDERS DAN (and also *anders* by itself) occurs in different positions, both on turn level as on sequence level. In Excerpt 28, ANDERS DAN appears at the beginning of a turn, preceded by the conjunction *en* 'and' (line 25) which links it to the

[12] In the ANS (*Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst*, 'General Dutch Grammar') (Haeseryn et al., 1997), a search for *anders dan* in the examples yields a few occurrences, but these examples are all used to illustrate different grammar or usage points and the meaning or function of *anders dan* is not addressed.

preceding turn by the same speaker (line 27). These two turns are separated by ja 'yes' with a slightly falling prosodic contour (line 26).

The excerpt is taken from conversation between a father (Henk, HEN) and adult daughter (Suzanne, SUZ) who are trying to find the best time and place for Henk to deliver a box to Suzanne. They are exploring options to do this the next day, when Henk will stop by Suzanne's work to drop off a small bag. Lines 15 to 19 form the end of that arrangement-making sequence. In line 20, Suzanne introduces *die doos* 'that box' as a possible addition to the drop-off of the bag. The use of the deictic indicates that the identity of the box is shared knowledge between Suzanne and Henk. It has not been previously mentioned in this conversation.

Excerpt 28 CGN fn008330 (box) 3:14-4:15

15 HEN: je bent morgen wel na tienen op 't max planck?
you are tomorrow PRT after ten at the ((name))
you will be at the Max Planck tomorrow after ten AM?

16 SUZ: ja ik ben daar gewoon uh
yes I am there simply uh
Yes, I'll just be there uh

17 HEN: okee↓↑
okay

18 SUZ: vanaf een uur of negen denk ik
from an hour or nine think I
as off about nine o'clock I think

19 HEN: okee↓ dan moeten we misschien eventjes uh
okay then must we maybe PRT
Okay, then maybe we should just uh

20 SUZ: ja ik zat te denken of t handig is dat jullie ook die doos
yes I sat to think if it handy is that you.PL also that box
yes, I was thinking if it might be handy if you would also

21 al meenemen maar da's nie handig want dan
already take-with but that's not handy because then
bring that box with you already, but that's not handy because then

21a zit ik met 'n doos
sit I with a box
I'm stuck with a box

22 HEN: ja want uh ja we willen die doos wel uh bij jou neerzetten op
yes because uh yes we want that box PRT uh at you put-down on
yes, because uh, yes we don't <u>mind</u> depositing that box at your place in the

23 janstraat maar dan staat ie buite
((street name)) but then stands it outside
Janstraat, but then it will be sitting outside

24 SUZ: ja_
yes

25 HEN: en anders dan moeten we weer <u>heel</u> moeilijk met <u>sleutels</u> doen,
and ANDERS DAN must we again very difficult with keys do
and ANDERS DAN we have to deal with a big hassle with keys

26 SUZ: ja ik zit te denke [maar en (ik ben)]
yes I sit to think but and (I am)
yes, I'm thinking but and (I am)

27 HEN: [hebben wij] trouwens een sl- hadden
have we actually a k- had
do we actually have a k- did

28 wij w- hadden wij een [sleu-
we PRT- had we a ke-
we act- did we have a ke-

29 SUZ: [ja:_ volgens mij hebben jullie
yes according-to me have you
yes, I believe you have

29a een <u>voordeur</u>sleutel,
a front-door-key
a key to the front door

Suzanne introduces the box drop-off as an add-on to the previously arranged return of her bag. In the same turn, she rejects this as inconvenient (lines 20-21a). Henk proposes an alternative way to deliver the box in lines 22-23, but signals a drawback to this solution: the box will be outside. The use of the particle *wel* in the proposal foreshadows the *maar* 'but' that introduces the drawback of the proposal. *Wel* is used to express contrast (Hogeweg, 2009). There is no equivalent in English, where this contrast would be achieved by prosodic means (Seuren & Huiskes, 2017). The turn is designed to reduce the preference for acceptance (Clayman & Heritage, 2014). Suzanne's *ja* 'yes' seems to be in response to line 23, acknowledging the drawback (line 24). In any case, Henk does not interpret it as an acceptance of this proposal, because in line 25, Henk introduces a possible action to avoid the drawback, using ANDERS DAN. By linking it to his previous turn with *en* 'and', the

continuity with the first drawback projects this as a solution, but one that is not ideal. Through his word choice *heel moeilijk doen* 'deal with a big hassle', Henk presents this step as an undesirable course of action. Suzanne acknowledges this and starts formulating an alternative plan. As it turns out (15 lines and several interruptions later), she presents an alternative to both the box being outside and dealing with key by proposing to stay home (not shown).

In this excerpt, ANDERS DAN is part of an expansion of the proposal, the first expansion being the end of the first turn (starting with *maar* 'but') that introduces an (undesirable) result of the proposed action. The second part (though not a second pair part, as it is the same speaker) is connected to the first expansion TCU with *en* 'and'. It introduces a means (*sleutels* 'keys') that would avoid the first result and allow the (not stated) alternative, namely putting the box inside. ANDERS DAN presents an alternative to the (negative) result of the initial proposal, which through its semantic design is presented as an argument to abandon this proposal for time and place of the transfer of the box. Note that Suzanne never provides a second pair part to the first pair part in line 22, aligning instead with the undesirability of the results, and that Henk does not pursue a response either.

6.2.2 ANDERS DAN to introduce a hypothetical undesirable consequence

Another example of *anders dan* appears in line 58 of Excerpt 29 below. It is taken from the same conversation as Excerpt 28 between Henk and Suzanne. In the time between Excerpt 28 and this one, Henk has mentioned that they (him and Marianne, presumably his partner) will surely come to Suzanne's city again some time soon. Without explicitly saying they will bring the box, this is what both Henk and Suzanne orient to. He gives an account for the likelihood of a future visit starting in line 46.

Excerpt 29 CGN fn008330 (box) 4:38 - 5:00

46 HEN: nee: en ook als Marianne hier straks met dat hondje zit
no and also if ((person name)) here shortly with that dog.DIM sits
no and also if Marianne is sitting here in a short while with that doggy

47 ja uh dat zij nou uh alt- altijd [hier] wil zitten=
yes uh that she PRT uh alw- always here wants sit
you see, and that she, well, alw- always wants to stay here (at home)

48 SUZ: [ja]
yes

49 HEN: =dat wil nie zegge dat ik altijd uh
that wants not say that I always uh
that doesn't mean that I always

50 [op dat beest z'n staart hoef te zitten]
on that animal its tail need to sit
have to be sitting on that animal's tail

51 SUZ: [nee dan kun je natuurlijk wel uh]
no then can you of-course PRT uh
no, then you can of course

52 HEN: kom maar dan ga 'k wel een keer een dagje weg
come PRT then go I PRT a time a day away
come on, then I'll go away for a day sometime

53 SUZ: okee.=
okay

54 HEN: =kom ik w- een keer een dagje naar Nijmegen uh iets
come I PRT- a time a day to ((town name)) uh something
(then I'll) come sometime for a day to Nijmegen uh

55 leuks doen een of ander [uh] museum [of] u:h ja weet ik wat,
fun do one or other uh museum or uh yes know I what
to do something fun, some kind of uh musuem or uh, yeah, whatever

56 SUZ: [ja] [ja]
yes *yes*

57 SUZ: ja_
yes

58 HEN: want uh anders dan krijg ik de hondeziekte uh
because uh ANDERS DAN get I the dog-sickness uh
because uh if not (then) I'll go dog crazy uh

59 SUZ: ja.
yes

60 HEN: °ben ik bang°
am I afraid
I'm afraid

Nee 'no' in line 46 provides agreement with a prior turn (not shown). Although Henk has stated previously 'we' will come again some time, Henk switches in line 49 to 'I' statements, confirming that a perceived obstacle (*dat hondje* 'that puppy') does not actually impede the execution of this promise. He provides an account for why the proposal (to come another

time) would not be an imposition (lines 52, 54-55). In line 58, he suggests that this might even provide a benefit for him. This benefit is introduced with ANDERS DAN.

As in Excerpt 28, ANDERS DAN is produced towards the beginning of a TCU that is part of a longer turn. It is preceded by the causal conjunction *want* 'because', linking it to the statement outlining a future action (lines 54-55) and separated from it by an agreement token from the other participant. The use of ANDERS DAN in this statement serves to oppose the situation of going out and *iets leuks doen* 'do something fun' (line 53-54) to staying at home and *krijg(en) de hondeziekte* 'going dog crazy' (line 58). ANDERS DAN is used to contrast these two alternatives in the following construction: *X,* ANDERS DAN *Y* 'if not X, then Y'. Other ways to render is could be "X, otherwise Y" and "X, or alternatively Y". If Henk does not get out, then he is afraid (line 60) he will go dog crazy.

6.2.3 Commonalities of ANDERS DAN in extended turns

The unifying factor in these two examples is that the alternatives contrasted by ANDERS DAN are produced by the same speaker and that they introduce the final TCU of an extended turn. But whereas in Excerpt 28 the alternative introduced by ANDERS DAN was a possible (undesirable) solution to a problem, in Excerpt 29 ANDERS DAN introduces a likely (negative) consequence of *not* doing the alternative.

In my data, I found 11 occurrences of ANDERS DAN as part of an extended turn, six of which fall into the second categorie: introducing a hypothetical undesirable consequence. A certain action needs to be taken (X) to avoid an undesirable result (Y). The end of Excerpt 19 (presented previously on page 55) contains another example of this use.

Excerpt 19 (partial) CGN fn008350 (oeuvre) 4:24 - 4:42

13 THO: nou wanneer gaan we dat uh wanneer spreken wij wat af:.
PRT when go we that uh when agree.on we something
'Well, when are we going to (do) that uh when are we going to get together'

14 Jij [en] ik.
You and I

15 ROB: [uh]

16 ↓ah ↑zo:: ja nee ik was het even helemaal kwijt waar je 't
ah so yes no I was it PRT completely lost where you it
Ah, right. Yes, no, for a moment there I had no idea what you were talking about'

17 over ha[d nee] ja natuurlijk wij moeten samen nog uh wat uh
about had no yes of-course we must together yet uh some uh
'no, yes, of course, the two of us need to

18 THO: [ja]

19 ROB: muziek instuderen ee:h ja dat kan ieder gewenst moment, uh
music practice ayh yes that can any desired moment
'practise some music yet. Uh, yeah, we can do that any time, uh

20 maar laten we daar de agenda even bijpakken want
but let we there the planner PRT get-with because
'but let's take out the planner for that because'

21 anders dan blijft dat zo'n vage afspraak
ANDERS DAN stays that such-a vague appointment
'otherwise it will be such a vague appointment'

In the preceding lines, Thomas has hinted to the need for a future meeting, but Rob has had difficulty remembering what he is referring to. In line 13, Thomas asks an explicit question. This is followed by an inserted sequence in lines 16, 17 and 19. Rob produces the second pair part in line 19 *dat kan ieder gewenst moment* 'we can do that any time'. He then makes a suggestion in line 20, followed by an account for the suggestion. This account starts *anders dan* and is linked to the suggestion with the conjunction *want* 'because'. What follows after ANDERS DAN is an predictable and undesirable result of not following the suggestion. If they don't get their planners out (X) then the time and place to meet will be vague (Y).

The seventh instance of ANDERS DAN in an extended turn occurs in the description of a stair lift, where an element can be folded in (X), otherwise the door would not be able to open (Y). The last instance, shown in Excerpt 24, resembles the case analyzed in section 6.2.1. First an undesirable situation is presented, and ANDERS DAN introduces a solution, in this case (contrary to the situation in Excerpt 28), a feasible one. Excerpt 30 precedes Excerpt 16 (page 51) with the last lines here overlapping with the start of Excerpt 16. Iris's house has been renovated and the acoustics are still very bad. She has just described to her mother Nel that she will move in a large carpet tomorrow.

Excerpt 30 CGN fn008280 (visit) 7:58 - 8:07

01 IRI: en dan de gordijnen en dan eh ja hopen dat als
and then the curtains and then uh yeah hope that when
'and then the curtains and then eh yeah hoping that when

02 de rest van de meubels ´r is dat ´t dat ´t
the rest of the furniture there is that it that it
the rest of the furniture is in, that it, that it

03 beter wordt
better gets
will get better'

04 NEL: ja. [Nou dat zal wel zeg
yes. Well, that will PTC PTC
'Yes. Well, it should I´d say'

05 IRI: [anders dan moet leonie d'r nog wat aan doen ma-
ANDERS DAN must leonie there yet something to do bu-
'if not, Leonie will have to do something about it yet bu-'

wat zeg je?
what say you
'what did you say?'

06 NEL: ja dat zal toch zeker wel
yes that wil PTC certainly PTC
'Yes, I'm sure it will, won't it?'

07 IRI: jawe:l↓ zal ook wel
sure will PTC PTC
'oh sure, I guess it will'

In line 1 to 3, Iris described the desirable outcome of her actions: it (that is, the acoustics) will get better. In line 4, Nel produces an alignment token and shares this expectation. This is in overlap with Iris, who continues her turn with ANDERS DAN, providing an alternative, next-step solution. In this case, as in Excerpt 28, the negative situation is presented first, and a possible remediation is introduced by ANDERS DAN. Whereas in Excerpt 28, the remediation was still problematic, here it is presented as the determined course of action. However, the solution presented by Iris involves a third party, and Nel is not part of the decision-making process. Therefore, there is no need for negotiation or agreement.

A thorough analysis of the different functions and meanings of ANDERS DAN, as well as its similarities and differences from the use of *anders* without *dan* is outside of the scope of this thesis. This short overview will however provide the context for the analysis of ANDERS DAN in specific phases of arrangement-making in the next section.

6.3 ANDERS DAN to propose an alternative, making closure possible

Excerpt 31 below illustrates the use of ANDERS DAN in a first-pair turn. I will try to show how it is distinct in both its positionality and turn design and how, in arrangement-making sequences, it may contribute to progressing the overall joint activity.

Femke (FEM) and Martin (MAR) are friends and Martin is concluding a telling of having forgotten a friend's birthday (line 1). In line 4, Femke proffers a new topic by asking about Martin's upcoming plans. The use of *al* 'yet' and the fact that Femke does not explicate the activity that is implied (thus presupposing shared knowledge) indicates that an invitation has been extended in the past and a decision from Martin is pending. Femke's question thus pursues the relevant second pair part to the invitation. In line 5, Martin replies with an affirmative, which seems to be taken by Femke as addressing the question *weet je al* 'do you know yet' but not yet the invitation: In line 6, Femke's *ja* 'yes' has a more pronounced contour than Martin's *ja* in line 5, which contributes to pursuing the answer to the inviation to come on Sunday. Martin provides a more substantial response in line 7 with a response particle and clausal repeat, *ja wij komen zondag* 'yes, we are coming on Sunday', also making explicit with *wij* 'we' that someone else, presumably Martin's partner Nina (see also line 22) is coming with him.

Excerpt 31 CGN fn008050 (Sunday) 06:56 - 7:43

01 MAR: ja was echt uh echt heel slecht allemaal [van mezelf.]
yes was really uh really very bad all of me
'yes, all that was really, uh really very bad on my part'

02 FEM: [hu-uh]

03 mm↓=

04 FEM: =weet je al of dat je zondag uh komt.
know you yet if that you sunday uh come
Do you know yet if you are coming on Sunday?

05 MAR: ja↑↓
yes

06 FEM: ja:↑↓=
yes

07 MAR: =ja wij komen zondag
yes we come sunday
Yes, we're coming on Sunday

08 FEM: nou dat vind ik leu:k,
well that find I nice
Well, I'm glad

09 MAR: i[k (wil)]

10 FEM: [en eet] je ook mee:?
and eat you.sg also with
and are you also eating with us?

11 MAR: hè?
huh?

12 FEM: eten jullie ook mee?
eat you.pl also with
are you also eating with us?

13 MAR: ook meeëten, uh: ja 'k denk 't wel °'k denk 't wel°
also eat-with uh yes I think it PART I think it PART
also eat with you uh yes I think so, I think so

14 FEM: °°ja. denk 't wel°°
yes think it PRT
yes. think so

15 MAR: dat wil jij natuurlijk weten voor de boodschappen
that want you of-course know for the groceries
you'll want to know for (getting) groceries of course

16 FEM: ja precies want de rest 'k bedoel uh taart of chips of
yes exactly because the rest I mean uh cake or chips or
yes, exactly, because the rest, I mean uh cake or chips or

17 weet ik veel wat uh da komt wel goed of zo maar als
know I much what uh that comes PART good or so but if
whatever else, that will all work out, but if

18 ik echt uh als 't mooi weer is gaan we namelijk barbecuen
I really uh if it nice weather is go we namely barbecue
I really uh if the weather is nice we'll have a barbecue, you see

19 ja dan moet je wel een beetje weten hoeveel vlees en
yes then must you PRT a bit.dim know hoe-much meat and
well, then you kind of need to know how much meat and

20 zo je wil hebben.
such you want have
such you want to have

21 MAR: ja ja ja precies
yes yes yes exactly

22 uhm ja nina zit nou beneden dus ik kan nou niet
uhm yeah ((person name)) sits now downstairs so I can't now not
uhm yeah, Nina is downstairs now, so I can't

23 meteen overleggen maar [ik] uh
right-away discuss but I uh
discuss it (with them) right this moment, but I uh

24 FEM: [ja]
yes

25 FEM: nee maar anders dan mail van de week ik [bedoel]=
no but ANDERS DAN email of the week I mean
no but ANDERS DAN e-mail (me) this week, I mean

26 MAR: [ja]
yeah

27 FEM: =ik doe toch zaterdagochtend boodschappen
I do PRT saturday-morning groceries
I am doing groceries Saturday morning anyway

28 MAR: o:↑kee.
okay

29 FEM: als ik 't dan zeg maar [vrijdag weet
if I it than say PRT friday know
if I know by say Friday then

30 MAR: [nee maar dan la- laat ik wel
no but than le- let I PRT
no, but then I'll let (you)

31 ruim van tevoren of vrijdag dan weten
well of before or friday then know
know well in advance, or Friday then

32 FEM: o:kee;
okay

33 MAR: heel ruim van tevoren kan natuurlijk al niet meer 😊h.h.h.😊
very well of before can of-course already not more
of course it can't be really well in advance anymore

34 FEM: 😊 nee dat kan al niet meer ha ha ha 😊
no that can already not anymore ha ha ha
no that's not possible anymore, ha ha ha

35 MAR: .hhh

36 FEM: 😊 nee da's waar ja 😊
no that's true yes
no, that's true, indeed

37 MAR: 😊 uh huh 😊

38 MAR: mooi, ja_
nice yeah

39 FEM: mm↑-mm_

40 MAR: ach ja nou en dan uh ah we hadden afgelopen weekend
ah yeah well and then uh ah we had last weekend
ah yeah well, and then last weekend we celebrated

41 hemelvaarstweekend gevierd
ascension-weekend celebrated
Ascension weekend

In line 8, Femke gives a positive assessment as sequence-closing third (Schegloff 2007) of the invitation sequence and then produces a follow-up inquiry in line 10: *en eet je ook mee* 'and are you also eating here'. This is an addition to the original plan, another invitation, that Martin has clearly not considered[13]. Martin first produces an open-class other-initiated repair in line 11, likely because he didn't hear what Femke said (their talk overlaps on the main verb of her question) (Drew, 1997; Dingemanse et al., 2015). This prompts Femke to repeat the question, this time using the second person plural pronoun. In line 13, Martin first repeats part of the prior turn (albeit with a grammatical modification to the verb: an infinitive form is used). He then hesitates briefly and gives a weak commitment with an affirmative particle and "I think so", which he repeats more softly. Femke responds with an inhale and a very soft repeat of Martin's answer (line 14), as if deciding how to build on his response or what to conclude from it for her next actions. Martin seems to interpret this as his response not having been satisfactory. Instead of waiting for Femke to pursue a commitment, Martin pre-empts this by indicating that he understands the need for this commitment in line 15. With *natuurlijk* 'of course', he frames this as a reasonable expectation. Femke readily agrees with this assessment of the situation in line 16 and produces an extended turn in which she accounts for the need to have an advance dinner guest count. In line 21, Martin aligns with Femke's explanation and then accounts for his inability to fully commit in this moment: his partner is not available for consultation. In lines 25/27, Femke offers a solution to this impasse by suggesting that Martin email her before she goes grocery shopping. As an invitation projects a response (Margutti et al.,

[13] In the Netherlands, a birthday celebration (as this seems to be) typically includes coffee and cake followed by drinks and snacks. A meal is generally not included, unless explicitly mentioned.

2018), Martin is expected to provide one. However, invitations are "considered free from obligation, urgency or need" (Margutti et al., 2018, p.53), and Femke accompanies her suggestion of e-mailing with an account that indicates to Martin that though there is a practical deadline, there is no rush. The account is formulated to show this, particularly the use of *toch*. The particle *toch* is is difficult to capture and is sometimes left untranslated (Seuren & Huiskes, 2017). In the context we see here, it can be qualified as "causal *toch*" (Foolen, 1994, p. 83). Foolen proposes a 3-step description of its meaning in a sentence (1994, p. 84). Applying his method, this is how *toch* is hearable in the current context:

1. I am going grocery shopping.
2. You might think I am going grocery shopping early in the week.
3. But that thought is incorrect, I am not going grocery shopping until Saturday.
   So you have time to e-mail me and don't have to tell me right now.

The conclusion in step 3 is not part of the meaning of *toch,* but it is a causative interpretation that occurs in relation to the first part of the utterance (Foolen, 1994): *mail van de week* 'email (me) this week'.

Femke starts this turn with ‘nee’, which seems to function in a similar way to English 'no' as a disjunction marker to signal that what follows is a departure from what has been discussed before (Schegloff, 2001; Raclaw, 2013). Both Schegloff and Raclaw included instances of 'no but' in their analysis, and *maar* 'but' has been signaled as a skip-connect device as well (Mazeland & Huiskes, 2001). Prosodically, there is no pause between *nee* and *maar*, both words being integrated into the TCU. As Femke has already signalled her understanding of Martin's inability to decide right now (line 24), *nee* 'no' at the start of line 25 can be interpreted as a shift and a reconnection to the mutually pursued goal of coming to an arrangement. With ANDERS DAN followed by a bare imperative, Femke proposes a solution to the impasse.

Martin agrees with *okee* 'okay' in line 28, which projects compliance with the request and provides with a clausal confirmation (line 31) after Femke has indicated when she needs to receive this e-mail in line 30. Femke accepts this commitment in line 32 with a sequence-

closing *okee* 'okay' (Mondada & Sorjonen, 2021). Martin then initiates a post-expansion, doing what Schegloff proposed to name a 'post-mortem' (2007, p. 143), with Femke joining in (lines 33-37). After this, Martin closes the topic with *mooi* 'good' and *ja* 'yeah' (line 38). Femke doesn't add to the topic either, responding instead with a *mm-mm* (line 39). This allows Martin to move to a another topic in line 40. He signals the ending of the topic with *ach ja*, with which Dutch speakers seem to classify what precedes as sufficiently discussed. It carries a note of "that's the way it is", which in English can be conveyed by *ah well*. It seems closer to German *naja* as break with the earlier subject (Golato, 2018) then to the very similar-looking particle combination *achja* (Betz & Golato, 2008).

The use of ANDERS DAN in this excerpt has both similarities and differences from the instances described above. Sequentially, it is not part of an extended turn. Syntactically, it is followed by an imperative, where the previous instances were followed by a finite verb in the present tense. Semantically, there is overlap with the use of ANDERS DAN in Excerpt 28 (bos sitting outside) and Excerpt 30 (bad acoustics), in that ANDERS DAN presents the remediation of a negative situation. However, in the former instances, the situation and remediation are presented as hypothetical and/or as being the responsibility of a third party, whereas here, the situation and remediation are in the present, concern a joint project, and project action that is immediate or in the near future.

Due to circumstances out of either Femke's or Martin's control, Martin is not able to provide a fitting answer to Femke's invitation. The use of ANDERS DAN combined with an imperative makes this hearable as an instruction on how and when to fulfill the answer requirement. After Martin's commitment to fulfill the requirement in time, the path is open to closing the sequence (and possibly the conversation).

We see the same use of ANDERS DAN in Excerpt 32. Danielle (DAN), the caller, and Mariska (MAR) have been trying to reschedule a time to see each other. In the beginning of the conversation, a time conflict comes to light. Danielle assumes they will see each other two days later, a Friday night. Her friend Mariska thinks it is the next day, Thursday night. In the mean time, both of them have other commitments on the night they assumed to be free. So

far, they have not been able to find an alternative time to meet. Danielle has a family get-together Sunday afternoon and Mariska has asked if Danielle wants to come for dinner afterwards. Danielle explains that the party includes an early meal and that, as a result, she will not need to eat anymore (line 36-37). This is hearable as declining Mariska's dinner invitation, and Mariska hears it this way: she echoes Danielle's words (partially in overlap), adding that she understands (line 37).

Excerpt 32 CGN fn006726 (time to meet) 4:18-4:42

36 DAN: maar dan hoe- hoef ik inderdaad eh
but then nee- need I indeed uh
'but then I don't nee- need

37 [niet meer te eten]
not anymore to eat
to eat anymore, indeed'

37 MAR: [dan hoef je niet] meer te eten nee dat snap ik
then need you not anymore to eat no that get I
'then you don't need to eat anymore, no, I get it'

38 DAN: mja
yeah

39 MAR: o ja [nou ja goed;] 't was [maar een ideetje (maar)]
oh yeah oh well fine it wat just an ideaDIM
'oh yeah, oh well fine, it was just an idea'

40 DAN: [.hh] [was anders]
was otherwise
'would otherwise

41 DAN: wel heel leuk geweest
PTL very fun been
have been really nice'

42 MAR: ja [als] je nou toch in de buurt was geweest
yeah if you now anyway in the neighbourhood had been
'yeah, if you would have been around here anyway

43 DAN: [ja]

44 MAR: dan was 't natuurlijk wel l[euk geweest]
then had it of-course PTL nice been
then it would of course have been nice'

45 DAN: [dan was 't] wel leuk geweest ja
then had it PTL nice been yeah
'then it would have been nice, yeah'

46 MAR: **.h nou ja anders dan anders dan maken we gewoon**
well yeah ANDERS DAN ANDERS DAN make we just
'well, yeah, ANDERS DAN, ANDERS DAN we'll just find a time

47 **voor dan voor voor voor die week d'rop dan een afspraak**
for then for for for that week after then an appointment
for then for for for that week after then,

47a **of niet?**
or not
right?

48 DAN: ja dat [moeten we] dan maar even doen ja 😊 haha 😊
yeah that must we dan PTL PTL do yes haha
'yeah, we'll have to do that then, yeah, ha ha'

49 MAR: [ja want]
yes because
'yes because'

50 MAR: want want ook al als ik aanstaande vrijdag zou komen
because because even i- if I next friday would come
'because because even i- if I came next Friday

51 dan moet je nog zaterdag om kwart voor acht werken
then must you still Saturday at quarter to eight work
you would still have to work at a quarter past eight on Saturday'

52 DAN: ja precies
yes precisely
'yes, precisely'

53 MAR: en i-ik ga zaterdag echt niet om half acht m'n bed uit
and I- I go Saturday really not at half eight my bed out
'and I- I am really not getting up at seven thirty or so on a Saturday

54 of zo [op zich] als je 't niet heel erg vindt
or so in itself if you it not very much mind
in any case, if you don't mind!'

55 DAN: 😊 [hi hi] 😊
hee hee

56 DAN: 😊 hi hi nee dat uh kan ik me voorstellen 😊
hee hee no that uh can I me imagine
'hee hee, no, I uh can imagine'

In lines 39 to 45, both friends agree that it would have been a good plan, had it worked. In line 46, Mariska gives up on finding a time to meet on the weekend and uses ANDERS DAN to make a proposal that will allow them to move forward (i.e., to consider other options). She starts her turn with *nou ja,* a Dutch discourse marker that can signal that the speaker is abandoning a topic (Mazeland, 2016), followed by ANDERS DAN, which she repeats. This

could indicate that she is ready to propose a solution, but is still searching for it. Her suggestion to find a time for the week after is made as a statement using *we* 'wij', which shows she views this as a joint project. With the tag question *of niet* 'or not', she recognizes Danielle's deontic rights to weigh in on the decision, but also displays her stance that agreement is more likely (see Drake et al., 2021, on such uses in German interaction). Danielle does indeed agree and ends her turn with slight laughter. This may be to display embarassment over the need to push the meet-up beyond the weekend, linked to the fact that earlier in the conversation, she assumed responsibility for the mix-up of the first arrangement. In line 49, Mariska starts a post-expansion, which, just as in Excerpt 31, could be considered a 'post-mortem' (Schegloff, 2007). Since Mariska stated earlier (not shown) that she does not want to cancel the commitment she has on Friday evening, the situation she describes is hypothetical and not an alternate option; Danielle's new work schedule is only an added factor. After this excerpt, Danielle expands on her work schedule (not shown) and the call is cut off without a new time being arranged. In a later conversation in the corpus (fn006727), the two interactants do end up finalizing a time and place to meet up.

The option introduced by ANDERS DAN in Excerpt 32 allows the participants to move towards closure of the arrangement-making activity by agreeing on an interim solution: making an appointment for a later date. Both participants seem to orient to this as the end of the activity, as they do not proceed by trying to find a later date, but instead move on to the topic of Danielle's new work schedule. However, since the call is cut-off, the possibility of them returning to the arrangement topic is open.

In Excerpt 33, ANDERS DAN is used to provide another option to accomplish an arrangement-making step. Kim has just told her mother Janny (JAN) that she tried to call her grandparents, but then realized they might be napping, so she hung up. Kim has not yet stated why she tried to call them and in line 2 Janny makes an assumption about the reason.

Excerpt 33 CGN fn008045 (invitation) 7:51 - 7:59

01 KIM: dus heb 'k opgehangen.
so have I hung_up
'so I hung up'

02 JAN: oh ja. want uh ja over zondag natuurlijk hè, nu jouw verjaardag.
oh yes because uh yes about sunday of_course PRT now your birthday
'oh yes, because uh yes, about Sunday of course, right, it's your birthday'

03 KIM: ja.
yes

04 JAN: m[aar
but

05 KIM: [daarom wilde ik ze inderdaad uitnodigen.
that's_why wanted I them indeed invite
'that's indeed why I wanted to invite them'

06 JAN: ja.
yes

07 KIM: daarom wilde ik ze even bellen
that's_why wanted I them PRT call
that's why I wanted to call them

08 JAN: **ja_ anders dan uh ja dan wil ik 't wel vragen**
yes ANDERS DAN uh yes then want I it PRT ask
yes ANDERS DAN uh yes then I don't mind asking

09 [als 'k ze zie.]
if/when I them see
if/when I see them

10 KIM: [ja:_ 's goed.]
yes is good
yes, okay

11 JAN: en als ik ze dan zie. ma als ik ze spreek
and if I them then see. but if I them speak_to
and if I see them then. But if I speak to them

12 JAN: ma als ik ze niet hoor nou dan hoor je 't wel
but if I them not hear PRT then hear you it PRT
but if I don't hear them, well then I'll let you know

13 KIM: ja_ en [ik heb nu]
yes and I have now

14 JAN: [heb je Ricky al geb-]
have you ((person name)) yet ca-
Did you ca- Ricky yet?

15 KIM: ja_ ik heb Ricky gebeld.
yes I have ((person name)) called.
Yes, I called Ricky.

In lines 3 to 7, Kim confirms and explains that Janny's assumption is correct: she wanted to invite her grandparents to celebrate her birthday. In line 8, Janny offers to Kim to extend the invitation on her behalf, an offer that Kim accepts immediately with a full acceptance *ja* and *is goed* (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1987). In lines 11 and 12, Janny explains the execution of the offer is conditional on her getting a hold of them, promising to let Kim know if not. In line 15, Janny asks about another potential invitee, and Kim confirms having spoken to him. The arrangement of inviting the grandparents is not revisited, which indicates that both participants orient to it being finalized.

In this instance, ANDERS DAN provides a course of action after a first attempt has failed. It is presented as an alternative to an unnamed option, that of Kim trying to get a hold of her grandparents another time. It's presumably a less onerous option, as Janny had previously stated that she planned to visit them. This may account for the immediate acceptance of the offer, without any hedging (Curl & Drew, 2008; Clayman & Heritage, 2014). Notable in this instance is that Janny, who was not previously part of the arrangement-making, now volunteers to participate in it.

6.4 Chapter summary

In this chapter, I have tried to describe some uses of the adverbial combination ANDERS DAN. After an exploration of the core meanings of *anders* and *dan,* I concluded that the combination of *anders* with *dan* needed to be analyzed in context to be able to understand its function in organizing talk.

After analyzing instances where ANDERS DAN was part of an extended turn, it emerged that ANDERS DAN can be used in two different situations. The common factor was linked to the core meaning of *anders*, namely 'different': two situations or courses of action are contrasted. In all my instances in extended turns, these situations or courses of action were hypothetical or generalized. The difference lay in the link established between the two options or alternatives. In one group, discussed in section 6.2.1, the proposition following ANDERS DAN introduces a solution to the preceding option. In the other group, discussed in

section 6.2.2, ANDERS DAN introduces an undesirable situation that could arise if the preceding option were not to be realized.

In section 6.3, I analyzed a use that first attracted my attention when examining arrangement-making sequences. When making arrangements, the desired outcome is to reach agreement on time, place and manner of a joint project (Heritage & Clayman, 2024). However, there may be obstacles to reach that goal that can't be overcome in the course of the conversation, or where a less onerous next-step might be available. Alternative options to the solution that was being pursued can help move the arrangement-making forward or redirect its course. One way to introduce these alternatives is with the adverbial group ANDERS DAN. In these instances, ANDERS DAN is part of a first pair part, and the alternative proposed makes a response relevant.

In this analysis, I have left out instances where *anders* was used without *dan* in similar positions. A more extended examination of this use is needed to determine the role of *dan* in this adverbial combination.

The use of ANDERS DAN to propose an alternative does not seem limited to arrangement-making sequences and a more in-depth analysis may further determine whether the type of sequence influences its function.

7 Conclusion

7.1 Findings

In this thesis, I set out to show the complexity and context-dependency of arrangement-making sequences in Dutch telephone conversations. My goal was to find out if the framework established by Heritage and Clayman (2024), which was based on data in British and American English, was valid for and confirmed in Dutch data. By analyzing 16 arrangement-making sequences and then mapping them against Heritage and Clayman's framework (2024), I was able to ascertain that many of the arrangement phases they described for English were also present in my Dutch data. In my analysis, I focused on the launch and closing phases of arrangement-making packages. However, beyond this more detailed analytic work, I was able to recognize other elements pointed out by Heritage and Clayman, such as the progressive granularity on timing arrangements (see Excerpt 22) and the step-by-step progression through stages of arranging the activity, the place and the timing of the joint activity.

One task for participants in arrangement-making is to make recognizable, and recognize, its beginnings and ends: In my data, 11 arrangement-making sequences (out of 16) were launched by referring to a partially arranged joint project. In my analysis, I tried to ascertain how participants make visible to each other that they are referring to an earlier conversation. I found that deictics (*dat, die* 'that') were used (Schegloff, 1996) as well as particles like *al* 'already' or *nog* 'still, yet', which participants in this context use to reactivate an earlier discussed plan or a previously issued invitation. These resources were used in addition to discourse markers that commonly signal a new topic, such as *hé* 'hey' or *oh* (rising intonation), which were present in all arrangement-making sequences. When looking at the ends of arrangement-making sequences, I found that evaluative assessments are produced *after* the arrangement proper had been closed. Participants express looking forward to, for example, their joint vacation (Excerpt 13) or their planned outing (Excerpt 20). Once the plan is in place, and no longer is just a hypothetical event, the

participants start treating it as a future reality and assess it positively as something to anticipate. After this type of positive evaluations, a topic switch is initiated.

The internal cohesion of the overall arrangement-making package and the shared goal to achieve an arrangement allows for turn formats that are highly context-dependent, such elliptical phrases (Mazeland, 2021, p. 179). These occur especially in the negotiation part of the arrangement-making, where proposals are made and responded to in order to find mutually agreeable times or places. I encountered these in several conversations (see, for example, Excerpt 22). I focused specifically on the beginnings and endings of arrangement-making packages, and the way they are embedded in the wider conversation. I only touched briefly on the intricacies of the internal structures of the package in Dutch, and further research is needed to uncover and describe these in detail. I conclude that Dutch arrangement-making sequences can be mapped quite closely to the framework proposed by Heritage and Clayman (2024). The actions are the same, but the linguistic means by which they manage the tasks involved in making arrangements as a social activity are different, since a different language is involved. For Dutch, and in contrast to English, particles (and modal particles in particular) seem to play an important role in managing arrangement-making, for example in activating shared knowledge at the beginning of the activity, or when proposing a solution for a problem encountered along the way. This would be an interesting avenue for further comparative research.

In Chapter 6, I sketch the functions of the adverbial combination *anders than*, typically translated as 'otherwise', by looking at its specific contexts of use in arrangement-making. My initial observations, from which I formulated the hypothesis that this word group served as a discourse marker that contributes to putting an arrangement on hold by proposing an interim solution, proved to be only partially true. A bigger collection showed that, as in *anders dan* in other positions and context (also discussed in Chapter 6), the core meaning of 'alternative' is valid in the context of first pair-parts of certain proposal sequences in arrangement-making as well. In those *anders dan*-turns, an alternative option to the one being jointly pursued up to this point is proposed, and participants orient to this proposal

as proffering a closing. This can be a closing of the current stage or phase of arrangement-making or the closing of the full arrangement-making package.

7.2 Contribution

This research contributes to the wider field of conversation analysis, and more particularly to work on longer stretches of talk - what has been termed *big package* (Sacks, 1995; Jefferson, 1988; Heritage & Clayman, 2024), *sequences of sequences* (Schegloff, 2007) and *activity* (Heritage & Sorjonen, 1984; Mazeland, 2019, 2021). Harvey Sacks, in his lecture on long sequences, outlines the complexity of finding the coherence of big packages and defining such packages, stating that this research was at "a primitive state" (1995, p. 358). The work in this thesis builds on Dutch research, specifically Mazeland's work on activities (2019, 2021), and expands on his discussion of an example of an arrangement-making sequence (Mazeland, 2019, pp. 39-42; 2021, pp. 168-171). It also serves as a cross-linguistic comparison to the recent work on arrangement-making by Heritage and Clayman (2024).

My analysis of *anders dan* in Chapter 6 in particular contributes to research on discourse markers and underscores the importance of sequential and turn-internal context in the interpretation of the function of discourse markers (Bolden, 2024). My research experience on this topic confirmed the truth of the warning issued by Bolden (2024) to novice researchers in the field interested in pursuing work on 'little words' in interaction: the "initial simplicity [of being easily noticeable and collectable] hides enormous analytic challenges that arise throughout the investigation, from figuring out what actually constitutes a collection to providing proper evidence for one's claims" (p. 615). I feel that I have only scratched the surface of the variety of ways in which the expression *anders dan* can be used, as well as the functions of *anders* without the addition of *dan*.

This research was initially motivated by cross-linguistic observations in my personal life and my professional work as a translator. As the direction of the research changed in the course of engaging with what I saw in the recorded data, I realized that the ways in which arrangement-making is introduced, the general structure of its unfolding, and the way

arrangement-making sequences are closed are related very closely to Dutch language teaching as well. Making arrangements is generally one of the first topics in language courses - students are, for example, instructed to work in small groups and propose an activity, discuss availability and report back with the plan they have arranged together. I was pleased to find that several key phrases that are taught in my textbook were also present in my data. The dialogue presented in the textbook mirrors the key stages of launch, arrangement-making proper and closing, but simplifies them, noteably leaving out the frequent response tokens indicating receipt of information (for example, the use of *oh* to receive new information (Heritage, 2018; Seuren, 2019)) and of acknowledgement (for example *ja* 'yes/yeah' (Mazeland, 1990)). Even if reduced complexity at the level of a textbook may be helpful to introduce students to new vocabulary and grammar, presenting them with 'real life' data in which they see or hear this recently acquired knowledge being used, and helping them notice the ways in which proficient speakers of Dutch arrange and manage their arrangement-making, may help bridge the step from theory to practice. This is especially important in foreign language teaching, that is, in contexts in which learners only have limited access to competent speakers and only limited opportunities to engage in meaningful interaction outside of the classroom in the language they are learning.

7.3 For further research

In this thesis, my focus was on the boundaries (openings and closings) of arrangement-making activities. A more in-depth study on Dutch data could examine the internal organization of the different stages that make up the arrangement-making proper. Additionally, further research into how participants manage arrangement-making that takes place over successive conversations could clarify the ways in which participants connect the different elements of the arrangement-making as one cohesive whole (through, e.g., referring to earlier stages and deferring final decisions to a later time) and thus create continuity across different speech events. For this to be possible, a longitudinal method of data collection would be necessary. Deppermann and Pekarek Doehler (2021) give an overview of past and current research that employs longitudinal approaches. They also point out challenges, noting, among other things, that "when studying, e.g., families or

peer groups, complete interactional histories will not be available. Since their starting point is not available, histories cannot be monitored and recorded continuously" (p.132). Aditionally, not all communication in a complex arrangement-making package that unfolds over a longer stretch of time and across different conversational events is verbal. For example, the participants from the conversation in section 4.4 start their conversation with a referal to a letter that one participant sent to the other (not shown). In Excerpt 31, a participant is asked to e-mail their response to an invitation. However, even though data collected from conversations between the same participants for a longer period will contain gaps, this type of study would provide more continuity than the data I had access to.

The rich complexity of particles always invites more research. For example, a study on the use of *nog* in turns that refer back to earlier conversations would contibute to a better understanding on arrangement-making that stretches out over more than one conversation, while a more extensive treatment of *anders (dan)* could further the understanding of its role in proposing alternative solutions, both in arrangement-making and in other contexts. Conversation analysis, where particles are studied in their natural habitat, that is, in interaction, is a prime method for studying these linguistice resources that give the Dutch language a depth and character that is often hard to communicate to non-Dutch speakers.

References

Auer, P. (2021). Undh (ähm) ja. In M. Kupetz & F. Kern (Eds.*), Prosodie und Multimodalität/Prosody and Multimodality. Empirische Beiträge der Interaktionalen Linguistik,* (pp. 91-118). Winter.

Betz, E., & Golato, A. (2008) Remembering Relevant Information and Withholding Relevant Next Actions: The German Token *achja*. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 41*(1), 58-98. DOI: 10.1080/08351810701691164

Bolden, G. B. (2024). Analyzing Particles. In J. D. Robinson, R. Clift, K. H. Kendrick, & C. W. Raymond (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Methods in Conversation Analysis,* (pp. 611–640). Cambridge University Press. https://doi-org.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/10.1017/9781108936583

Clayman, S.E., & Heritage, J. (2014). Benefactors and beneficiaries: Benefactive status and stance in the management of offers and requests. In P. Drew & E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds), *Requesting in Social Interaction*, (pp. 55-86). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Clift, R., Kendrick, K. H., Raymond, C. W., & Robinson, J. D. (Eds.). (2024). Jeffersonian Transcription Conventions. In Robinson, J. D., Clift, R., Kendrick, K. H., & Raymond, C. W. (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Methods in Conversation Analysis,* (pp. 974–989). Cambridge University Press.

Clift, R., & Mandelbaum, J. (2024). Discovering a candidate phenomenon. In J. D. Robinson, R. Clift, K.H. Kendrick, & C.W. Raymond (Eds.), *Handbook of methods in conversation analysis,* (pp. 143-169). Cambridge University Press.

Corpus Gesproken Nederlands - CGN (Version 2.0.3) (2014) [Data set]. Available at the Dutch Language Institute: https://hdl.handle.net/10032/tm-a2-k6

Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2014). What does grammar tell us about action? *Pragmatics, 24*(3), 623-47. doi: 10.1075/prag.24.3.08cou

Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Thompson, S.A. (2022). Action ascription and deonticity in everyday advice-giving sequences. In A. Deppermann & M. Haugh (Eds.), *Action ascription in interaction*, (pp. 183-207). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108673419.010

Curl, T. (2006). Offers of assistance: Constraints on syntactic design. *Journal of Pragmatics, 38*, 1257-1280. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2005.09.004

Curl, T.S., & Drew, P. (2008). Contingency and Action: A Comparison of Two Forms of Requesting, *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 41*(2), 129-153. DOI: 10.1080/08351810802028613

Deppermann, A. (2009). Verstehensdefizit als Antwortverpflichtung: Interaktionale Eigenschaften der Modalpartikel denn in Fragen. In J. Bücker & S. Günthner (Eds.), *Grammatik im Gespräch,* (Vol. 33, pp. 21–56). Walter de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110213638.21

Deppermann, A., & Haugh, M. (2022). Action Ascription in Social Interaction. (2022). In A. Deppermann & M. Haugh (Eds.), *Action Ascription in Interaction*, (pp. 3-27). Cambridge University Press.

Depperman, A., & Helmer, H. (2013). Zur Grammatik des Verstehens im Gespräch: Inferenzen anzeigen und Handlungskonsequenzen ziehen mit also und dann. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft 32*(1), 1-39. https://doi.org/10.1515

Deppermann, A., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2021). Longitudinal Conversation Analysis - Introduction to the Special Issue. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 54*(2), 127-141. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2021.1899707

Drew, P. (1997). 'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 28*(1), 69-101

Egbert, M. (2003). Die interaktionelle Relevanz einer gemeinsamen Vorgeschichte: Zur Bedeutung und Funktion von übrigens in deutschen Alltagsgesprächen. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft, 22*(2), 189-212.

Foolen, A. (1994). Toch wel. In R. Boogaart & J. Noordegraaf (Eds) *Nauwe betrekkingen. Voor Theo Janssen bij zijn vijftigste verjaardag*, (pp. 81-88). Stichting Neerlandistiek VU/Nodus Publikationen.

Foolen, A. (2011). Pragmatic markers in a sociopragmatic perspective. In G. Andersen & K. Aijmer (Eds.), *Pragmatices of society,* (pp. 215-240). De Gruyter Mouton.

Foolen, A., & Van der Wouden, T. (2025). Pragmatic markers in Dutch. In: C.A. Chapelle & H. Hasselgard (Eds.) The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics (Grammar). John Wiley & Sons.

Floyd, S., Rossi, G., & Enfield, N. J. (Eds.) (2019). *Getting others to do things: a pragmatic typology of recruitments*. Language Science Press.

Golato, A. (2010). Marking understanding versus receipting information in talk: *Achso*. and *ach* in German interaction. *Discourse Studies, 12*(2), 147–176. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24049825

Golato, A. (2018). Turn-initial naja in German. In Heritage, J. & Sorjonen, M-L (Eds.), *Between Turn and Sequence. Turn-initial particles across languages*, (pp. 414-443). John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/slsi.31.14gol

Golato, A., & Betz, E. (2008). German *ach* and *achso* in repair uptake: Resources to sustain or remove epistemic asymmetry. *Zeitschrift Für Sprachwissenschaft, 27*(1), 7–37. https://doi.org/10.1515/ZFSW.2008.002

Haeseryn, W., Romijn, K., Geerts, G., de Rooij, J., & Van den Toorn, M. (1997) *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst*. https://e-ans.ivdnt.org/.

Heritage, J. (1985). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson (Ed.), *Structures of Social Action* (pp. 299–345). Cambridge University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511665868.020

Heritage, J. (2002). Oh-Prefaced Responses to Assessments. A Method of Modifying Agreement/Disagreement. In: C.E. Ford, B.A. Fox & S.A. Thompson (Eds.). *The language of turn and sequence,* (pp. 196-224). Oxford University Press.

Heritage, J. (2016). The Recruitment Matrix. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *49*(1), 27–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2016.1126440

Heritage, J. (2018). Turn-initial particles in English. The cases of oh and well. In J. Heritage, J., & M.-L. Sorjonen (Eds.) *Between Turn and Sequence. Turn-initial particles across languages,* (pp 156-189). John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/slsi.31.06her

Heritage, J., & Clayman, S. E. (2024). Making Arrangements: A Sketch of a 'Big Package.' *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 57*(3), 279–300. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2024.2369483

Heritage, J., & Sorjonen, M.-L. (1994). Constituting and maintaining activities across sequences: *And*-prefacing as a feature of question design. *Language in Society*, *23*(1), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500017656

Heritage, J. & Sorjonen, M.-L. (Eds.) (2018), *Between Turn and Sequence. Turn-initial particles across languages*. John Benjamins

Hoey, E. M., & Webb, J. C. (2024). Conversation-Analytic Methods of Data Collection. In J. D. Robinson, R. Clift, K. H. Kendrick, & C. W. Raymond (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Methods in Conversation Analysis,* (pp. 51–80). Cambridge University Press.

Hogeweg, L. (2009). The meaning and interpretation of the Dutch particle wel. Journal of Pragmatics, 41(3), 519–539. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2008.06.012

Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. (1987). *Establishing agreement. An analysis of proposal-acceptance sequences*. De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110849172

Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. (1990). Accounting for proposals. *Journal of Pragmatics 14*, 111-124. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90066-M

Instituut voor de Nederlandse Taal (n.d.) *Het project Corpus Gesproken Nederlands*. https://taalmaterialen.ivdnt.org/wp-content/uploads/documentatie/cgn_website/doc_Dutch/topics/index.htm

Jefferson, G. (1972). Side sequences. In D. Sudnow. *Studies in social interaction,* (pp. 294-338). Free Press.

Jefferson, G. (1988). On the Sequential Organization of Troubles-Talk in Ordinary Conversation. *Social Problems, 35*(4), 418–441. https://doi.org/10.2307/800595

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kendrick, K. H., & Drew, P. (2016). Recruitment: Offers, Requests, and the Organization of Assistance in Interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *49*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2016.1126436

Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly Incomplete Utterances: A Pedagogical Practice for Eliciting Knowledge Displays in Error Correction Sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 35*(3), 277–309. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327973RLSI3503_2

Levinson, S. C. (2013). Action formation and ascription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.) *Handbook of Conversation Analysis,* (pp. 103-130). Wiley-Blackwell

Lindström, A. (2017). Accepting remote proposals. In G. Raymond, G. H. Lerner, & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Enabling human conduct: Studies of talk-in-interaction in honor of Emanuel A. Schegloff*, (pp. 125–142). John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/pbns.273.07lin

Margutti, P., Tainio, L., Drew, P., & Traverso, V. (2018). Invitations and responses across different languages: Observations on the feasibilit and relevance of a cross-linguistic comparative perspective on the study of actions. *Journal of Pragmatics 125*, 52-61. https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/journal-of-pragmatics/vol/125/suppl/C

Max Planck Institute (2008). *The Leipzig Glossing Rules: Conventions for interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glosses*. https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php retrieved 31-10-2024

Mazeland H. (1990). "Yes" "No" and "Mhm": Variations in Acknowledgment choices. *Réseaux, Hors Série 8, n°1, 1990. Les formes de la conversation volume 1*, (251-282). https://doi.org/10.3406/reso.1990.3542

Mazeland, H. (2003) *Inleiding in de conversatieanalyse.* Coutinho.

Mazeland, H. J. (2006). Conversation Analysis. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. 2nd Edition (Vol.3),* (pp. 153 - 162). Elsevier.

Mazeland, H. (2016). The positionally sensitive workings of the Dutch particle nou. in P. Auer & Y. Maschler (Eds). *Nu/nå. A Family of Discourse Markers across the Languages of Europe and Beyond,* (pp. 377-408). De Gruyter.

Mazeland, H. (2019). Activities as discreet organizational domains. In E. Reber, & C. Gerhardt (Eds). *Embodied Activities in Face-to-face and Mediated Settings : Social Encounters in Time and Space*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Mazeland, H. (2021). Die Aktivität als eigenständiger interaktionsorganisierender Bereich. In: B. Weidner, K. König, W. Imo & L. Wegner (Eds.). *Verfestigungen in der Interaktion: Konstruktionen, sequenzielle Muster, kommunikative Gattungen*. De Gruyter. p. 159-194. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110637502

Mazeland, H., & Huiskes, M. (2001). Dutch 'but' as a sequential conjunction. In M. Selting & E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.) *Studies in Interactional Linguistics*, (pp. 141-269). John Benjamins.

Mazeland, H., & Plug, L. (2010). Doing confirmation with ja/nee hoor: Sequential and prosodic characteristics of a Dutch discourse particle. In D. Barth-Weingarten, E. Reber, & M. Selting (Eds.), *Prosody in Interaction (Vol. 23)*, (pp. 161–188). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/sidag.23.14maz

Melman, F. (n.d.). *Taalkundigen tapen telefoongesprekken*. New Scientist. https://www.newscientist.nl/nieuws/taalkundigen-tapen-telefoongesprekken/

Mondada, L., & Sorjonen, M.-L. (2021). OKAY in closings and transitions. In L. Mondada, E. Betz, M.-L. Sorjonen & A. Deppermann (Eds.), *OKAY across Languages* (Vol. 34, pp. 93–127). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/slsi.34.04mon

Ogiermann, E., & Blitvich, P. G.-C. (2019). Im/politeness between the Analyst and Participant Perspectives: An Overview of the Field. In E. Ogiermann & P. G.-C. Blitvich (Eds.), *From Speech Acts to Lay Understandings of Politeness: Multilingual and Multicultural Perspectives,* (pp. 1–24). Cambridge University Press.

Raymond, G. (2004). Prompting Action: The Stand-Alone "So" in Ordinary Conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 37*(2), 185–218. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi3702_4

Raymond, C. W., Clift, R., Kendrick, K. H., & Robinson, J. D. (2024). Methods in Conversation Analysis. In J. D. Robinson, R. Clift, K. H. Kendrick & C. W. Raymond (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Methods in Conversation Analysis,* (pp. 3–48). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee-Goldman, R. (2011). No as a discourse marker. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(10), 2627–2649. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.03.011

Robinson J.D., Clift R., Kendrick K.H., & Raymond C.W. (Eds) (2024) *The Cambridge Handbook of Methods in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1995). Spring 1971. April 12 Long sequences. In H. Sacks (Ed.) *Lectures on Conversation, Volume 2,* (pp. 354-359) . https://doi-org.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/10.1002/9781444328301.ch13

Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (2007). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In N. J. Enfield & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Perspectives,* (pp. 23–28). Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1984). Notes on methodology. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.) *Structures of social action,* (pp. 21–27). Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, & E. A., Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50, 696–735.

Schegloff, E.A. (1972). Notes on a conversational practice: Formulating Place. In D. Sudnow. *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 75–119). Free Press.

Schegloff, E.A. (1979). Identification and recognition in telephone openings. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*, (pp. 23–78). Erlbaum

Schegloff, E.A. (1986). The routine as achievement. *Human Studies, 9,* 111-151

Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Some Practices for Referring to Persons in Talk-in-Interaction. In B. A. Fox (Ed.) *Studies in anaphora*, (pp. 437–486). J. Benjamins.

Schegloff, E.A. (2001) Getting serious: Joke → serious 'no'. *Journal of Pragmatics 33,* 1947-1955

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: a primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2009). A Practice for (Re-)Exiting a Sequence: And/But/So + Uh(m) + Silence. In B. Fraser & K. Turner (Eds.), *Language in Life, and a Life in Language: Jacob Mey — A Festschrift,* (pp. 365-374). Emerald Group Publishing.

Schegloff, E. A. & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening Up Closings. *Semiotica*, *8*, 289-327. 10.1515/semi.1973.8.4.289.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*.Cambridge University Press. https://doi-org.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/10.1017/CBO9780511611841

Selting, M et al. (2011). A system for transcribing talk-in-interaction: GAT 2 translated and adapted for English by Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Dagmar Barth-Weingarten. *Gesprächsforschung*, *12*, 1-51.

Seuren, L. (2018). Assessing Answers: Action Ascription in Third Position. *Research on Language and Social Interaction 51*(1). 33-51 https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2018.1413890

Seuren, L. (2019). Oh (/o/) als ontvanger van informatie in sociale interactie [Oh (/o/) as information receipt in Dutch talk-in-interaction]. *Tijdschrift voor Taalbeheersing, 41*(2), p. 363-389. https://doi.org/10.5117/TVT2019.2.002.SEUR

Seuren, L.M. & Huiskes, M. (2017) Confirmation or Elaboration: What Do Yes/No Declaratives Want?. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 50*(2), 188-205. DOI:10.1080/08351813.2017.1301307

Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (2012). *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Stevanovic, M., & Peräkylä, A. (2012). Deontic Authority in Interaction: The Right to Announce, Propose, and Decide. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*. *45*(3), 297-321. DOI: 10.1080/08351813.2012.699260

Stivers, T., & Sidnell, J. (2016). Proposals for Activity Collaboration. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 49*(2), 148-166. DOI: 10.1080/08351813.2016.1164409

Stivers, T., Rossi, G., & Chalfoun, A. (2023). Ambiguities in Action Ascription. *Social Forces 101*(3). 1552-1579

Van Dale, n.d. Anders. In *Dikke Van Dale*. Van Dale Uitgevers. https://zoeken.vandale.nl/?dictionaryId=gwn&article={"search"%3A"anders","index"%3A1,"type"%3A"EXACT","dictionaryId"%3A"gwn"}&query=anders

Van der Wouden, T. & Foolen, A. (2011). Pragmatische partikels in de rechterperiferie. *Nederlandse Taalkunde, 16*(3), 307-322. https://doi.org/10.5117/NEDTAA2011.3.PRAG497

Van der Wouden, T., & Foolen, A. (2021). Dutch pragmatic markers in the left periphery. In D. Van Olmen & J. Šinkūnienė (Eds.), *Pragmatic markers and peripheries,* (pp. 49–74). Benjamins.

Van Eerten, L. (2007). Over het Corpus Gesproken Nederlands. *Nederlandse Taalkunde,12*(3), 194-215

Van Son, R., Wesseling, W., Sanders, E. & Van den Heuvel, H. (2008). The IFADV Corpus: a free dialog video corpus. In: European Language Resources Association (ELRA), *Proceedings of the Sixth International Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'08)*. Marrakech: ELRA

Wang, X. (2023). The Interplay of Designedly Incomplete Utterances and Representational Gestures in Chinese as a Second Language Classrooms. *Bulletin Suisse de Linguistique Appliquee*, 81-104.

Zinken, J. (2016). *Requesting responsibility: the morality of grammar in Polish and English family interaction*. Oxford University Press.

Appendix 1 Transcription symbols

Transcription conventions

Temporal and sequential relationships

[	Onset of overlap
]	End of overlap
=	Latched talk
(0.6)	Duration of silence, represented in tenths of a second.
(.)	Micropause, less than 0.2 of a second.

Aspects of speech delivery

° °	Soft volume
underline	Emphasis of some kind
CAPS	Loud volume
↑	Step-up in pitch
↓	Step-down in pitch
> <	Rushed or compressed talk
s:::::	Sound stretch; the more colons, the longer the sound
cu-	Cut-off word or sound
.	Final falling intonation
?	Final rising intonation
,	Final slightly rising intonation (in Finnish examples level)
;	Final slightly falling intonation
.hhh	Inbreath
hhh	Outbreath
(hhenhh)	Aspiration, often laughter
£	Smiley voice

Miscellaneous

(word)	Transcriber doubt
(this/that)	Alternative hearings
((description))	Description of what can be heard or seen

Heritage & Sorjonen (2018, pp. 477-478)

Appendix 2 Extended transcripts

Extended transcripts do not always have English glosses or idiomatic translation. There are four extended transcriptions available with varying detail.

Transcript 1 CGN fn008160 (oral exam and casino) 0:56 111
Transcript 2 CGN fn008280 (visit) 7:58 118
Transcript 3 CGN fn008330 ((doos)) 3:34-5:05 122
Transcript 4 CGN fn008350 (darten en oeuvre) 1:00 - 127

Transcript 1 CGN fn008160 (oral exam and casino) 0:56

Michelle (21) and Frank (18) are siblings. Both are studying for exams, Michelle in university and Frank in high school. In the beginning of the conversation, they discussed Frank's school exams and soccer news. Frank is watching a soccer game in the background.

0:56

01 FRA hé maa:r kunnen wij nog trouwens uh mondeling uh oefene↑
Hey but can we yet by-the-way oral practice

01a met engels?
with English
'Hey, by the way, can we yet practice my oral (exam) for English?

02 MIC ja tuur↑lijk.
yes of-course

03 FRA ja?
yes?

04 MIC zeg maar wanneer↑↓
say PTL when
'Just tell me when'

05 FRA is wel uh belangrijk toch?
is PTL uh important right
'That is kind of important, right?

06 MIC j[a_]

07 FRA [°even gewoon een beetje°]
just simply a litte-bit

08 MIC want wanneer is dat? dat is de week van van je verjaar↑dag↓
because when is that? that is the week of of your birthday

09 dan.
then
'Because when is that? That would be the week of- of your birthday then.'

10 FRA ja klopt. ik begin volgens mij uh tien juni begin ik met uh
yes correct.I begin according-to me uh ten june begin I with uh

11 discussiëren en debatteren nederlands
discussing and debating Dutch
'Yes, that's right. I start I think uh June tenth I start with discussion and debate (for) Dutch

12 MIC ja:↑

(1:13 to 1:29 omitted, where Frank details what he has to prepare for the Dutch oral exam)

Michelle brings the conversation back to the English exam in line 13.

13 MIC en verder? wat heb je verder dan nog? engels?
en further? What have your further then yet? English?
'And after that? What else do you have yet then? English?

14 FRA ja engels mondeling: en duits mondeling
yes English oral and German oral

15 MIC o:h oké. nou-
oh okay. well

16 FRA en dan uh klaar. (.) ja.
and then uh done. yeah

17 MIC nou dan kunnen we wel een keertje .h ik kom 't weekend naar-
well then can we PTL a time.DIM I come the weekend to
'Well, then we can some time .h I'm coming this weekend to-'

18 oh nee maar je bent- da's met je verjaardag natuurlijk_
oh no but you are that's at your birthday of course
'oh no but that's your – that's when your birthday is of course'

19 ha [da's niet handig]
huh that's not handy
'huh, that's not convenient'

19 FRA [ja klopt] ja.
yes correct yes

20 MIC maar ik heb uh zelf dan ook uhm uh:m proefwerken of tentamens
but I have uh myself then also tests or exams
'but I myself will also have tests or exams then'

21 dus dan kan je altijd een keertje 's middags langskomen
so then can you always a time in the afternoon come by
'so then you could always stop by some time in the afternoon'

22 want dat is 's och[tends]
because that is in the morning
'because that is in the morning'

23 FRA [oh ja↓]

24 MIC °d[us dat lijkt me wel een goed idee.°]
so that seems me PTL a good idea
'so I think that would be a good idea'

25 FRA [oh dan ben je VRIJ 's middags_]
oh then are you free in the afternoon
'Oh, then you are off in the afternoon'

26 MIC zeg je?
say you
'(what) did you say?'

27 FRA ben je 's middags vrij_
are you in the afternoon free
'You'll be off in the afternoon'

28 MIC ja want dan heb ik tot elf uur tentamen ofzo
yes because then have I until eleven o'clock exam or so
'Yes, because then I'll have an exam until eleven o'clock or something'

29 d[us dan kan je daar]na gewoon komen
so then can you after that simply come
'So then you can simply come after that'

30 FRA [o:h ja.]

31 MIC a[ls je dat leuk vindt]
if you that nice find
'If you'd like to'

32 FRA [o:h perfect]

33 MIC ja↑=

34 FRA =gaat wel lukken.
go PTL succede
'That'll work'

35 .h hey jij had negen en een half hè?
hey you had nine and a half right?
'Hey, you got a 9.5 (grade out of 10) right?'

(topic switch. Michelle talks about her exam.)

36 FRA ja ben ik weer [was] uh Gerard even
yes am I again was name PTL
'Yes, I'm back. That was Gerard.'

37 MIC [ja]

38 FRA ja [dus u:h]
yeah so uh

39 MIC [o::_kay.]

40 [hé wat wil-]
hey what want
'Hey, what do (you) want

41 FRA [ja één nul uh] Turkije staat ´t als je ´t wilt weten
yeah one zero uh Turkey stands it if you it want to know
'Yeah, it's one-zero for Turkey, in case you want to know'

(0.1)

42 MIC oké wat wilde ik nog- oh ja we he-
okay what wanted I yet- oh yes we ha-
'okay, what did I want to- oh yes, we did-

43 MIC heb jij nog iets bedacht voor je verJAARdag dat je
have you yet something thought-of for your birthday that you

44 wil hebbe_
want have
Have you thought of something yet that you would like to get for your birthday?

45 FRA van↑ wie?
from who?

46 MIC van mij↑
from me

47 FRA U:::hm

48=> MIC ik dacht misschien kunnen we een keertje samen iets uh
I thought maybe can we a time together something uh
I thought maybe we could go and do something together sometime

49 gaan doen dat we naar de film gaan of uh w-wil je naar
go do that we to a movie go or uh w-want you to
go to a movie or d-do you want to go to

50 [de efteling]
the efteling
the Efteling (an amusement park)

51=> FRA [nee nee nee hol]land casino↑ want ik word acht↑tien
no no no holland casino because I become eighteen
No, no, no, Holland Casino, because I'm turning eightteen

52=> MIC oh dat is leu:k [dat] doen we
oh that is fun that do we
Oh, that's fun, we'll do that
53 FRA [ja]

54 MIC gaan we gewoon naar het casino_
go we simply to the casino
'We'll just go to the casino'

55=> FRA zullen we 't doen?
shall we it do
'You want to do it?'

56=> MIC ja: goed idee
yes good idea

57 FRA ja_

58=> MIC ja PRIma (.) l[euk↓
yes great, fun

59 FRA [ja helemaal vergeten dat ik dat
yes completely forgot that I that

60 eigenlijk mag nu hu-hu-hu
actually may now ha ha
'Yes, (I) completely forgot that I'm actually allowed to do that now'

61 MIC w zeg je?
wh say you
'wh did you say?'

62 FRA helemaal vergeten dat ik daar naartoe mag nu
completely forgot that I there to may now
'(I) completely forgot that I am allowed to go there now'

63 MIC ja_

64 FRA ja_

65 MIC leu:k man
fun man

66 FRA zullen we dat doen dan?
shall we that do then
'You want to do that then?'

67 MIC gaan we doen ja gaan we gelijk doen
go we do yes go we immediately do
'We'll do it, yes, we'll do it right away'

68 FRA ja (0.1)
Yes

69 want jij bent 'r al es een keer geweest toch?
because you have there already once a time been right
'because you have been there once before, right?'

70 (0.1)

71 MIC u:::hm (0.1)

72 ja i- in ZANDvoort ben ik een keertje ge[weest] ja.
yes i-in (town name) have I once been yes
'yes, I was once i-in Zandvoort'

73 FRA [ja]

74 j[a] toch?
yes PTL
'yes, weren't you?'

75 MIC [ja.] ja::_ was leuk.
Yes yes was fun

76 FRA °leek me [wel leuk om te doen°
seemed to me PTL fun to do
'I thought it'd be fun to do'

77 MIC [maar we kunnen ook dat je dan u:h tentamen
but we can also that you then uh exam

78 komt voorbereiden bij mij hier↓↑
come prepare at me here
'but we could also do it (this way) that you come over here to prepare your exam

79 (.)

80 FRA wat zei je sorry,
what said you sorry
'what did you say, sorry'

81 (0.1)

82 MIC dat je je tentamen hier komt voorbereiden en dat we
that you your exam here come prepare and that we

83 dan uh naar den haag gaan want daar heb je er ook
then uh to (town name) go because there have you also

83a een,
one
'that you come to prepare your exam here and that we then go to The Hague, because there is one there as well'

84 FRA ja ook holland casino_
yes also (name) casino

85 MIC JA ja [ja.]

86 FRA [ja] ah↑ j[a]

87 MIC [ja] ja geen illegale °ofzo_°
yes yes no illegal-one or so
'yes, yes, not an illegal one or something'

88 FRA (smiling) A:H okay. ja.

89 MIC °nee_° (.) maar dan kun[nen we dat toch] doen?
no but then can we that PTL do
'no, but than we could do that, couldn't we?

90 FRA [o↑kay_ ja]

100 nee: is perfect lijkt me leuk
no is perfect seems to me fun
'no, that's perfect, sounds like fun'

101 MIC ja↑↓

102 FRA ja want uh gewoon een beetje voor de lol
yes because uh just a bit for the fun

103 beetje: kijken wat er allemaal is toch?
a bit look what there all is PTL
'yes, because (it's) just for a bit of fun, to look a bit what's all there, right?'

104 MIC ja en uh ik durf nooit wat in te zetten maar
yes and uh I dare never something to put in but

105 als jij dat [wel uh wel durft]vind ik 't [prima]
if you that PTL uh PTL dare find I it great
'Yes and I uh never dare to bet anything but if you do dare, that's fine with me

106 FRA [hu hu: huhuhu] [.h h.](laughing)

107 mm hu huhu [hi]

108 MIC [en dan] deel ik in de winst ofzo (smiley voice)

109 FRA .hh hu j[a toch]

110 MIC [vin 'k wel een] goed plan.
Find I PTL a good plan

111 FRA ja [is] wel leuk om te doen ja
Yes us PTL fun to do yes
112 MIC [ja]

113 doen we dat.=
do we that
'That's what we'll do'

114 =.h hé:_ ik kreeg trouwens een smsje van
Hey I got by-the-way a text from

(topic switch at 4:11)

Transcript 2 CGN fn008280 (visit) 7:58

Mother (Nel) and adult daughter (Iris), who is married with three children. Iris has been telling about the renovations to her house and how there is a hollow sound when talking because the rooms are completely empty. She has been describing the plan for moving things back in, which should improve the acoustics. After agreeing, Nel changes the subject to a visit she and her husband hope to make to Iris'.

01 IRI en dan de gordijnen en dan eh ja hopen dat als
and then the curtains and then uh yeah hope that when

02 de rest van de meubels ´r is dat ´t dat ´t
the rest of the furniture there is that it that it

03 beter wordt
better gets
'and then the curtains and then eh yeah hoping that when the rest of the furniture is in, that it, that it will get better'

04 NEL ja. [Nou dat zal wel zeg
yes. Well, that will PTC PTC
'Yes. Well, it should I´d say'

05 IRI [anders dan moet leonie d'r nog wat aan doen ma-
if not must leonie ther yet something to do bu-
'if not, Leonie will have to do something about it yet bu-'

wat zeg je?
what say you
'what did you say?'

06 NEL Ja dat zal toch zeker wel
Yes that wil PTC certainly PTC
'Yes, I'm sure it will, won't it?'

07 IRI jawe:l↓ zal ook wel
sure will PTC PTC
'oh sure, I guess it will'

08 NEL ja. OH↑ ik heb het nog met uh met vader d´r over
yes oh I have it PTCL with uh with father there about
Oh I talked it over with father

09 gehad als wij: naar nuenen gaan vijf oktober vinden we het
had when we to nuenen go five october find we it
when we go to Nuenen on October fifth we would

10 echt gezellig om dan nog even langs
really pleasant to then PTCL PTCL by
really enjoy to stop by then

11 te ko[men
to come

12 IRI [oh dat is heel fijn=
oh that is very nice
'oh, I'm very glad'

13 NEL =zul[len we]zullen we dan maar even belle?
shall we shall we then PTCL PTCL call
How about we give you a call then

14 IRI [da's heel leuk]
that's very fun
That's great

15 IRI ja.
yes

16 NEL want ik heb geen flau:w idee hoe lang we bij timo uh nou
because I have no faint idea how long we at timo uh

17 IRI .h je gaat bijtijds
you go in-good-time
'You'll leave in good time'

18 NEL we gaan bijtijds wij wouen er tussen tien en
we go in-good-time we wanted there between ten and

19 elf zijn
eleven be
'We'll leave in good time, we wanted to be there between ten and eleven'

20 IRI ja↑
yes

21 NEL en en dan gaan we in ieder geval naar het HUIS
and and then go we in any case to the house
'and and then we will definitely go to the house'

22 en ik weet niet wat ie wat ie wil met vader
and I know not what he what he wants with father
'and I don't know what he wants (to do) with father'

23 en of tie nog een klusje voor ons heeft of niet
and if he yet a job.DIM for us has or not
'and if he has something to do for us or not'

24 IRI nee.
no

25 NEL zal misschien ook nog een beetje van het WEER afhange
will maybe also yet a little on the weather depend
'that may also depend a bit on the weather'

26 IRI ja.

27 NEL dus 't wordt (.) nou ik neem toch eigenlijk wel aan
so it will-be well I assume PTC really PTC …

na de lunch voordat we koffie hebben gedronken enzo,
after the lunch before we coffee have drunk and such

'so it will be (.) well, I assume that is will actually be after lunch, by the time we have had coffee and such'

28 IRI ja:_

29 NEL en- maar of het nou een kopje THEE is of dat dat
and but whether it PTC a cup TEA is or that it

ook nog
also yet
'and- but whether it will be for a cup of tea or that it will be also - '

(.)

30 IRI of dat nog later wordt
or it yet later will-be
'or if it will be even later'

31 NEL een happie wordt dat kan ik totaa:l nie overzien
a bite will-be that can I totally not predict
'a bite (to eat) that I can really not predict'

32 IRI => nee. nou ik maak wel iets wat ik makkelijk van
no. Well I make PTC something that I easily from

33 van vijf naar zeven uit kan breiden
from five to seven can expand
'No. Well, I'll make something that I can easily expand from from five to seven

34 NEL ja [goed]
yes good

35 IRI [en dan] uh dan zien we wel
and then uh then see we PTC
'and then uh then we'll see'

36 NEL dan zien we wel. wij nemen toch in ieder geval
then see we PTC we take PTC in any case

37 de telefoon mee [dus] dan uh
the phone along so then uh
'Then we'll see. We are taking the phone along anyway, so then –'

38 IRI [ja]

39 d' kinderen vinden het ook hartstikke gezellig als jullie
the children find it also super fun if you

40 effe komen buurten dus uh
PTC come visit so uh
'The children also love it when you stop by to catch up so uh'

41 NEL Ja: dat- nou ik vind ´t ook gezellig
Ye:s that well I find it also fun
"Yes that – well I also enjoy it'

42 en ik ben trouwens razend benieuwd
and I am by-the-way enormously curious
'and besides, I can't wait (to see the changes)'

43 IRI .h huhuhu ((laughs))

44 NEL ((smiley voice)) .h k wil 't echt wel weer zien
I want it really PTC again see
'I really want to see it again'

45 IRI ja [nou 't is uh] 't is een complete
yeah well it is uh it is a complete

46 NEL ['um ((clears throat)) ja]

47 IRI ged- gedaanteverwisseling ho[or]
met- metamorphosis PTC
'Yeah. Well, it's uh, it's a complete met- metamorphosis, I tell you'

48 NEL [ja]

49 IRI ja

50 NEL nou: ontzettend leuk. wij hebben net de fotootjes
well terribly fun. We have just the photos.DIM
'Well, lovely. We just got the photos back from Luxemburg'

teruggehad van Luxemburg
got-back from Luxemburg

(topic switch. Conversation ends soon after, mentioning only a next phone call without revisiting this planned visit)

Transcript 3 CGN fn008330 ((doos)) 3:34-5:05

Father (54), Henk, and daughter (27), Suzanne. They have been talking about whether Suzanne will repaint the walls of her rented apartment. In line 2, Henk changes the topic to a small bag Suzanne left behind, and then switches to ask about a box that needs to be brought to Suzanne.

01 SUZ dan moet alles van de muur enzo en de koelkast
then must everything off the wall and-such and the fridge
then everything needs to come off the wall and such and the fridge

02 HEN hé maar uh dat tasje hè wat uh marianne vroeg zich
hey but uh that bag.DIM eh what uh ((person name)) asked herself
hey, but un that small bag, y'know, what uh Marianne was wondering

03 af of daar dringende dingen in zaten [voor jou] de pil ofzo=
if there urgent things in sat for you the pill or so
if there was anything urgent in it for your, like the pill or so

04 SUZ [nee]
no

05 SUZ =ja die zat 'r wel in maar die heb ik hier ook
yes that sat there PTCL in but that have I hier too
yes, that was in it, but I have it here as well

06 HEN oh↓ want 'r zat wel make-up spul enzo in
oh because there sat PTCL makeup stuff and-such in
oh because there was makeup stuff and such in it

07 SUZ ja
yes

08 HEN maar uh wij komen dus morgen gewoon uh langs Nijmegen
but uh we come so tomorrow simply uh past ((town name))
but uh so we are actually passing by Nijmegen tomorrow

09 SUZ ↑o[kee.]
okay

10 HEN [dus] het is voor ons een kleine moeite om uh eventjes
so it is for us a small effort to uh briefly

11 te pauzeren:
to pause
so it's no problem for us to uh take a short break

12 SUZ ja.
yes

13 HEN en dan uh komen we gewoon even op 't Max Planck langs
and then uh come we simply PTCL at the ((institute name)) past
and then uh we'll simply stop by at Max Planck

14 SUZ ja, .h [ja want]
yes .h yes because

15 HEN [je bent] morgen wel na tienen op 't Max Planck?
you are tomorrow PTCL after ten at the ((institute name))
you will be at the Max Planck tomorrow after ten AM?

16 SUZ ja ik ben daar gewoon uh
yes I am there simply uh
Yes, I'll just be there uh

17 HEN okee↓↑
okay

18 SUZ vanaf een uur of negen denk ik
from an hour or nine think I
as off about nine o'clock I think

19 HEN okee↓ dan moeten we misschien eventjes uh
okay then must we maybe PTCL *Okay, then maybe we should just uh*

20 SUZ ja ik zat te denken om t handig is dat jullie ook die doos
yes I sat to think if it handy is that you.PL also that box
yes, I was thinking if it might be handy if you would also

21 al meenemen maar da's nie handig want dan
already take-with but that's not handy because then
bring that box with you already, but that's not handy because then

21a zit ik met 'n doos
sit I with a box
I'm stuck with a box

22 HEN ja want uh ja we willen die doos wel uh bij jou neerzetten op
yes because uh yes we want that box PTCL uh at you put-down on
yes, because uh, yes we don't mind depositing that box at your place in the

23 janstraat maar dan staat ie buite
((street name)) but then stands it outside
Janstraat, but then it will be sitting outside

24 SUZ ja.
yes

25 HEN en anders dan moeten we weer heel moeilijk met sleutels doen,
and ANDERS DAN must we again very difficult with keys do
and ANDERS DAN we have to deal with a big hassle with keys

26 SUZ ja ik zit te denke [maar en ik ben]
yes I sit to think but and I am
yes, I'm thinking but and I am

27 HEN [hebben wij] trouwens een sl- hadden wij w-
have we actually a k- had we PTCL-
do we actually have a k- did we

28 hadden wij een [sleu-
had we a ke-
have a ke-

29 SUZ [ja:_ volgens mij hebben jullie
yes according-to me have you
yes, I believe you have

29a een voordeursleutel,
a front-door-key
a key to the front door

30 HEN wat wat is we- wat bedoel je met voordeur
what what is whi- what mean you with front-door
what what is whi- what do you mean by front door

31 buitendeur of jouw (.) voordeur
outside-door or your front-door
outside door or your front door[14]

32 SUZ nee 'k geloof mijn voordeur an[der uh
no I belief my front-door other uh
no, I think my front door otherwise

33 HEN [daar hebben wij dus niks aan
there have we so nothing on
So that won't be of any use to us

34 SUZ ja dan moet je belle
yes then must you ring
yes, then you'd have to ring (the bell)

35 .h nee [maar] ik zit te denke,
.h no but I sit to think
.h no, but I'm thinking

36 HEN [hmm_]

37 ja,
yes

38 SUZ na mij uh
after me uh

39 HEN a::h maar wij komen vast nog wel een keer 'k bedoel dit uh
a::h but we come certainly yet PTCL a time I mean this uh
ah, but we'll certainly come again some time, I mean this uh

40 we komen vast nog wel een keer in de [richting] u:h u:h
we come certainly yet PTCL a time in the diretction uh uh
we'll certainly come again some time your way uh uh

41 SUZ [okee↓]

42 okee_ ja nee want ik bedacht anders kan ik ook probere
okay yes no because I thought ANDERS can I also try
okay, yes no because I thought ANDERS I could also try,

[14] likely referring to a so-called 'galerijflat', where the 'outside door' gives access to the main hall and stairwells. Each floor has an outside walkway with 'front doors' giving access to individual appartments.

43 zeg maar thuis te blijven maar 'k heb ook m'n laptop hier
say PTCL at-home to stay but I have also my laptop hier
say, to stay home, but I also don't have my laptop here

44 niet [dus] dan kan ik ook nie wer[ken]
not so then can I also not work
so then I can't work either

45 HEN [ja] [.h]
yes

46 nee: en ook als Marianne hier straks met dat hondje zit
no and also if ((person name)) here shortly with that dog.DIM sits
no and also if Marianne is sitting here in a short while with that doggy

47 ja uh dat zij nou uh alt- altijd [hier] wil zitten=
yes uh that she PTCL uh alw- always here wants sit
you see, and that she, well, alw- always wants to stay here (at home)

48 SUZ [ja]
yes

49a HEN =dat wil nie zegge dat ik altijd uh
that wants not say that I always uh
that doesn't mean that I always

49b [op dat beest z'n staart hoef te zitten]
on that animal its tail need to sit
have to be sitting on that animal's tail

50 SUZ [nee dan kun je natuurlijk wel uh]
no then can you of-course PTCL uh
no, then you can of course

51 HEN kom maar dan ga 'k wel een keer een dagje weg
come PTCL then go I PTCL a time a day away
come on, then I'll go away for a day sometime

52 SUZ okee.=
okay

53 HEN =kom ik w- een keer een dagje naar Nijmegen uh iets
come I PTCL- a time a day to ((town name)) uh something
(then I'll) come sometime for a day to Nijmegen uh

54 leuks doen een of ander [uh] museum [of] u:h ja weet ik wat,
fun do one or other uh museum or uh yes know I what
to do something fun, some kind of uh musuem or uh, yeah, whatever

55 SUZ [ja] [ja]
yes yes

56 ja_
yes

57 HEN want uh anders dan krijg ik de hondeziekte uh
because uh ANDERS DAN get I the dog-sickness uh
because uh if not I'll get dog crazy uh

58 SUZ ja.
yes

59 HEN °ben ik bang°
am I afraid
I'm afraid

60 SUZ maar uh je moet nog even vertellen hoe het ging met 't hondje
but uh you must yet PTCL tell how it went with the doggie
but uh you have to tell met yet how things went with the doggie

Transcript 4 CGN fn008350 (darten en oeuvre) 1:00 -

Two friends, Rob (50) and Thomas (41)

They discuss the preceding evening (same or day before?) where they had participated in an 'open podium' and it had been concluded, by themselves and another person (Wim), that that had not been a good idea. Apparently, Wim had reiterated this Rob later in the evening. After reporting this in the current conversation (with some irritation on both sides), Thomas asks if Wim had had anything else "shitty" to say (line 1). This leads to the end of that topic. In line 7, an arrangement making sequence (with had been launched before this conversation) is re-initiated.

At 1:00

01 THO had ie nog meer lulligs uh te missen,

02 ROB nee: verder niet=

03 THO =ne[e nee

04 ROB [°nee h.h. ((chuckling)) nee h.h.°

05 THO .hh n[ee nee goed ja uh perfect h. in orde .h
.hh n[o no good yes uh perfect h. all right .h

06 ROB [.hh

07 maa:r even kijken we hadden het over die u:h darte
but PTCL look we had it about that u:h play_darts

08 met u:h .h de ondernemende jongens hè,
with uh .h the enterprising boys PTCL

09 THO .h de ondernemende jongens ja dat uh mmm↑ dat kan
.h the enterprising boys yes that uh mmm that can

10 dus TOCH niet doorgaan op de dag d[ie ik had gepland]
PTCL PTCL not take_place on the day that I had planned

11 ROB [↑ah a:h↓]

12 THO want dan uh kan jos niet,
because then uh can jos(name) not
because then Jos is not available

13 ROB oh da's jam[mer

14 THO [die komt dan net terug van uh

15 Schiermonnikoog, en [u:]h .h op die dag en dan weet ik niet

16 ROB [ja_]

17 THO hoe laa:t, en uh nou ja ik kan me voorstellen

dat je [dan wat a-]

18 ROB [oh die heeft] ook herfstvakantie

natuurlijk gehad↓ met de kinderen [dan.

19 THO [ja::_ [ja:.

20 ROB [ja. ja.

21 THO .hh en uh hij nam: *als uh volgende optie uhm (.) .t
.hh and uh he took as uh next option uhm

*paper rustling

22 ja wat nam ie daar, u::hmm negen of tien november:.
yes what took he there nine or ten november

23 ROB .hh=

24 THO zou je dan kunne?
would you then be_able
would you be available then?

25 ROB da's ook weer een zaterdag en [een uh zondag]hè,

26 THO [zaterdag zondag,]

27 ROB ja_ uh even kijke_ †ah ik geloof 't WEL want .h

†paper rustling

28 twee november dan had ik ZELF nog *uh .h dan HAD ik

*paper rustling

29 zelluf↓↑ dan hebben WIJ samen volgens mij eig'lijk iets=

30 THO =ja.

31 ROB ja hè, [dat zullen] we dan maar meteen even

32 THO [klopt ja]

34 ROB opschrij[ven da's uh overdag] ja_=

35 THO [da's overdag hè_ 's middags]

36 ROB ja,=

37 THO ja.

38 ROB °plusminus twee uur zet ik maar even neer°

39 THO twee uur

40 ROB °Grave. Velp heet ´t daar hè maar goed dan
weet ik welk Velp

41 THO [dit is]uh richting uh Mook

42 ROB [°en xxx°]

43 ROB u::h nee, ´t is echt Grave en dan u:::h

44 vlak [NA Grave] of zo

45 THO [Grave oh ja Grave]

46 ROB nee da's niet mook 'k weet 't even niet

47 THO nee [nee gra]

48 ROB [’t is uh] nou ja aan de rechterkant van de maas

49 THO oh ja

50 ROB volgens mij eerst moet je de maas over maar goed uh

51 THO [.hh]

52 ROB [we KOmen d’r wel.]

53 THO ‘ké.

(1.5)

54 ROB u:h dus dat staat voor de TWEEde e:n dan de NEgende
u:h so that stands for the SECond and then the NIneth
uhm so that's down for the second and then the nineth

55 dan zouden wij uh ja dat zou wel KUNnen_
then would we uh yes that would PTCL can
then we would uh yes, that would work

56 heel ↑goed (pa)s
very good (fi)t

57 THO ja,

58 ROB negende ’s avonds? [Of uh?]

59 THO [negen of de t] uh of de tiende

60 ROB oh↑ negen of de tiende=

61 THO =°ja °.

62 ROB ja_ staat alle TWEE nog leeg_

63 THO kan allebei nog?

64 ROB dus als je ’t mij zo snel mogelijk laat weten dan uh_

65 THO ja_ [ja:_ ‘k zal zo u:h] jacques 'r even over bellen,

66 ROB [ja_ da heb ik]

67 die termijn heb ik nog geen afspraken ↑staan hoor.

68 THO ja. maar wat is uh wat is je voorkeur?

69 ROB u:::h maakt mij eigenlijk niet zoveel ui[t_

70 THO [nee?

71 ROB neuh_=

72 THO =nee

73 ROB tien nja nee t maakt me ECHT nie uit.

74 THO goed.

75 ROB .h dus als die jongens gewoon een lekkere zaterdagavond
76 doorzakpartij willen dan is ’t uh h.h. ((laughs))
77 ook goed
78 THO ja. nou: ik denk niet dat dat uh ‘rvan komt hoor
79 ROB nee_ nee
80 THO maar je weet ’t niet
81 ROB nou we zouen een biertje drinken nou dat is op zaterdagavond
82 toch wel leuker dan op zondag
83 THO misschien
84 ROB ja.
85 THO ja:_ precies ja.
86 .h u::hm [dan begint iedereen ook wat]
87 ROB [ja want zondag moet ik ook weer werken]
88 THO ontspannener aan zo’n uh bijeenkomst. goed. .h
89 ROB wat zeg je? wat zeg je?
90 THO dan begint iedereen ook uh als za- zaterdagavond dan heb
91 je iets minder reserves:=
92 ROB =ja dat denk ik dat denk ik [toch ja want uh
93 THO [u:hm mentaal zo
94 ROB zondag heb je toch weer uh hè maandag moeten we weer werke=
95 THO =j[a
96 ROB [enzovoort .[.h]speelt bij mij ook wel mee ja
97 THO [ja.]
98 ROB dus [uh wat dat betreft]
99 THO [’s goed. ja. ja bij mij ook] ik heb d’r heel veel
100 [ja.]
101 ROB [ja. ‘h.]
102 THO u::hm goed nou ik zal daar Jacques over bellen ik denk wel
103 dat dat uh goed is
104 ROB ja. [en dan hoor]ik het nog wel eve uh terug
105 THO [volgens mij]
106 ja.

107 ROB van je
108 THO ja. we zitten op de tijd?
109 ROB uh, oh ‘k zal even kijken moment ((rustling)) ja vijf
110 minuten dus dit zou al voldoende zijn
111 THO zijn we al vijf minuten bezig?
112 ROB we zijn al vier komma negenenvijfti- ja dat wil zeggen
113 inclusief bellen en het naar jou bellen nee da’s waar
114 da[’s waar]
115 THO [oh] ja
116 ROB wij hebben zelf nog maar vier minuten op de teller staan
117 denk ik=
118 THO =ja .h maar dat was uh ze moesten drie minuten hebben geloof
119 i[k?]
120 ROB [j]a:: daarom dit is dit moet voldoende zijn
121 THI nou. goed [babbeldebabbel]
122 ROB [dit is een: ge]sprek dat helemaal nergen over
123 gaat [maar
124 THO [blabla[bla]
125 ROB [behal]ve wat afspraken [.h maar ook dat hoort]
126 THO [huhuhu ((laughing))]
127 ROB bij de nederlandse telefoonge[sprekken
128 THO [ook dat hoort bij de
129 nederlandse telefoongesprek-_ ook herhalingen_
130 ROB juist [zoals we] net al zeiden
131 THO [en uhm]
132 huhuhu [hehe] ((laughing))
133 ROB [huhuhu]
134 THO goed. [we hangen ↑op_]
135 ROB [je zult toch] ja goed zo
136 THO ja uh nee toch even wat [wan]neer gaan wij uh nog wat doen?
137 ROB [nee↑↓]
138 ja?

139 THO een oeuvre opbouwen of uitbouwen

140 ROB WAT moet ik opbouwen, een euro?

141 THO een oeuvre

142 ROB oh een OEUvre

143 THO ja.

144 ROB vertel.

145 THO nou wanneer gaan we dat uh wanneer spreken wij wat af:.

146 Jij [en] ik.

147 ROB [uh]

148 ↓ah ↑zo:: ja nee ik was het even helemaal kwijt waar je 't

149 over ha[d nee] ja natuurlijk wij moeten samen nog uh wat uh

150 THO [ja]

151 ROB muziek instuderen ee:h ja dat kan ieder gewenst moment, uh

152 maar laten we daar de agenda even bijpakken want anders dan

153 blijft dat zo'n vage afspraak .hh uh goed

154 morgenavond NIET want dat wilde luuk nog weer wat even samen

155 oefenen, uh: DINSdagavond.

156 THO dinsdagavond KAN ik niet_

157 ROB kun je niet oh nee da's waar jij hebt dinsdag en woensdag

158 altijd wat hè,

159 THO ja.

160 ROB uh DONderdagavond.

161 THO donderdagavond kan ik ook niet.

162 ROB hè?=

163 THO =dan ga ik met Frank trainen_

164 ROB ev-,

165 THO maar overdag een keer of zo?
but daytime a time or so
'but during the day some time or so'

166 ROB overdag. kan oo[k.] dinsdagMIDdag_
daytime can too tuesday_afternoon
'during the day is also possible. Tuesday afternoon

167 THO [ah.]

168 THO dinsdagmiddag. Juist.
tuesday_afternoon Right

169 ROB goed zo nou hebben we mekaar.
alright now have we each_other
'Alright, now we've got each other'

170 Twee uur?
Two o'clock?

171 THO twee uur.
two o'clock.

172 ROB °twee uu:r_ Thomas hier. Goed zo.°
two o'clock Thomas here. Alright.

173 THO nou zeg dat uh .h is al meteen een hele afspraak
well say that uh .h is already directly a whole appointment
'Well. look at that! That uh .h is right away quite a commitment'

174 dat uh dan gaat m'n hele uhm m'n hele week KANtelt daar.
that uh then goes my whole uhm my whole week pivots there.
'that uh that's where my whole uh my whole week pivots there.'

175 Da's namelijk mijn uh enige .h
that's namely my uh only
'because that's my uh only'

176 ROB vrije moment.
free moment

177 THO n-nee m'n enige afspraak
n-no my only appointment

178 ROB oh ((smile voice))[je enige AFspraak.
oh ((smile voice)) your only appointment

179 THO [mh mh mh] ((laughs))

180 ROB oh ko-
oh co-

181 THO ja.
yes

182 ROB dat [is] interessant.
that is interesting

183 THO [ja.]
yes

184 .hh goed twee uur
.hh good two o'clock

185 dan uh dan [kom ik eraan en dan uh zien we wel]
then uh then come I to_there and then uh see we PTCL
'then uh then I'll come to your place and then uh we'll see

186 ROB [en dan kom je hier en dan gaan uh]
and then come you here and then go
'and then you come here and then (we) will uh

187 rommelen we eventjes een paar cd’s d’ruit.
fiddle we quickly a few cd's out_of_it
'we quickly churn out a couple of cd's'

188 THO pre[cies

189 ROB hé het is denk ik ook wel een goed idee om ‘t ‘ns even

190 op te nemen,

191 THO ja.

192 ROB daar enig serieus aandacht aan te besteden.

193 want uh ik HEB al trouwens hele leuke dingen op minidisc hier

194 staan hoor van ons beiden,

195 THO ja,

196 ROB ja. Die heb ik nog ’s nageluisterd en toen dacht ik nou zelfs

197 DAT zou als demo nog heel aardig door de [beugel kunnen_

200 THO [↑oh ja_

201 THO ↑oh late we daar eve naar luistere,
oh let us there PTCL to listen
'Oh, let's have a listen to that'

202 ROB maar daar kunne we naar luistere_ kunne w' ons late
but there can we to listen can we us let
'but we can listen to that, we can get

203 inspirere [en dan gaan] we weer uh=
inspire and then go we again uh
'inspiration and then we'll (play?) again

204 THO [ja.]
yes

205 ROB =want daar spele we namelijk ook wel es wat andere
because there play we namely also PTCL PTCL some other

206 dinge dan alleen de: bond[15], .h
things than just the federation
'Because there we do also play some other things besides the federation's pieces'

[15] It is not clear what *bond* (union, federation) refers to. It may be a shortened form of *muziekbond* 'music federation', these are regional associations of amateur orchestras and (brass) bands. They also publish or select certain pieces of music that are approved for music competitions and exams of different levels. https://www.knmo.nl/bonden/

207 THO ja.
yes

208 ROB en dat klinkt ook hartstikke leuk [als afwisseling].
and that sounds also extremely nice as variety
'and that sounds very nice as well, for variety's sake.

209 THO [↑oh goed joh]
oh good PTCL
'oh, that's really good'

210 ROB ja_<

211 THO leuk.
nice

212 ROB goed ik zie je dinsdag.
good I see you tuesday
'Good, I'll see you on Tuesday.'

213 THO oké. [↑jo Rob.]
okay yo ((name))

214 ROB [groetjes] doeg.
greetings bye
'See ya, bye'

215 THO doei.
bye