УДК 811.163.41'34:811.111'34 ; 801
Претходно саопштење

Ksenija Bogetić
Filološki fakultet, Univerzitet u Beogradu

NOTES ON THE ROLE OF PROSODY IN CONVERSATIONAL DISCOURSE: EVIDENCE FROM ENGLISH AND SERBIAN TALK IN INTERACTION

This paper examines the role of prosody in Serbian and English conversational discourse. The underlying assumption is that the investigation of conversational prosody can yield deeper understanding of both prosody and conversational structure, but that it demands a different approach that is not based on sentence-level grammar. The corpus used consists of three recorded conversations in English and three in Serbian, transcribed using the conventions of DuBois et al. (1992, 2006). The results point to several systematic tendencies in the role of prosody in turn taking, as well as in the realization of interruptions and simultaneous speech. In this respect, notable similarities between English and Serbian are found. In a more general sense, it is argued that it has become necessary for speech prosody research to step beyond sentence-level models and take a more interactionally oriented approach.

Key words: prosody, conversation, turn-taking, talk-in-interaction

1 Introduction

Prosody has long been recognized as playing a central role in the production and interpretation of spoken language. Major approaches to prosody, however, have been based on speech read in laboratory settings, produced in ideal recording conditions, with conclusions and theories established on the basis of sentence-level models (e.g Trager 1964, Lehiste and Ivić 1986, Bolinger 1989, Cruttenden 1997). Only recently, there has been a growing awareness of the fact that prosodic study derived from spontaneous speech may provide a deeper understanding of both conversation structure and prosody (Schegloff 1998:237, Furo 2001:3). What nevertheless still emerges from the existing literature is the need for fuller examinations of prosody in the conversational context. Also there is scarce, if any, litrature on the conversational prosody of Serbian.

ksenija.bogetic@gmail.com

This study represents an initial segment of a wider analysis of conversational prosody of English and Serbian, intended to point to some aspects of interest that have been little studied in the existing literature on prosody. It touches on some methodological issues, such as determining appropriate units of analysis, and then moves on to show particular discursive functions of prosody not captured by word and sentence-level analyses. The focus is primarily on the interactional function of prosody in managing spontaneous conversation. The principal hypothesis is that participants actively make use of prosodic information in order to project, interpret and produce verbal behaviour in spontaneous interaction, drawing on socially acquired rules of conversation. The underlying assumption is that it has become necessary for prosodic research to step beyond sentence-level grammar and take a more interaction-oriented approach.

In this study a communicative approach is adopted and prosody is viewed in light of discourse organization. Crucially, investigating the discourse functions of prosody presupposes reliance on stretches of speech longer than a sentence. For this purpose, a corpus of spontaneous conversations in Serbian and American English has been collected. The corpus is composed of spontaneous conversations recorded by the participants themselves and transcribed using the transcription conventions of DuBois et al. (1992, 2006). It totals 6 conversations altogether (3 in Serbian and 3 in English), comprising about 1 hour 16 minutes of speech and about 4000 intonation units. The obtained discourse-level material was subjected to acoustic analysis, although impressionistic observations are also found to be useful. The list of the transcription conventions used is given in the Appendix.

The following are some findings and observations about prosody in conversational interaction. The intention is to offer a concise account of the role of prosody in interaction and to point to aspect of interest for future research. The paper starts with a brief section introducing the basic concepts and terminology pertaining to conversation analysis and prosody, and then moves on to methodological issues and a summary of findings. The focus is on conversational structure and the management of its sequential order, and it is hypothesized that the investigation of prosodic form can provide additional insight into the turn-taking mechanism and the management of turn-taking violations.

Наслеђе 16 • 2010 • 205-220

2 Background

2.1 Conversation

However mundane or unsensational it may appear, conversation is a fundamental activity in social life. As such, it has nowadays been firmly established as a linguistic and social activity worthy of study in its own right, rather than the erratic reflection of linguistic competence, as it used to be viewed in the earlier structuralist tradition (TenHave 2007:3). In the past two or three decades, the management of everyday talk has been receiving growing attention in areas as diverse as linguistics, psychology, sociology, anthropology, gender studies and socially oriented discourse analysis. Early studies on the topic were mainly prescriptive in focus, and only since the 1960s the investigation of how people actually speak, rather than how they *should* speak, has earned a legitimate place in linguistic scholarship (TenHave 2007:11). The analytic framework that allowed for this shift of emphasis is conversation analysis (or CA) developed by Harvey Sacks and Emanuel Schegloff (1973, 1974).

Conversation analysis is primarily concerned with the ***sequential order of conversation*****,** or the ways participants take turns at talking in orderly and systematic ways (Schegloff 2000:1). A key question in this respect is how it is possible for interactants to so easily synchronize this ***turn-taking*** with so little gap or overlap (Wennerstrom 2001:168). Sacks, Schlegloff and Jefferson (1974:701) showed that orderly turn-taking is feasable because participants mostly take turns at what they termed ***transition-relevance places*** (***TRPs***), or places at which legitimate transition between speakers is in some way signalled as possible. Sacks et al. (1974:704) further propose a simple set of turn-taking rules:

1. If a speaker has selected a particular next speaker, then that speaker should take a turn at that place.
2. If no such selection has been made, any next speaker may select himself/herself as the next speaker.
3. If no next speaker has been selected, then the current speaker may, but need not, continue talking.

These rules are tacitly understood by the participants, forming a part of their linguistic and interactional competence, although they need not be recognized overtly. This is what makes it possible for interactants to manage and negotiate their participation in conversation (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008:41).

One more concept needs to be introduced at this point. It has been termed ***projectability*** and involves the possibility for participants to

project, at the course of what is being said, the type of unit in question and its possible completion point. This projection is based on a whole set of inferential signals, that may be syntactic or pragmatic, but also prosodic in nature. Signalled in these ways, projectability allows participants to identify the first possible completion point of a unit, which becomes the initial TRP, where speaker changes can occur (Furo 2001:35). It is thus crucial in accomplishing orderly interactional sequences with little gaps and overlaps.

2.2 Prosody

Prosody is generally defined as the suprasegmental aspects of speech that comprise phonetic features such as pitch, loudness, length and quality (Banno 1999:9, Cruttenden 1997:2). These features are associated with intonation, exhibited in gradient contasts resulting from pitch movements and pitch accents within an utterance (Banno 1999:10). Although the terms *prosody* and *intonation* are sometimes used unterchangeably, prosody is usually thought of as including some phenomena which are not encompassed by intonation, such as pauses, silences and voice quality.

In the English tradition, there is a large body of work dealing with speech prosody. Kenneth Pike was among the first American structuralists to systematically analyze prosodic factors in English. He used the term *intonation contours* for abstracted sentence melodies (Pike 1945, reproduced in Bolinger 1969:53). Pike's system was later adopted by Trager and Smith (1951) and Trager (1964), whose primary contribution was a more thorough examination of the role of stress and of pitches occurring at pause points. Within the British tradition, one of the most significant contributores was David Crystal with his *Prosodic systems and intonation in English* (1969). He analyzed the tone unit as the primary functional unit to which linguistic meanings are attached. In more interaction oriented research, an influential model of prosody is that of Halliday (1967a, 1967b), founder of systemic-functional linguistics, who developed a functional description of English intonation. Halliday was also one of the first researchers to analyze natural conversation, a sample of which he included at the end of his book *Intonation and Grammar in British English* (1967a). More recent studies on British and American English include Selkirk (1995) Brazil (1997), Cruttenden (1997), Wennerstom (2001).

Research done on the speech prosody of Serbian has yielded comparably less result, mostly focusing on the problem of word accents (e.g. Fekete 2000, Petrović 1996). One influential publication in this area is

Наслеђе 16 • 2010 • 205-220

that by Lehiste and Ivić (1986). The book addresses the gap that the authors identify in research on Serbo-Croatian prosody. The authors are primarily interested in accentual patterns in final and nonfinal sentences and clauses. While the analysis offers much novel data on Serbian prosody, it is nevertheless somewhat limited in scope and the material used (272 sentences produced by two participants). Also, the study does not address the topic of discourse prosody and is only based on sentence-level material. The questions of Serbian interactional prosody thus remain underresearched to date.

Altogether, the vast majority of research on prosody and intonation has so far dealt mainly with (usually read) speech collected in experimental laboratory setting, using sentence-level data for analysis. Considering the nature of naturally-occurring talk in interaction, which normally involves incomplete sentences, repetitions, hesitations and false starts, it seems appropriate to assume that conversational prosody cannot be adequately and fully described on the basis of sentence-level models. A discourse-level approach is thus crucial in accounting for the interactional meaning of particular prosodic events in real-time conversation. The goal of this study is to address this gap and point to some possible avenues for further explorations.

3 Going beyond sentence-level prosody

The examination of the collected material confirms the hypothesis that discourse-level speech exibits some difference in prosody and that its investigation calls for including a wider spectrum of prosodic characteristics and a somewhat different approach from sentence-level inquiry. The following is an attempt to briefly cover these aspects and point to some possible avenues for further explorations.

3.1 Different units of analysis

Whatever its theoretical background or language of interest, every study of prosody must involve well-defined units of analysis. However, identifying units appropriate for a discourse-level examination poses some methodological challenges and has yielded some disagreement among sholars.

Looking at any transcript of conversational interaction, it becomes evident that conversational speech is not segmented into regular syntactic units such as full sentences or clauses. It typically involves frequent repetions, false starts, repair, self-repair, interruptions, collaborative constructions etc. Altough they represent relevant categories for spoken discourse, syntactic units are thus evidently inappropriate as units of

analysis. What is required as a basis of interaction-oriented examination of prosody is a cognitively and interactionally defined unit that speakers use to articulate turns at talk in interaction.

An increasingly influential attempt to formulate and define units of spoken discourse is that of Wallace Chafe (1994, 1998), based on cognitive constraints, information flow and the referential aspects of discourse. Chafe introduces ***intonation units*** (IUs) as basic units of talk that are functionally relevant. The intonation unit is defined as "a sequence of words combined under a single, coherent intonational contour" that "plays an important functional role in the production and comprehension of language" (Chafe 1994:62). Chafe shows that intonation units often correspond to syntactic units, as approximately 60% of intonation units in English are shown to consist of a single clause (Chafe 1994:78). However, this leaves 40% of cases where IUs do not entail such syntactic correlations, but are composed of close fragments, single words, noun phrases, prepositional phrases etc. While Chafe's account is mainly based on cognitive constraints, such as the one-new-idea-per-unit constraint (Chafe 1994:99), intonation units may also be viewed as interactional units. As Kärkkäinen (2003:29) points out, IUs are sensitive not only to cognitive, but also to interactional constraints that emerge in the course of talk, and as such are especially appropriate for analyzing any aspect of conversational discourse.

Having this in mind, the present paper draws on the notion of intonation units as proposed by Chafe, while also viewing them as interactional units. When the examination of prosody is concerned, these are seen as the only appropriate units of analysis, as the observations on interactional prosody and its role-in turn-taking, such as the ones presented below, would be virtually impossible if merely relying on sentence and clause units.

3.2 Prosody in the managament of turn-taking

The notion of projectability - an interlocutor's ability to anticipate when a turn is likely to end - was examined in both the English and the Serbian conversations, with a focus on prosodic features. The patterns that have emerged hold for both languages, with minor differences in frequency. Several prosodic cues are shown to have a crucial role in talk-in-interaction, allowing the participants to interpret meaning and to predict what is to follow.

The analysis has thus shown that speakers choose to take the floor not only on the basis of syntactic completion, but that they also project turn-completion onto particular prosodic signals. Such signals are per-

ceived by listeners slightly in advance of the end of a turn and they enable participants to anticipate turn-completion before it actually occurs. In the analyzed material, several instrumentally identifiable prosodic cues that are perceptually effective as markers of TRPs have been identified.

The most common of such cues in both English and Serbian are *pauses*, which tend to occur at ends of turns, thus marking potential loci of turn-completion at which the next speakers can take over the floor. The following example from Serbian offers an illustration [1]:

(1)

1 DINA; On je meni reko
2 Ja sam se prebacio na ovaj novi program
3 Jer mi je neko reko da je lakši
4 (1.1)
5 MAJDA; Njemu nijedan neće biti la:k
6 ..
7 DINA; A kako da ostaje ovde?
8 ..
9 MAJDA; Ne znam ja sad dal on ostaje
10 ..
11 DINA; Pa reko mi je
12 Upi[sao se]
13 MAJDA; [A pa dobro] ja reko ti mene pitaš
14 ..
15 DINA; Upisao se

The analysis shows that pauses function as significant cues in turn-taking. Although they are by no means fixed signals, it appears that participants often associate pauses with turn-completion, which prompts them to take the floor. Long pauses are almost uniformly followed by turn shifts in both languages. This confirms the existing findings of pauses as good predictors of turn completion (e.g. Wennerstrom and Siegel 2001:11).

The second prosodic property shown to be transition-relevant is the so-called *final lengthening* (Klatt 1975:129-140), or the lengthening of syllables at the ends of intonation units. This prosodic property is shown to play a role in the local interactional management of conversation, al-

1 The transcription of pauses here follows the system of DuBois et al. (2006:1): short pauses are indicated with two dots, longer pauses (of approximately three tenths of a second up to one second in length) are transcribed with three dots, while long pauses (of more then one second) have the measured length of the pause given in parenthesis.

lowing participants to predict turn finality and act with little gap or silence. Lengthening is not only found on words bearing focus, but is just as common on non-focal lexemes. Also, the data from both languages show that final lengthening is found most frequently on the final syllable in the IU, but the effect is also found to spread on the preceding syllable. This calls for including both final and next-to-final syllables when identifying final lengthening. The following example illustrates the final lengtehning phenomenon (lenghtening is marked with : in line with DuBois et al. 2006:1):

(2)
1 SANDRA; well
2 it's your very first .. like official ima:ge
3 STEVE; yeah yeah it's my first-
4 SANDRA; like if this -
5 STEVE; and this little initial thi:ng
6 there's plenty more I can do:

Sandra's turn in line 2 contains lenghtening on the very final unstressed syllable in the IU (*image*). The example shows what this means in discourse: Steve takes the lengthening to indicate turn-completion and takes over immediately, without any pauses. But Sandra's interruption that promptly follows in line 4 indicates that she may not have been done with her turn, which leads to a series of interruptions where turns are being negotiated.

The corpus shows that turn-finality is also characterized by a *drop in pitch*. In both langauges, there is a marked tendency for pitch levels to diminish not only at the ends of intonations units, but at the ends of turns as a whole. This downward pitch movement, typically occurring at the final word or syllable in the IU, can be taken as an indicator of turn completion, where the floor can legitimately be shifted from one speaker to another. This is thus another prosodic property that appears to play a notable role in the speakers' mutual management of interaction. In the following example, the average pitch level for the segment is 262 Hz; in Dina's last intonation unit in line 4, the average pitch is similarly 244 Hz, starting at 270 Hz (*Ja*) and ending in a notable drop at 208 Hz (*smrzla*), leading Majda to take over the turn immediately.

(3)
1 DINA; Oni su hteli ceo dan da bleje u Belegišu
2 Pošto je kao trijes stepeni danju
3 A vidim što ima trijes stepeni
4 Ja sam se **smrzla**
270Hz 262Hz 266Hz 208Hz
5 MAJDA; U ponedeljak će biti jedanes

Similarly, turn-final segments in both English and Serbian commonly involve a *drop in loudness*. Again, this prosodic change can be taken as a salient marker of potential transition-relevance places. The material indicates that decreased amplitude, i.e. loudness, is commonly associated with the giving away of a turn in conversation in both Englash and Serbian. The example below illustrates the turn-final decrease in intensity (marked as P><P in the transcription), where Anne's turn starts at 74 db, progresses at an average of 70 db, and ends in 54 db.

(4)

1 ANNE; That's funny cause I'm just talking about the food
2 ..
3 But mm yeah it was nice
4 ..
5 And I P>went there for lunch today<P
6 MEGAN; Very cool
7 So were you nervous your first day?

3.3 Prosody and the violations of turn-taking rules

3.3.1 Interruptions

Interruptions represent a significant and much studied aspect of language in interaction (e.g. Zimmerman & West 1975, Schegloff 2002, Kohonen 2004, Coates 2004, Tannen 2005). The examination of the material collected confirms the hypothesis that interruptions may be more fully understood if observing their prosodic form.

In the present analysis, the examination of interruption in the prosodic structure of English and Serbian discourse has revealed patterns of occurence that exhibit notable regularities. The analysis shows that interruptions occur as products of partcipants' orientation to the conversational set of rules and that they are motivated jointly by emotional and turn-competitive needs. Altogether, 46 instances of interruption were identified in the English material and 65 in Serbian, and their phonetic properties were analyzed acoustically for both languages.

On a most general level, the phonetic realization of interruptions is shown to involve high amplitude and elevated pitch. In both English and Serbian conversations, the onset of an interruptive utterance is typically followed by a notable rise in pitch level and/or loudness, which may be seen as a way of compensating for the intrusion and maintaining the fundamental orientation to the basic rule-set. In the following example, Majda interrupts in line 3 at a pitch level of 401 Hz and loudness at 69

dB, which is significantly higher than the pitch and loudness of Dina's preceding interrupted utterance in line 2):

(5)

1	DINA;	I onda su kao rekli	
2		Baš će to da bude sve strava a-	***283 Hz 58 dB***
3	MAJDA;	I svi nose neko	***401 Hz 69 dB***
4		neka:	
5		nacionalna obeležja	

However, the exact pitch levels are found to vary according to the emotional and cognitive urgency of an interruption. Most generally speaking, greater urgency involves higher pitch and loudness. It thus appears crucial to distinguish between functions and types of interruptions, such as those that are directly turn-competitive and those that are purely supportive or cooperative.

3.3.2 Overlap

Looking at the prosodic form of utterances can also be revealing when investigating the ways people manage and resolve overlapping segments in conversation. The instance of both parties starting to speak at the same time and continuing in overlap for several syllables or words is common in both language materials, though it appears somewhat more frequent in Serbian. Similarly as in the case of interruptions, such overlapping sequences are found to be typically characterized by a rise in pitch level, and even more prominently, loudness. These prosodic features function as resources that may be drawn on in competing for the turn at the moment of overlap. The following is an example of such competition:

(6)

1	BRIAN;	Especially when you're	
2		you know	
3		(1.5)	
4		watching @twilights	
5		@@@	
6		..	
7		Oh man that movie was [S:o stu]pi:d	***310 Hz 56 dB***
8	MARIA;	[It was really] ba:d	***366 Hz 71 dB***

Further, a similar tendency as with interruptions is noted in the case of overlaps: overlaps that are directly competitive for the floor generally involve higher pitch and greater loudness than those that are simply cooperative, such as back-channels (m*hm, yeah, right*) and brief expressions of agreement and support (*I know what you mean*). There appears

Наслеђе 16 • 2010 • 205-220

to exist, however, some difference in the prosodic change between English and Serbian, the Serbian overlap instances showing somewhat less rise in pitch and loudness than the English ones. It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss interruptions and overlap in more detail, but it would be interesting to examine the variations in prosody depending on the discourse functions and types of these elements, which may potentially yield valuable insights into some cross-linguistic differences in the management of such seemingly disruptive segments.

4 Discussion

The findings confirm the hypothesis of prosody as actively employed in the projection and production of verbal behaviour. Prosody is shown to be a significant resource for interpreting meaning in discourse and situating one's own participation in it. This is in line with Schegloff's (1998:237) view of prosody as one of the sets of linguistic resources by which participants interactively produce conversation. Its interactional role is thus distinct from that of sentence-prosody, contibuting to a wider spectrum of turn-taking actions.

The analysis of prosodic properties of turns and intonation units has yielded some insights into the local organization and management of conversational structure. Namely, speakers choose to take the floor not only on the basis of syntactic completion, but they also project turn-completion onto particular prosodic cues, such as pauses, syllable lengthening or drop in pitch or loudness. These cues can be perceived by listeners slightly in advance of a turns's end, enabling them to anticipate turn-completion before it actually occurs. The analysis points to some notable patterns of occurrence in this respect, with the majority of turn-transitions marked by at least one of the four described prosodic cues. This is not to say that such prosodic signals can function entirely on their own, or that there is a one-to-one correspondence between a specific signal and an interactional function. They are essentially the result of complex negotiating of the ongoing discourse organization, working together with non-verbal cues, syntax, pragmatic and cognitive factors to produce clear signals of conversational intentions. Moreover, as spoken discourse involves a number of synactically possible completion points, prosody can be relied on to project TRPs out of all the syntactically complete utterances.

Apart from these more or less smooth transitions, instances of interruption and overlap have been identified and analyzed separately. What emerges from the analysis is that such elements are typically marked

prosodically, involving a rise in pitch or loudness. One implication of this finding is that interruptions and overlap do not merely represent random violations of the turn-taking rules, but are fundamentally related to the basic rule-set. If these rules are to be broken, this has to marked and compensated in some way, and one way of compensating for intrusion is precisely through prosody. The fact that the prosodic form of interruptions and overlap appears to vary depending on the level of intrusion (i.e. whether the disruption is turn-competitive or purely cooperative) further confirms the view of prosody as reflecting orientation to the basic turn-taking rules. All this gives importance to Drummond's (1989:150-166) emphasis on distinguishing between disruption and facilitation, as the analysis shows that even when a speaker is interrupted formally, i.e. caused to stop speaking or abandon the turn, this is often motivated by the need to offer support to current talk. By looking at the prosodic properties of different interruption and overlap types, their interactional implications may be understood more fully.

All these findings point to the roles of prosody as a set of interactional resources for speakers and hearers distinct from the functions of sentence-level prosody. This is seen as giving support to Emanuel Schegloff's (1998:236) claim that the notion of conversational prosody must be viewed *in contrast* to the prosody of invented sentences, experimentally read sentences or elicited utterances, as the study of conversational prosody involves the study of the ways interaction figures in the production and understanding of talk.

5 Conclusion

The investigation of prosody in English and Serbian talk-in-interaction has confirmed the underlying assumption in this paper, the view of conversational prosody as distinct in use and function from sentence-level prosody and worthy of analysis in its own right. Prosody is shown to play a role in the management of turn-taking in conversation, allowing participants to interpret what has been said, to predict what is to follow, or to signal and compensate for rule-violations, such as interruptions and overlap. However, these are just preliminary findings and though they indicate some avenues for further explorations, more work with larger corpora is needed. What is nevertheless apparent from the present analysis is that in order to fully understand the prosodic characteristics of conversational discourse, it is necessary to explore a wide range of properties such as pauses, silences, pitch, loudness and tempo

and investigate their *interactional* function using *discourse*-level material. The application of such findings is undoubtedly extensive, ranging from second and foreign language teaching to the design of intelligent dialogue-systems software.

Altogether, the results presented here lend support to the view that prosodic analyses of spontaneous speech can provide deeper insights into both prosody and conversational organization. Prosody is shown as playing a notable role in the management and organization of conversation, as a resource for signaling the various speakers' needs and motivations. All this confirms the idea that valuable new insights may be obtained in prosodic research that steps beyond sentence-level grammar and takes a more interaction-oriented approach.

APPENDIX

Transcription conventions

STEVE;	speaker attribution
..	short pause (untimed)
...	longer pause (untimed)
(1.2)	long pause (timed)
:	prosodic lengthening
[ ]	overlap first pair
[$_2$]	overlap second pair
-	truncated/cut-off word
(H)	inhale
(Hx)	exhale
@	laugh
@you're @ kidding	laughing word
(COUGH)	vocalism
(TSK)	click
<VOX>	voice of another
###	unintelligible (one symbol per syllable)
#word	uncertain transcription
((COMMENT))	analyst comment
~Pete	pseudograph
<L2 L2>	code switching
>>	speeding up
<<	slowing down

<P P>	quiet voice
→	unit of interest

Литература

Бано 1999: M. Banno, *Towards a discourse model of prosodic structure : a prosodic and syntactic analysis of declination in Japanese.* Thesis (M.A.)University of California, Santa Barbara.

Болингер1989: D. Bolinger, *Intonation and Its Uses: Melody in Grammar and discourse*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Чејф 1994: W. Chafe, *Discourse, consciousness, and time: the flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Чејф 1998: W. Chafe, Language and the flow of thought. *У*: Michael Tomasello (ред.) *The new psychology of language,* Erlbaum, 93-111.

Коутс 2004: J. Coates, *Women, Men and Language*, Harlow: Pearson Longman.

Купер-Кулен и Селтинг: E. Couper-Kuhlen and M. Selting, *Prosody in conversation: Interactional studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Кратенден 1997: A. Cruttenden, *Intonation,* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Кристал 1969: D. Crystal, *Prosodic systems and intonation in English,* London: Cambridge University Press.

Драгин 2005: Г. Драгин, Прозодијске особине говора спикера – новинара – РТВ Нови Сад, *Зборник Матице српске за филологију и лингвистику,* 48, 1-2, 277-282.

Драмонд 1989: K. Drummond, A backward glance at interruptions. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 53, 150-66.

ДуБоа 2006: J. Du Bois, *Comparison of transcription symbols,* http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/projects/transcription/A04comparison.pdf, 25. 8. 2010.

ДуБоа и др. 1992: J. Du Bois, S. Schuetze-Coburn, S. Cumming and D. Paolino, Outline of discourse transcription. *У*: J. A. Edwards J. A. i M. D. Lampert M. D. (red.) *Talking data: Transcription and coding indiscourse research,* Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum, 45-89.

Фекете 2000: E. Фекете, Неке појаве систем(ат)ског нарушавања акценатске норме. *Јужнословенски филолог*, 56, 1297-1329.

Фуро 2001: H. Furo, *Turn-taking in English and Japanese: Projectability in grammar, intonation and semantics*, New York: Routledge.

Халидеј 1967: M. A. K. Halliday, *Intonation and grammar in British English,* Paris: Mouton.

Хачби и Вуфит 2008: I. Hutchby and R. Wooffitt, *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation,* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Клат 1975: M. Klatt, Vowel *lengthening* is syntactically determined in connected discourse, *Journal of Phonetics, 3,* 129-140.

Кохонен 2004: S. Kohonen, Turn-taking in conversation: overlaps and interruptions in intercultural talk, *Cahiers, 10,* 15-30.

Лехисте и Ивић 1986: P. Lehiste and P. Ivić, *Word and sentence prosody of Serbo-Croatian,* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Мурата 1994: K. Murata, Intrusive or cooperative? A cross-cultural study of interruption. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *21,* 385-400.

Петровић 1996: Д. Петровић, Фонетика – српски језик на крају века. *У*: М. Радовановић (ред.) *Срūски језик на крају века*, Београд: Институт за српски језик САНУ.

Секс *и др.* 1974: H. Sacks, E. Schegloff and G. Jefferson, A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation, *Language,* 50, 696-735.

Шеглоф 1998: E. Schegloff, Reflections on studying prosody in talk in interaction, *Language and speech*, 41, 235-263.

Шеглоф 2000: E. Schegloff, Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation, *Language in Society,* 29, 1-63.

Шеглоф 2002: E. Schegloff, Accounts of conduct: Interruption, overlap and turn-taking. У: J.H.Turner (ред.) *Handbook of Sociological Theor*y, New York: Kluwer, 287-321.

Танен 1990: D. Tannen, *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation,* New York: Morrow.

Танен 2005: D. Tannen, *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Тен Хав 2007: P. Ten Have, *Doing conversation analysis,* London: SAGE.

Трејџер 1964: G. Trager, The intonation system of American English. *У*: D. Bolinger (ред.) *Intonation. Selected readings,* London*:* Penguin Books, 83-86.

Венерстром 2001: A. Wennerstrom, *The Music of Everyday Speech : Prosody and Discourse Analysis,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Зимерман и Вест1975: D. Zimmerman and C. West, Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversations. *У*: B. Thorne, B. and N. Henley (ред.), *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance,* Rowley: Newbury House, 105-129.

Ксенија Богетић

НАПОМЕНЕ О УЛОЗИ ПРОЗОДИЈЕ У ДИСКУРСУ КОНВЕРЗАЦИЈЕ: НАЛАЗИ ИЗ ГОВОРА У ИНТЕРАКЦИЈИ НА ЕНГЛЕСКОМ И СРПСКОМ ЈЕЗИКУ

Резиме

У овом раду разматрана је улога прозодије у дискурсу конверзације у српском и енглеском језику. Основна претпоставка је да испитивање конверзацијске прозодије може допринети дубљем разумевању и прозодије и конверзацијске структуре, али да оно захтева и битно другачији приступ од досадашњих приступа, који углавном остају у оквирима нивоа реченице. Коришћени корпус састоји се од по три снимљене конверзације на српском и енглеском језику, транскрибоване на основу конвенција ДуБоа и сарадника (DuBois et al. 1992, 2006). Прозодија је овде посматрана кроз комуникативни, интеракцијски приступ, у светлу организације дискурса. том погледу, примећене су бројне подударности између српског и енглеског језика. У ширем смислу, ово упућује на потребу да испитивања прозодије говора изађу ван оквира чисто реченичних модела и усвоје више интеракцијски оријентисан приступ.

Прихваћено за штампу јула 2010.