
Book Section:
Clift, Rebecca, Kendrick, Kobin H., Raymond, Chase Wesley et al. (2024) Jeffersonian Transcription Conventions. In: Robinson, Jeffrey D., Clift, Rebecca, Kendrick, Kobin H. and Raymond, Chase Wesley, (eds.) The Cambridge Handbook of Methods in Conversation Analysis. Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics. Cambridge University Press, UK, Cambridge, pp. 974-989.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108936583.035

Jeffersonian transcription conventions[1]

Compiled with notes by Rebecca Clift, Kobin H. Kendrick, Chase Wesley Raymond and Jeffrey D. Robinson

The following is a list of commonly-used transcription conventions for audio data as originally developed by Gail Jefferson (see Jefferson, 2004) and based on Clift (2016). The chapter by Oloff and Hepburn (2024/this volume) explains in detail the analytic rationale for the use of such conventions, and Clift (2016, pp. 44-53) gives an account of how the system developed. Here, in contrast, we give brief notes, where deemed necessary, to show something of the analytic relevance of capturing such detail. Note that Appendix 2 shows how Lorenza Mondada integrates many of these into her conventions for transcribing visual conduct. Phenomena under discussion are marked in **bold** for ease of reference.

1. Preliminaries

A. Transcriptions are commonly in the font Courier or Courier New, which are monospaced fonts, in 10 point size. Use of a monospace font facilitates vertical alignment of characters through simple spacing rather than tabs, thereby ensuring that such alignment is preserved across documents. Keeping all symbols in the monospaced font as far as possible, rather than importing symbols from other fonts, also facilitates transfer across documents. While there is no correct way to lay out a transcript – and you will see from the chapters in this volume that practices vary – the following are some general guidelines based on commonly-observed usage:

1. Using the space bar, and not tabs, in each case, the first two characters on each line are dedicated to line numbers. While automatic line numbering can be useful initially as transcripts are being developed, ultimately hard line numbering will have to be used, as automatic line numbering does not transfer as excerpts are taken from the larger transcript.
2. Then there are at least two spaces to accommodate placement of arrows (if an arrow is included, there are usually one or two spaces either side of the arrow; see section 1.D below for placement of arrows)
3. Then three characters dedicated to speaker designation, followed by a colon. Note that Lorenza Mondada (see Appendix 2) standardly uses lower-case designations for lines of visible action, and upper-case for lines of speech, e.g. 'nan' vs. 'NAN' and so increasingly, upper-case is used for speaker designation. Mondada does not use colons after speaker designations.
4. Then two or more spaces (depending on whether and where an arrow is included, see section 1.D)
5. Then the beginning of the transcript
6. The length of each line should be constrained (e.g., to a maximum 75 characters, including spaces) to conform to publication requirements. E.g.

[1] Clift, R., Kendrick, K. H., Raymond, C. W., & Robinson, J. (2024). Jeffersonian Transcription Conventions. In J. D. Robinson, R. Clift, K. H. Kendrick, & C. W. Raymond (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Methods in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 974–989). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108936583.035

```
01  ADA:  Can I sit ↑do(hh)wn: is it al(h)right if I ↑sit, is it
```

B. Line numbers are indicated for each line (not each turn) down the left-hand side of the transcript for reference purposes, starting from 1. In this appendix we preface lines 1 to 9 with a zero thus: 01. This facilitates alignment with numbers from 10 onwards, although it is also common to use just single numbers, e.g. 1, 2, etc. Non-human actions are included. E.g.

```
01        ((Ring rin-))
02  ROB:  Hello.-
```

The 'Hello' in line 02 is responding to the summons of the ringing phone. But even if it is not immediately clear to the transcriber whether a non-human action is salient to the interactants, the action should be included, as whatever salience it may have to participants may only become evident upon repeated inspection of the materials. See also paragraph A, section 4 below.

C. Speakers in the data, and names of places and institutions, are given pseudonyms, usually with names fitting the syllable structure of the original (on which, see Jefferson, 1971). To preserve space, participant IDs are often reduced to three characters followed by a colon (e.g., 'ROB:' for 'Robin:' in the extract above).

D. Right-facing arrows (→, --> or ->) beside speaker names indicate lines of analytic focus, e.g., in publications. For instance, Heritage (2024/this volume) draws attention to the *oh*-prefaced utterances in each of the following arrowed lines, which might be indicated as:

```
06     EMM:  ...Are you th:e ol:dest one the cla:ss?
07 --> NAN:  °Oh: w- by fa:r.°
08     EMM:  ↑Are yih rill[y?↑
09 --> NAN:                [°Oh: ya:h.°
10     EMM:  Didju learn a lo:t'n cla:ss?
```

Or as:

```
06  EMM:      ...Are you th:e ol:dest one the cla:ss?
07  NAN: -->  °Oh: w- by fa:r.°
08  EMM:      ↑Are yih rill[y?↑
09  NAN: -->                [°Oh: ya:h.°
10  EMM:      Didju learn a lo:t'n cla:ss?
```

Some authors also use boxes or shading to indicate elements *within* a turn that are the object of analysis. Drew, et al. (2024/this volume) include the following example from Curl (2005), where the authors box each of the speaker's successive self-corrections, which are the focus of their discussion of the segment:

```
11  NAN:  We:ll dih you wanna me tuh be tih js pick you
12        Can u you (.) get induh Robins'n? so you c'buy
13        a li'l pair a'slippers?h
```

And in their paper on hendiadys, Drew et al. (2021, p. 337) use shading to indicate the presence of a hendiadic construction:

```
07  SHI:  I said, yih don't honestly think. thet wir all gonna j's
08        stand here, .hh en watch you break the la:w.h
09        (0.4)
10  (S):  .pt.hhh
11  SHI:  Youkno:w,
12        (0.2)
```

E. The data source is given above the transcript. Minimally, this includes the name of the recording, and, if relevant, the corpus it appears in (on naming conventions, see Albert & Hofstetter, 2024/this volume). Additional information to include, particularly in the context of publications, can be a timestamp and/or a vernacular or memorable title for the extract (see Walker, 2024/this volume). The publicly available datum transcribed in Raymond, et al. (2024/this volume) includes the following header, indicating that it is taken from the ninth video in the 'Joint Activities' (JA) corpus, at 4 minutes and 0 seconds.

```
[JA_9_4:00] 'State Liquor Laws'
```

In rare cases where a brief, unrecorded piece of data is mentioned, the abbreviation 'FN' (fieldnote) is standardly used, as in the following case from Gail Jefferson, cited in Heritage (1984, p. 299):

```
[GJ:FN]

((three people walking together: someone passes them wearing
a photograph teeshirt))

01 --> N:  Oh that teeshirt reminded me [STORY]
```

F. Transcriptions often adopt Jefferson's 'modified standard' orthography and make use of 'eye-dialect' in an attempt to capture pronunciational particulars (see Jefferson 1983, 1996). In the following short sequence, taken from Jefferson (2004, pp. 21-22), the same speaker pronounces the same word (*to*) variously as "to" (line 1), "tuh" (line 2) and "dih" (line 9):

```
01  DEA: --> ↑Started with (1.0) en instruction to me::
02       --> (0.9) from Bob Halderman. (0.4) tuh see if we
03           couldn't set up ay perfectly le↓git'mate (0.3)
04           campaign intelligence operation over et the
05           ReElection Committee.
06           (.)
07  NIX:     Mmhm,
08           (0.8)
09  DEA: --> Not being in this business?=I turned dih
10           somebuddy who: .h had been in this business:
11           (.) Jack Cau'field who: w'z I don'know if
12           you r'member Ja:ck er not he w'z...
```

2. Temporal and sequential relationships

A. Overlapping or simultaneous talk is indicated in a variety of ways.

[Separate left square brackets, one above the other on two successive
[lines with utterances by different speakers, indicates a point of overlap onset, whether at the start of an utterance or later. E.g:

```
01  CALL:   Downton, though, she worked fer::I dunno
02          if you know Russ Ogle[thorpe,
03  DES:                         [Yeah, I know'm. Mm hm,
04  CALL:   She works fer him,
```

] Separate right square brackets, one above the other on two successive
] lines with utterances by different speakers indicates a point at which two overlapping utterances both end, where one ends while the other continues, or simultaneous moments in overlaps which continue. E.g.:

```
16  JAN:  Oh I kno:w ah mean ah I c-[I:
17  JER:                            [Wiyl
18        (.)
19  JAN:  con[t e s t e d  that]
20  JER:     [You were the:re y]es[I know.]
21  JAN:                         [Yez I c]ontested tha(h)at very
22        str(h)ongly. .hh[hhh
23  JER:                  [I kno:w.
```

Note that while overlap onset is invariably transcribed, the transcription of overlap offset with right square brackets is optional as it is often difficult to precisely discern (see examples above); it is most commonly indicated where the overlap is complex or where it has particular analytic significance.

B. Equal signs, angled brackets

= Equal signs may come in pairs: one at the end of a line and another at the start of the next line. They are used to indicate two things:

1. If the two lines connected by the equal signs are by the same speaker, then there was a single, continuous utterance with no break or pause, which was broken up in order to accommodate the placement of the overlapping talk. E.g.

```
04  JOH:   Oh, I was just gonna say come out and come over
05         here and talk this evening, [but if you're going=
06  JUD:                               ["Talk", you mean get=
08  JOH:   =[out you can't very] well do that.
07  JUD:   =[drunk, don't you? ]
```

2. If the lines connected by two equal signs are by different speakers, then the second followed the first with no discernible silence between them, or was 'latched' to it. E.g.

```
01  LOT:  Ah wouldn'ev'n le-e- tell Bud I:'d jis go ahead'n
02        have the party.
```

```
03  EMM:  .t Yah,=
04  LOT:  =Tuh hell with im.
```

When there is a single equal sign in the course of one turn-at-talk it shows that the speaker is circumventing turn transition by compressing the space in which transition to a next speaker may occur. E.g.

```
12  ROB:  Now listen ta me.=I jus' wanna tell you one thing.
```

This phenomenon has been called a 'rush-through' (Schegloff, 1982, 1987; Walker, 2010) (see also 'abrupt-join', Local and Walker, 2004; for more on this, see Section 4.C below). As suggested by these terms, a speaker may speed up on approaching the transition space, and this may be captured, alternatively, by the following to indicate a "jump-started" (Schegloff 2005, p. 473) entry into the subsequent unit. E.g.

```
<   02  JOH: Ha you doin-><say what 'r you doing.
```

This device has clear relevance to turn-taking issues.

C. Numbers in parentheses indicate silence.

(0.5) Silence is standardly represented in tenths of a second, so (0.5) indicates half a second's silence. This may be measured with software (see below), but CA has standardly measured silences manually relative to speech tempo to try and capture the interactional sense of what a silence implicates. Because speakers have differing speech rates, the interactional pause between speakers with fast speech rates (e.g. the stereotypical New Yorker) clearly has a different interactional implication from that between speakers where the speech rate is much slower and there is some evidence that speakers accommodate to each other with respect to speech rate (see Kendall, 2013). For this artisanal mode of transcription, the transcriber listens to a portion of the talk approaching the silence, calibrating the counting of the silence to the speech rate. The counting phrase is then produced at the rate of the preceding talk (Auer et. al, 1999; Wilson and Zimmerman, 1986). The counting phrase might be something like 'Mississippi One, Mississippi Two, Mississippi Three…" where each syllable of the phrase marks two-tenths of a second pause, and each complete phrase a whole second. Thus the silence ending at 'Mi-' is a (0.2) pause, 'Missi-' a (0.4) pause, and the silence ending between 'Missi-' and 'Mississi-' is a (0.5) pause. Note that when pause occurs after a speaker has come to a point at which the talk is possibly complete, the pause is transcribed on a separate line. E.g.

```
09  DON:  .hh My ca:r is sta::lled.
10        (0.2)
11  DON:  ('n) I'm up here in the Glen?
```

See Schegloff (1995) for a detailed discussion of how the two-tenths of a second pause at line 10 is 'as fully fledged an event in the conversation as any utterance' (op.cit.198). Clearly silence at certain places in talk is implicative; and turn-taking and preference (to name but two orders of organization) would not have been discoverable without making the silence available to see.

(.) A micropause of less than one-tenth of a second.

It should be noted that such artisanal measurements may then be subject to more objective examination. There is an extensive discussion of timings in Kendrick and Torreira (2015) who investigate CA claims, made on the basis of artisanal measures, regarding the timing of preference. On the basis of their sample of preferred and dispreferred actions, they suggest that 'Jefferson's timing undershoots objectively measured time by roughly 120ms and that there is an additional undershoot of approximately 15% for each 1,000 ms' (2015, p. 28). To put this in some kind of context, Greenberg, on a four-hour phonetically transcribed sample of spontaneous talk, finds that the mean average time to produce a syllable of spoken English is 200 ms. (1999, p. 170).

In quantitative studies of timing, the silences measured with software which are the focus of the analysis are typically shown in milliseconds rather than tenths of seconds. These measurements may co-occur with the more common artisanal measurements. E.g.

```
01 Emm:  Honey I'll come down after I had muh liddle bowl a'soup'n
02       salad'n I'll call'em ba:ck to yuh I'd love it.
03       (1025 ms)
04 Mar:  We:ll (0.7) Oka:y [I:-uh: (.) I wanteda (j's)
05 Emm:                    [D'you haftuh have it done no:w?
```

3. Aspects of speech delivery

A. Punctuation marks are not used in their usual sense to mark aspects of grammar, but indicate intonation contours.

. The period indicates a falling, or final, intonation contour, not necessarily at the end of a sentence.

? A question mark indicates rising intonation, not necessarily a question.

, A comma indicates 'continuing' intonation, not necessarily a clause boundary.

¿ An upside-down question mark indicates a low rise, i.e. stronger than 'comma' intonation, but weaker than that indicated by a question mark.

All of these possibilities are indicated in the excerpt below.

```
05  EMM:   [PA:R:T of ut.w:Wuddiyuh -Doin.
06         (0.9)
07  NAN:   What'm I do[in¿
08  EMM:               [Cleani:ng?=
09  NAN:   =hh.hh I'm ironing wouldju belie:ve tha:t.
10  EMM:   Oh: bless it[s hea:rt.]
11  NAN:                [In f a :c]t I: ire I start'd ironing en I:
12         d-I:(.)Somehow er another ir'ning js kind of lea:ve me: co:[ld]
13  EMM:                                                             [Ye]ah,
14         (.)
```

Note that at the end of line 12, there is no intonational marking, which indicates that the prosody here is level; this is sometimes indicated with an underscore (e.g., "co:ld_")

B. Colons are used to indicate the prolongation or stretching of the sound just preceding them. Standardly each colon designates one-tenth of a second. E.g.

```
01  B:  I: uh::: I did wanna tell you en I didn' wanna tell you
02      uh:::::: uh:: las' night. Uh::: because you had entuht-
03      uh:: company I, I-I had something (.) terrible t' tell you.
```

This fragment clearly shows a speaker having to impart difficult news. Hesitation, dysfluency and a displayed reluctance to do so are all components of doing something – here an announcement – with delicacy (on which, see Lerner, 2013). In addition, Schegloff (1984) and Schegloff, et al. (1977) note that so-called 'sound stretches' may adumbrate self-repairs.

Note that graphically stretching a word on the page by inserting blank spaces between the letters is not intended to indicate how it was articulated, but rather is used to align with overlapping talk. E.g.

```
10  EMM:  Oh: bless it[s hea:rt.]
11  NAN:              [In f a :c]t I: ire I start'd ironing
```

C. Hyphens

word- A hyphen after a word or part of a word indicates a cut-off or self-interruption, often done with a glottal stop. E.g.

```
Uh::: because you had entuht- uh:: company
```

The cut-off here is used to implement a self-repair, in this case, substituting something that was starting to be produced (arguably, here, 'entertainment') for something else.

D. Underlining

Capturing prosodic prominence, or accentuation, on specific syllables, is a practice that has evolved over the years. In early transcripts, attempts are made to capture this form of emphasis, either by increased loudness or by higher pitch, by underlining.

word E.g.

```
01  JEN:  Anyway ah'll see you on Sunday[Ahnn.
02  ANN:                               [Yes.
```

Orthography may also indicate marked production in particular cases. So Schegloff (1989, p. 144) transcribes a meal-time exchange between Robbie (ROB), about six years old, and his mother (MOM) with doubled letters in line 04 to indicate what Schegloff describes as 'clearly enunciated consonants':

```
01 MOM:      Cut that (up)/(out) Rob
02           (0.2)
03 ROB:      Hm?
04 MOM: --> I said, 'Cutt itt'
05 ROB:      ((Transfers fork from right to left hand))
```

In more recent years, additional visual representation methods such as spectrograms and pitch traces have been used when focus on particular prosodic elements is necessary. See T. Walker (2014) and G. Walker (2017) for more information.

WORD Particularly increased loudness relative to surrounding talk is indicated by capital letters. E.g.

```
01  TOM:      Em
02            (2.0)
03  TOM:      ↓Em
04            (3.0)
05  TOM: --> EmiLY:
06  EMI:      What.
```

So in the exchange above, Tom's first two attempts to summon Emily meet with no response. It is only on his third summons, using the full form of the name at line 5, with increased loudness, accentuation, and the sound stretch at the end of the name that Emily responds. The transcription of these features of production thus gives us access to how phonetic and lexico-syntactic resources combine to bring off recognizable actions.

E. **o** **°word°** The degree sign indicates that the talk following it was markedly quiet or soft. When there are two degree signs, the talk between them is softer than the talk around it (and the more degree signs, the quieter the talk). Producing talk softer or less loud relative to one's own talk may be a device for the doing of delicacy. So in the extract from the Australian language Murrinh Patha below, when Mona (MON), having been pressed to produce the name of someone whose name is subject to a naming taboo, does so, at line 08, she produces it *sotto voce*, thus displaying the delicacy attending its production:

(Blythe, 2013:900; lines of grammatical notation omitted here for clarity)

```
06  EDN:      Nanggalyu;
              Who was it?
07            (1.3)
08  MON: --> °Birrarriya.°=
              Birrarri.
```

Schegloff also discusses an American English instance from the mid-60's where a speaker, on the phone to her friend about a recent holiday trip to Lake Tahoe in California, lowers her voice to deliver, *sotto voce*, 'what could be reckoned to be prejudiced comments about various so called "minority groups". Although she has little reason to believe she can be overheard, she nonetheless lowers her voice to register an awareness of, and orientation to, the impropriety of what she is doing' (2003, p. 34):

```
07  BEV:   And I don' know, Ann, but I think - they're stealing
08         a lotta Los Vegas.
09  ANN:   I wouldn't be surprized.
10  BEV:   The other thing that we noticed, ((voice drops in
11         volume)) You know, we didn't see any Jews, -- you know
12         in Las Vegas, you [know how you see those greasy old=
13  ANN:                     [Uh huh,
14  BEV:   =women an' [men, but at-
15  ANN:              [Uh huh,
16  BEV:   And very few Negroes. ((voice moves to low-normal))
17         But we saw lots of Orientals.
18  ANN:   [Mm hm,
19  BEV:   [You see, I think they come in from San Francisco.
20  ANN:   Mm hm,
21  BEV:   ((voice returns to normal)) And the Orientals, you know,
22         always very well dressed,
23  ANN:   Mm hm,
24  BEV:   And they're tremendous gamblers.
25  ANN:   Mm hm,
26  ANN:   I think that's (    )
27  BEV:   So uhm uh:: they have a grand time at the crap games.
28  ANN:   Mm[hm,
29  BEV:     [They-
30  BEV:   They really at uh- it's a something to see, and I'm glad
31         saw it, 'n I had a wonderful time doin' it.
```

F. Combinations of underlining and colons are used to indicate intonation contours as follows:

_: If the letter(s) preceding a colon is underlined, then there is an 'inflected' falling intonation contour. E.g.

```
01  A:  th'fuhrst bit'v (.) income isn'tax[ed.
02  B:                                    [No: that's right, mm:
```

: If a colon is itself underlined, then there is an inflected rising intonation contour. E.g. in 'fi:ne' here at line 3:

```
01  VIC:  How are ↓you all. [Yer a l]ittle ti:red]°nah°
02  DOR:                    [Oh wir ]all fi:ne,  ]Yes I'm jus:
03        sohrta clearing up a bi[t nah,]
04  VIC:                          [°Ohhhh] deah, °
```

G. ↑↓ The up and down arrows mark sharper rises or falls in pitch than would be indicated by combinations of colons and underlining, or may mark a whole shift, or resetting, of the pitch register at which the talk is being produced. E.g.

```
11  LES:  .hhh Uh:m (.) Hal is ↑it (.) da:ncing this
12        Saturday, hhh
```

and:

```
01  VIC:  How are ↓you all.
```

H. The combination of 'more than' and 'less than' symbols, or angled brackets,

> < indicates that the talk between them is compressed or rushed. E.g.

```
01  A:  Good luck. Nice to [↑ s e e::    y o u : : ]
02  B:                     [>Nice to< ↑   see:: you::]
```

< > Used in the reverse order, the 'more than' and 'less than' symbols can indicate that a stretch of talk is markedly slowed or drawn out.

```
10  MUM:  No::w, would you phlea:se <finish your ↑soup>
```

While there has been some work on slowed speech rate with respect to turntaking (see Local et. al, 1986 on Tyneside English), there appears to be little examination of this marked speech rate in the implementation of actions as such. The slowed speech in the directive above is, however, surely implicated in the constellation of features delivering the action. Here is an exemplar from Murrinh-Patha, taken from just before the extract cited in section E above. On first being asked to identify someone whose name is subject to a naming taboo, Mona instead delivers a description which may enable Edna to identify him for herself. The description is produced on markedly slower pace:

(Blythe, ibid.)

```
01  EDN:  ↑Nanggalardu, (.) ↓dannyiyerr↓ngime¿
          Who was it that told us that story?
02        (0.15)
03  MON:  <MaKA:RDU warda>;
          He isn't around any more.
```

I. Aspiration and aspects of voice quality

hh **(hh)** Hearable aspiration is shown where it occurs in the talk; the more 'hh's, the more aspiration. The aspiration may represent breathing or laughter (but see Potter and Hepburn, 2010, on an alternative characterization of laugh particles as 'interpolated particles of aspiration' or IPAs). If it occurs inside the boundaries of a word, it may be enclosed in parentheses in order to set it apart from the sounds of the word (as shown in the turn below). E.g.

```
04  BEE:  Ba::sk(h)etb(h)a(h)ll?
05        (h)(Whe(h)re.)
```

£ £ Talk enclosed within pound sterling signs is done in an auditorily recognizable 'smiling' voice:

```
04  PAT:  £I'm seventy-fi[:ve.£]
05  MEG:                 [G  o:]shh!
```

This convention has been adapted to local currencies as well—e.g., instead of the British pound sign, Yu (2022) uses the Chinese Yuan symbol working with data in Mandarin.

~ ~ Tremolo, or what Hepburn (2004) calls 'wobbly voice'; the following is from Hepburn (2004:265):

```
01  CPO:  you sound as though you're
02        very upset about it.
03  CAL:  .Shih ~yeh I am.~
04        (0.6)
05  CPO:  °Mm.°
06        (0.3)
07  CAL:  ~I'm clo(h)se to tear:s.~
08        (0.6)
09  CPO:  I can ↑hear that, (0.2) °Yeah:.°
```

 # # Talk enclosed within hashtags is produced in creaky voice. In some older transcripts, creaky voice is denoted by asterisks thus: ***creak***. Note that Lorenza Mondada (Appendix 2) uses hashtags to mark the placement of figures in transcripts, and often uses asterisks to delimit gestures by a participant.

.hh Inbreaths are shown as 'hh's with a dot before it (sometimes raised), with one 'h' corresponding to one-tenth of a second.

·hh E.g.

```
01  JES:  ..cuz she's nevuh been cah[mpin[g.]
02  ANN:                           [.hhh[I ]t's smashing…
```

The marked overlap here shows Ann preparing to speak as Jessie comes to the end of her turn.

4. Other markings

A. **(( ))** Double parentheses are used to mark the transcriber's description of events, sometimes alongside an attempted transcription of the sound. Thus ((cough)), etc. E.g. in Schegloff (2007, p. 134):

```
07  NAO:  [En Da:d]dy, hh
08  MAR:  Yea:h.
09  DE?:  [ukh! ((cough))
10  NAO:  [ho- willyuh hold this.
11  MAR:  Wudizit.
12        (.)
13  NAO:  My bracelet.
```

These should be transcribed as we cannot know their analytic relevance in advance. Jefferson raises the possibility that someone might hear 'laughter' when what has been done is 'coughing', and might then 'join in' that laughter by himself laughing (Jefferson, 1972, pp. 448–449). Twenty years later she discovers, in the course of transcription, a recorded case of someone laughing to another's possibly laughter-relevant but non-laughter noises (e.g. 'a frog in the throat', detailed in Jefferson, 2010). Jefferson captures the CA orientation to the possibilities of analysis thus:'…as Sacks said when a student asked, re. some remarks Sacks had made about Poetics in ordinary talk, ''Couldn't that be carried

too far?'' Sacks responded: ''The whole problem is that it's nowhere in the first instance. The issue is to pull it out and raise the possibility of its operation.'' [1995, p. 325]' (2010, p. 1484). Note that when a phenomenon is the analytic focus, attempts will be made to capture the sound orthographically. So Hoey (2020, p. 124), examining sniffing in interaction, transcribes the sniff at line 5 below as **>.nh<**:

```
01  GOR:  I think maybe u- u- I w- (0.2) um would like tuh-
02        stop really goin ou:t at least forright no:w
03  DEN:  Yeah.
04  GOR:  .hh U::m I jus- .hhhh (0.5) u:: hh I feel really ba:d
05        because I- u:m (1.0) >.nh< I wish- I think I just we
06        don't have as much in common as: I think we both tho:ught
```

Hepburn (2004:261) discussing sounds associated with crying, uses **.shih** to denote a 'wet sniff' and **.skuh** to denote a 'snorty sniff'.

Aspects of voice quality may also be glossed in brackets:

```
05  CIN:  >gli gnocchi!< ((constricted))
                 gnocchi
```

B. Parentheses

(Mm) When all or part of an utterance is in parentheses, or the speaker identification is, it indicates uncertainty on the transcriber's part.

(up)/(out) Alternate hearings are given when it it not possible to distinguish between them. E.g. Schegloff (1989, p. 144):

```
01     MOM:  Cut that (up)/(out) Rob
```

(--) Sometimes transcribers designate the number of syllables heard with dashes; such indicators of what might have been said are particularly useful in joint or group collaboration over transcripts. It is quite possible to return to data after many years to hear something clearly which was once obscure or ambiguous.

( ) Empty parentheses show no hearing was possible of what was being said, with the spacing roughly corresponding to the amount of inaudible material in turn.

C. Analysis- or Publication-specific markings

Analysts sometimes also invent new symbols and notation to indicate the phenomena that constitute their analytic focus, so as to render these interactional objects more easily visible within transcripts. Care is taken to not use a symbol that already has another meaning.

For instance, Hoey (2014) uses the notation **hx** to denote sighing, which is phonetically and interactionally distinct from a typical outbreath (h). For example (2014:179):

```
01  LIL:     When's your: presentation?
02  REB:     (h::) ((lips parted, gazes down))
03       --> (hx::).=Wednesday?=
             |_______| ((gazes away))
                       |____________| ((returns gaze))
04                             =I like...I finished the poster.
```

Local and Walker (2004) use the symbol ▶ to indicate the constellation of phonetic and temporal features that indicate an abrupt-join, as in:

```
13  ILE:            [ye::s]
14  ILE:  =[ n o : ]
15  JAN:  =[huh .hu]hh
16  ILE:  o[kay
17  JAN:   [I've got to ru(h)un
18        (.)
19  ILE:  alright
20  JAN:  .hh okay▶how're you feeling
21  ILE:  oh I feel fine
22        (1.0)
23  ILE:  absolutely fine
```

In his work on rhythm, Ogden (2024/this volume) uses the following notation, involving Greek letters and carats, to capture precise information about the rhythmic timing of pulses:

```
         π----345----π----------730----------π
06  B:  hOw is your BAby h.
07      (0.4)
08  A:                                        ! hE's WONderfu:l
Pulse:                              ^         ^
```

References

Albert, S., & Hofstetter, E. (2024). Working with data I: Field recordings. In J. D. Robinson, R. Clift, K. H. Kendrick, & C. W. Raymond (Eds.). *The Cambridge handbook of methods in conversation analysis* (pp. xx-xx). Cambridge University Press.

Auer, P., Couper-Kuhlen, E. and Müller, F. 1999. *Language in Time: The Rhythm and Tempo of Spoken Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Blythe, J. 2013. Preference Organization Driving Structuration: Evidence from Australian Aboriginal Interaction for Pragmatically Motivated Grammaticalization. *Language* 89 (4): 883-919.

Clift, R. 2016. *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P., Hakulinen, A., Heinemann, T., Niemi, J. and Rossi, G. 2021. Hendiadys in naturally-occurring interactions: A cross-linguistic study of double verb constructions. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 182: 322-347.

Greenberg, S. 1999. Speaking in Shorthand: A Syllable-centric Perspective for Understanding Pronunciation Variation. *Speech Communication* 29: 159-176.

Hepburn, A. 2004. Crying: Notes on description, transcription and interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 37:3, 251-290.

Hoey, E.M. 2014. Sighing in Interaction: Somatic, Semiotic, and Social. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 47:2, 175-200

Hoey, E.M. 2020. Waiting to inhale: On sniffing in conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 53, 1, 118-139.

Jefferson, G. 1971. *A report on some difficulties encountered when using pseudonyms in research generative transcripts*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Sociology, University of California, Irvine.

Jefferson, G. 1972. Side Sequences. In D. Sudnow (ed.) *Studies in Social Interaction*. New York: The Free Press, pp. 448-449.

Jefferson, G. 1983. Issues in transcription of naturally-occurring talk: Caricature versus capturing pronunciational particulars. *Tilburg Papers in Language and Literature*. Tilburg University, pp. 1–12.

Jefferson, G. 1996. A case of transcriptional stereotyping. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26, 159–170.

Jefferson, G. 2004. Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (ed.) *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 13-31.

Jefferson, G. 2010. Sometimes A Frog in Your Throat Is Just a Frog in Your Throat: Gutturals as (Sometimes) Laughter-implicative. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 1476-1484.

Kendall, T. 2013. *Speech Rate, Pause and Sociolinguistic Variation: Studies in Corpus Sociophonetics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kendrick, K.H. and Torreira, F. 2015. The Timing and Construction of Preference: A Quantitative Study. *Discourse Processes* 52(4): 255-289.

Lerner, G. H. 2013. On the place of hesitating in delicate formulations: A turn-contructional infrastructure for collaborative indescretion. In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond, & J. Sidnell (Eds.), Conversational Repair and Human Understanding (pp. 95–134). Cambridge University Press.

Local, J.K., Kelly, J. and Wells, W.H.G. 1986. Towards a Phonology of Conversation: Turntaking in Tyneside English. *Journal of Linguistics* 22 (2): 411-437.

Local, J.K. and Walker, G. 2004. Abrupt-joins as a Resource for the Production of Multi-unit, Multi-action Turns. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36 (8): 1375-1403.

Oloff, F. and Hepburn, A. 2024. Multimodal transcription as process and analysis: capturing the audible and visible. In J. D. Robinson, R. Clift, K. H. Kendrick, & C. W. Raymond (Eds.). *The Cambridge Handbook of Methods in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, xx-xx.

Potter, J. and Hepburn, A. 2010. Putting Aspiration into Words: 'Laugh particles', Managing Descriptive Trouble and Modulating Action. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42 (6): 1543-1555.

Sacks, H. 1992*. Lectures on Conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schegloff, E.A. 1982. Discourse as an Interactional Achievement: Some Uses of 'uh huh' and Other Things That Come Between Sentences. In D. Tannen (ed.), *Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics 1981: Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*.

Schegloff, E.A. 1984. On Some Gestures' Relation to Talk. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 266-298.

Schegloff, E.A. 1987. Recycled Turn Beginnings. In G. Button and J.R.E. Lee (eds.), *Talk and Social Organization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. pp. 70–85.

Schegloff, E.A. 1989. Reflections on language development and the interactional character of talk-in-interaction. In M.H. Bornstein and J.S. Bruner (eds.) *Interaction in Human Development*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 139-153.

Schegloff, E. A. 1995. Discourse as an Interactional Achievement III: The Omnirelevance of Action. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28 (3): 185-211.

Schegloff, E.A. 2003. The Surfacing of the Suppressed. In P. Glenn, C. LeBaron and J. Mandelbaum (eds.) *Studies in Language and Social Interaction: A Festschrift in Honor of Robert Hopper*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 531-40

Schegloff, E.A. (2005). On integrity in inquiry…of the investigated, not the investigator. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4-5), 455-80.

Schegloff, E.A. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walker, G. 2010. The Phonetic Constitution of a Turn-Holding Practice: Rush-throughs in English Talk-in-Interaction. In D. Barth-Weingarten, E. Reber and M. Selting (eds.) *Prosody in Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp.51-72.

Walker, G. 2017. Visual Representations of Acoustic Data: A Survey and Suggestions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 50(4), 363-387.

Walker, T. 2014. Form ≠ Function: The Independence of Prosody and Action. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 47(1), 1–16.

Wilson, T. and Zimmerman, D.H. 1986. The Structure of Silence Between Turns in Two-Party Conversation. *Discourse Processes* 9 (4): 375-390.

Yu, G. 2022. 什么是会话分析. (What is Conversation Analysis). Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.