I.A.D.A.

International Association for Dialogue Analysis

(Bologna)

Secretariat:

Marina Bondi *(Modena)*
Secretary

Malcolm Coulthard
(Birmingham)

Marcelo Dascal *(Tel Aviv)*

Franz Hundsnurscher
(Münster)

Catherine Kerbrat-
Orecchioni *(Lyon 2)*

Bernd Naumann *(Erlangen)*

Eddo Rigotti *(Lugano)*

John Sinclair *(Birmingham)*

Sorin Stati *(Bologna)*
President

Edda Weigand *(Münster)*
Vice-president

http://zsf5.uni-muenster.de/
zsf/iada/iada.htm

Prof. Marina Bondi
Università degli Studi
di Modena e Reggio Emilia
Corso Vittorio Emanuele 59
I-41100 M O D E N A
Tel. (39) 059 - 2057002
Fax. (39) 059 - 2057007
email: mbondi@unimo.it

I.A.D.A.
Forum

3
2002

KARIN AIJMER
Göteborg University

RESEARCH ON DIALOGUE ANALYS IN THE NORDIC COUNTRIES

There is a rich tradition of dialogue research in the Nordic countries with a focus on spoken language and interaction. Much research focuses on conversation studies. Although different approaches to the study of talk-in-interaction are encouraged, Conversational Analysis seems to be the dominant approach in discourse studies. The interest in analysing spoken language has resulted in a project on Grammar and Conversation which has the purpose to give new perspectives on Swedish by examining the relationship between social interaction and the structure of grammar in conversation

The project uses several methods such as Conversational Analysis and different branches of functional grammar. The empirical material consists of video and audio recordings of naturally occurring interaction which is analysed both from a microsociological interactional point of view and a more traditional linguistic angle. The projects involves four universities (Göteborg, Linköping, Uppsala and Helsingfors) and senior researchers and doctoral students from different departments. The areas which are focused on are turn constructional units (TCUs), deixis, discourse particles and modality (see http: //www.nordiska. uu.se/ samtal/ main/ html).

Jens Allwood at the Linguistics Department, Göteborg University studies spoken language in different professional and non-professional social activities within the theoretical framework of activity-based communication analysis. The database compiled for this purpose is 'The Swedish Spoken Language Corpus', a corpus of spoken Swedish which includes a large number of different social activities (e.g. auctions, court proceedings, dinner discussion, sermons, telephone conversation, service encounters). The corpus has been manually coded to make it possible to study communication management (including hesitations, changes, feedback and turntaking) and speech acts. Elisabeth Ahlsén from the same department has collected a database of interactions between persons with aphasia and therapists or family members and studies the conversational strategies used by the participants. Spanish is one of the languages studied in Lars Fant's project (Stockholm University) dealing

with the construction of national identity in conversations beteen Swedes and Spaniards.

The Department of Communication Studies at Linköping University has a research programme called 'Discourse in Society'. The emphasis is on problems in communication and on analysing the interaction between professionals and lay persons (e.g. doctor-patient) or between representatives for different professions. The research at the department includes the interactive use of technical media and communication by e-mail, multimedia and expert systems and the analysis of the discussion of biotechnology in focus groups (Per Linell, Viveka Adelswärd, Victoria Wibeck). Research on computer-mediated communication and internet chat is also carried out at the English Department, Växjö university (Tuija Virtanen) and at the Linguistics Department, Göteborg (Ylva Hård af Segerstad).

In addition to the empirical studies of particular forms of dialogue, we can mention the contributions to the theory and methods of dialogue analysis. by Per Linell. Linell has emphasised the dialogic nature of written language and has contributed to a dialogue theory of language and discourse (Linell 1982, 1998).

Historical dialogue analys is a new branch of dialogue analysis reflecting the recent interest in pragmatics and in historical corpora in language study. It is represented in Sweden by Merja Kytö, the English Department, Uppsala University who (together with Jonathan Culpepper) is developing a historical corpus of dialogues representing court proceedings, witness depositions, play texts, etc which will be used to try to understand the spoken conversation of the past. A glimpse of what one can do with such a corpus is given in a study of 'hedges' in Early Modern English Dialogue (words such as sort of which increase or decrease fuzziness) (Culpepper & Kytö 1999).

The availability of the London-Lund Corpus of Spoken English has been an inspiration for research on spoken English in Swedish Karin Aijmer, the English Department, Göteborg University, has studied conversational routines such as thanking, apologizing, requesting and offering in different text types in the corpus (Aijmer 1996) and is using a corpus-linguistic approach to examine discourse particles in English (Aijmer, forthcoming). At Stockholm University, Britt Erman and Ulla-Britt Kotsinas have studied new senses and functions of discourse particles in Swedish

and English in a grammaticalization perspective (Erman & Kotsinas 1993). Erman is also interested in conversation management from a gender perspective and has shown that women give more feedback and interrupt less regardless of the sex of the interlocutors (Erman 2001).

The Bergen Corpus of London Teenager Language (COLT) is the first large English corpus focusing on the speech of English teenagers. COLT material has, for instance, been used to study backchannelling, vague language, and discourse strategies. Andersen (1997) shows that teenagers apply words like oh, like, innit with greater frequency than adults and Stenström (1998) studies the variation between cos and because in teenage talk. In the Nordic countries, research into teenage language is carried out by UNO (Language contact and youth language in the Nordic countrics). a project which aims at the investigation and comparison of spoken and written informal language of Nordic teenagers. Another project led by Jan Svennevig, University of Agder and Oslo, has the purpose to study problems of understanding in the interaction between immigrants and the social authorities.

Critical discourse analysis and argumentation analysis are represented in Cornelia Ilie's work on argumentation and rhetorical strategies in parliamentary debates in talk shows (e.g. Ilie 1994).

References

Aijmer, Karin. 1996. Conversational routines in English: Convention and creativity. London and New York: Longman.

Aijmer, Karin. (to appear) A corpus-linguistic study of English discourse particles. Benjamins: Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Andersen, Gisle. 1997. Pragmatic markers in teenage and adult conversation. Gisle Andersen Home page. University of Bergen.

Culpeper, Jonathan and Merja Kytö.1999. Modifying Pragmatic Force: Hedges in Early Modern English Dialogues. Historical Dialogue Analysis, eds. Andreas H. Jucker, Gerd Fritz, and Franz Lebsanft. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 293-312.

Erman, Britt. 2001. Pragmatic markers revisited with a focus on you know in adult and adolescent talk. Journal of pragmatics 33(9): 1337-59.

Erman, Britt and Ulla-Britt Kotsinas. 1993. Pragmaticalization: the

case of ba' and you know. Studier i modern språkvetenskap: 53-73. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Ilie, Cornelia. 1994. What Else Can I Tell you? A Pragmatic Study of English Rhetorical Questions as Discursive and Argumentative Acts. Stockholm Studies in English Stockholm 82.

Linell, Per, 1982. The Written Language Bias in Linguistics. (SIC 2). (Linköping: Tema Kommunikation).

Linell, Per. 1998. Approaching dialogue: interaction and contexts in dialogical perspectives. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Stenström , Anna-Brita. 1998. From sentence to discourse: Cos (because) in teenage talk. Discourse markers. Description and theory, eds. Andreas H. Jucker and Yael Ziv. Amsterdam and Philadelphi: John Benjamins, 127-46.

LARISSA WUNDERLICH

DIALOGUE ANALYSIS 2000
An International Conference of the International Association for Dialogue Analysis (I.A.D.A.) at the 'Università degli Studi di Bologna', 15-17 June 2000

Ten years ago, the "International Association for Dialogue Analysis (I.A.D.A., see also <http://zsf5.uni-muenster.de/zsf/iada/iada.htm>) was founded in Bologna. In order to celebrate this anniversary, the President of the Association, Sorin Stati, invited the I.A.D.A. members to attend an international conference in the founding city. The conference took place at the 'Dipartimento di Studi Linguistici e Orientali' of the 'Università degli Studi di Bologna'. Financial support was given by the 'Centro Interfacoltà di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata', the City Council of Bologna, the Rolo Banca, and the committee for Bologna 2000, European city of culture.

After the opening session, where Sorin Stati, Marina Bondi ('secretary') and the Dean of the 'Facoltà di lettere e filosofia' welcomed the participants, the conference began with a round-table discussion on "Dialogue

Analysis 2000", to which especially the organisers of the former conferences had been invited. In the first paper, A decade of dialogue analysis, Franz Hundsnurscher (Münster) gave a survey of the main trends in dialogue analysis in the last ten years, concentrating mainly on the work within the I.A.D.A. and summarizing the conferences of the past decade. He pointed out that the dialogue analysts left behind structuralist or generative approaches and stated that dialogue analysis now influences entire linguistics.

The increasing boom in dialogue studies of different kinds was the subject of Frantiπek Daneπ' (Prague) paper Research prospects against the background of hitherto analytical experience. He discussed some basic deficiencies of the approaches by Grice and Brown/Levinson, which he considered to be too negatively oriented. In contrast to their investigations of destructive, confrontational, and "face-threatening" aspects of communication, he proposed a positively oriented approach which stresses constructive and co-operative language use. He concluded that we should focus less on the 'face' and more on the 'heart'.

Eddo Rigotti and Andrea Rocci (Lugano) showed in their paper Pour une typologie du non-sens that the traditional criterion of well-formedness is not suitable to judge upon the sense or non-sense of an utterance. They concentrated on the analysis of non-sense, which, according to them, arises from the disregard for a presupposition. The type of the disregarded presupposition was taken as the basis of their typology, which they illustrated by various examples.

A very interesting paper on Authentic, falsified and suppressed dialogue in police records of interviews with suspects was given by Malcolm Coulthard (Birmingham), who investigated the difficult question of how the authenticity of such police records can be proved. As suspects are sometimes condemned mainly because of their verbal statements, this question is extremely important. Statements that seem to be monologic in their final version are, strictly speaking, written reports of dialogues during which the suspects are often provoked by constructed questions to give certain answers. Statements often contain formulations that express the suspect's uncertainty about the circumstances of the crime, which makes their credibility doubtful.

John Sinclair (Tuscan Word Centre - Birmingham) tried to answer the question Can we have a conversation with a computer? Although the

technical capabilities of the computer are by now sufficient, a communication comparable to human dialogue still seems to be inaccessible. It is true that we meanwhile seem to be capable of conversing with the computer, but the ideal client for online offers like E-Commerce is still the "clicker", who is willing to enter into the linear discourse process.

The last paper of the first day was presented by Edda Weigand (Münster). In Dialogue Analysis 2000: towards a human linguistics she looked back at the classical models which restrict and thus do not meet the complex object. By means of authentic examples she showed that meaning is not defined but negotiated in dialogue. Interlocutors integrate different communicative means, which cannot be separated. According to Weigand, concepts of probability are constitutive components within the dialogic action game. In the action game the knowledge of the other's preferences plays a role, and not all meanings are explicitly verbally expressed, not only because the dialogue would be clumsy and unproductive but because the interlocutor can infer by his or her cognitive and perceptive abilities. The open system of principles of probability on which our communicative action is based leads to a redefinition of linguistics as a human science orientated towards human beings and their abilities.

On Friday morning the round-table discussion continued with Adriana Bolívar's (Caracas) paper Political change and changes in Venezuelan political dialogue. The effects of the political change in Venezuela on the democratic dialogue were presented from three angles. At first, Bolívar gave a historical survey of the ruling parties up to the present day. Secondly, she analyzed the dialogue between the traditional presidents and the people. These dialogues were elaborated speeches read from notes. Thirdly, she illustrated the dialogue of the new president, who represents the "new democracy" and speaks without notes, thus appearing to create a greater closeness to the people. Special attention was paid to the use of personal pronouns. Within the new president's speeches, a noticeable shift from we ('nosotros') to I ('yo') was remarked, which, according to Bolívar, indicates a strong tendency towards authoritarianism.

Svetla Cmejrková (Prague) analyzed in Media dialogue as a genre of public oral discourse the question-answer format of interviews broadcasted on Czech television. She presented not only the strategies and technical devices of the interviewer, e.g. the assessment of the answer or the attempt to have an informal conversation, but also the strategies of the intervie-

wee, who judges the interviewer's questions or asks questions his/herself. Furthermore she described the tendency to repeat the interview partner's statement, which is used to negotiate correctness, adequacy, and meaning in the course of the interview.

An illustrative picture of today's possibilities of having a conversation with the computer was depicted by Marcelo Dascal (Tel Aviv) in his contribution Conversation with ECAs (Embodied Conversational Agents): The dream and the state of the art. He showed by three examples of an ECA what kind of progress has so far been made concerning the integration of facial play and body language into the communication between man and machine. But he also showed that the quality of this kind of communication is still far away from that of interhuman dialogue.

In his paper Strategies of understanding in dialogue, Valerij Dem'-jankov (Moscow) presented an interpretative approach concerning human communication which rests on a modular view of human mentality. He mentioned nine modules and their rules of coming to an understanding. Here also a positive assessment of communication was significant, which he emphasized by the rule "Relax and rely on the speaker".

In his paper Dialogue and identity, Robert Maier (Utrecht) stated that the functioning of dialogue with its rules and ways, not only in conversation, but also in discussions and negotiations, is adequately understandable only with respect to the personal and social identity and the relation of power between the interlocutors.

The aspect of emotion was focussed on by Jackie Schön (Toulouse-Le Mirail) in her contribution L'expression affective: une dimension constitutive de l'analyse du dialogue. She analyzed especially those expressions of emotions that are created through an unusual application of lexemes. Schön highlighted on the one hand that this procedure follows regular dialogic methods, and on the other hand that it is socially stigmatized.

With the help of occasionally humorous authentic dialogue examples, Bernd Naumann (Erlangen) demonstrated in his paper Chaotic Dialogues. Can ideas formulated in Complexity Theories be made useful for Dialogue Analysis? that some principles of the Theory of Chaos or Theory of Complexity can also be applied within linguistics, particularly within dialogue analysis. These principles aim at universality, e.g. the principles of non-linearity, self-similarity, and extreme sensitivity to initial conditions.

In Some recent trends in the study of discourse particles, the Swedish corpus linguist Karin Aijmer (Gothenburg) dealt with the various ways of translating well into Swedish. She also looked at the Swedish source expressions for the use of well in the English translation. Her analysis was based on the "English-Swedish Parallel Corpus".

Afterwards the vice-president of the association, Edda Weigand, summarized the various aspects of the round-table discussion in her closing speech. Most of the contributions have shown that traditional methodological views have to be re-thought. We have to refrain from the perspective of rule-governed communication, and we have to realize that rules are only tools used by human beings and thus depend on their individual decisions. 'Addressing the complex' is the main challenge of the new millennium. We have to develop an adequate new way of theorizing, for which the integration of different dimensions is required right from the beginning. Dialogue has to be seen as an open system ranging from order to disorder, from rules to principles of probability, and from conventions to presumptions.

Friday afternoon began with Michael Metzeltin's (Vienna) plenary session on Dialogue et pouvoir. He stressed the dialogic orientation of any communication and stated that the imperative has to be seen as the original form of dialogue. He then explained the semantic structures of the imperative and the reply considering the relations of power between the interlocutors. Even if the speaker is in a superior position, imperatives like aime-moi do not work and therefore have to be rephrased, e.g. je veux que tu m'aimes.

Afterwards two parallel sessions followed containing papers on various subject areas of dialogue analysis. Not all of them can be mentioned here in detail. Laurie Anderson (Siena-Arezzo) and Régine Borderie (Reims) dealt with dialogic action between more than two interlocutors; Susan Petrilli, Massimo Bonfantini and Augusto Ponzio (Bari) concentrated especially on dialogues in a three-party composition. Dialogues in the mass-media, particularly on television, were the topic of Gerda Lauerbach (Frankfurt/Main), Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard (Birmingham), Elda Weizman (Ramat-Gan), Luisa Granato (La Plata) and Jírì Kraus (Prague). Gabriella Del Lungo (Florence), as well as Polly Walsh and Belinda Crawford (Florence), addressed dialogic aspects of lectures, Christina Samson (Florence) and Julia Bamford (Siena) especially of lectures on economics.

Gina Poncini's (Lugano) study dealt with the use of evaluating language in international business meetings. The issue of politeness is of great interest within dialogue research and was taken into account in the papers of Adelino Cattani (Padua), Liliana Ionescu-Ruxandoiu (Bucharest), Ludmila Kastler (Grenoble III), Olga Tchesnokova (Moscow), and Michel Marcoccia (Troyes). Milena Srpová (Paris III) and Margareta Magda (Bucharest) dealt with intercultural and interethnic dialogues respectively. Some papers referred to historical dialogue analysis, among them Donna Shalev's (Jerusalem) paper on mechanisms of response in ancient Greek, and Gerd Fritz' (Gießen) paper on dialogical structures in 17th century controversies. Anna Orlandini (Toulouse) and Mirka Maraldi (Bologna), who examined exclamations of indignation and of incredibility, included Latin in their examination. The clearly dialogic orientation of texts which seem to be monologic at first sight but are only components within the action game, was illustrated in the contributions by Henning Westheide (Leiden) and Larissa Wunderlich (Münster).

The other contributions can neither all be mentioned explicitly nor easily be grouped together. Silvana Contento (Bologna) demonstrated how language and gestures interact. Cornelia Ilie (Stockholm) analyzed meta-discourses in institutionalized dialogues. Franz Hundsnurscher (Münster) systematized lies and gave some reasons for the rigorous demand of some philosophers for strict sincerity in verbal interaction. Marianne Doury (Lyon II) described the argumentative structures of everyday talk about immigration. Carla Bazzanella and Alberto Baracco (Turin) talked on misunderstanding in Internet Relay Chats. The conference languages were English, German, French, and Italian.

The organizers managed to give the conference a stylish setting with an eventful social program. Already at the conference eve, Sorin Stati invited early arriving participants to a welcome drink at his home. The first conference evening ended with a social dinner during which many lively talks with old and new acquaintances developed. The visit of the Villa Griffone, the house of birth of Guglielmo Marconi, offered a pleasant change after a long series of papers. This villa is about a quarter of an hour from Bologna in the Bolognese hills and includes now the Marconi Museum. There was a very interesting guided tour of the museum and a chamber concert, followed by a social dinner in an 'Osteria'.

With the closing session on early Saturday evening the fruitful and

stimulating conference ended. A selection of the papers will be published in a volume on "Dialogue Analysis 2000", edited by Marina Bondi and Sorin Stati, within the series "Beiträge zur Dialogforschung" of the Max Niemeyer publishing house. Karin Aijmer took the opportunity to invite the participants to the next I.A.D.A. conference "Dialogue Analysis VIII: Recent trends in Dialogue Analysis", to be held in April 2001, in Gothenburg.

The author's address:
Larissa Wunderlich, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster, Fachbereich 9: Philologie, Arbeitsbereich Sprachwissenschaft, Bispinghof 2B, D-48143 Münster, wundela@uni-muenster.de

EDDA WEIGAND

DIALOGUE ANALYSIS 2000: BETWEEN GENERAL RULES AND PRINCIPLES OF PROBABILITY

A decade of Dialogue Analysis within the framework of our International Association reminds us to reflect on the results we have achieved. I will try to sketch the state of the art in Dialogue Analysis from my point of view with special reference to the research done in our Association and presented in the papers of the Round Table of the 10th anniversary in Bologna 2000 (cf. Weigand forthcoming, Bondi/Stati forthcoming).

The first point to be made is that classical theorizing still remains. Classical theorizing has not stopped with the pragmatic turn. The essential point in defining the orthodox view is based on the fact that it starts with methodology and reduces the natural object to an artificial one by establishing an own methodological level of competence as a rule-governed closed system. In this way, Dialogue Grammar has focused on

what I would like to call the 'deep structure' of dialogue. I remember Hundsnurscher's programmatic article of 1980 in which he postulated a method contrasting with Conversational Analysis by substituting so-called well-formed dialogues for the natural object of authentic texts. The point of rules is also focused on by Sorin Stati (1982) in his book 'Il dialogo'. We will not forget that rules remain an important methodological technique. However, in dialogue considered as dialogic interaction, rules are tools used by human beings and thus de-pendent on their individual decisions. What we thought to be the great merit of Dialogue Grammar namely that it complied with the methodological conditions of generative gram-mar, turns out, in my opinion, to be the main obstacle we have to overcome. Thus we are not departing from the hard line, we are departing from the simple which avoids the complex. Martinet (1975), a long time ago, showed us the right way by urging us 'not to damage the integrity of the object by methodological exigencies'. Excluding constitutive features of our natural object, human dialogic inter-action, such as cognition and the fact that we are always different human beings interacting in the action game, cannot be the right method for describing and explaining our object. We have to accept that our object consists of a mix of various integrated variables ranging from order to disorder. The attempt to describe it by total abstraction from disorder can only result in a theory myth.

Problematizing orthodox theorizing and accepting the complex mix of order and dis-order that our object-of-study represents is in my opinion the challenge we have to tackle when facing the new millennium. It requires us to recognize the object-in-function and to derive from it an adequate new way of theorizing. Most of the approaches used in Dialogue Analysis recently have tried to address the object-in-function in the belief that it is the authentic text that has to be analysed and dealt with. Karin Aijmer (1996) demonstrated convincingly that discourse particles can be comprehended in their multiple variety and multifunctionality only with the support of large text corpora. Large text corpora may be used for the analysis of verbal phenomena like discourse particles; they must however not be identified with our object-in-function. Text corpora are usually analysed from the ob-server perspective and contain only empirically reg-istrable means. These are heavy restric-tions imposed on human dialogic interaction which do not allow our object-in-function to be identified

with text corpora. What is it about human dialogic interaction that cannot be gained from text corpora? That is the question. Or to put the question from the perspective addressed by John Sinclair in his contribution to the Round Table: What is it about a conversation that seems alien to computers?

The conclusions to be drawn seem evident. We must not think that it suffices to analyse authentic texts as an observer. There are various complex phenomena influencing dialogic interaction which are not registered in text corpora and which can be understood only from inside the Action Game. Various contributions of the Round Table refer to those cognitive phenomena which are constitutive for dialogic interaction. Power, for example, is dealt with by Michael Metzeltin, identity is the topic of Robert Maier's contribution, or emotion is addressed by Jackie Schön. Svetla Cmejrková and Adriana Bolívar also deal with aspects of dialogue which cannot totally be figured out from authentic texts. It is these aspects which are among the prospective research objectives indicated by Frantiπek Daneπ. The cognitive level is addressed by Valerij Dem'jankov. In dialogic interaction we use different communicative means, empirical verbal and perceptual means and cognitive means which must not be separated. 'Integration is the name of the game' as Marcelo Dascal calls it. According to recent research in the cognitive sciences we have to account for the integration of different dimensions from the very outset. Linguistics therefore can no longer be considered a science of language in the narrow sense but has to be compre-hended as a science of a complex human ability which integrates the verbal, cognitive and perceptual dimensions.

Further conclusions result from the fact that it is different human beings, different individuals interacting. This property is focused on in the contributions by Malcolm Coulthard (e.g. 1985: 145) pointing to individuality and by Bernd Naumann (in his contribution to the Round Table) pointing to chance and chaos. Dialogue at the beginning of the new millennium indeed has to be seen as an open system ranging from order to disorder, from conventions to suppositions, from general rules to principles of probability (cf. Weigand 2000).

References

Aijmer, Karin (1996): Conversational Routines in English. Convention and creativity. - London, New York: Longman (Studies in language and linguistics).

Bondi, Marina/Stati, Sorin (eds.): (forthcoming): Dialogue Analysis 2000. - Tübingen: Niemeyer (Beiträge zur Dialogforschung).

Coulthard, Malcolm (1985): An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. - London, New York: Longman, 2nd edition.

Hundsnurscher, Franz (1980): Konversationsanalyse versus Dialoggrammatik. - In: H.Rupp, H.-G.Roloff (eds.): Akten des VI. Internationalen Germanisten-Kongresses, Basel 1980, Teil 2, 89-95. Bern etc.: Lang.

Martinet, André (1975): Functional Linguistics. La linguistique fonctionnelle. - In: A.Martinet: Studies in Functional Syntax. Études de syntaxe fonctionnelle, 9-81. München: Fink.

Stati, Sorin (1982): Il dialogo. Considerazioni di linguistica pragmatica. - Napoli: Liguori editore.

Weigand, Edda (2000): The Dialogic Action Game. - In: M.Coulthard, J.Cotterill, F.Rock (eds.): Dialogue Analysis VII: Working with Dialogue. Selected papers from the 7th IADA conference, Birmingham 1999, 1-18. Tübingen: Niemeyer (Beiträge zur Dialogforschung 22).

- (forthcoming): Dialogue Analysis 2000: towards a human linguistics. - In: M.Bondi, S.Stati (eds.): Dialogue Analysis 2000. Tübingen: Niemeyer (Beiträge zur Dialogforschung).