

This is a repository copy of *Swallowing in conversation*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/170382/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Ogden, Richard orcid.org/0000-0002-5315-720X (2021) Swallowing in conversation. *Frontiers in Communication. Language Sciences*.. 657190. ISSN 2297-900X

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2021.657190>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Swallowing in conversation

Richard Ogden

Centre for Advanced Studies in Language & Communication, Department of Language & Linguistic Science, University of York, YORK YO10 5DD, United Kingdom

Correspondence:

Richard Ogden

richard.ogden@york.ac.uk

Keywords: swallowing, conversation, non-verbal communication, emotion, phonetics

Language of the submission: British English

Abstract

Swallowing — a complex physical process that involves closure of the mouth and nasal cavities, as well as the glottis, and the raising and lowering of the larynx — is at the boundary between speech and the body, yet almost nothing is known about how it works in conjunction with speech in spoken interaction.

Research into swallowing, mostly in speech therapy, has explored the articulations required, how long it takes the bolus to pass through the mouth to the stomach, and the sounds occur on the way. In the phonetics literature, swallowing is regularly excluded from study: in experiments, tokens with swallowing are excluded; and while swallowing is used to set up certain experiments, its effect on speech is not the object of such studies, though it is sometimes mentioned as a possible action during a stretch of silence, as in word search.

Although speaking and swallowing are mutually incompatible, in conversation, swallowing has to be coordinated around the processes of speaking. It can be part of the preparations for speech; it can also occur within and after stretches of speech.

While swallowing has been marked in conversation analytic transcripts in several languages, it is almost never commented on. Like sniffing, crying or laughing, swallowing occurs in the vocal tract and may accompany speech, but is not considered as part of the stream of speech. It is clearly related to drinking, which Hoey (2015, 2017, 2020b) shows is strategically placed in the sequential unfolding of talk. In the same spirit, this paper will treat swallowing as an interactional resource which is bound up with language, and which has particular affordances and demands.

This paper fills a gap in our knowledge, by focusing on swallowing that is embedded within, before, or after stretches of speech. It considers the phonetic, linguistic and

38 interactional features of swallowing. It thus explores how verbal conduct is intertwined
39 with one aspect of bodily conduct.

40 **1. Introduction**

41 Swallowing — a complex physical process that involves closure of the mouth and nasal
42 cavities, as well as the glottis, and the raising and lowering of the larynx — is at the
43 boundary between speech and the body, yet almost nothing is known about how it works in
44 conjunction with speech in spoken interaction.

45 Like sniffing, crying or laughing, swallowing occurs in the vocal tract and may
46 accompany speech, but is considered marginal to speech (see Keevallik & Ogden, 2020, and
47 papers therein). It is clearly central to eating and drinking, which Hoey (2015, 2017,
48 2020b) shows can be strategically placed in the sequential unfolding of talk. In the same
49 spirit, this paper treats swallowing as an interactional resource which is bound up with
50 language, and which has particular affordances and demands.

51 Studies of swallowing in speech therapy focus on the physical processes of swallowing,
52 mostly in isolation, or swallowing food or drink, but not alongside or within talk. In the
53 phonetics literature, swallowing is regularly excluded from study: in experiments, tokens
54 with swallowing are excluded; and while swallowing is used to set up certain experiments
55 (e.g. Faucher et al, 2019), its effect on speech is not the object of such studies, though it is
56 sometimes mentioned as a possible action during a stretch of silence, as in word search
57 (Belz & Trouvain, 2019; Ogden, 2013).

58 This study fills a gap in what is known about swallowing, by considering how it works
59 in one of its indigenous environments: talk-in-interaction. The paper draws on a variety of
60 data, including audio and video data, primarily from the UK. The examples are tokens of
61 swallowing where participants are not also eating or drinking, or indeed tasting, of which
62 swallowing may be a visible and prominent element (Mondada 2020: 149).

63 Section 2 offers a brief survey of what is already known about swallowing. I describe
64 the physical process of swallowing and its audible and visible effects, and review what is
65 known about swallowing from studies in both Conversation Analysis and elsewhere.

66 A primary question of the study is where in talk people audibly (and visibly) swallow. I
67 show the placement of swallowing relative to the online phonological and syntactic
68 construction of a turn at talk. I show that swallows that project more talk (Section 4) and
69 swallows that project no more talk cooccur with different syntactic, prosodic and phonetic
70 features. Section 6 looks at examples of swallowing embedded with affective displays,
71 including sobbing and facial and verbal displays of ‘trouble’.

72 **2. Background**

73 **2.1 The physiological process of swallowing**

74 Swallowing is the process of moving a ball of food or liquid (bolus) from the mouth to
75 the oesophagus and then into the stomach. This is accomplished by a complex series of

76 voluntary and involuntary actions which are tightly coordinated with each other. Firstly,
77 the tongue pushes the bolus to the back of the mouth. Secondly, the bolus is passed into the
78 pharynx. At this point, the soft palate is raised, sealing off the nasal cavities and making
79 nasal airflow (including therefore breathing) impossible; the vocal folds close, the larynx
80 rises, and the epiglottis covers and protects the larynx (forming an epiglottal stop: Esling et
81 al. 2019: 53), and prevents the bolus passing into the lungs. Finally, the bolus moves to the
82 oesophagus, and from there it is pushed into the stomach through muscle contractions.

83 The action of swallowing is incompatible with speaking, because the closures at the lips,
84 glottis and velum mean that the vocal tract is temporarily sealed off, and the airflow
85 required for speech is not possible. Later sections will show how swallowing affects
86 surrounding speech, and how swallowing is placed within talk.

87 **2.2 Sounds of swallowing**

88 Although speech is not possible during swallowing, the biomechanical movements of
89 swallowing do produce a number of sounds. These sounds are generally rather quiet, or
90 inaudible; and they have much lower amplitude than speech. In speech therapy studies they
91 have mostly been examined by using a stethoscope placed above the larynx while being
92 asked to swallow something, usually a thickened liquid; or by placing a microphone in the
93 same location (Ferruci et al. 2013).

94 A study by Morinière et al (2008), on 75 recordings of 15 individuals, identified three
95 common acoustic components during swallowing: (1) the laryngeal ascension sound, (2) the
96 upper-sphincter opening sound, which was found in all their recordings, and (3) the
97 laryngeal release sound. The laryngeal ascension sound is rather low in intensity, so is
98 heard as quiet. The upper-sphincter opening sound was found in all their recordings, and is
99 the sound of the bolus flowing through the pharynx, and corresponds to the 'gulping' sound
100 most commonly associated with swallowing. On average it lasts 185 ms in their data
101 (approximately the duration of a long vowel in English). The laryngeal release sound, like
102 the ascension sound, is quiet and not always present. The laryngeal ascension and release
103 sounds are shorter (average 106 ms and 72 ms respectively), transient, click-like sounds.

104 Swallowing can take between 0.25 and 0.8 s. The average total duration of a swallow is
105 around 0.4 s, with an average intensity of around 44 dB, which is quiet (Cichero &
106 Murdoch, 2002). On average, the swallowing sounds of females are higher in timbre than
107 those of males; for males, there is more variability in the timbre depending on the size of
108 the bolus (Cichero & Murdoch, 2002: 630). The same study showed that subjective
109 discrimination of swallowing sounds was fairly reliable: they were recognised more than
110 70% of the time, and when the bolus was 15 ml, they were distinct 90% of the time.

111 These findings mean that it is reasonable to use auditory data to detect swallowing, and
112 that swallowing may be audible for participants in conversation.

113 Although swallowing is not compatible with speaking, it affects the production of
114 speech before and after the swallow occurs. During swallowing itself, the vocal folds are
115 closed, so exhalation – a prerequisite for the vast majority of speech sounds – is not
116 possible. In addition, the lips are closed and the velum raised, so neither ingressive nor
117 egressive airflow can occur. In short, speech is physically not possible during swallowing.
118 However, swallowing can take place before, during or after the act of speaking, and
119 sometimes its effects are audible within speech.

120 The acoustic properties of speech can be affected by swallowing shortly before its onset
121 and offset. The raising of the larynx required while swallowing shortens the vocal tract. The
122 movement of the larynx produces changes in the voice quality; a raised larynx is associated
123 with higher F0 (Honda, 2004, cited in Esling et al, 2019: 95). The change of the length of
124 the vocal tract changes the natural resonances of the vocal tract. Since the movement of the
125 larynx is pretty rapid, these resonance changes are also rapid. The data in this paper does
126 not allow further investigation into the acoustic effects of swallowing on speech.


127 Once the swallow is complete, adjustments need to be made to the vocal tract to
128 produce speech. These adjustments include e.g. separation of the lips, and the removal of
129 the tongue from the roof of the mouth, resulting in lipsmacks and clicks.

130 The sounds of swallowing are illustrated in Example 1. The speaker, Sue, has projected
131 a two-parted answer to a question from Charlie about why Britons do not forage. The
132 swallow comes at the end of the first part of her answer, and just before the second, already
133 projected, part.

134 **Example 1: vegtalk BBC Radio 4 19.12.03 forage**

135 01 Sue: there are TWO mAIn reasons: uh Charlie. I think (.) the fIrst
136 02 is that we've become very URbanised. we live- a LOT of us live
137 03 in towns, M:Any more than live in the cOUNtry,
138 04 Ch: [mm.
139 04 Sue: [.hh and-uhm ((0.62 SWALLOW CLICK)) I think the sEcond thing is
140 05 that ACcess to the cOUNtry in the UK is kind of (.)
141 06 <<p> TRICKY>.

142



143
 144 *Fig. 1. Spectrogram and waveform of a swallow + click combination from Example 1. T1 and*
 145 *T2: transients relating to phases of swallowing. C: click sound on release of the swallow.*

146
 147 The final [m] of 'and-uhm' is relatively short, and there is an abrupt drop in volume, so
 148 it sounds cut off. Between the end of [m] and the onset of 'I think' is a gap of 620 ms,
 149 during which the swallow occurs. Two transients (audible as momentary popping sounds)
 150 are visible, marked as T1 and T2 in Figure 1. T1 is the laryngeal ascension sound. T2 which
 151 is louder, and whose energy is in the F2 region, is the upper sphincter opening sound, and
 152 the sound of saliva passing down the oesophagus. It lasts about 100 ms. Both of these
 153 sounds are low in intensity in comparison with the speech that surrounds them. The
 154 swallow is released with a click (marked C) just after 4.8 s.

155 This stretch of talk has a very noticeable rhythmical organisation. The asterisks in Fig.
 156 1, have been placed at amplitude and f0 peaks in the signal (see Ogden & Hawkins 2015 for
 157 a complete description of the method). These mark the approximate location of rhythmical
 158 beats. 'And-uhm' has two beats; the next beat in talk comes on 'I' at around 4.9 s. The
 159 swallow occurs during a silent beat, marked (*). Rhythmicity can be seen in the
 160 approximately equal intervals in time between the marked beats: i.e. the beats are
 161 isochronous, and this generates a sense of rhythmicity. Rhythmicity in turn generates
 162 coherence across the gap, projecting moments in time with which further speech events can
 163 be coordinated (cf. Ogden, 2013: 314-316, on clicks used as metronomes with the same
 164 function), and tying the talk after the swallow with the talk before it. Interestingly, the
 165 swallow is timed in such a way that the return to talk happens on beat with prior talk, so

166 while the swallow disrupts the flow of surrounding talk, it is also fitted to aspects of the
167 production of that talk.

168 The swallow comes just after the second reason of two — already projected in line 1,
169 with ‘two main reasons’ — has been projected with ‘and-uhm’: it occurs at a place of
170 ‘maximal grammatical control’ (Schegloff 1996: 93). The click, which occurs immediately
171 before the second reason is presented, bears some resemblance to a ‘new sequence indexing
172 click’ (Wright 2007, 2011), in that the swallow and the click are placed at a structural
173 juncture, where the material after the swallow + click is the start of something new (in this
174 case the second projected reason).

175 As we will see from later examples, swallows are quite regularly positioned within
176 speech so as to accommodate the action of speaking, on both the syntactic and prosodic
177 front.

178 **2.3 Swallowing as silence**

179 Although swallowing may produce noises, swallows are often inaudible. Silent or
180 inaudible swallows cannot therefore be transcribed from audio data; in addition,
181 transcribers may decide *a priori* that such events are not worthy of transcription. Belz &
182 Trouvain (2019) and Trouvain, Werner and Möbius (2020) note that many things labelled
183 as ‘silences’ in phonetic studies in fact include sounds such as in-breaths and clicks —
184 swallows could be added to this list.

185 **2.4 Visible effects of swallowing**

186 While the sounds of swallowing are often hard to observe, visible signs of swallowing
187 are often more accessible. The upward then downward movement of the larynx is
188 accompanied by movements of muscles and bones in the neck. The following things can
189 commonly be seen during swallowing:

190

- 191 • the lips may be tightly pressed together (cf. Peräkylä & Ruusuvuori, 2012: 77)
- 192 • tendons in the neck may be visible as the larynx is raised and lowered
- 193 • the upward and downward movement of the larynx may be seen
- 194 • there may be a forward movement of the chin, straightening out the pharynx

195

196 Some of these features are visible in Figure 2, which is taken from Example 5.

197



198
199 *Fig. 2. Images of swallowing from Example 5. The speaker (pictured) says ‘Belinda got-uhm :①*
200 *(0.7 SWALLOW ②) CLICK ③ a ([ei]) (0.6) grant’.*

201 *(1): taken at the end of ‘uhm’. Note the tightly pressed lips with the outer surfaces pressed*
202 *inwards. (2): taken during the swallow. Note the visible tendons in the neck as the larynx is*
203 *raised. (3): the swallow is released into a click, and the lips are opened.*

204 The visibility of swallowing in video data is contingent on the positioning of the camera
205 relative to the speaker, the visibility of the neck (perhaps because of clothing), and the
206 speaker’s own physiology. Such contingencies mean that swallows may not be visibly
207 accessible to the analyst, depending on the data recording.

208 **2.5 Swallowing in spoken interaction**

209 In the main disciplines to have considered swallowing – phonetics and speech therapy
210 studies – swallowing is dislocated from speech, and is treated as an action by itself.

211 In phonetic studies, swallowing is predominantly mentioned in two speech contexts. The
212 first one is in setting up ultrasound experiments, where swallowing liquid helps the
213 experimenter to establish the line of the hard palate. However, this is only part of the set-
214 up, and not an element of any study, so any data on swallowing is discarded. Secondly,
215 swallowing is mentioned as a reason to exclude data samples from experimental study,
216 since it is treated as a disfluency, and experiments in general require speech to be fluent.

217 In speech therapy studies, the main area of interest is dysphagia, where one or more
218 aspect of swallowing is not working properly. Most of these studies are interested in the
219 physiology of swallowing, and so they focus on what happens when a participant attempts
220 to swallow something that has been ingested. Swallowing is therefore treated as a process
221 by itself, separate from speech.

222 In Conversation Analysis, swallowing has rarely been commented on, although
223 examples of it appear in published transcriptions in several languages. It has been
224 mentioned in the context of crying (Hepburn, 2004; Hepburn & Potter, 2012: 200) and
225 drinking (Hoey, 2020b); but little is said about the placement of swallowing in speech, or
226 its effects on speech.

227 This paper fills a gap in our knowledge, by focusing on swallowing that is embedded
228 within, before, or after stretches of speech. It considers the phonetic, linguistic and
229 interactional features of swallowing. It thus explores how verbal conduct is intertwined

230 with one aspect of bodily conduct.

231 **2.6 The syntactic placement of swallows in talk**

232 Swallowing has been marked in conversation analytic transcripts in several languages:
233 e.g. English (Schegloff, 1988: 226), Estonian (Laanesoo & Keevallik, 2017: 294-5), German
234 (Selting, 2012: 405), Italian (Rossi, 2015: 41-2), and Norwegian (Sikveland & Ogden, 2012:
235 176). However, it is almost never commented on. A survey of the placement of swallows in
236 these transcripts shows that they can occur before the verbal components of a TCU
237 (Hepburn, 2004: 260; Laanesoo & Keevallik, 2017: 294-5); in the middle of a syntactic
238 clause (Schegloff 1988: 226; Hepburn, 2004: 285; Sikveland & Ogden, 2012, 176; Ogden
239 2013; 311); or as a standalone (Hepburn, 2004: 273). Thus swallows occur either in places
240 which do not disrupt the syntactic structures of the talk in progress (e.g. where placed in
241 pre-TCU position), or in positions of what Schegloff calls ‘maximal grammatical control’
242 (Schegloff 1996: 93).

243 One of the goals of this paper is to explore where swallows are embedded within talk,
244 and what the affordances of swallowing in such positions are. In addition to the positions
245 noted above, we will show examples of swallows that are produced post-completion,
246 making them similar to some clicks (Ogden 2013, 2020), sniffs (Hoey 2020a) or sighs (Hoey
247 2014).

248 **2.7 Swallowing and displays of emotional affect**

249 As well as being a somatic necessity, swallowing is associated with heightened affective
250 states and crying or sobbing. The spontaneous swallowing rate has been shown to increase
251 with emotional arousal (Fonagy & Calloway, 1985; Ritz & Thöns, 2006). In an experimental
252 setting, Cuevas et al., (1995) found that heart rate, limb movement, sweat production and
253 swallowing all increased in conditions of heightened emotional arousal, whereas they all
254 dropped in a low arousal condition.

255 Roach et al. (1998: 87) treat ‘gulping’ (which we take as a form of a loud, audible,
256 swallow) as a reflex:

257 ...an involuntary indication of genuine emotional stress. Extreme emotional states produce
258 altered patterns in respiration, the endocrine system, and the metabolism in general, which
259 may result in audible changes to speech.

260 There exists the possibility that such reflexes are not always involuntary, but may be
261 consciously used to convey a particular emotional state. Scherer (1985) makes this
262 distinction in his discussion of unconscious “push-effects” versus conscious “pull- effects”.

263 There seem to be no empirical studies exploring how swallowing is connected to

264 displays of affective states in natural speech. If experimental findings translate to everyday
265 settings, we would expect swallowing to be more frequent in affective displays. Hepburn
266 (2004) is one of the few CA studies which mentions swallowing explicitly, in the context of
267 crying.

268 If swallowing can be recruited as part of a display of an affective state, as a 'pull-effect',
269 then we would expect to find that there are orderly practices for embedding it within
270 language, alongside other linguistic practices around the display of emotion. While this
271 paper does not contain enough data to provide an unequivocal analysis of the association
272 between swallowing and displays of emotional affective states, it does contain cases where
273 swallowing prefigures such a display, or avoids one.

274 **3. Data and methods**

275 **3.1 Sources of data**

276 The language of the data is British English. The examples presented in this paper come
277 from three main sources:

278

279 1. *Rossi Corpus of English* (RCE). RCE was recorded in York in 2011. It consists of
280 conversations between colleagues and friends in a natural setting. Most of the data
281 comes from RCE14, *Colleagues* (two British speakers, one male, one female), and
282 RCE25, *Bench* (two female speakers, one North American, the other British), because
283 these two recordings provide clear visual access to the participants' necks, so that
284 swallowing is visible. The RCE data includes high quality audio files, which make
285 closer acoustic analysis possible. Altogether, RCE14 and RCE 25 amount to 56
286 minutes of data, and they yielded 14 clear examples of swallowing.

287

288 This data was complemented by publicly available sources of data which contain other
289 kinds of social interactions. These are from edited, but unscripted, British reality TV shows:

290

291 2. *Repair Shop*. Repair Shop is a British TV programme where people bring in objects
292 that are broken, to get them mended. They present their items and tell a brief story
293 about their sentimental value. They return to the repair shop to collect these items
294 some time later. The collection draws especially from the return visit, where the
295 repaired and restored items are revealed. This is often a moment for a display or
296 outpouring of emotion. In total, 12 episodes were inspected (a total of 8 hr 45
297 minutes), with 35 objects repaired and a total of 8 swallowing episodes on the return
298 of repaired items. The data is British English.

299 3. *Judge Rinder*. Judge Rinder is a British TV programme mimicking a small claims

300 court. While it has entertainment value, it often puts the plaintiffs and defendants in
301 emotionally charged positions. Two episodes yield three examples of swallowing; the
302 data is British English.

303

304 The figures provided in this list should be treated with caution: given the limitations of
305 both audibility and visibility of swallowing, they certainly do not capture all instances of
306 swallowing, and it is not possible to draw robust conclusions about the frequency of
307 swallowing from this data.

308 None of these sources allow for control over factors important to traditional
309 sociolinguistics, such as gender, age or origin of the speaker. As with other ‘liminal’
310 phenomena within speech (Dingemanse 2020; Keevallik & Ogden 2020), it is possible that
311 there is individual variation in the frequency with which such items are produced. For
312 swallowing, any variation may not be consistent for a given individual, for physiological
313 reasons, such as temporarily having a dry mouth, or crying.

314 Data for Repair Shop and Judge Rinder were collected from broadcasts available via Box
315 of Broadcasts. Ethical approval was granted by the ethics committee of the Department of
316 Language & Linguistic Science at the University of York in accordance with the University’s
317 ethical framework.

318 **3.2 Selection criteria**

319 Like breathing, swallowing is a somatic function which mostly goes unnoticed. Not all
320 in- or exhalations are audible; and not every swallow is audible or visible either. Therefore
321 the focus of this paper is moments in talk-in-interaction where swallowing is either
322 noticeably (which is not to say *deliberately*) visible or audible, or both. This means that there
323 are many instances of swallowing in the data sources which are not (and cannot be)
324 included in this collection. This is an inevitable consequence of the fact that swallowing is
325 only sometimes perceptible to an observer. While it means that the analysis is not
326 exhaustive and does not account for all occasions on which people swallow in interaction,
327 the resulting situation is comparable with that of breathing in conversation, where the in-
328 or out-breaths that can be observed are the ones which are transcribed are available for
329 analysis. It is a reasonable assumption that swallows which cannot be observed are
330 predominantly vegetative.

331 **3.3 Transcription**

332 Transcripts mark accentuation and intonation following the GAT conventions for
333 English (Couper-Kuhlen & Barth-Weingarten, 2011). Swallowing and other physical
334 activities are presented between double parentheses, with the duration, where available,
335 presented first. Concurrent bodily activities are shown with a ‘+’.

336 3.4 Methods

337 The data were analysed using the methods of Conversation Analysis and Interactional
338 Linguistics (see e.g. Clift, 2016; Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 2017). The main task of this
339 paper, as in Ogden (2020), is to establish what the more general principles are by which
340 such events are understood by participants, such as the sequential and rhythmical
341 positioning already seen in Example 1. For this reason, individual pieces of data were
342 considered with respect to aspects of their linguistic design, sequential positioning, and
343 participants' orientations to swallowing. Both visual and audible information were taken
344 into account in the analysis in the case of video data.

345 4. Swallows in the context of projecting more talk

346 Swallows can occur where more talk is projected through syntactic, prosodic and turn
347 organisational structures. In these cases, they are placed at points in the emerging talk that
348 suggest a sensitivity to syntactic and prosodic structures, and to the progressivity of talk.

349 In Example 2, talk is projected through the sequential organisation of an adjacency pair.
350 Judge Rinder (JR) is questioning a young man (YM) about his education. In this example,
351 YM does a swallow in pre-turn position after JR's first pair part.

352 Example 2: Rinder 18/01/2016:[11:50]¹

353 01 JR: were you in ONE foster home? were you i- or: in SEveral.
354 02 YM: SEveral.
355 03 JR: what qualify%CATions did you leave SCHOOL with;%
356 04 YM: %((opens mouth, looks away))-----%
357 05 .thh uhm ((SWALLOW CLICK)) uhm I didn- I didn't do very WELL in
358 06 school,
359 07 but I managed to get a BA. (.) in Art; which is my chOsen STUdy.
360

361 The Judge's question at line 3 presupposes that YM left school with qualifications. The
362 first part of YM's answer in line 5 implies that he left without qualifications, thus indirectly
363 rejecting the presupposition of the question. The second part of the answer in line 7
364 mentions a BA, not the kind of qualification obtainable at school; so in the end the answer
365 does refer to qualifications, but not the kind targeted by the Judge's question. YM's answer
366 overall, then, is a complex one, which among other things has to deal with a problem in the
367 presuppositions of the question.

368 This complex answer is preceded in pre-beginning position by a number of audible and
369 visible articulations: he turns his head and opens his mouth to breathe in in overlap with
370 JR's question; this results in a percussive with an in-breath (.thh), and is followed by a

¹ Judge Rinder, 14:00 18/01/2016, ITV London, 60 mins.

<https://learningonscreen.ac.uk/ondemand/index.php/prog/0B221B3E?bcast=120939256> (Accessed 15 Jan 2021)

371 hesitation particle ('uhm'). These index incipient speakership, and thus display an
 372 orientation to the relevance of talk. There is then a swallow that is released into a click
 373 (arguably the most audibly salient part of the swallow from the participants' perspective),
 374 then another hesitation particle and a self-repair. So in this case the swallow is part of a
 375 cluster of objects in pre-beginning position (Schegloff, 1996) which serve to delay the
 376 verbal part of the answer, a typical feature of turns with dispreferred formats (Pomerantz
 377 1984, Sacks 1987; for a more phonetically grounded account, see Kendrick & Torreira,
 378 2015). The swallow itself is not audible, and so could be transcribed as a silence; but it is
 379 clear from visual evidence and auditory evidence through the click that there is a swallow.

380 Swallows in this context are part of a family of practices like in-breaths, clicks and
 381 changes in body posture: they index 'preparing the vocal tract for speech', so displaying an
 382 orientation to the relevance of speaking now, while simultaneously delaying but projecting
 383 talk.

384 In the next example, a swallow is placed between two clauses. Here, a subordinate
 385 clause initiated with *when* is first extended with two conjunctions, then the speaker
 386 produces a swallow (line 8), released into some lip smack noises, before the main clause
 387 (line 10).

388 **Example 3: RCE 25 Bench 16:04 no funding**

389 01 B: is he AY ARCH- AY AITCH ARR CEE fUnded.
 390 02 (0.9)
 391 03 A: <<p> he's not got Any funding.> (0.5)
 392 04 ↑did I not TEll you the (0.4) whOle STOrY;
 393 05 B: <<p> no.>
 394 06 A: <<all> about him.>
 395 07 .hh when I was in OXford,
 396 08 and we met UP and we went out for DINner,
 397 09 ((1.3 **SWALLOW** LIPSMACKS))
 398 10 um, we were CHAttin:g, (0.75)
 399 11 and (...) he mEntioned something about (0.9) the fact
 400 12 that he (.) didn't have AHRC FUNdi:ng,
 401 ((continues story))

402
 403 In this example, the swallow is placed at a syntactic and prosodic boundary between
 404 two clauses within a multi-clause sentence. The 'when' clause, extended with two 'and'
 405 conjunctions, projects a main clause which has not yet been produced. The first clause at
 406 line 7 sets the scene for the story projected at lines 4-6. It is extended with two subsequent
 407 clauses in line 8, which extend the 'when' clause again. So the ends of the clauses in lines 7
 408 and 8 project more talk syntactically and pragmatically, and there is no TRP in these places.
 409 B does not make any move to come in during the gap where A swallows at line 9. The
 410 syntactic positioning of this swallow is different from the one in Example 1, as it occurs
 411 between two sentential clauses; it is closer syntactically to Example 2, where a swallow was

412 placed at a high-level syntactic boundary.

413 It is hard to ascribe an action to the swallow in this case. If swallowing is a somatic
414 requirement, then timing it so that it falls at a clause boundary means that it is less exposed
415 in the interaction than if embedded within a lower-level constituent such as between ‘we’
416 and ‘went’ or ‘went’ and ‘out’. This seems to be such a place: the coparticipant does not
417 treat this as a TRP, and the current speaker, A, treats this as a suspension of her talk which
418 is resolved by the syntactically fitted clause at line 9.

419 In Example 4, a swallow appears embedded within a TCU, at a major phrase boundary.
420 Will has repaired a jewellery box which he is returning to Karen. This box belonged to
421 Karen’s grandmother, but Karen did not know the box’s origin. Will has just opened the box
422 before he explains to Karen that he discovered a scrap of paper in the box which they take
423 as confirmation of the origin of the box.

424 **Example 4: Repair Shop [20/07/2019, 24:04] Jewellery box²**

425 01 W: interestingly eVnOU:gh, on the invsI:de,
426 02 ((**SWALLOW**)) there’s some old NEW:Spaper. (.)
427 03 and I was trying to work out how ↑OLD this `wA:s-
428 04 where it CAME from.
429 05 K: yeah.
430 06 W: I thOUght it was iTAlIAn,
431 07 K: rIGHt?
432 08 W: Olive wood, ninteen TWENTies,
433 09 I actually found a little piece of PAPER.=
434 10 =<<all> and I was thInking,>
435 11 “is this iTAlIAn?” right in the mIddle it says “ROma”.
436 12 so, OBvIously:-
437 13 K: so it IS Italian.
438 14 W: yeah.
439 15 K: OK.
440 16 W: I thought I’d kEEp that there, just for a kEEpsake.
441 17 K: that is GORgeous. it’s BEAUtiful.
442

443 In this case, the swallow is positioned within a sentence, at the boundary between a
444 fronted prepositional phrase and the rest of the sentence. Although this is a major phrase
445 boundary, the sentence itself is incomplete.

446 The two fronted adverbial phrases ‘interestingly enough’ and ‘on the inside’ are
447 produced as separate intonational phrases, each with a final fall-rise intonation contour,
448 which is commonly used to project more talk. The repetition of the contour facilitates the
449 hearing of these two phrases as belonging to the same larger hierarchical unit, while at the
450 same time projecting the rest of the sentence. Thus the placement of the swallow here
451 displays an orientation to the unfolding syntactic and prosodic units: it is located at major

² The Repair Shop, 16:30 20/07/2019, BBC1 London, 30 mins.

<https://learningonscreen.ac.uk/ondemand/index.php/prog/0EA6D962?bcast=129746111> (Accessed 20 Apr 2020)

452 boundaries where continued talk is projected through prosodic and syntactic structures, and
453 Karen makes no move to come in at this point.

454 The swallow is positioned before material that completes the sentence, ‘there’s some old
455 newspaper’. This turns out to be the key ‘news item’ in Will’s turn in line 1: he goes on to
456 explain how this discovery of the newspaper is what enabled him to establish the
457 provenance and date of the jewellery box. This turns out to be news which receives a
458 strongly positive assessment from Karen (line 17). As we will see in later examples,
459 swallowing is frequently placed before talk which reveals something that is given an
460 affective value by the participants.

461 Example 5 is an example of swallowing during a word search, where the swallow is
462 positioned within a syntactic phrase and not at a major phrase boundary. A and B are
463 sitting next to each other on a bench. They have been talking about how someone they both
464 know has failed to get a research grant. The extract starts with B’s contrasting story in
465 response, about how Belinda has been awarded a prestigious research grant. The swallow
466 appears in a word search initiated with ‘uhm’ and ended with a click before the searched-
467 for word — see Wright (2005) for further details of similar practices.

468 Example 5: RCE25 Bench 19:11 grant

469 01 B: <<f> beLinda,> um —
470 02 LUke was telling me yesterday that belinda gOt-uhm:
471 03 ((0.7 SWALLOW)) ((CLICK)) a/[ei] (0.6) `GRANT
472 04 from the: (.) paul mEllon: center or the yale
473 05 center for british ART to go Over: to: YALE
474 06 for a couple of mOnths,
475 07 and I think sh[e’s leaving soon.
476 08 A: [<<p> ^wo:w.>
477 09 (1.3 A nods)
478 10 B: <<p> (s *) > h I’d really [lIke tha:t.
479 11 A: [(* *)
480 12 I’ve not spOken to her for A:ges=
481 13 =I need to get in tOUch with [her.
482 14 B: [(I) saw her like (..) two
483 15 months ago
484

485 In line 2, B is part-way through a TCU when she signals suspension of her talk with
486 ‘uhm’. ‘Uhm’ often indexes upcoming problems in production (Jefferson 1974, Fox Tree &
487 Clark 1997), and as in other cases noted by Wright (2005) it marks the onset of a word
488 search stretch.

489 The [t] of ‘got’ is released with aspiration. ‘Got-uhm’ has two syllables of equal metrical
490 weight, and mid level tones. Wright (2005: 191) notes that this is a common intonational
491 feature of pre word search stretches, and that it is a device for projecting an upcoming focal
492 accent. It matches many of the features described in Local (2004) for ‘and-uhm’ (see also
493 Example 1). The talk is suspended at a point where the syntactic structure is also
494 incomplete: the verb ‘got’ requires a noun phrase as an object. Thus the syntactic and

495 phonetic design serve to suspend the progressivity of the talk while simultaneously
496 projecting certain features.

497 After the [m], B presses her lips tightly together (a more extreme articulation than for
498 [m]; see Fig. 2), then swallows. As she swallows, her head and her gaze direction tilt
499 downwards. The swallow is released into a click, and the indefinite article that follows this
500 is in full form (reminiscent of Jefferson's 1974 observations on the full form of 'the', [ði], as
501 part of an error correction device). During the silence that follows this, the articulations are
502 visibly prepared for 'grant' – in particular, the lips can be seen to be rounded in anticipation
503 of [r]. (It is interesting to note that Wright, 2011: 220, on the basis of audio data, notes
504 other cases where speakers produce tight bilabial closures which are held for quite a while
505 before being released into percussives and/or clicks, often with an in-breath.)

506 B's gaze up to this point is away to the distance. However, she blinks and turns her head
507 towards B as she reaches *from the....* and her gaze is to A as she says 'Paul Mellon Center'.
508 So B's gaze behaviour during the part of the turn where the click is produced suggests that
509 she is still working on the production of her turn.

510 Swallows in word searches are one feature among others: hesitation particles, suspended
511 prosodic and syntactic features, a click on release of the swallow. Wright's (2005)
512 observations on audio data match these observations very closely: she notes that features
513 like these (including audible glottal closure, which must be present for swallowing) serve to
514 retain the turn, and a co-participant does not generally come in. As noted earlier, many
515 swallows are inaudible, and it is very likely that swallowing is a more common feature of
516 word searches than can be gleaned from transcriptions, where they are probably under-
517 represented, especially in audio-only data.

518 Examples 2-5 show that swallows can be placed at a point where talk is projected. In
519 pre-turn position (as in Example 2), there are other features of delayed but incipient
520 speakership, and usually before the swallow. A swallow in pre-turn position may function
521 as a preparation for speaking: if audible or visible, it may be considered as removing the
522 vocal tract of unwanted liquid before speaking is possible. It may thus come to index
523 incipient speakership.

524 Where the swallows are located at syntactic and prosodic boundaries, these boundaries
525 have syntactic, prosodic or sequence-organisational features that project more talk. These
526 features appear before the swallow, making the silence during the swallow less susceptible
527 to incoming talk from a co-participant. Although the progressivity of talk in these cases is
528 temporarily halted, its completion is projected. It is noticeable that most of these swallows
529 have an audible release, with clicks and lip smacks quite common. These sounds have been
530 shown to project further talk (Kosmala, 2020; Ogden 2013; Paschen, 2019; Pinto & Vigil
531 2019).

532 Co-participants do not treat the gaps in talk that result from swallowing as TRPs.

533 All these features suggest that speech and swallowing are planned together: swallowing
534 is not merely a somatic feature, independent of speech; but is rather intertwined with it.
535 Swallows seem to come at a point after which further talk has already been projected.

536 5. Swallows in the context of projecting no more talk

537 Swallowing also occurs in the context of projecting no more talk by the same speaker,
538 thereby yielding the turn space. Many of these cases feature tightly closed lips, without
539 subsequent lip smacks or clicks (an audible sign of release). Such swallows occur at points
540 of syntactic and/or prosodic completion, including turn-final position. In these cases,
541 swallowing serves as a non-verbal extension of a prosodically and syntactically complete
542 TCU, similar to other post-completion expansions such as sighs (Hoey 2014), clicks (Ogden
543 2020) or sniffs (Hoey 2020a), or a change of facial expression (Kaukomaa, Peräkylä and
544 Ruusuvoori, 2015). According to Schegloff (1996: 90) minimal post-expansions bring a TCU
545 to a close and offer a speaker to display “retroactive alignment towards it, or the
546 consequences of it”. Swallows seem to index again that the just-finished TCU is in fact
547 complete.

548 Example 6 illustrates this well, where a sequence-closing third is followed by a swallow
549 (line 21), and then a new sequence of action is initiated.

550 Example 6: RCE25 Bench 06:14 Lawrence Sterne's burial place

551 *B has just mentioned Shandy Hall.*

552 01 A: Oh, okay. is thAt where lAUrence stERne is BURie:d?
553 02 (1.0)
554 03 B: ↑↑I dOn't KNO:w.
555 04 (0.9)
556 05 B: I think [so-
557 06 A: [cause I know my PAREnts: (.) went
558 07 ((1.1 rocks head side to side)) SOMEwhe:re, (0.8)
559 08 um (...) on their WA:y (...) to YOR:k; (0.5)
560 09 and (.) they said, “O:h, we've just been to (0.8) see
561 10 laurence sterne's GRA:VE.”
562 11 B: Well, PO:Ssi[bly, and I think that's where he] `WROTE
563 12 A: [<<laugh> that's LOVEly.>]
564 13 B: tristram SHA:ndy, but (.) [I'm not (0.6)
565 14 A: [mm.
566 15 B: <<cr> enTIREly CERTain,>
567 16 (1.4)
568 17 A: [mm
569 18 B: [((mouths something))
570 19 B: <<laugh, nod>> if he's STILL THE:Re.>
571 20 (0.4)
572 21 A: <<p> yEAh.>
573 22 A: [((1.2 SWALLOW))
574 23 [((3.8 B drinking from her can; A looking ahead))
575 24 A: <<p> mm.>
576 25 <<laugh> I'm gonna TRY not to drInk tonIGHt,>

577 26 ((laughs)) I think I need a night OFF.
578

579 A initiates an adjacency pair in line 1. There is a rather complex and non-aligned
580 sequence in response, but 'I'm not entirely certain... if he's still there 'in lines 13-19
581 provides a lexically and syntactically fitted answer from B, and is identifiable as the second
582 pair part to line 1. A's 'yeah 'in line 21 is a sequence closing third (Schegloff 2007). It is
583 followed by a swallow which is not accompanied by any click, lipsmack or in-breath, i.e.
584 there are no signs that this swallow prefaces further talk immediately. Then there is a lapse
585 during which B drinks, and both A and B look away from each other. Hoey (2020b: 110 ff.)
586 shows that drinking can be used "as a display of the speaker's commitment to unit
587 completion", and in this case it is an alternative to expanding the sequence. At line 25 A
588 initiates a new topic. Thus A's swallow at line 9, and B's drinking at line 10, serve to
589 underscore the closure of the question-answer sequence which is started at line 1 and
590 verbally finished at line 21: the swallow is a physical action done on completion of a
591 sequence-closing turn, and is one of the non-verbal features that mark the closing of the
592 sequence.

593 In Example 7, Valerie is having a prize cup returned to her which her dad had won as a
594 young man, and is the only such item she has left of his athletics career. For her the value
595 of the repair to the cup makes up for not being able to 'indulge 'him while he was alive (line
596 23).

597 Example 7: Repair Shop [21/4/19 40:01] China cup³

598 01 B: do you want to see what 'I've managed to 'DO? (.)
599 02 Val: [do please
600 03 B: [or wE've managed to do?
601 04 Vic: yes pLEA:se.
602 05 B: ((lifts the cover off the cup))
603 06 Val: [& GASPS &]
604 val &hand to mouth; sobs&
605 07 Vic: [<<f> wOw.>]
606 08 (3.0)
607 09 Vic: †OOh.
608 10 Val: Oh, that's <<sob> ^BEAUtiful.>
609 11 Vic: †that's `BRILliant.
610 12 Val: †Oh, that's Dad's ^SIGNature.
611 13 Vic: †O:h; †^WO::W.
612 14 Val: isn't that `LOvely; hɑ:h
613 15 Vic: that's REA:lly `GOOD.
614 16 Val: <<sob,p > it IS, isn't it?>
615 17 you knOW, Brenton, you ASked me what that mEAnt to mE:,
616 18 and I said .h at the time that it represEnted dad's

³ The Repair Shop, 14:00 21/04/2019, BBC1 London, 45 mins.

<https://learningonscreen.ac.uk/ondemand/index.php/prog/135AFBDB?bcast=128953867> (Accessed 11 May 2020)

617 19 athLEtic caree:r,
618 20 but it means m- much MO:re than that to mE:, nOW,
619 21 my fAther died at the Age of fifty THREE. in nineteen SEventy.
620 22 because Dad's died so YOUNG,
621 23 we weren't able to indulge our FA:ther as we had our MOther.
622 24 .h but NOW. what you've done to that CUP. it makes me feel
623 25 .pth that we've done something for <<sob> dad as WELL.>
624 26 ((TIGHT LIPS, SWALLOW))
625 27 B: that's good.
626 28 Val: <<sob> •and it is really
627 b: •approaches Val-->
628 29 Vic: yeah.
629 30 Val: •thAnk you Brenton.
630 b: •hugs Val----->
631 31 B: &it's been a pleasure doing it. •&
632 b: -->•
633 Val: &sobs-----&

634

635 Valerie's turn, lines 16-25, is complex. It starts with a recollection of an earlier
636 interaction with Brenton, and launches a longer sequence where she contrasts her current
637 feelings with her feelings earlier. In line 23, she contrasts her relationship with her mother
638 with the one with her father, and introduces a sense of regret about her relationship to her
639 father. At lines 24-25, she starts to describe how her feelings have changed. In just the place
640 where she might verbalise her feelings ('it makes me feel...'), there is a gap, and an in-
641 breath initiated by an opening of her lips (.pth): this perturbation in the progress of the
642 TCU already hints that she has trouble putting her feelings into words; it is clear from her
643 face that she is starting to cry.

644 The TCU at lines 24-25 is syntactically and prosodically complete, though fragmented. It
645 ends with her sobbing as she speaks, and at the end of the TCU she closes her lips tightly,
646 and swallows.

647 Brenton treats this TCU (and with it, the longer telling started at line 17) as complete by
648 producing a summary assessment at line 27 which Valerie's brother acknowledges at line
649 30. The tight lips and swallow at line 26 seem to display Valerie's inability to say more
650 while displaying (but not verbalising) in post-completion position her emotional investment
651 in the repair she has had done: the swallow comes in the context of what for her is an
652 emotional event. Brenton orients to Valerie's display of strong emotions by going to hug her
653 (lines 28-30).

654 In this case, then, swallowing is treated as marking the ending of a longer turn, which is
655 a telling about strong and complex emotions, which are not easily verbalised by the speaker
656 and which are interwoven with sobs. We consider the affective work of swallows more in
657 the next section.

658 Given that swallowing requires complete lip closure and is incompatible with speech,
659 post-completion swallows indexically reinforce the completion of a turn. In Examples 6-7,

660 swallows present the talk in the prior turn as finished: the TCUs are complete syntactic and
661 prosodic units, and they present complete recognisable actions which are treated as such by
662 the participants.

663 In this section, I have shown that the positioning of swallows displays sensitivity to
664 ongoing sequential, syntactic and prosodic units. In the next section, I will show how
665 swallowing contributes to the display of affect within turns: that is, swallowing can
666 laminate turns at talk to display something about the speaker's inner state.

667 **6. Swallowing and affective displays**

668 In some of the examples considered already, swallows are present in turns where a
669 speaker displays an affective stance. Example 2, 'neglected young man' is not merely an
670 answer that challenges the presuppositions of the question; in challenging the
671 presupposition of the judge's question – that normally one leaves school with qualifications
672 – the young man also publicly admits failure to a person in authority, before explaining a
673 success. In Example 7, China Cup, Valerie talks about her satisfaction in making up for
674 something they had not been able to do for her father before he died. There are elements of
675 pleasure, gratitude and sadness in her response to the repaired cup.

676 In the examples considered in this section, I look more closely at some of the affective
677 displays in the context of the swallowing. Common to several of these examples is a
678 temporary display of being 'lost for words'. Other co-occurring features are facial
679 expressions that display trouble; and lexical choices that tend towards extreme case
680 formulations (Pomerantz 1986). There are also instances of sobbing or crying, which both
681 generate fluid in the vocal tract. This fluid needs to be removed from the vocal tract in
682 order for speech to be possible; so swallowing commonly occurs in this environment (cf.
683 Hepburn 2004).

684 In several of the cases we will see, the swallow comes before the display of affect, and
685 so can be seen as a kind of projection device. This is reminiscent of the 'guttural' sounds
686 observed by Jefferson (2010), which she analyses as sometimes 'laugh-premonitory'
687 (Jefferson 2010: 1478). Swallows, in a similar way, may be understood as connected to
688 sobbing or crying, though of course the kinds of laryngeal and pharyngeal constrictions that
689 Jefferson described as 'guttural' are associated with laughter are compatible with speaking
690 (Chafe, 2007; Esling, 2007), while swallowing is not.

691 We start with an example with a swallow in pre-turn position. In Example 8, Michael is
692 collecting a Portuguese guitar that had belonged to his grandmother. When he brought the
693 guitar in, he told how his grandfather had serenaded his grandmother with this guitar; and
694 he described his grandmother as his 'hero', 'best friend', and the guitar was one of her
695 'treasures'.

696 **Example 8: Repair Shop 7/8/19 [36:50] Portuguese guitar⁴**

697 01 D: hi MICHAel?
698 02 M: helLO?
699 03 D: nIce to SEE you agAIn?
700 04 M: And YOU?
701 05 D: so... ↑do you wanna SEE it?
702 06 M: I can't WAIT.
703 07 D: <<laugh> gOOD.>
704 08 ↑hOpe you're going to be `↓PLEASed.
705 09 D: ((reveals the guitar))
706 10 M: %↑it's \$comp`LE:TE. Hāh\$ (1.0)%
707 %smiles-----%
708 11 % and it's ↓SHI:ny. %
709 ((face not visible))%
710 12 I'm jUst a little bit %taken aBACK Actually:, it's: ?ə? (...)
711 %frowns-----
712 13 to see it comple:TE-
713 14 (...) ?is ?^də?^də it's- it has? (...)
714 15 ?it looks HAPPY.
715 16 I feel really RUDE that I'm \$not <<laugh> looking at [YOU:.\$>
716 17 D: [<<laugh>-
717 18 M [I just... I can't take my EYE:S off of it.]
718 19 D: [<<laugh>----->]
719 20 it- I- I'm just (..) blOwn aWA:y.
720 21 D: well, you- you talked about it as your grandmother's (.)
721 22 TREAsure.
722 23 M: ((**SWALLOW** %TIGHT LIPS)) <<p>↓ yEA:h,> % (..)
723 %nods-----%
724 24 it really WA:S.
725 25 I knOw there's more to the stOry: (..) arOUNd this than than I KNO:[W.
726 26
727 27 D: [mm
728 28 M: it's a little bit hEArtbreaking that I don't
729 29 KNOW that whO[le stO[ry,
730 30 D: [mm. [mm.
731 31 M: but she GLOWed when she used to (.) tEll me abOUT thI:s.
732 32 you've gIven me bAck (..) a ↓MEemory.
733 33 THANK you.

735 At line 9 Michael sees the repaired guitar. Initially he produces two assessments of it
736 ('complete' and 'shiny'), which are coproduced with smiles (\$). At line 12, his smile changes
737 to a frown. He then produces a number of syntactic frames for assessments, all of which
738 have perturbations in the production, and there is no assessment term in the slot where one
739 term could be placed (lines 12, 14, 18 and 20) — he displays difficulties in verbalising how

⁴ The Repair Shop, 19:00 07/08/2019, BBC2 England, 60 mins.
<https://learningonscreen.ac.uk/ondemand/index.php/prog/142B6002?bcast=129858708> (Accessed 20 Apr 2020)

740 he feels.

741 At lines 21-22, David invites Michael to reminisce about the guitar's connection to his
742 grandmother. This reminiscence is already projected as an emotionally charged one with
743 the word 'treasure' to refer to the guitar – the term that Michael himself used when
744 bringing the guitar in and describing his affection for his grandmother, and her relationship
745 to the guitar. This turn is framed as an assessment where the speaker has lower epistemic
746 authority than the recipient, thus making a response from Michael relevant. Michael's
747 response at line 23 is initiated with his lips visibly closed and pressed tight together,
748 nodding – an embodied and immediate confirming response – and then a swallow, which
749 displays a temporary inability to talk, and serves to delay the verbal part of his response.
750 His 'yeah' is produced quiet, and low in his pitch range, a contrast with his prior talk,
751 perhaps marking that this talk is on a different footing from earlier talk.

752 As we saw in Example 7, at a moment where an affective display has been made
753 relevant, Michael displays a temporary inability to verbalise, which is also congruent with
754 his earlier difficulties (cf. Wilkinson & Kitzinger 2006, who consider some cases where
755 people are 'lost for words'). Michael's turn at lines 25-31 is an account of his lack of
756 knowledge of precise details. In the turn, he uses a strongly valenced term, 'heartbreaking'
757 to express regret; he reminisces about how his grandmother related to the guitar ('she
758 glowed'); and he expresses his gratitude for the repair.

759 In this example, a swallow comes in response to an invitation to share an emotionally
760 charged memory. While the detail of Michael's affective stance is unspoken, the swallow
761 seems to be one device, in pre-turn position, that projects something about the quality of
762 the upcoming talk.

763 In Example 9, the swallow is postpositioned. Karen has returned to collect a wooden
764 jewellery box that has been repaired. The box has some inlaid birds, which are fragile.
765 When the box was first brought in for repair, Will expressed worries that he would not be
766 able to clean the box without damaging the birds: so there is a risk that the repair has not
767 been successful. This is alluded to in lines 9-13.

768 **Example 9: Repair shop 20/07/2019 [23:13] Jewellery box⁵**

769 01 K: hi there
770 02 W hello
771 03 ((some material edited out))
772 04 ((The box is on the table, covered up.))
773 05 W: so:. (...) beFORE you have a vLOO:k, I just wanted to vSAY,
774 06 I started cleaning the vBOX,
775 07 K: yEAh(p°), ((**SWALLOW**))
776 08 W: a:nd uh- (.) I cleaned (.) the bORder around the ↑<<f> TOP?>

5 The Repair Shop, 16:30 20/07/2019, BBC1 London, 30 mins.

<https://learningonscreen.ac.uk/ondemand/index.php/prog/0EA6D962?bcast=129746111> (Accessed 20 Apr 2020)

777 09 I wasn't too SURE or NOT to (.) clean the CENT[re,
778 10 K: [\ll mouths> right>
779 11 W: where the bIR:ds were.=
780 12 =cause I was worried about .h removing the ↑BIR:DS and
781 13 everything Else.
782 14 bu:t, I gave it a vGO,
783 15 W: removes the cover from the box
784 16 K: OH. vWO:W?
785 17 oh. I'm FLABbergasted.
786 18 W: Yeah?
787 19 K: Yeah, it's absolutely LOVELy, yeah, it's <<f> fantASTi:c.>
788 20 I'm really PLEASEd with that, (..) yEAh.
789 21 W: you can actually (.) SEE them now.
790 22 K: you can actually SEE them.

791

792 At line 5, Will projects a news delivery (Freese & Maynard, 1998; Maynard & Freese,
793 2012), the first part of which comes in line 6. The revealing of the repaired box is being
794 delayed, so lines 5-6 could be heard as a prefatory account for disappointing news, given
795 the warning when the box was brought in that cleaning it might damage the birds. Karen's
796 'yeah((p)' at line 7 acknowledges this preface to news, in a lexically minimal way; with no
797 lexical material, this turn has a provisional character in response to the projected news
798 (Freese & Maynard 1998: 209). It also lacks many of the features identified by Freese &
799 Maynard (1998) as associated with the receipt of 'good' news, such as high amplitude and
800 high pitch register. The post-positioned swallow, with the tightly closed lips, displays that
801 Karen has no more to say (see Raymond 2010 for discussion of 'nope' with similarly
802 minimal features and noticeable bilabial closure). While it gives the go-ahead for Will's next
803 turn, the minimal design of this turn seems to mark her readiness to receive news that
804 might not be good, i.e. treating Will's pre at line 6 as a preface to potentially bad news.
805 Will's next turns also orient to the potential for a bad outcome through his description of
806 his careful cleaning process (lines 8-14).

807 In fact, when Will reveals his work at line 15, it turns out to be treated as 'good' news
808 (lines 16-17, 19-20), and is receipted with dynamic intonation contours, a wider pitch span,
809 and strong lexical formulations ('flabbergasted', 'absolutely lovely', 'fantastic').

810 So in this case, a post-positioned swallow with tightly closed lips indexes both 'nothing
811 more to say' and in conjunction with the minimality of the turn and its absence of high
812 pitch, high register intonation, it displays an orientation to the possibility that Will's
813 projected news delivery will be 'bad' news.

814 6.1 Swallowing as part of a display of trouble

815 Example 10 contains an example of a swallow which is embedded within a longer turn
816 that displays trouble. Anne and John are discussing what Anne can do with a chapter she
817 has written.

818 **Example 10: RCE14 Colleagues 00:22:42 ELR**


819 01 Anne: no I wAs gonna A:SK you actually,=
 820 02 =cos I wAs gonna send the: italian cOnvert piece
 821 03 to: (.) ee ell ARE ①.
 822 04 f(0.8 SWALLOW② + scrunched up eyes) f
 823 fhand lifted from table and clenched))f
 824 05 CLICK m- a:nd (0.4) got VERY confUsed by w- (.) the Em ell EY
 825 06 fReferencing stuff.
 826 ffacial display of 'trouble'③-->
 827 07 John: fCLICK oh I'll be HAPpy to look thrOU[ghf it with you
 828 anne -->f
 829 08 Anne: [<<all> is that alRIGHT>
 830 09 because I uhm-
 831 10 John: it's pretty SIMple.
 832 11 Anne: because I s[aid the-
 833 12 John: [or at- at lEAsT it's the One I knOw BE:ST.
 834

835 The sequence begins with Anne making a pre-request (line 1). This is followed by an
 836 account for the upcoming request at lines 2-3, which ends with the name of the journal she
 837 plans to send the paper to. John does not respond to this pre-sequence. Anne follows it at
 838 line 4 with a swallow, along with other physical, visible evidence of 'trouble': scrunched up
 839 eyes (Figure 3), and her hand is moved to being clenched.

840 As in other examples, the swallow is placed after a syntactic and prosodic boundary, in
 841 this case after a point of syntactic and prosodic completion. There are no obvious signs of
 842 trouble in the talk-so-far, though there are a few possible candidates. First, a request for
 843 help may in itself be a sign of trouble, something that the requester cannot do for themself.
 844 Secondly, by identifying the journal, Anne might be drawing on shared knowledge about
 845 the challenges of a successful submission; but that is not explicit.

846 The next verbal part of her turn, lines 5-6, identifies her trouble ('very confused') and
 847 explains what is causing her difficulty, and is followed in line 6 by another facial expression
 848 that displays trouble (Fig. 3). John's offer at line 7 orients to Anne's verbal account and
 849 visual display of trouble. Anne then orients to the possible imposition his offer will cause
 850 him (lines 8, 9, 11).

851



852
 853 *Figure 3. 1: End of line 3, "ELR". 2: Swallow at line 4. 3: Line 6: sides of the mouth turned down,*

854

neck tightened, displaying 'trouble'.

855 So the swallow at line 4, along with other physical displays, is part of a gestalt that
856 embodies and projects a trouble which is later verbalised, and brings it to the surface of the
857 interaction.

858 In this case the swallow, along with other physical features of production, laminates the
859 evolving action of making a request, displaying 'trouble' or 'difficulty' with something she
860 needs help with. The physical display and verbal account of trouble contribute to recruiting
861 John's offer in response (line 7) (Kendrick & Drew, 2016). The swallow and accompanying
862 facial expression, and the facial expression in lines 8-9 form a gestalt that displays 'trouble'
863 in a way that is much less obvious from the linguistic design of Anne's turn. Thus the
864 swallow, with its accompanying facial expression, and then the facial expression at line 8
865 contributes to the addition of a sequentially relevant affective dimension to the formulation
866 of the ongoing action. As in other cases, the position of the swallow is sensitive to the
867 unfolding syntactic and prosodic structures, and to the actions that they implement.

868 **6.2 Swallowing and crying**

869 It has been claimed that swallowing commonly co-occurs with crying (Hepburn 2004:
870 286). This is perhaps unsurprising, since crying generates fluids that need to be removed
871 from the vocal tract, and swallowing does this. Crying is a sign of a heightened emotional
872 state; so swallowing can be part of such a display. In Example 7, Valerie's swallowing comes
873 before she sobs, but sometimes crying and swallowing are concurrent.

874 Example 11 illustrates one such case. Here, a young man has used a large sum of his
875 mother's money to have his back tattooed with an image she finds obscene. This image has
876 just been shown to the court, and the mother has just wiped a tear from her eye.

877 **Example 11: Rinder 24/04/2018 [21:33]** ⁶

878 01 JR: hOw does it fEEl knowing that hE had (.) held out to you
879 02 he was going to use that money to pay you BACK;
880 03 .h and instEAd he did THAT.
881 04 M: och ooh I was FUmIng;
882 05 disGUSte:d;
883 06 J: mm
884 07 M: I would nEver fo- forgIve him for dOing thAt,
885 08 he knew ((unclear; crying))
886 09 ((sniff))
887 10 he's wrEcked his BOdy;
888 11 J: CLICK he mAy have wrecked his BOdy,
889 12 that's HIS prob°lem°.
890 13 what about YOU.

⁶ Judge Rinder, 14:00 24/04/2018, ITV London, 60 mins.

<https://learningonscreen.ac.uk/ondemand/index.php/prog/112642D9?bcast=126592563> (Accessed 15 Jan 2021)

891 14 M: (terri-) DEvastated over i:t. ((**SWALLOW**))
 892 15 J: .hh what does it mean to YOU nOt to have that that fOUr
 893 16 thOUsand POUNDS.
 894 17 M: .h well I TRUSTed him.

895

896 The judge first enquires about the mother's emotions (line 1). This is done so as to
 897 present the young man's behaviour as blameworthy (line 3), i.e. siding with the mother's
 898 stance towards her son. In response to this question, the mother describes her feelings using
 899 the strong terms 'fuming' and 'disgusted' (lines 4-5), and the grave, unforgivable nature of
 900 what he has done (line 7).

901 At line 8, she starts another TCU with 'he knew', but then her speech becomes indistinct
 902 as she begins to cry. Unlike many cases of swallowing, where the swallow seems to be
 903 carefully placed so as not to disrupt the syntax, the crying here is embedded within an
 904 ongoing turn, which continues alongside the crying. It thus seems to be a spontaneous
 905 outpouring of emotion (cf. Wilkinson & Kitzinger 2006).

906 At lines 11-13 the judge acknowledges her assessment by recycling her extreme case
 907 formulation ('wrecked his body'), and with his question at line 13 provides her with an
 908 opportunity to focus on her feelings. She makes a summary assessment ('devastated', line
 909 14), which is followed by a swallow.

910 The Judge treats this swallow at line 14 as a sign that the TCU is complete. He initiates
 911 a next action at line 15, with a new first pair part on the effect of the young man's actions,
 912 and the sum of money.

913 M's post-completion swallow comes in the context of strong emotions identified verbally
 914 and displayed physically throughout the sequence through crying. While the crying co-
 915 occurs with speech in line 8, the swallow is post-positioned after a prosodically,
 916 pragmatically and syntactically complete TCU in line 14. It occurs at what turns out to be
 917 the termination of question sequence and the progression to the next. Thus this swallow
 918 handles both matters of sequential organisation and affective display.

919 Examples in this section and elsewhere in the paper show swallows as a part of displays
 920 of affective stance. Experimental findings that the rate of swallowing increases with
 921 heightened emotional arousal cannot be verified through this data, but the data support the
 922 finding that swallowing occurs in such environments. What conversational data adds is an
 923 understanding of the complex of linguistic and bodily resources available to participants in
 924 such displays; and CA more particularly shows that bodily actions like swallowing are
 925 precisely and delicately timed with other ongoing activities in interaction. Swallowing is by
 926 no means the only resource for laminating an ongoing activity with an affective stance; but
 927 because of its association with sobbing and crying, it is reasonable to claim that swallowing
 928 can index the same kinds of emotional states as sobbing and crying.

929 7. Discussion

930 In this paper, I have considered the positioning of swallows in talk. I have focused on
931 three main aspects: swallows in the context of projecting more talk; swallows in the context
932 of projecting no more talk; and the association of swallows with affective displays.

933 Like sighs (Hoey, 2014), sniffs (Hoey, 2020a), and clicks (Li 2020; Ogden 2013, 2020;
934 Pinto and Vigil, 2020; Wright 2011), swallows are placed in ongoing talk in a way that
935 displays sensitivity to emerging syntactic and phonological structures. This placement
936 suggests at the very least that linguistic and somatic functions are planned in parallel:
937 swallows do not occur randomly distributed in speech, but are rather precisely placed with
938 respect to the linguistic and turn constructional units of organisation.

939 Many cases of swallowing in talk are inaudible, or barely audible. It seems very likely
940 that some ‘silences’ are in fact occasions on which participants swallow: silence does not
941 necessarily mean inactivity, as we know from multimodal studies of interaction.

942 While the sounds of swallowing are low in amplitude, swallows can be made audible by
943 the events just before and after the occurrence of the swallow.

944 I showed that it is common for swallows that occur in a context where more talk is
945 projected to be released with audible clicks. A stretch of talk like that shown in Example 1
946 (‘and-uhm ((0.62 SWALLOW CLICK)) I think’) is a specialised kind of ‘closure piece’ (Kelly
947 & Local 1986): an intonation contour is suspended at the onset of the piece; the lips are
948 closed for [m] in ‘uhm’ and simultaneously to produce the swallow. Whereas Kelly & Local’s
949 ‘closure pieces’ have silence at their centre, these stretches of talk have a swallow in the
950 portion where talk is suspended: so while there might be silence, there is physical activity
951 which temporarily makes speech impossible. The closure for the swallow is released with a
952 click when the talk is resumed.

953 Swallows are frequently released into lip smacks or clicks, which have been shown
954 elsewhere to project further talk. Arguably, because clicks and lip smacks are more audible
955 than swallows (which are often also difficult to see), prior research has underplayed or
956 ignored some swallows, focusing on the auditorily salient clicks instead. Rather than think
957 of such stretches as (silence + click), it is probably more accurate in many cases to treat
958 them as (swallow + release), where the release may be noisy. Some clicks, then, may be
959 best understood as the audible release features of a swallow.

960 On the other hand, the inaudibly released bilabial closures in ‘yeap ((SWALLOW))’ and
961 ‘nope ((SWALLOW))’ serve to mark no continued talk by the speaker: these cases have
962 phonetic features of turn-finality (Local & Walker, 2012) and that includes the absence of
963 an audible release to the closure required for a swallow. So the phonetic and prosodic
964 details of talk around swallowing – before, during and after – make a significant
965 contribution to the progressivity or suspension of talk.

966 Swallowing removes liquid from the vocal tract. Since a clear vocal tract is a
967 precondition for speaking, swallows form a natural class with other visible or audible
968 preparations for talking, and can be used as a practice to delay the onset of talk, while
969 simultaneously displaying an orientation to the relevance of talk. Seeing swallows and other
970 preparations for speaking (like taking an in-breath, adjusting the body posture, or the
971 audible separation of articulators) as a natural class that displays an orientation to the
972 relevance of talk while not talking (yet) gives an explanation for their positioning in pre-
973 turn position, and provides co-participants with a way to understand one another's
974 behaviour and adjust their own conduct accordingly.

975 In the absence of instrumental data, or imaging, it is not possible to speculate on what
976 is happening inside a speaker's vocal tract, e.g. whether it is dry, or how saliva builds up. A
977 more thorough-going phonetic and physiological study would be needed to answer this
978 question. Nonetheless, the point remains that the audible and/or visible removal of fluid
979 from the vocal tract by swallowing seems to be one way to index incipient speakership.

980 These observations point to the kinds of resources and practices participants in
981 interaction have to make sense of a bodily activity which may be somatic in origin, but
982 which may come to be implicated in other kinds of communicative practice. They also
983 highlight the importance of observing the phonetic details not just of swallowing per se, but
984 of the surrounding talk, and relating these observations to more general knowledge about
985 the phonetic features of talk.

986 Swallowing can often be seen: tightly closed lips, the rise and fall of the larynx and
987 accompanying facial expressions have all been noted in the data in this paper.

988 Closed lips – normally visible even when the rise and fall of the larynx during
989 swallowing is not – can be used to make visible that the speaker is unavailable to speak or
990 (when positioned after the end of a turn) has nothing more to say. This basic feature of
991 swallowing provides coparticipants with a visual cue as to what is going on in the current
992 speaker's vocal tract. It was also shown that the lips are not just closed, but often tightly
993 closed in a posture that is not used for the production of bilabial speech sounds like [m],
994 [b], or [p].

995 The rise and fall of the larynx, and straightening of the pharynx, are (like the sounds of
996 swallowing itself) not necessarily available: the swallow might be too fast, or there might be
997 clothing that obscures sight of the swallower's neck, or the camera angle might not allow it.
998 However, where this is visible, it can form part of the audible/visible gestalt of swallowing.
999 The visible cues of swallowing can thus index unavailability to speak.

1000 Facial expressions are sometimes used alongside swallowing (as in Example 10) to
1001 laminate the unfolding talk with a visible affective display along the lines of Peräkylä &
1002 Ruusuvuori (2012). Experimental findings that show that the rate of swallowing increases
1003 with emotional arousal (Fonagy & Calloway, 1985; Cuevas et al. 1995). In these cases,

1004 swallows seem to form a gestalt with other bodily actions. The absence and unavailability
1005 of speech coupled with other bodily conduct accompanying swallowing is a resource that
1006 participants can use to display trouble without verbalising it.

1007 In short: the semiotic affordances of the audible and visible aspects of swallows can be
1008 exploited in speech: the incompatibility of speaking with swallowing, visibly tightly closed
1009 lips, and aspects of the release of swallows such as clicks, all have indexical value in speech.

1010 When it comes to the placement of swallows relative to syntactic structures, there is a
1011 close relation between possible syntactic completion points and issues of projection, which
1012 are also intimately bound up with prosodic design. I present simplified versions of the data
1013 here, and use square brackets with labels, $_{XP}[\dots]_{XP}$, to surround syntactic phrasal units.

1014 Firstly, swallows occur in pre-turn position, before the onset of lexical material:

1015

1016 Example 2: .thh uhm SWALLOW CLICK uhm $_s$ [I didn't- I didn't do very well in school]

1017 $_s$

1018 Example 8: SWALLOW $_{RespToken}$ [yeah] $_{RespToken}$

1019

1020 Secondly, swallows occur on the completion of talk:

1021

1022 Example 7: $_s$ [We've done something for dad as well] $_s$ SWALLOW

1023 Example 11: $_{AP}$ [Devastated over it] $_{AP}$ SWALLOW

1024 Example 9: $_{RespToken}$ [Yeah] $_{RespToken}$ SWALLOW

1025

1026 In both these positions, the swallow does not interrupt the progress of the current unit,
1027 and it is positioned after the syntactic phrase boundary; and the current unit is recognisable
1028 as a complete TCU.

1029 In other cases, swallows are embedded within TCUs. In principle, swallows could occur
1030 anywhere, but they always occur between words (and in this data never in the middle of a
1031 word). This alone displays that 'word' is treated an indivisible unit by the person who
1032 swallows.

1033 Swallows may be positioned within a phrasal constituent, such as within a verb phrase
1034 (VP):

1035

1036 Example 5: $_s$ [$_{NP}$ [Belinda] $_{NP}$ $_{VP}$ [$_V$ [got] $_V$ -uhm SWALLOW $_{NP}$ [a (0.6) grant] $_{NP}$] $_{VP}$] $_s$

1037

1038 Taking a rather classical approach, the swallow here is positioned between the verb (V)
1039 'got', which requires a noun phrase (NP) as an object to make a verb phrase (VP), which is
1040 an obligatory element of a sentence (S) in English. So here the swallow is located at a point

1041 of syntactic incompleteness: in the middle of a VP. The presence of ‘uhm’ indicates the
1042 suspension of the ongoing VP; and the intonation is suspended at this point too.

1043 In Example 4, the swallow is placed between a fronted prepositional phrase before the
1044 subject and complement of the sentence. This is not at a point of syntactic completion (and
1045 not at a TRP), but at the boundary of a PP, and before one of the obligatory elements of a
1046 sentence:

1047

1048 Example 4: $s_{[AdvP][Interestingly\ enough]}_{AdvP} pp_{[on\ the\ inside]}_{PP} SWALLOW_{NP[there]}_{NP}$
1049 $vp_{[’s\ some\ old\ newspaper...]}_{VP} s_{[]}$

1050

1051 Other examples like these, with different kinds of syntactic units but all of the general
1052 form XP (to generalise over NP, VP, AP, etc), are also found in examples in the literature:

1053

1054 Schegloff (1988: 226): $s_{[NP[A\ member\ of\ your\ own\ staff,\ Mr\ Craig\ Fuller]}_{NP} SWALLOW_{VP[has\ testified...]}_{VP} s_{[]}$

1055

1056 Rossi (2015: 41-42):

1057 $s_{[NP[Io\ e\ la\ Lidia]}_{NP} SWALLOW_{VP[abbiamo\ prima\ raccolto\ i\ soldi]}_{VP} s_{[]}$

1058 $s_{[NP[Lidia\ and\ I]}_{NP} SWALLOW_{VP[collected\ the\ money\ first]}_{VP} s_{[]}$

1059

1060
1061 In all these cases, the syntax projects more to come, and the talk contains other features
1062 that project that further talk. In cases like Example 5, where the swallow comes within a VP
1063 and after ‘uhm’, the intonation contour is suspended, whereas in examples like Example 4,
1064 where the swallow comes after an PP boundary, the intonation contour (a fall-rise) is
1065 complete, but together with the syntactic incompleteness serves to project further talk.

1066 This sketch of the syntactic positioning of swallows suggests that swallowing is
1067 sensitive at least to words; and also to higher-level syntactic constituents than words. It is
1068 also clear that syntax and prosody work in parallel, since matters of unit construction and
1069 unit completion are, for participants, complex emergent. Further work and more data are
1070 needed to explain how exactly this syntactic phrasing maps to intonation phrases and
1071 boundaries and how together they serve to project more talk to come.

1072 In some cases, swallowing is a practice that physically displays not just unavailability
1073 to speak but perhaps an inability to speak. Some of the examples of swallowing in this
1074 paper are in the context of displays of sobbing or crying. Because of its association with
1075 crying, swallowing can be recruited as part of a display of a heightened affective stance,
1076 and sometimes the inability of a speaker to find the right words — swallowing can be one
1077 way to display ‘lost for words’. In other cases, swallows are in or associated to turns
1078 accompanied by strong lexical formulations. There remains much to do to understand how

1079 and on what occasions swallowing works in such displays, and more ecologically valid data
1080 is needed.

1081 In their distribution, swallows bear some resemblance to other sounds and actions like
1082 sniffs, sighs and clicks, which use some or all of the vocal tract. This paper shows that
1083 swallows are similarly liminal events, and that language and speech are intertwined with
1084 such events in orderly ways in everyday interaction, providing participants with non-verbal
1085 semiotic resources.

1086 **Acknowledgements**

1087 I would like to thank the reviewers and the editors for their constructive feedback on
1088 the paper. I am grateful to colleagues in the Centre for Advanced Studies in Language and
1089 Communication and especially to Marina Cantarutti for their support with this paper.

1090 **References**

- 1091 Belz, M., Trouvain, J. (2019). Are 'Silent' Pauses Always Silent? International Congress of Phonetic
1092 Sciences ICPhS 2019, 2744–2748.
- 1093 Cichero, J. A. Y., & Murdoch, B. E. (2002). Acoustic signature of the normal swallow:
1094 Characterization by age, gender, and bolus volume. *Annals of Otology, Rhinology and*
1095 *Laryngology*, 111(7), 623–632. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000348940211100710>
- 1096 Clift, R. (2016). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1097 Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Barth-Weingarten, D. (2011). A system for transcribing talk-in-interaction: GAT
1098 2. *Gespraechsforschung*, 12(12), 1–51.
- 1099 Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Selting, M. (2017). *Interactional Linguistics: An Introduction to Language in*
1100 *Social Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1101 Cuevas, J. L., Cook, E. W., Richter, J. E., McCutcheon, M., & Taub, E. (1995). Spontaneous
1102 swallowing rate and emotional state - Possible mechanism for stress-related gastrointestinal
1103 disorders. *Digestive Diseases and Sciences*, 40(2), 282–286.
1104 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02065410>
- 1105 Dingemans, M. (2020). Between Sound and Speech: Liminal Signs in Interaction. *Research on*
1106 *Language and Social Interaction*, 53(1), 188–196.
1107 <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2020.1712967>
- 1108 Esling, J. H. (2007). States of the larynx in laughter. In *Interdisciplinary Workshop on The Phonetics of*
1109 *Laughter*. Saarbrücken. Retrieved from [http://www.coli.uni-saarland.de/conf/laughter-](http://www.coli.uni-saarland.de/conf/laughter-07/files/ESLING.pdf)
1110 [07/files/ESLING.pdf](http://www.coli.uni-saarland.de/conf/laughter-07/files/ESLING.pdf)
- 1111 Esling, J. H., Moisik, S. R., Brenner, A., & Crevier-Buchman, L. (2019). *Voice Quality. The Laryngeal*
1112 *Articulator Model*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1113 Faucher, G., Karimi, E., Ménard, L., & Laporte, C. (2019). Automatic palate delineation in ultrasound
1114 videos. In S. Calhoun, P. Escudero, M. Tabain, & P. Warren (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 19th*
1115 *International Congress of Phonetic Sciences* (pp. 422–426). Melbourne. Retrieved from
1116 https://icphs2019.org/icphs2019-fullpapers/pdf/full-paper_321.pdf

- 1117 Ferrucci, J. L., Mangilli, L. D., Sassi, F. C., Limongi, S. C. O., & Andrade, C. R. F. de. (2013).
 1118 Swallowing sounds in speech therapy practice: a critical analysis of the literature. *Einstein (São*
 1119 *Paulo, Brazil)*, 11(4), 535–539. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1679-45082013000400024>
- 1120 Fonagy, P., & Calloway, S. P. (1986). The effect of emotional arousal on spontaneous swallowing
 1121 rates. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3999\(86\)90048-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3999(86)90048-6)
- 1122 Fox Tree, J. E., & Clark, H. H. (1997). Pronouncing “the” as “thee” to signal problems in speaking.
 1123 *Cognition*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277\(96\)00781-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277(96)00781-0)
- 1124 Freese, J., & Maynard, D. W. (1998). Prosodic features of bad news and good news in conversation.
 1125 *Language in Society*, 27(02), 195–219. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500019850>
- 1126 Hepburn, A. (2004). Crying: Notes on Description, Transcription, and Interaction. *Research on*
 1127 *Language & Social Interaction*, 37(3), 251–290. <https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi3703>
- 1128 Hepburn, A., & Potter, J. (2012). Crying and Crying Responses. In A. Peräkylä & M.-L. Sorjonen
 1129 (Eds.), *Emotion in Interaction* (pp. 195–211). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 1130 Hoey, E. M. (2014). Sighing in Interaction: Somatic, Semiotic, and Social. *Research on Language and*
 1131 *Social Interaction*, 47(2), 175–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2014.900229>
- 1132 Hoey, E. M. (2015). Lapses: How People Arrive at, and Deal With, Discontinuities in Talk. *Research*
 1133 *on Language and Social Interaction*, 48(4), 430–453.
 1134 <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2015.1090116>
- 1135 Hoey, E. M. (2017). Lapse Organization in Interaction. Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics.
 1136 Retrieved from
 1137 https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item_2475085_3/component/file_2479411/content
- 1138 Hoey, E. M. (2020a). Waiting to Inhale: On Sniffing in Conversation. *Research on Language and*
 1139 *Social Interaction*, 53(1), 118–139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2020.1712962>
- 1140 Hoey, E. M. (2020b). When Conversation Lapses. *The Public Accountability of Silent Copresence*.
 1141 Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 1142 Jefferson, G. (1974). Error correction as an interactional resource. *Language in Society*, 2, 181–199.
- 1143 Jefferson, G. (2010). Sometimes a frog in your throat is just a frog in your throat: Gutturals as
 1144 (sometimes) laughter-implicative. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(6), 1476–1484.
 1145 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.01.012>
- 1146 Kaukoma, T., Peräkylä, A., & Ruusuvuori, J. (2015). How Listeners Use Facial Expression to Shift
 1147 the Emotional Stance of the Speaker’s Utterance. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*,
 1148 48(3), 319–341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2015.1058607>
- 1149 Keevallik, L., & Ogden, R. (2020). Sounds on the margins of language, at the heart of interaction.
 1150 *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 53(1), 1–18.
 1151 <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2020.1712961>
- 1152 Kendrick, K. H., & Drew, P. (2016). Recruitment: offers, requests, and the organization of assistance
 1153 in interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 49(1), 1–19.
 1154 <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2016.1126436>
- 1155 Kendrick, K. H., & Torreira, F. (2015). The Timing and Construction of Preference : A Quantitative
 1156 Study. *Discourse Processes*, 52, 255–289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2014.955997>

- 1157 Laanesoo, K., & Keevallik, L. (2017). Noticing Breaches with Nonpolar Interrogatives: Estonian Kes
 1158 (“Who”) Ascribing Responsibility for Problematic Conduct. *Research on Language & Social*
 1159 *Interaction*, 50(2), 286–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2017.1340721>
- 1160 Li, X. (2020). Research on Language and Social Interaction Click-Initiated Self-Repair in Changing
 1161 the Sequential Trajectory of Actions-in-Progress Click-Initiated Self-Repair in Changing the
 1162 Sequential. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 53(1), 90–117.
 1163 <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2020.1712959>
- 1164 Local, J., & Kelly, J. (1986). Projection and silences: Notes on phonetic and conversational structure.
 1165 *Human Studies*, 9(2–3), 185–204. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00148126>
- 1166 Local, J. K. (2004). Getting back to prior talk: and-uh(m) as a back-connecting device. In E. Couper-
 1167 Kuhlen & C. E. Ford (Eds.), *Sound Patterns in Interaction: Cross-linguistic studies from*
 1168 *conversation* (pp. 377–400). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 1169 Local, J., & Walker, G. (2012). How phonetic features project more talk. *Journal of the International*
 1170 *Phonetic Association*, 42(03), 255–280. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025100312000187>
- 1171 Maynard, D. W., & Freese, J. (2012). Good news, bad news, and affect: Practical and temporal
 1172 “emotion work” in everyday life. In A. Peräkylä & M.-L. Sorjonen (Eds.), *Emotion in Interaction*
 1173 (pp. 92–112). Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- 1174 Morinière, S., Boiron, M., Alison, D., Makris, P., & Beutter, P. (2008). Origin of the sound
 1175 components during pharyngeal swallowing in normal subjects. *Dysphagia*, 23(3), 267–273.
 1176 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00455-007-9134-z>
- 1177 Ogden, R. (2013). Clicks and percussives in English conversation. *Journal of the International*
 1178 *Phonetic Association*, 43(03), 299–320. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025100313000224>
- 1179 Ogden, R. (2020). Audibly Not Saying Something with Clicks. *Research on Language and Social*
 1180 *Interaction*, 53(1), 66–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2011.619309>
- 1181 Paschen, L. (2019). On Clicks in Russian Everyday Communication. In N. Thielmann & N. Richter
 1182 (Eds.), *Urban Voices: The Sociolinguistic, Grammar and Pragmatics of Spoken Russian* (pp.
 1183 237–257). Vienna: Peter Lang.
- 1184 Peräkylä, A., & Ruusuvoori, J. (2012). Facial Expression and Interactional Regulation of Emotion. In
 1185 A. Peräkylä & M.-L. Sorjonen (Eds.), *Emotion in Interaction* (pp. 64–91). Oxford: Oxford
 1186 University Press.
- 1187 Pinto, D., & Vigil, D. (2019). Searches and clicks in Peninsular Spanish. *Pragmatics. Quarterly*
 1188 *Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA)*, 29(1), 83–106.
 1189 <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.18020.pin>
- 1190 Pinto, D., & Vigil, D. (2020). Spanish clicks in discourse marker combinations. *Journal of Pragmatics*,
 1191 159, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.01.009>
- 1192 Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of
 1193 preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social*
 1194 *Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1195 Pomerantz, A. (1986). Extreme Case Formulations: A way of legitimizing claims. *Human Studies*, 9,
 1196 219–229.

- 1197 Raymond, G. (2010). Prosodic variation in responses: The case of type-conforming responses to
1198 yes/no interrogatives. In D. Barth-Weingarten, E. Reber, & M. Selting (Eds.), *Prosody in*
1199 *Interaction* (pp. 109–130). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- 1200 Ritz, T., & Thöns, M. (2006). Affective modulation of swallowing rates: Unpleasantness or arousal?
1201 *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2006.05.008>
- 1202 Roach, P., Stibbard, R., Osborne, J., Arnfield, S., & Setter, J. (1998). Transcription of Prosodic and
1203 Paralinguistic Features of Emotional Speech. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association*,
1204 28(1–2), 83–94. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025100300006277>
- 1205 Rossi, G. (2015). The request system in Italian interaction. Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics.
1206 Retrieved from
1207 https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item_2156684_9/component/file_2156683/content
- 1208 Sacks, H. (1987). On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In
1209 Button, Graham, John R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and Social Organisation*, (pp. 54–69). Clevedon:
1210 Multilingual Matters.
- 1211 Schegloff, E. A. (1988). From Interview to Confrontation: Observations of the Bush/Rather
1212 Encounter. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 22(1–4), 215–240.
1213 <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351818809389304>
- 1214 Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Turn Organization: One Intersection of Grammar and Interaction. In E. Ochs,
1215 E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and Grammar* (pp. 52–133). Cambridge:
1216 Cambridge University Press.
- 1217 Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction. A Primer in Conversation Analysis*.
1218 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1219 Selting, M. (2012). Complaint stories and subsequent complaint stories with affect displays. *Journal*
1220 *of Pragmatics*, 44(4), 387–415. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.01.005>
- 1221 Sikveland, R. O., & Ogden, R. (2012). Holding gestures across turns: Moments to generate shared
1222 understanding. *Gesture*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.1075/gest.12.2.03sik>
- 1223 Trouvain, J., Werner, R., & Möbius, B. (2020). An Acoustic Analysis of Inbreath Noises in Read and
1224 Spontaneous Speech, (May), 789–793. <https://doi.org/10.21437/speechprosody.2020-161>
- 1225 Wilkinson, S., & Kitzinger, C. (2006). Surprise as an Interactional Achievement: Reaction Tokens in
1226 Conversation. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 69(2), 150–182.
- 1227 Wright, M. (2005). Studies of the phonetics–interaction interface: Clicks and interactional structures
1228 in English conversation ([Doctoral dissertation](#), University of York).
- 1229 Wright, M. (2007). Clicks as markers of new sequences in English conversation. In *International*
1230 *Congress of the Phonetic Sciences XVI* (pp. 1069–1072). Saarbrücken. Retrieved from
1231 www.ichps2007.de
- 1232 Wright, M. (2011). The phonetics–interaction interface in the initiation of closings in everyday
1233 English telephone calls. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(4), 1080–1099.
1234 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.09.004>