Title: Situating embodied instruction - proxemics and body knowledge

# Abstract

In various ways the movement and experience of the body is instructed by others. This may be in the dance class or on the playing field. In these interactions, one person claims knowledge of the other's body and rights to instruct how that body functions, moves, and feels. By undertaking a close analysis of embodied and spoken interaction within performance training sessions from a multimodal conversation analytic perspective this paper will identify one kind of broad sequential trajectory – from intimate contact to public display - that shows how an instructor claims rights over the internal workings of another's body by traversing different levels of proximity and sensorial modalities.
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# Introduction

In various ways the movement and experience of the body is instructed by others. This may be in the dance class or on the playing field. In these interactions, one person claims knowledge of the other's body and rights to instruct how that body functions, moves, and feels. In the main, this is from the 'outside'; an instructor claims rights to instruct the person how to use their body in publicly available ways. However, there is a sub-class of embodied instruction in which it is the *internal* workings of the body that is the focus of knowledge claims. Here, how the learner’s body *feels* to the person is claimed by the instructor as being within their own domain of knowledge.

Making claims to know about another's body and, further, prioritising such claims over what the person themselves might claim, is a particular moment in interaction that warrants attention. It speaks to the topic of this special issue in the way ‘embodied knowledge’ is manifested in sequentially produced knowledge claims. In the following analysis, such moments are approached through the example of embodied instruction seen in music performance instruction. The data for the analysis is drawn from musical masterclass sessions in which near professional performers are coached in front of an audience of peers by experts in music performance. These experts included those who practice a form of body instruction called Alexander Technique.

The Alexander Technique (henceforth AT) is a therapeutic form of body instruction deployed in performance training. Created and developed by Frederick Matthias Alexander in the 1890s, the body is observed, diagnosed, and instructed by an AT practitioner so as to affect 'better' body use (Valentine, 2004). It has become a popular form of physical therapy in areas of performance, such as dance, vocal training, and actor training. However, it is also widely offered for general health issues – such as backache - to members of the public. Therapeutic outcomes are formulated as a re-asserting of the 'natural' use of the body; the manner in which the person normally uses their body is characterised as habitually incorrect (Tarr, 2008). This strong claim is supported and furthered through verbal and embodied interaction in one-to-one hands-on sessions and group instructional classes.

By undertaking a close analysis of embodied and spoken interaction within an AT session from a multimodal conversation analytic perspective (Mondada, 2016), this paper will identify one kind of broad sequential trajectory – from intimate contact to public display - that shows how a person claims rights over the internal workings of another's body. The features of this 'interactional project' (Robinson, 2003), while peculiar to AT interactions, are indicative of a more general progression seen in other instances of what I will call 'experiential epistemics'. Such analysis enables us to ask questions about embodied knowing and such intimate affective practices as kinesthetic empathy (Wood & Rosenberg, 2016). These practices are premised upon spatial relationships between the bodies of recipient, practitioner and audience member and the apparent access afforded through the sense of touch, over and above that afforded by sight and sound.

The analysis is founded on work on ‘touch-in-interaction’ (Reed, 2019; Goodwin, 2017; Cekaite, 2016; Nishizaka & Sunaga, 2015) and the manner in which forms of verbal ‘directive’ (Craven & Potter, 2010; Goodwin, 2014; Goodwin & Cekaite, 2014) are deployed in instructional settings (Szczepek Reed et al., 2013; Reed & Szczepek Reed, 2014). Of particular interest are the ways in which epistemic access (Heritage, 2012 ) – that is the right to claim knowledge – is oriented to the body through finely detailed sequences of verbal and embodied interaction. The broader analytic context is the phenomenology of the body (Sheets-Johnstone, 2009) and ‘intercorporeality’ (Meyer et al, 2017).

# Background

Concern with spaces and their ownership has its foundations in the cultural anthropology of Edward T. Hall (1966; 1968). His notion of 'proxemics' is claimed to be the 'hidden dimension' of cultural life and cultural comparison. Hall identifies concentric spheres of proximity that extend from the 'personal space' - subdivided into 'intimate distance' and 'personal distance' - of a person out towards 'social' and 'public' spaces. According to Kendon (1990), “Hall has pointed out that at different distances the senses make available different kinds of information and this has consequences for the kinds of actions that will be used in interaction” (p. 214).

Taking up the spatial metaphor, infused by terminology from ethology (territory, preserves, mark), Goffman (1971) writes,

“The prototypical preserve is no doubt spatial and perhaps even fixed. However, to facilitate the study of co-mingling … it is useful to extend the notion of territoriality into claims that function like territories but are not spatial, and it is useful to focus on situational and egocentric territoriality. Starting, then, with the spatial, we shall move by steps to matters that are not” (p. 29).

Goffman’s formulation of spatial territories includes ‘personal space’ and ‘use space’. He moves to the boundary between bodies with the idea of ‘sheath’ – “the skin that covers the body and… the clothes that cover the skin” (p. 38) – and then details the ‘information preserve’ – “the set of facts about himself to which an individual expects to control access while in the presence of others” (pp. 38-9). Information preserves include the contents of the person's mind, 'control over which is threatened when queries are made that he sees as intrusive, nosy, untactful' (Goffman, 1971, p. 39). A similar 'preserve' can be seen in the embodied experiences of the person. As Stivers et al. (2011) point out "Goffman thus implies that one’s knowledge, particularly personal knowledge, falls within one’s own information preserve, and that ‘territorial offences’ can thus occur with respect to knowledge just as they can with respect to possessed objects”(p. 6).

Heritage (2011) notes that in everyday conversation, knowledge is highly dynamic. In normal conversation, who knows what, who has rights to know, and who has responsibility to know, are weaved through interaction. Accordingly,

“These differential rights extend into realms of everyday events and representations, where issues of priority and epistemic territory are the objects of near-relentless interactional calibration’ (Heritage, 2011, p. 182).

In line with this continual ‘calibration,' Heritage notes, "territories of experience present a more sequestered aspect" (p. 183). Here he is reaching for those instances of emotional and experiential *empathy* that are navigated by interactants,

“If difficulties with the social organisation of knowledge concern the management of ownership and priority in relation to mutually accessible goods, difficulties in the social organization of experience concern the construction of resources by which an interlocutor can reach towards moments of genuine singularity. In empathic moments, two great moral systems grind into one another. The first, concerned with respect for the **personal experiential preserves** of the individual on which coherent personhood itself ultimately depends, collides with a second that mandates human affiliation within a community of persons and a common social, moral and cultural heritage. Under such circumstances, the practical achievement of an empathetic moment concerns, to adapt Garfinkel’s (1952: 114) marvellous phrasing, how persons ‘isolated, yet simultaneously in an odd communion, go about the business of constructing an order together’ (Heritage, 2011, p. 183, emphasis added).

The claiming of rights to know about the 'personal experiential preserve' of the person's embodied experience is 'sequestered' and morally problematic. It is unsurprising in such situations that we see delicate work to attain and maintain rights to speak knowingly and authoritatively about the other’s body experience, In what follows an example of this kind of delicate work is presented, which involves a move from ‘intimate’ spaces that afford touch to ‘social’ spaces of demonstration.

# Data Collection and Methodology

The extracts presented here are part of a corpus of data collected over a three-year period 2010-2012) amounting to fifty hours of data. The primary focus of this data collection was interaction in musical masterclasses. A subset of these masterclasses involved an AT Practitioner (approximately half). In combination with two other 'Masters' the AT Practitioner worked with individuals and groups of performers as part of the masterclass process. The author was present at these recordings and managed the video recording of the interactions. Informed consent was secured from all participants and all identifying information has been removed or obscured (in the case of visual materials).

The resulting recordings have been transcribed using a tailored form of the Jeffersonian notation system, drawing on Heath et al.'s (2010) work on video transcription as well as the history of work in multimodal analysis, including that by Goodwin (2000), Mondada (2019), and Streeck et al (2013).

# Analysis

The following analysis will plot the trajectory of embodied instruction from intimate space to social space in relation to making knowledge claims about a person's body. As a consequence of this trajectory, the AT Practitioner is positioned as knowing expert for the recipient of the AT interaction and an attendant audience of student peers. There are three elements to this trajectory:

1. Implied embodied responses;
2. Student recruitment;
3. Mimetic demonstrations.

Similar instances have been used to detail this progression in Reed & Wooffitt (forthcoming) in relation to sociological concerns with ‘body pedagogics’ (Shilling, 2017 ) and habitus (Bourdieu, 1977). Here we focus on the spatial and sensorial dynamics of this progression.

# Implied embodied responses

The following instances are premised upon a simple three-part sequence. The AT Practitioner issues a directive or instruction, the student complies with the directive, and the Practitioner then evaluates the directive. This is a sequence seen in multiple instructional interactions and is a fundamental feature of classroom interaction (where it might be posed as a question-answer adjacency pair followed by an evaluative turn by the teacher). This is called an 'Instruction-Response-Evaluation' sequence (Margutti and Drew, 2014; Mehan, 1978; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975).

The actions in an AT interaction cross modal boundaries and the 'response' to the verbal instruction is accomplished as an (apparent) embodied action. Evaluation secures the embodied response as having occurred. Here are two simple examples.

Extract 1: LMNAT140 3:29

The AT Practioner is standing behind the student with her hands on either side of the student's back.

01 P: take a breath for me in the::re

02 (0.7)

03 P: great .h now that's all moving really nicely

Extract 2: LMNAT140 6:27

The AT Practitioner has her left hand on the Student's hip and right hand on her lower back

01 P: we're just gonna soften those knees

02 (0.3)

03 P: lovely enjoy the connection that you have with the floor

In extract 1, the Practitioner issues an embodied 'directive' (Szczepek Reed et al., 2013), there is a vocal pause of 0.7 seconds and then the Practitioner issues an evaluation ('great') in line 03. This is followed by a qualification of the positive response ‘.h now that’s all moving really nicely’.

Similarly, in example 2 the Practitioner issues a directive (line 01), followed by a pause and then an evaluative 'lovely' in line 03 and a further experiential directive to 'enjoy the connection' with the floor. The video data includes two angles from the front and the rear and in neither of the examples can an embodied movement on the part of the student be discerned in the ‘silence’ between utterances. We might be tempted to transcribe some kind of response here, but this would be an *analytic* outcome (of writer and audience member alike) in an ethnomethodological sense. There is no discernible visual-body response, and this is an important aspect of the trajectory towards epistemic access of the Practitioner, as they alone mark the response as occurring.

The key issue here is that the proximity of the Practitioner and their visible use of touch warrants a reading of the interaction as having an embodied response. That is, the 'evaluation' turn is seen to imply a response turn, albeit in the embodied mode. This reading follows for both audience member and analyst.

While the silences in extracts 1 and 2 provide an “interactive turn space” (Iwasaki, 2009) as a projected opportunity in the TCU/turn-in-progress, such responses can be seen to occur in overlap with the talk of the Practitioner. This can be seen in extract 3. Given that we, as analysts or observers, do not have access to the haptic aspects of behaviour, we hear and see that the student’s response is accomplished through internal bodily-visual movements not accessible to the observers through the video recording.

Extract 3: LMNAT030 0:29

01 P: just soften a little bit let go f'me a bit

02 P: great

This effect is accentuated when the talk of the Practitioner involves incomplete utterances and an evaluative utterance element is latched to the preceding talk. Extracts 4 and 5 show two examples of this. More precisely, we can see that the truncated utterance elements are positioned in relation to a latched new turn construction unit (TCU).

Extract 4: LMNAT030 1:18

01 P: if if if you want to sort of soften the muscles there:

02 P: so that (.) the weight of your head=there you go:

In extract 4 the instruction to 'soften the muscles there' is followed by an increment of 'so that (.) the weight of your head' as consequence or likely indicator that the instruction has been complied with. Note, this is incomplete and truncated with a latched evaluative utterance element produced as a further TCU. The truncation and latching 'catches' the embodied response in progress and conveys to onlookers the immediacy and responsiveness of the noticing.

Extract 5: LMNAT040 2:11

01 P: just think about this bit here

02 P: there you are on your two feet

03 P: so you can let go of this a little bit I w'd

04 (0.6)

05 P: imaging=there you go so you've let of that bit

Similarly, in extract 5 a series of directives is produced in a sequence that progresses towards a potentially identifiable embodied response in line 3 'so you can let go of this a little bit'. Produced initially as new TCU, ‘I w’d’ is followed by a 0.6 second pause and continued with 'imagining'. The latched 'there you go so you've let go of that bit' reorients to the recognisable instruction and again its production conveys immediacy and responsiveness.

This collection of instances are premised upon the IRE (initiation-response-evaluation) sequence in instructional settings. Rather than premised purely on talk, however they are (strategically) multi-modal, in that the instruction or directive element of the sequence as well as the evaluation are accomplished through talk, while the response on the part of the student is accomplished through embodied action. Further to this, and given the proximity of AT practitioner to the body of the student (in relation to the distance of the onlookers to the interaction, including the analyst and reader of this account), the embodied activities of touch and response are only directly accessible to the practitioner/student dyad. It is then the central argument of this paper that these differential proxemics license a set of particular role activities. Specifically, the Practitioner has the right to determine whether an embodied response has occurred and then the right to evaluate that response. What is more, these rights establish primary epistemic access for the Practitioner. This could be summarised as the reflexive construction of an unseen assessable, born of the sequential implicativeness of the IRE Sequence. This then leads on to a second strategy for further securing those epistemic rights, the recruitment of the recipient.

# Recipient Recruitment

Primary epistemic access and epistemic rights are furthered though recipient recruitment which can be summarised as attaining general agreement and is accomplished through what might be termed 'do you feel that' instances. Extracts 6 to 9 detail those interactional moves.

ExTRACT 6: LMNAT140 4:02

01 P: so|what I just want to (.)| invite you to do::

02 P: |~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~|\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ ((RH LH to hips of S))

03 (0.2)

04 P: ve:ry slowly:::

05 (0.4)

06 P: you're going to take your ar:ms

07 P: forward | in the way you just did

08 S: |~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ ((moves arms forward))

09 P: an I'm gonna rebalance you from your ankle joints

10 (|--------)

11 S: |~~~~~~~~| ((moves arms forward))

12 P: you feel that

13 S: mm:::

Extract 6 begins with a series of embodied directives (lines 01, 04, 06-07) followed by an embodied response from the student (line 08, 11). In line 12 the Practitioner produces a question as confirmable evaluation (line 12), oriented to the topic of embodied 'feeling'. The indexically shaped 'you feel that' is most proximate to the statement in line 09 of the Practitioner that she will 'rebalance' the student's body. As with the previous examples of embodied movement, this ‘rebalancing’ is not visible to the onlooking audience. The practitioner has their right and left hands on the hips of the student, standing just behind her (line 01).

By not specifying what is to be felt, the precise nature of this 'rebalancing' is ambiguous. Indeed, the question 'you feel that' could reference the embodied response to the directive (lines 01-07), the raising of the hands in lines 8 and 11. The referent of the question (the 'that' of the utterance) is topicalised and elaborated upon in the subsequent interaction (seen in Extract 7). This elaboration follows the securing of the positive confirmation of ‘mm:::’ in line 13 of Extract 6.

Upon confirmation the practitioner formulates something like an upshot, with '.hhh therefore you do not have to grab anything' (Extract 7, 14, 16) furthering the epistemic authority of the speaker. Notably, a second call for confirmation is issued ('do you feel the difference') in line 17 with the recipient anticipating the questioner's intent and producing a confirmatory embodied 'nodding' gesture in overlap with 'feel the difference' (Extract 7, line 18).

ExTRACT 7: LMNAT140 4:02

14 P: |.hhh therefore |you do not

15 P: |~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~|\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ ((RH to middle of S back))

16 P: have to grab anything

17 P: do you |feel the difference

18 S: |~~ ~~~ ~~~ ~~~ ~~~ ((nodding))

Immediately following this second (embodied) confirmation we see another 'upshot' utterance, produced with a turn-initial element of 'tso' (Extract 8, line 19) which provides a for summary formulation segment delivered to the audience and then student: In line 22 the practitioner moves to one side of the recipient and turns her gaze to the audience members (23) and utters 'all that'. Turning her gaze back to the student in line 24 she utters 'it was:: half an inch' produced with rising intonation. The student responds with 'yeah' (line 26).

Extract 8: LMNAT140 4:02

19 P: .hh tso:

20 (0.5)

21 P: all that | it was::

22 P: ~~~~~| ((moves to side of S))

23 P: ~~~~~| ((gaze to audience))

24 P: |~~~~~~~ ((gaze to S))

25 P: half an inch↑

26 S: yeah

There follows a series of targeted assertions and claims, accomplished through selective gaze recipiency to and from the student (lines 32 and 38). These are subtly matched to utterances that either reference the student in first (‘you’) or third person (‘she’). For example in line 31 the transition from gaze at the student to gaze at the audience is accompanied by a reference to the student as 'she'. Similarly at line 38 the gaze movement is in the opposite direction, as 'she was balanced’ is followed by an evaluative response initiation question to the student: ‘did you get that’ (39).

Extract 9: LMNAT140 4:02

27 P: |tso I had to move half an inch backwards

28 P: |~~~ ((looks to audience))

29 ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ ((MIMES body of S))

30 P: from the from the ankle joint

31 P: |.hh so that | she did not

32 P: |~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~~~ ((looks at S; looks at A))

33 P: |have to grab hold of her spi::ne| in order to balance

34 P: because | the weight of the arms | plus the flu:te

35 P: |~~~ ((steps to side S))

36 P: |~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~((MIME raises LH RH))

37 P: she was bal|anced

38 P: |~~~~~ ((turns head to look at S))

39 P: did you get that

39 S: yeah

In summary, once agreement to a general evaluative question ('you feel that') is achieved, a more elaborate set of knowledge claims are produced that are bolstered through inserted confirmatory exchanges. The progression is toward greater epistemic detail, resulting in agreement with the total formulation of a 'rebalancing' and affirmation of the Practitioner's insight.

# Mimetic Demonstrations

One other element of the latter part of this interaction is the embodied work of the AT Practitioner (Extract 9 lines 27 and 36, and Extracts 10 and 11). These efforts mirror those seen in the work of Keevallik (2013) on embodied demonstrations. In the first instance the Practitioner mimes an angular change in the student's body with her right forearm (Figure 1) (the numbered images correspond to those in the transcript).

Extract 10: LMNAT140 4:02

27 P: |tso I had to move half an inch backwards

28 P: |~~~ ●1 ●2 ((looks to audience))

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [image 1] | [image 2] |
| ●1 | ●2 |

Extract 10: LMNAT140 4:02

34 P: because | the weight of the arms | plus the flu:te

35 P: |~~~ ((steps to side S))

36 P: |~~~~~~~~~~~~●3~((MIME raises LH RH))

37 P: she was bal|anced

|  |
| --- |
| [image 3] |
| ●3 |

To underline this move to turn the Practitioner’s body into an object, this final extract shows a form of mimicry that involves moving in front of the recipient and performing an 'exaggerated' version of what the Practitioner has detected. The preceding interaction contains implied embodied movements and student recruitment (not shown).

The Practitioner frames an embodied mime with the utterance 'what he did so that you know:w (0.4) is::' (lines 01-04). She follows the mime with 'that' (line 06). As she produces this utterance she moves from the side of the student to stand in front of him. The Practitioner goes on to downplay the mime as an 'exaggeration' but then uses it as basis for an upshot formulation of the issue at hand with the student's posture.

Extract 11:

01 P: what he did so that you kno:w

02 P: ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ ((walks in front of S))

03 (0.4)

04 P: is::

05 P: ●1(-------------)●2

06 P: tha::t

07 (0.3)

08 P: i've exag(ated) it .hhhhhh t'so:: (0.2)

09 P: this part of his back came in:

10 P: .hhh t'so exactly the bit that you want

11 P: to be (.) able to move (0.3) he squashed .hh

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [image 4] | [image 5] |
| ●1 | ●2 |

# Discussion

Here I am concerned with the pursuit of 'rights' to make claims about the body of the Alexander Technique recipient by the Practitioner. Clearly, this is a delicate issue. The right to say something about the internal workings of another's body is fraught with difficulty. Of particular concern is that the Practitioner be deemed knowledgeable in front of others; It is not only the recipient who must be convinced, it is also those onlookers present in the room. In the situation under study, these onlookers are fellow students who may be part of an upcoming therapeutic interaction (or may already have been). Establishing epistemic rights and maintaining them is therefore important.

Through this process the Practitioner is teaching the student how to feel, position, and move their bodies based on the AT technique. Teaching others those bodily feelings, awareness, and movements is the primary goal and main business of the interaction. The teaching/instruction purpose is also evidenced by how the Practitioner engages both the immediate participating student involved in the demonstration, but also the students in the audience. By engaging the two groups of students (or students in the two different roles) through different means (haptic-tactile, visual and verbal with the immediate participating student, and visual and verbal with the students in the audience), the Practitioner displays her orientations to the relevance of the instructional content and techniques to both groups of students. It also displays her orientation to the teaching objectives of the masterclasses.

The topic of proxemics is a useful foundation. Hall's static demarcation of different spheres of influence premised upon the senses, sensitises us to the action possibilities afforded by different material, spatial and social relations. Kendon's point that at different distances different senses (touch, sound, sight) make available different forms of information becomes a sensitising concept (Blumer, 1954) for orienting conversation analytic endeavours towards an understanding of the senses-in-interaction (Mondada, 2019). The desire to analyse sensorial interaction beyond sight and sound puts the analyst at a disadvantage with current data collection techniques. But the answer to this dilemma is to espouse the sense-making practices of any such sensorial interaction in public. It is precisely the unavailability of such features as small muscular movements that provokes, and provides for, interactional resources. It is precisely those 'invisible' interactions that become strategically integrated into verbal and multimodal patterns of sense-making.

This is why Alexander Technique interaction in a music masterclass, which requires the public identification and acknowledgement of unavailable sensorial features, is a perspicuous setting for understanding how they are made available. To be clear, I am not arguing that these practices are particular to the masterclass, however their wider relevance would need to be a matter for future research. The prize in the longer term is analytic purchase on such mysterious aspects of human sociality as kinesthetics (the sense a person has of their own body) and kinesthetic empathy (the sense they have of other bodies) (Streeck, 2009; Sheets-Johnstone, 2018; Wood & Rosenburg, 2016).

In the data under study, the trajectory is from intimate touch (private space) to public mimesis (social space), supported through strategic assertions and acknowledgements of embodied insight.

Of primary importance is the initial claims to embodied response-evaluation afforded by the intimacy and bilateral connection of touch. Hall's hidden dimensions of personal and social space are elaborated by Goffman to encompass both the 'sheath' of the skin and the 'informational territory' of the body. The situational and egocentric consort to effect territories of personal experiential preserves and at the same time provide means for their sequestering. Evaluation as evidence of embodied response functions through forms of conditional relevance, reflexively performed for those onlookers to the scene.

Response-evaluation is only the first move in the trajectory, however. While the interaction includes incremental elaborations, they are followed by more concerted (and often concentrated) work to effect epistemic insight. Recruitment of recipients involves strategically placed other-initiated evaluative responses followed by upshot elaborations in close proximity. Each agreement affording further rights to speak (to the embodied experience).

Finally, the Practitioner effects physical separation, relinquishing the intimacies of touch and embracing the social space. The Practitioner takes on the body of the other through mime. Here the right to 'speak' the body of the other is complete, the Practitioner's body plays stand-in for the student's body and it is now the Practitioner's body that becomes instructional artefact for the attendant onlookers.

This paper has sketched out an activity project at the centre of the AT interaction. This project has a trajectory from touch and talk, to talk and mime. It is a strategy that relies and capitalizes on the differing information available by the senses at differing distances between bodies. It results in a form of experiential epistemics, that is the right to claim knowledge of the embodied experiences of others.
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# Appendix

# Transcription notation

The transcription notation and system used is adapted from Jefferson and Heath. It replaces numerical pauses lengths with a graphical representation so as to allow for clear description of the actions that occur simultaneously with verbal pauses. Graphical notation of an action (as opposed to descriptive notation) is positioned in line with the verbal utterance line, while a descriptive gloss is offered in the right-justified double parentheses relating to that notation. Embodied actions are indicated by the indentation of identifiers by one space, and line numbers are attributed to the verbal utterances only, so as to underline the simultaneous nature of the verbal and embodied actions.

~~~ action, aligned with vocal utterance

\_\_\_\_\_ ‘held’ action (such as touch)

| timing point, relating to aligned point in verbal and action line

[ verbal overlap

(-----) pause, length indicated in tenths of a second

* image capture point