Communication Department Faculty Publication Series

Communication

2017

# Creative Resonance and Misalignment Stance: Achieving Distance in One Hebrew Interaction

Gonen Dori-Hacohen
*University of Massachusetts Amherst*

## Recommended Citation

**Creative Resonance and Misalignment Stance:**

**Achieving Distance in One Hebrew Interaction**

Author: Gonen Dori-Hacohen

Affiliation: Department of Communication, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Email: gonen@comm.umass.edu

Address: 650 North Pleasant St., Amherst 01033 U.S.A.

## Abstract

This paper elaborates on one element of the theory of Dialogic Syntax, Du Bois's main tool for stance-taking, namely creative resonance. The examples are taken from a recording of a car ride which was part of data collected for the analysis of Hebrew. The focus in the analysis is on misalignment, when participants use stance acts to distance themselves from each other. The main claim of this paper is that whenever a stance act takes place, the relations between the participants are at stake. I show how creative, and to a lesser extent pre-existing, resonance can be used for creating and enhancing distance in misalignment. The discussion connects resonance and Dialogic Syntax with other frameworks for the study of language and interactions.

Key Words: dialogic resonance, stance, misalignment, Hebrew

Bio:

Gonen Dori-Hacohen, Ph.D. 2009, University of Haifa, Israel, an Associate Professor at the Department of Communication, University of Massachusetts, Amherst is a discourse analyst and a communication scholar, studying interactions both in the media and in mundane situations, focusing on the intersection of interaction, culture, politics, and the media. Currently he studies civic participation in Israeli radio phone-ins, American Political Radio Talk, and other arenas of public participation, such as online comments. Further information can be found at http://gonen.dori-hacohen.com/

**Creative Resonance and Misalignment Stance:**

**Achieving Distance in One Hebrew Interaction**

## 1. Introduction

Stance has always been a topic of interest to linguists and sociolinguists. Yet, whereas until the end of the 20th century stance was mainly studied in written texts, lately stance has been studied as an element, even a central one, of verbal interactions. Conversation Analysis (henceforth CA) has identified stance as a new area for research (e.g. Heritage & Raymond 2005) and suggested it is significant in action formation (in the conversation-analytic sense of how interlocutors construct their paired utterances in order to make sure that the 'main job' of the turn is being performed and recognized, and how these utterances are constrained by the expectations projected by other adjacent utterances; Stivers 2013). Elsewhere, Du Bois (e.g. 2007) has developed a dialogical view of stance. In his view, stance is carried out through the use of Dialogic Syntax, the processes and practices which create intimate and systematic grammatical relations between one utterance and the next. Here, I expand on one aspect of his work, namely the different types of resonance which function to generate formal engagement (Du Bois 2014). Du Bois suggests two types of resonance, one defined as pre-existing resonance and the other, the focus of this paper, as creative resonance. I illustrate these notions, mainly creative resonance but also pre-existing resonance, in one interaction and demonstrate how they can be  used to create divergent alignment (or misalignment) between the participants. Following these illustrations, I will suggest how resonance, with its two types, and Dialogic Syntax may relate to other frameworks of language and interaction.


## 2. Stance, dialogic resonance, and its structural relations

Du Bois discusses stance acts, the idea that utterances create stance, and focuses on inserting dialogicality into the discussion of stance (often discussed monologically, as in news articles or speeches). He defines stance as follows:

> Stance is a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means, of simultaneously evaluating objects, positioning subjects (self and others), and aligning with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field. (Du Bois 2007: 149)

This definition focuses on the publicness of the stance act, situating it in the social domain, as it is exercised in interaction. Moreover, this definition points to what Du Bois terms the stance triangle, the three interconnected elements around which every stance act is constructed. The first element of that triangle is the evaluative one of stance-taking. This element has to do with evaluating a "stance object": something (or someone or some idea) is being evaluated. The evaluative element of stance-taking is focal in such actions as assessments, which have been at the center of Du Bois's attention (and are not central to our discussion). The second element in stance-taking, according to Du Bois, is the position taken by the speaker. When talking, speakers position themselves, epistemically, affectively, or otherwise, in presenting their subjectivity with respect to the stance object.

The third element of the stance act is the relations the speaker creates, wants to create or responds to with regard to the other participant(s) in the public event in which the stance act takes place and with regard to their previous evaluations of the stance object. In every utterance, participants project their relations towards their fellow participants, and in an exchange of utterances, participants negotiate not only the assessment of an object but also their mutual relations, and at times their relations with outside members. This third element of stance focuses, therefore, on the intersubjective world, that is, the shared social world participants create via speech and its actions. This means that, in every stance act, the relations between the participants

are at stake. When someone acts by taking a stance, she aligns herself with the other participant. This can bring the participants closer together in a convergent way, that is, in convergent alignment (simply called alignment), or pull the participants apart in a divergent alignment, here termed misalignment.

Prior research has mainly discussed misalignment in actions such as assessment. This is indeed a natural environment for the study of stance-taking, since it is the participant's agreement or disagreement with the other's assessment which creates the mis/alignment. Pomerantz (1984) shows that in assessments agreements are preferred to disagreements; in the terms of Dialogic Syntax, intersubjective alignment is anticipated and projected. However, as Couper-Kuhlen shows (2014), other actions, such as requests for action (Stivers 2013), also prefer a specific next action. In this view, when someone makes a request, "a type of action advocating something the recipient will do that will benefit the speaker" (Couper-Kuhlen 2014:630), she seeks alignment, that is the granting of the request and alignment with her as a speaker, and there is a strong intersubjective tendency from the part of the addressee to comply. The actual occurrence of the request action creates alignment between the participants. Even if it is an action that participants may prefer to avoid, unless the request is cumbersome or impolite there is no reason to expect intersubjective misalignment. Nonetheless, as we will see from the analysis of the example below, the intersubjective element is focal also in requests.

The relations between stance acts are not theoretical. In Du Bois's framework of Dialogic Syntax, it is the syntax of the utterances that creates the stance acts. Du Bois shows that every utterance creates the formal base for the next utterance, which in turn corresponds to the prior utterance, via the process of resonance. In turn, resonance is what enables participants to take a stance vis-à-vis prior stance acts. Participants resonate with prior stances by incorporating prior

linguistic material into their utterances. In repeating a prior utterance, a speaker can align with it, as the phonology, morphology, lexicon, and syntax of both utterances converge. Conversely, some minor or major changes from one utterance to the next may create different patterns of resonance, leading to different stance work, that is, divergence in stance and misalignment (if it concerns the intersubjective element of stance).

Du Bois thus identifies two types of resonance (Du Bois, in progress). "Pre-existing" resonance is resonance which reuses elements from the prior utterances. Thus, repetitions, transformations, recycles and changes in word order all constitute "pre-existing" resonance. The other type of resonance, at the focus of this paper, is creative resonance, which requires "an abductive leap" (Peirce 1931-1958) for its recognition (Du Bois, in-progress: 9). In creative resonance, the relations between one utterance and another are not immediately transparent and are less visible than those in pre-existing resonance, since participants may manipulate and change as much of the grammar as they wish, while minimally (and at times not even that) maintaining coherence between their utterances. I argue that creative resonance is used in misalignment to increase the dis-stance between the participants as much as possible by disconnecting the words and syntax of an utterance from the prior one.

## 3. The data

The data was recorded during a car ride at my request (I was not present in the car). This recording formed part of data collection for the analysis of Hebrew (see Hacohen and Schegloff, 2006; Dori-Hacohen, 2010). The drive took place at night, for which reason gestures are secondary. I am using this single case to exemplify larger patterns that also can be found elsewhere (Schegloff 1987).

The participants are two women. Dorit, the driver (28 YO, the name is a pseudo-name starting with D for Driver), lives a couple of hours north of the passenger's house, from where they drove to a pub in Israel's largest city, Tel-Aviv. Gali, the passenger (30 YO, the name is a pseudo-name starting with G for Giver), lives some 30 minutes by car from Tel-Aviv. Gali and Dorit used to be best friends at the art school they attended. However, after finishing school, a couple of years prior to the recording, they seemed to drift apart.

The segments analyzed below are taken from the first 20 minutes of the recording. As the analysis will show, most actions are used to enhance the misalignment between the participants. This misalignment is a result of a request for action, made three minutes into the recording, which is rejected. Following this request and its rejection, the passenger (the interlocutor whose request was rejected) uses most actions to create misalignment. The negative stance is thus what explains most of the elements of their interaction. I mainly focus on direction request sequences[1] and show how Dialogic Syntax achieves misalignment stance acts.

I present the data in two ways. First, I present the transcripts, using CA conventions (Jefferson 2004), on either 2 or 3 lines.[2] I also discuss the actions and their sequences from a conversation-analytical position as the context for the stance analysis. To show resonance, I use Du Bois's representational system of diagraphs (see Nir & Zima, this issue). Du Bois does not usually "title" the elements of the diagraph, stressing that it is the elements of talk that the diagraph presents, and not necessarily traditional grammatical elements, since resonance can use and abuse these traditional grammatical elements. I show the data in these forms of presentation to show what interlocutors achieve by the use of creative resonance.

---

[1] I do not analyze other actions, mainly due to lack of space.
[2] I use two lines when the word-to-word and a readable and clear English translation are close together. I use three lines where the word-to-word translation is not clear enough to English readers and demands further translation.

**4. The central request to go dancing**

Since this sequence is long, I present it in the Appendix. Here, I present the main sequence, with the turn that constitutes the base first pair part (FPP) in CA terminology (for the terminology for analyzing sequences of actions from this perspective see Schegloff, 2007), that is, Gali's turn initiating the request action (which comes after a pre-sequence), and the base second pair part (SPP), meaning Dorit's response. In between these two turns there are 3 insertion sequences (Appendix: 7-15), which lead to Gali's (G) repetition of the FPP in a shortened form (1:15).

(1) The dancing request adjacency pair

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3 Gali: | =*boyi lirkod maxar, bevakas ⇑ha::.* | |
| | come dancing tomorrow, Please. | |
| 4 | (1.2) | |
| 5 Gali: | *keyilu bovakasha, I am pleadin*, | |
| | I mean please, I am pleading you ((in English)). | |
| 6 Dorit: | °*ow* [*key.*° | |
| | o [key. | |
| 7 Gali: | [*ani enha::g ad haoman shva es[re mavtixa.* | |
| | [I I'll+dri::ve to the ((Dance club name)) promise | |
| . | | |
| . | | |
| . | ((7 turns omitted)) | |
| 15 Gali: | *ke::n.* (0.6) *baa*? | |
| | ye::s. (0.6) coming? | |
| 16 Dorit: | °*ani baa.*° *aniBAa*. | |
| | °I am coming.° I am COMIng. | |
| 17 | *ani agid lax she'ani baa* | |
| | I'll tell you that I am coming | |
| 18 | *vemaxar ani arimelayi:x telefon*, | |
| | and tomorrow I will call you ((and say)) | |
| 19 | *tish/me'/i:: Oded ye/a/le::v*. | |
| | listen ((*my boyfriend*)) will be insulted. | |

Gali makes a request to go dancing (1:3), ending it with a "please," marking the turn as a direct request (Blum-Kulka 1987). Since this turn follows a pre-request (Appendix: 1-2), it is easily recognizable as a request.[3] Couper-Kuhlen (2014) suggested accepting a request is the preferred SPP, an analysis which is also supported by preference structure (Schegloff 1988a), since Gali uses a positive directive. Yet, at the end of the request's first turn construction unit (TCU), and after the "please" increment, there are no uptakes (1:4), which, based on the adjacency pair rule (Schegloff 1968) and on preference organization (Pomerantz 1984), suggest that a dispreferred response is looming.

After the long pause, Gali repeats her request (1:5). In the repetition, unlike what was suggested by Pomerantz (1984), she does not back off of the request but intensifies it, turning the action into "pleading". Although there is a very soft acknowledgement of the request (1:6), Gali does not seem to hear it, since she overlaps it with a promise (the first insertion sequence), which is supposed to make Dorit's granting the request easier (1:7).

The intensification of the request into pleading, combined with the promise to reduce the work demanded of Dorit by the request, follows what Clayman & Heritage (2014) termed the "Felicific Calculus", since the requester does everything to help the requestee grant the request. For Clayman & Heritage, therefore, this is stance work. As I show in the next analysis, this is stance work that tries to increase the alignment between the participants.

Following the insertion sequences, Gali repeats her request in a compressed form (1:15). Despite the long delay with no response following the first request, Gali uses a yes-tilted yes/no question, *ba'a* (the Hebrew *benoni,* or participial form, which is typically used to express present

---

[3] I am not aware of a research equivalent to Couper-Kuhlen's work (2014) in Hebrew. Gali uses the imperative form, which is used for most categories of actions that Couper-Kuhlen studied. This form indeed may be confusing, because it is unclear why this is a request and not a proposal. Yet, Gali's request shows, according to Couper-Kuhlen's analysis, that Gali will enjoy going dancing more than Dorit and/or that Dorit's costs (which are attended to in the insertion sequences) are higher than Gali's.

tense predications) which is short for *Are you coming* for the re-request. This *benoni* yes/no question is used to create a strengthened commitment towards the future. Thus, Gali's turn is a request tilted towards acceptance and leaves little room for a rejection.

The SPP repeats the redoing of the FPP, twice, suggesting Dorit grants the request (1:16). Yet, within this repetition, Dorit changes her voice from soft to very loud, and then recasts her just prior talk into a future narrative (1:17),[4] within which she contrasts what she has just said or would have soon said (1:16-17) with what she will be doing tomorrow (1:18) – calling Gali on the phone to tell her she is not willing to hurt her boyfriend's feelings. This narrative implies she will cancel her current granting of the request and will not go dancing with Gali (1:19).

This is a dispreferred SPP, which is done in the "classic" dispreferred way (Pomerantz 1984): it is delayed, both in the sequence – via insertion sequences – and in the turn – via repetitions; it uses pro-forma granting of the request (1:16); it does not use a direct rejection or negation of the request; and it gives an account instead of a direct rejection.

The stance act in the SPP pinpoints the problem in the participants' relations that not granting the request creates and is best shown in a diagraph of these adjacent turns.

Diagraph 1. The dancing request Base Pair

| 15 | **Gali** |  |  | *baa*?<br>Coming? |  |  |  |
|----|----------|--|--|------------------|--|--|--|
| 16 | **Dorit** |  | *ani*<br>I | *baa*<br>come. |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  | *ani*<br>I | *baa*<br>come. |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  | *ani*<br>I | agid<br>tell.1st.SG.FUT | *lax*<br>to.you |  |  |
| 17 |  | *she'* | *ani* | *baa* |  |  |  |

---

[4] Clift (2006) shows that when a speaker quotes her past self she strengthens her epistemic claim regarding the assessment of objects. Here, we have an example of quoting one's future self; I am not aware of any research into this phenomenon.

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | that | I | come | | | |
| 18 | | *ve*<br>and | *ani*<br>I | *arim*<br>call.1st.SG.FUT | *elayix*<br>to.you | {*maxar*<br>tomorrow} | *telefon*<br>phone |
| 19 | | | | *tishme'i*<br>listen.2nd.FEM.SG.FUT | | | |
| 19 | | | *Oded*<br>boyfriend's<br>name | *ye'alev*<br>be-insulted.3rd.MS.SG.FUT | | | |

Dorit starts her turn by repeating the verb form of Gali's request. Gali, in repeating her request (1:15 as compared to 1:4), uses a zero-anaphora utterance without a pronoun. Dorit uses pre-existing resonance to align with Gali. Yet, Dorit inserts herself as an agent into her utterance with the pronoun *ani* ('I'). Although grammatically this insertion is necessary,[5] it overemphasizes Dorit's agency. Moreover, since she repeats it twice, once quietly, and the second time shouting, her *pre-existing resonance* while inserting herself shows a different stance.

After using the *pre-existing* resonance, Dorit continues. She uses the *pre-existing* resonance to build self-resonance as the framing resonance (Du Bois 2014) by creating a story. In her futuristic story, Dorit recasts her prior utterance and inserts it into a subordinate clause complementing a verb of saying that is inflected in the future tense. These manipulations reduce Dorit's commitment to accepting the request (Appendix: 17-19). This meta-linguistic and meta-communicative bi-clausal construction rejects the explicit acceptance of the request and therefore makes it less certain. Shifting the acceptance of the request into a futuristic dependent clause cancels the acceptance and the commitment behind it.

Moreover, Dorit makes some creative changes in her narrative, resulting in a *creative resonance* pattern. She puts Gali in the object position (tell *you*, call *you*, listen to *you*), while

---

[5] The Hebrew verb system inflects the pronoun in the past and future tenses, making it redundant. However, Gali used the *benoni* in her request (*ba'a* in Hebrew), and in doing so she did not use the pronoun.

putting either herself[6] or her boyfriend in the subject position. Dorit also changes the arguments and their relations. Gali does not use any arguments in her request (1:15), using only the verb in its *benoni* form. Thus, neither subject nor object is present in the request. As the diagraph shows, Dorit incrementally inserts arguments. First, she adds herself as a subject (1:16). Then she inserts Gali as the object (1:17), keeps herself as the subject and Gali as the object (1:18), before putting her boyfriend as the subject (1:19) with no objects. This final element of the rejection (1:19) ends where Gali started: Dorit does not have herself or Gali in the utterance, and creatively mirrors Gali's lack of arguments (regarding the participants) when making her boyfriend the subject of an object-less utterance. In this process, Dorit *creatively* first inserts all the missing arguments from Gali's turn to then remove them.

Similarly, Dorit builds off of Gali's turn in order to reject by her use of verb forms. First, she re-uses the request verb, *ba'a* (come), thus resonating with Gali's verb of motion (1:14, 15, 16, 17). Then, Dorit switches to a verb of saying (*lehagid* 'to tell'), and continues with another verb of communication in a formulaic phrase (*yarim telefon* lit. lift a phone = 'give you a call', 1:18). From this she moves to a perceptual verb (*tishme'i* 'listen', 1:19), before finishing up with an emotional verb (*ye'alev* 'will be insulted', 1:19). Thus, here too Dorit uses the syntax to *creatively resonate* with Gali's turn. This creative resonance creates the misalignment between the participants. Moreover, this conceptual distance between the verbs is iconic to the growing distance between Dorit and Gali.

Although Dorit starts by repeating Gali and seemingly joins her stance towards dancing and going dancing as the base resonance (therefore accepting her objective stance and even her subjective stance), her focus resonance is opposite to Gali's. In fact, it aligns Dorit with her

---

[6] Dorit uses the double pronominal form (*ani arim* 'I will pick up') to mark her agency (1:17,19). This form is more than minimal referencing, marking these actions as special (Hacohen & Schegloff 2006).

boyfriend and not with Gali. Dorit and Gali may share some stance elements: they share the objective stance that dancing is good; they may even share the subjective position of wanting to dance. However, the intersubjective element of stance is the one they do not share, due to Dorit's aligning with her boyfriend and not with Gali.

This rejection leads to a stance rift. In the post-expansion sequences Gali tries to force an intersubjective realignment (Appendix: 23) shouting: "[*ma XPAt*] *lanu*? '[Why DO we] care?'". This turn uses the first person plural to try and force Dorit to rejoin Gali in the same group (the conversational 'we', Dori-Hacohen 2014) and to realign them as a social group. Moreover, this social group shares the same feelings (of caring). Much as in rejecting the request, Dorit rejects this question in a preferred way: she first agrees with the stance of the question before disagreeing with it (Appendix: 25-29). In this rejection Dorit solidifies her position of preferring not to hurt her boyfriend over dancing with Gali and makes the misalignment with Gali stronger.

This misalignment in intersubjective stance creates a stance rift which may be equivalent to a breakdown in the intersubjective world, upon which social actions are based (Garfinkel 1967). Dorit and Gali do not share the same social world: in Gali's world, since she and Dorit are best friends, Dorit should have granted this request (which is why its structure was so heavily tilted towards being granted); in Dorit's world, her boyfriend is more important than Gali (and Gali should understand and accept that, which she does not). Therefore, from this moment onward, the participants do not evaluate objects in the same way (the breakdown of the evaluative element of stance), and do not position themselves in similar emotional and cognitive places (the breakdown of the positioning element of stance), all this being due to the breakdown of the intersubjective element of stance. The requests for driving directions that I will analyze next show that this is the case and demonstrate how Gali uses these requests in such a way that

the misalignment in the intersubjective element of stance continues and overrides all other actions.


## 5. Misalignment via Creative Dialogic Resonance

The participants are in the same car and are supposedly going to the same place (unlike the research into direction giving and stance in Mondada 2011). Since they are going out to enjoy themselves in Israel's biggest city, Tel-Aviv, we should expect the driving directions to be given in the easiest format to follow so that they will get to where they want to go. Nevertheless, Gali uses the direction requests, requests for information (Heritage 2012), for the purpose of misalignment stance acts. Therefore, Dorit redesigns each new request in order to limit Gali's ability to misalign, but to no avail.

Dorit, in asking for basic directions, begins with the most open form of request and hence the least challenging to answer.

(2) The 1st direction request sequence

1 Dorit:      *e:: derex agav, ze:: at zoxeret lehagid li le:an liso'a*?=
              um, by the way, it, you remember to tell me where to drive?
2 Gali:       *anaxnu lo yo:dim lean anaxnu nosim.*=
              we don't know where we're driving.

Dorit (2:1) shifts the interaction to her request for direction request and frames it as an "aside" by using a discourse marker (*derex agav* 'by the way'; Maschler 2009). Then she repairs what might have been a general request starting with *ze* 'it' to a personal one, *at* "you". She uses a second person pronoun to start the request, presenting her request as a B-event, that is, an event known to Gali – the most open-ended, least challenging request, which requires only confirmation (Labov & Fanshel 1977). The epistemic verb *zoxeret* 'remember', in its *benoni* participial form used for talking about the present, suggests that Gali should know where they are going and must

not forget to deliver this information to Dorit so that she can get them there. The object of remembering is the act of uttering the directions to the co-participant, hence *lehagid* 'to tell' (2:1). The indirect object *li* 'to me' which marks the recipient, personalizes this request (especially since it is grammatically unnecessary) and assigns the role of "the driving guide" to Gali. In this personalization Dorit makes the existence of both participants as separate individuals (*at* you, *li* me) explicit. The two later verbs, *lehagid* 'to tell' and *liso'a* 'to drive', are dependent on the first one, *zoxeret* 'remember', which carries feminine gender marking. Thus, in her request Dorit creates a dependency chain (Nir, personal communication) which multiplies the demands of the requests: Gali needs to know where they are going, to tell that to Dorit and to remember both of these things. Since it is a true request, Gali uses rising intonation to mark the whole construction as a question.

This format creates a cross-cutting stance structure in the request. The request format reduces the epistemic demand from Gali since it is in a "declarative statement" – it "encodes a relatively flat epistemic gradient" (Heritage 2012: 9), suggesting Gali and Dorit know the same things: where they are going ('to drive'); that Dorit expects something from Gali ('to tell'); that this something is supposed to be giving Dorit the driving instructions, since Gali and Dorit know that Gali is the local. The epistemic gradient in this case is whether to take a right or a left turn, or some other direction. The request is indirect, further reducing the demands from Gali. However, the personalization of the request, breaking it down to "you" and "me", and the grammatical structure that creates Dorit's layered dependency on Gali, all these devices increase the intersubjective aspect of stance. Thus, Dorit uses grammatical structures to create a minimal epistemic gap between herself and Gali, while using other resources to increase the intersubjective alignment between them.

Gali rejects the request by stating a lack of knowledge (2:2) regarding the goal of their journey.

Diagraph 2. The first direction request sequence

| **Dorit** | *at* | *zoxeret* | *lehagid* | *li* | *le'an* | *liso'a* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | you | remember.FM.SG | to tell | me | where | to go |
| **Gali** | *anaxnu* | *lo yod'im* | | *anaxnu* | {*le'an*}[7] | *nos'im* |
| | we | not know.MS.PL | | we | {where} | go.MS.PL |

The diagraph demonstrates the systematic changes Gali performs on almost all of Dorit's request words. First, whereas Dorit used the second person singular feminine pronoun *at* 'you', making the first person single reference for Gali the more prominent response,[8] Gali mirrors Dorit's first person pronoun, although in the plural *anaxnu* 'we'. Second, Gali replaces Dorit's main verb *zoxeret* 'remember' with the explicit epistemic verb *yod'im* 'know', keeping the *benoni* participial form used for present tense, while negating this predicate. Like her pronoun, Gali's verb form is also in the plural form; however, the verb is in the masculine, whereas Dorit used the feminine form of the verb.[9] Gali omits the first dependent verb, the original complement, *lehagid* 'to tell'.

The two shared lexemes are the verb in the subordinate clause and the adverb *lean* 'where', which opens the clause. Gali keeps the same verb, 'drive' (the root *N.S.ʔ.* in Hebrew), but changes its grammatical form: Dorit used the infinitive (*liso'a* 'to drive'), and Gali switches to the participial form (*nos'im* 'driving', the *benoni* in the masculine form). The adverb is the only word that is not changed between these two turns. However, its position in the sentence is shifted to the position of the complement of the main clause. By manipulating the

---

[7] Do Bois (see 2007) uses {} when he moves elements of the utterance to fit the diagraph.
[8] Hebrew *at* ('you' singular) may lead to *ani* ('I').
[9] I do not want to overstate the change to the masculine form, since it is the unmarked form in Hebrew. However, Gali could have kept the feminine form Dorit started with by using the plural feminine form *yod'ot*.

complementation structure (Maschler & Nir 2014) through the omission of the infinitival complement *lehagid* 'to tell', Gali grammatically aligns the subject of her complement clause (another *anaxnu* 'we'*)* with the indirect object of Dorit's original complement clause *li* 'me'. This alignment is highlighted in sharing the superfluity of these pronouns, since both the *li* 'me' and the *anaxnu* 'we' are grammatically unnecessary.

The switch to a first person plural is especially interesting. Gali's utterance is an assertion of knowledge, or lack thereof, stating ignorance about where they are going. Gali claims that Dorit shares this lack of knowledge via the use of 'we' (a 'conversational we,' Dori-Hacohen 2014). In contrast to Dorit's expression of shared epistemic stance about where they are going, Gali's utterance creates an opposite epistemic stance, as delivered in her negating the verb of knowing. This shared unknowing is false, since Dorit knows where they are going, only the driving instructions are unknown. Gali manipulates the epistemic stance to achieve misalignment in the intersubjective stance. Thus, the request for information regarding the driving directions is rejected on the basis of an unshared intersubjective world and not the epistemic one: both participants say that they share the same knowledge (either of knowing or not knowing where they are going), yet they do not share the same world. Only after Dorit states (or restates) the name of the pub they are going to (their favorite pub, not shown here) does Gali give the directions.

*Creative* resonance is thus used to emphasize the misalignment between the participants. Gali's turn changes the wording from the prior turn, and the combination of little repetition and extensive systematic syntactic change produces the "abductive leap" (Du Bois, in progress) which is at the core of creative resonance. Of the six words Dorit used in her turn, Gali omits one ('to tell'), repeats another in a different grammatical position ('where'), and systematically

changes the other five, either from singular to plural, to a different verb from the same verb category, or to a different grammatical form. Gali's changes in the selection of words and their position in relation to the prior turn function to maximize the distance between the participants; Gali uses as little language as possible from Dorit's turn to create this distance. All this relational work goes hand in hand with, or on top of, rejecting the request for driving instructions. Thus, the Dialogic Syntax increases the distance between the participants and shows that the breakdown of the intersubjective world is influencing the epistemic stance. Hence, it is the misalignment at the intersubjective level that explains the rejection of the request for information (both the action itself and especially its format and word choices), regardless of the participant's epistemic stance.

Gali achieves a similar stance act in the next direction request sequence. Dorit, seeing that her format enables misalignment, changes the request from an open-ended B-event statement to a multiple-choice question, asking for the correct answer.

(3) The second direction request sequence

```
1 Dorit:     lo meshane. =E:: lehamsix lekivun tel aviv aayalon
             never mind. (either) to go on in the direction of Tel-Aviv, Ayalon
2            xeyfa o lifnot bixlal leHod HaSharon kodem kol?
             Haifa, or to turn altogether to ((G's city)) in the first place?
3               (0.5)
4 Gali:      e: tm hm (0.6) ken, anaxnu lo ohavim et hercliya.
             e:::: tm hm (0.6) yes, we don't love Herceliya.
```

Dorit in her question gives four options, naming three different cities and one road: Tel-Aviv, Ayalon (the highway to Tel-Aviv), Haifa, or as the last option Hod Hasharon, the city from which they were coming. This last option shows that Dorit is aware of problems in their relations (intersubjective stance), since she hints that cancelling the current activity is a possibility. Dorit, by stating as many directions as possible, uses many epistemic resources, trying to force Gali to choose from a limited set of options which may also limit the possibility for misalignment.

The answer ('e:::: tm hm (0.6) yes, we don't love Herceliya.') shows the breakdown of a shared social (and geographical) world. First, Gali does not respond, keeping silent for half a second, then utters a few unintelligible syllables, and finally goes for an even longer silence.[10] These are harbingers of a dispreferred response (Pomerantz 1984). She then states her negative affective subjective stance regarding another city, Herceliya. This is another dispreferred SPP, which does not follow the format of the question, and minimally provides some (affective) information which may relate to the requested information.[11] The diagraph presents the stance act even more clearly.

Diagraph 3. The second direction request sequence

| **Dorit** | | {} | *lehamshix*<br>to.continue | *lekivun*<br>in the direction | *T-A, Ayalon,*<br>*Haifa,* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *o*<br>or | | *lifnot*<br>to.turn | *bixlal le-*<br>actually to | *Hod HaSharon* | *kodem kol*<br>first (of) all |
| **Gali** | *ken*<br>yes | *anaxnu*<br>we | *(lo) ohavim*<br>(no) love.MS.PL | *et*<br>ACC | *Hercliya* | |

As with the first direction request sequence, Gali changes everything from Dorit's turn. It starts with the following format: whereas Dorit has used a multiple choice question, Gali answers it as if it were a yes/no question with a resounding "yes".[12] Then, Gali inserts a pronoun, which is not an option in Dorit's non-finite structure. This pronoun resonates with the pronouns in the previous sequences, as Gali again inserts Dorit into her 'conversation we' (Dori-Hacohen 2014), and goes back to the post-expansion sequence of the dancing request (Appendix: 23). Whereas

---

[10] These lapses may relate to Gali's need to process where they are and to give the correct directions. However, since she is the "local" who knows this road better, this seems unlikely.

[11] Gali's instructions were correct: She instructed Dorit where *not* to go. Dorit offered three options, Hod Hasharon which involves a U-turn and a return home, Tel-Aviv and Ayalon, which involve a left turn, or Haifa, a right turn. By saying they do not like Hercliya, Gali suggests they should not turn toward Hercliya, which is in the same direction as Haifa (meaning a right turn), for which reason Gali hints at making a left turn to Tel-Aviv, where the pub they are going to is located.

[12] I am not aware of an analysis of conformity for "or" or multiple choice questions.

Dorit only uses infinitives in her turn (two of them, 'to continue' and 'to turn'), Gali changes the verb form to a *benoni* serving to express habitual present tense. She also changes the type of verb from Dorit's directional ('continue', 'turn') to an affective verb ('love'). The most astounding change is the name of the city: Dorit has offered four different names, but Gali finds a fifth option.[13] Maybe since no element from the prior turn has been retained, Dorit does not understand this answer and has to repeat it. Only then does Gali give the instructions more clearly (an action I do not discuss here and which leads to a new argument between the participants).

As in the first direction request sequence, Gali again uses creative resonance to distance herself from Dorit. By using a different city name, she shows she does not share the same coordinates – that is, they do not share the same geography. Again, creative resonance is used to reject a request, and to avoid giving directions, heightening the misalignment in intersubjective stance. This continues in the next request.

(4) The third direction request sequence

| 1 Dorit: | [*ani pona po*] *yemina*? |
|          | I turn here to the right? |
| 2. Gali: | *hey: hi lomedet kvar. Yee*: |
|          | hey she learns so fast. Yee: |

Dorit changes the format of the request to a yes/no question. Thus, she decreases the options for answering from multiple options to two options. This yes/no question posits a preferred response, a "yes", and creates a preference for the conforming type (Raymond 2003), either a "yes" or a "no". In Heritage's (2012) terms, it is a straight interrogative request which suggests a course of action and requests a confirmation, which will confirm the directions instead of giving them.

---

[13] See Schegloff (1972) on reference to places, a format whose rules Gali violates.

Unlike the prior answers, Gali indeed confirms the request, quickly and in a preferred manner. Yet, there is no type-conforming token (yes or no are missing) and the answer transforms the question terms (Stivers & Hayashi 2010), showing resistance to the question. Even when Gali confirms Dorit's request, she distances her talk from Dorit's.

Diagraph 4. The 3<sup>rd</sup> direction request sequence

| **Dorit** | *ani* | *pona* | *po* | *yemina* | | |
| | I | turn.FM.SG | here | right | | |
| **Gali** | *hi* | *lomedet* | | | *kvar* | {*hey,*} *yee* |
| | she | learn.FM.SG | | | already | {hey,} yee |

Again, Gali changes almost everything from Dorit's turn. She starts by using a response cry (Goffman 1981, *hey* in Hebrew), which breaks type-conformity, since it is used instead of a "yes" or "no". Although she keeps the singular voice this time, she does not address Dorit, avoiding the second person singular, and changes Dorit's first person to a third person (*hi* 'she'). The verb keeps the same form (*benoni*). However, Gali changes the verb of direction into an appraising verb ('learn'). Gali omits the two spatial adverbs and uses a time adverb. She ends the turn with another response cry, bracketing her answer with two such cries, both showing either happiness or mock happiness, and exaggerates the lack of a tying format (as Raymond 2003 has suggested, type-conforming can be used either at the beginning of a turn or at its end, so that the position of the response cries mirrors such a tying format). Therefore, in lacking a tying format response, withholding direct confirmation, alienating the other speaker from the interaction by referring to her in the third person, and by replacing the spatial adverbs with a time adverb, Gali changes all the elements from Dorit's turn, again using creative resonance.

Creative resonance distances the participants' words from each other much as in the previous direction request sequences analyzed here. However, Gali aligns with the object of Dorit's turn, embracing the need to turn right. This alignment makes this sequence less

combative, or less misaligned, than the prior sequences, since the participants share at least one stance element, the evaluative one.

In the next request, Dorit changes the format again, to a tag-question request for confirmation (Heritage 2012).

5. The fourth direction request sequence

1 Dorit:      [*efush*]*ehu::::: pana ani pona, ken?*
              Where he turned I turn, right?
2 Gali:       *yesh rak pniya axat.*
              There is only one turn.

Ending the request with a "yes" suggests that Dorit knows the right answer and needs Gali to confirm it. As in the previous actions of this type, Gali rejects the request. There is no type-conforming response to this yes/no tag question, and the answer transforms everything in the question (Stivers & Hayashi 2010). Moreover, Gali continues to systematically change everything in Dorit's turn.

Diagraph 5. The fourth direction request sequence

| **Dorit** | *ani* | *pona* | *efusheho pana* | | *ken*? |
| | I | turn.FM.SG | where he turned | | yes? |
| **Gali** | *yesh* | *pniya axat* | | *{rak}* | |
| | EXIST | turn one | | only | |

Gali changes the type of main clause from an SV (Subject-Verb) clause to an existential construction,[14] which has no verb. In this construction, the subject in second position is preceded by the non-verbal predicate. Gali also omits the subordinate adverbial clause ('where he turned').

---

[14] The following sequence presents similar creative resonance:

| Interviewer | Do | you | think? | |
| Interviewee | | It | is | just a fact. |

The interviewer asks a yes/no question, using the second person reference and an epistemic verb. The interviewee switches to an existential construction, eliminating the person reference and the epistemic verb from his answer. This creative resonance distances the answer from the question, and shows that it is not about the interviewee's thoughts, but about the state of the world. The interviewee uses creative resonance to misalign with the question and to distance himself from the question, its terms, and the interviewer.

The noun in Gali's clause corresponds to the verb Dorit used (*pniya* and *pona* share a root P.N.Y). Gali inserts an adverb (*rak* 'only').

To summarize, in these direction requests, Dorit moves her request format to limit the possible response, starting from allowing unlimited options, to four, to two, and finally to one option. Throughout the requests Dorit minimizes the epistemic effort Gali needs to make to supply the requested information. Yet, in all the requests, Gali does not provide confirmation, while at times she withholds the information. The responses are done using creative resonance, in which Gali changes Dorit's syntax systematically. As Du Bois has suggested, stance is created via the relations between and across utterances, and the stance across these utterances is one of misalignment, in which Gali stresses her distance from Dorit by distancing her utterances and turns from Dorit's. This misalignment indeed catches Dorit's attention, and leads to meta-discursive discussions we do not have space to pursue here.

## 6. Resonance, Dialogic Syntax and other theories of Interaction

The data and the discussion following each example have presented the notion of creative resonance as part of Dialogic Syntax. I have focused on creative resonance, although the next excerpt shows the use of pre-existing resonance to create misalignment.

Diagraph 6. The fifth request for direction

| **Dorit** | *an'lo* <br> I don't | *pona* <br> turn.FM.SG | *po* <br> here | *yemina*? <br> to.the.right? | |
| **Gali** | {she} <br> {that} | *racuy* <br> (it is) desired | | | *meod* <br> very |
| | (you) | *tifni* <br> turn.2nd.FM.SG.FUT | *po* <br> here | *yemina* <br> to the right | |

Dorit asks for another direction, this time suggesting that she knows the right way to go (not to turn right). Here, Gali constructs her turn as a cleft construction before repeating Dorit's exact words ('turn here to the right', with the necessary grammatical changes). This repetition, while rejecting the content, shows that Gali knows how to use pre-existing resonance to create misalignment. Yet, even here there is some creative resonance: the cleft construction ('(It is) very desired = it is recommended') changes the register of the interaction to an institutional one: it is used as an impersonal construction, reflecting distance between the two speakers.

Thus, these two types of resonance are resources for creating stance in interactions. As I have shown throughout the paper, each turn is a reaction to the stance of the prior turn. In fact each stance act reacts to another stance act. In this I would like to call on the perspective of CA for the organization of turns. The way one action relates to another in CA (Heritage 1984) resembles how stance acts and utterances relate to one another: each action builds upon the prior one and creates the backdrop for the next action. Similarly, the view that talk and its achievements, actions or stance acts create an intersubjective world is another element shared by Du Bois's framework and CA.[15] And lastly, both frameworks see interactions as arenas which participants themselves have resources to mobilize for their actions. Although this paper has not focused on the relations between CA and Dialogic Syntax, a closer look at the excerpts above reveals tight relations between adjacency pair structure and stance acts, Dialogic Syntax, and resonance. My claim would be that adjacency pairs – especially at the center of sequences, that is, base pairs – do stance acts, mainly with regard to the intersubjective aspect of stance. The relationship between Dialogic Syntax, which itself resonates with the resources and practices that CA has identified as connecting First Pair Part and Second Pair Parts, will have to wait for future exploration.

---

[15] See also Haddington 2006; Du Bois & Kärkkäinen 2006; Nir, Dori-Hacohen & Maschler 2015.

The examples in this paper also hint at the idea that much of the structural work CA describes can be complemented by examining stance work, in its fullest sense. Heritage & Raymond (2005) discuss stance and its relations to assessments, and show how the different formats for assessments relate to the stance that speakers have. After discussing stance in assessments, Heritage discusses it more head-on in requests for information (Heritage 2012). However, Heritage's interest is directed more towards the creation of knowledge and its management. He shows how formats of requests for information (much like assessments) as well as giving the information are based on the participants' epistemic status and stance. Similarly, Clayman & Heritage (2014) discuss another action, or set of actions, of proposing something, and its "benefactive stance." This is equivalent to epistemic stance with regard to the information request sequences. As my data shows, we do not need to labor on every action to find its stance. Instead, we can see stance acts as operating at a level above the action level. Thus, requests do both requests as well as stance acts. Stance acts may be a meta-action in interaction (Nir et al. 2014). Resonance, and more specifically creative resonance, may also explain some of Schegloff's later work regarding word selections (2003a, 2003b). Resonance and Dialogic Syntax can thus be viewed as the finer level of granularity (Schegloff 2000) for many of the preference organizations CA described and for transformative turns (Stivers & Hayashy 2010). And finally, it seems that the intersubjective facet of stance has stronger implication than the epistemic stance (Heritage, 2012) in the construction of requests and in their responses.

Although Du Bois's notion of stance is rooted in linguistic analysis, one can also see a relation between his work and Goffman's later work. Goffman (1981) sees stance as one of the elements of footing. Stance creates and shapes both the participation framework (be it overhearer, bystander, or the different types of recipients) and the production of utterances

(animator, author, principle, figure). Future work may elaborate on the relations between the stance triangle and Goffman's footing.

Looking more generally at language, this paper argues that creative resonance leads to distance between participants' actual language. In turn, this distance mirrors misalignment in their intersubjectivity. This view leads to an iconic view of language as suggested by Becker's (1982: 128) notion of iconicity. For Becker, the use of language involves five different acts: the sound, the grammatical structure, the evocation of prior text, relations to other people, and reference to the world. He defines iconicity softly as follows: "We might now define an iconicity as an 'integration' across two or more of the multiple acts of using language" (1982: 129).[16] In his example, Becker analyzes a sentence by Emerson and shows how the sounds of the sentence (the sound act) resemble the reference to the world. Similarly, in the data above, creative resonance creates an iconic relation to the participants' intersubjective stance: the distance between their words and utterances (which Gali maximizes) resembles the distance between them and their relations. In our data, the rift in the language is iconic to the rift in the social relations between the participants (and we did not say much about evoking prior text, the premise of resonance). If we take Du Bois's notion seriously, then the structural level of language (one of Becker's acts of language) – via Dialogic Syntax, which evokes prior text – is iconic to interacting with other people (another of Becker's acts of language), and the distance between the words and utterances is iconic to the distance between the people. Language and its usage, both in grammar and in evoking prior text, are iconic of the stance of participants and the relations between them.

## 7. Conclusions

---

[16] I would like to thank Yael Maschler for pointing me in this direction.

In this paper I could only make suggestions about the relations between Du Bois's stance framework and the types of resonance and other views of language and interactions. Yet, the data and its analysis suggest a "happy coincidence" in which dispreferred second pair parts are done via creative resonance. In other words, the participants misalign in their interaction by disjointing their words and utterances from one another in a series of requests, mainly for directions.

We have seen various ways in which the participants use syntax for creative resonance. At times they use omissions to disconnect the utterances from each other. In other segments they use additions (of pronouns) to create divergence between the utterances. Usually they change the verbs and pronouns, from one form of a verb to another, or from one verb to another, or from one pronoun to another, not its "obvious" counterpart (the *I* and singular *you* being replaced by the *I* and *we* or *she*). These syntactic changes enable misalignment between the participants as well as rejecting the actions while using the dispreferred structures for this rejection.

Before suggesting a few conclusions, here are some shortcomings of the current research. First, it analyzes a single interaction, which may be considered a weakness, although Schegloff (1987) has argued that an interactional phenomenon can be illustrated on the basis of one interaction. Yet, other research, including the work of Nir and her colleagues (2014), Du Bois and Kärkkäinen (2012), and Haddington (2006) all have suggested similar conclusions: Dialogic Syntax and CA can and should go hand in hand when analyzing interactions.

A similar shortcoming is the "uniqueness" of the interaction. The interaction revolves around misalignment. Yet, this weakness is also a strength since it allows us to systematically look at misalignment in interactions. Moreover, many interactions revolve around misalignment (one merely has to return to most early CA data to see this is the case, something that is often overlooked in research). This shortcoming goes hand in hand with a focus on the analysis of just

one type of action, requests, and requests for direction. For lack of space, it was not possible to show how misalignment works in other actions. However, other actions in the data were used to create misalignment by using both the action structures explained by CA and Dialogic Syntax.[17] Expansion of the research towards showing how misalignment is done in other conversational structures, such as story prompts, pre-sequences, and other structures awaits further work. Similarly, I have focused on the relations between First and Second Pair Parts, and have not discussed how Dialogic Syntax and resonance may help at other levels of the interaction, including overall structural organization (recall the use of the 'we' in excerpts 1-3).

Despite these weaknesses, some conclusions may be drawn from this paper. Whereas Du Bois only sees a link between stance with dialogicality, I claim that stance is a central part of dialogicality; that is *stance operates in every utterance*. As Du Bois & Kärkkäinen (2012) have suggested, stance and stance work are omni-relevant in interactions. I propose that every exchange of utterances can be analyzed for its stance acts, most significantly in their intersubjective aspect. Most utterances, if not all, therefore, achieve stance acts, in which a participant takes a stance towards an object, presents her subjective stance, relates to the co-participant(s), and indicates the differences in their stance with relation to prior stance acts. Moreover, stance that is created early on in an interaction may carry over throughout the interaction, via the resonance work in the participants' talk. Indeed, the data suggests such a carry-over, and the accounts for the rejections of the driving requests circle back to the rejection of the request to go dancing. Thus, one rejection leads to changing the format of the next request.

---

[17] Here is one example of misalignment in a story-prompt:
D:      *=at shomaat eze mesibat trans hayta be:: e kaz yerushalayi:m*?
          ((do)) you hear what a dance party was i:::in e sor- Jerusalem?
G:      *>ken. ma ze meshane< bemeyle lo hayit hole:xet.*
          >yeah. what difference does it make< you would not have gone anyways.
Dorit suggests a story about a party, Gali accepts this prompts via the "yeah", just to reject its relevance and the telling, due to Dorit's lack of interest in going to parties. As in prior data, Gali changes most words from Dorit's turn to distance herself from Dorit.

As for Du Bois's framework of stance, this paper contributes some suggestions and expansions. First, it has expanded the framework toward discussing actions other than assessments. Second, this paper emphasizes the work done by creative resonance, an aspect that has been under-researched. Third, it brings to the fore the element that Dialogic Syntax seems to shy away from – the action level. This is partially due to the language of that framework: "syntax" suggests relations between parts of utterances and utterances, and for Du Bois (2014) actions (that is, Pragmatics) reflect the relations between meanings, not between utterances. Therefore, actions may fall outside the scope of Dialogic Syntax. However, there is no reason to think that actions may not resonate with each other and thereby add to and strengthen the work of syntactic resonance. If conversational structures (such as yes/no questions) resonate with each other, actions (such as requests) may resonate with each other as well. Indeed, we have shown that the direction requests all resonate, creatively, with the dancing request.

Lastly, it is not clear what type of a triangle Du Bois's stance triangle is; one may assume it is an equilateral triangle. However, I posit that the triangle has a base, and that the intersubjective stance edge is more prominent than the objective and subjective edges. As Schegloff noted, in mundane interaction "mere description" (1988b: 19) rarely exists, that is, the evaluative element of stance is always a vehicle for achieving something else. Du Bois's framework has yet to deal with what happens when there is a divergence between different facets of stance. As we saw in Excerpt 2, Gali in her request created a cross-cutting stance: she made a bid for shared epistemic demands while focusing on divergent intersubjective stance. In Excerpt 4, although the evaluative stance was shared (the positive evaluation of taking a right turn), the intersubjective element of stance was not shared, as Gali's turn did not align with much of Dorit's turn, in order to distance herself from Dorit's talk and to create misalignment at the

intersubjective level. This all suggests that the intersubjective stance element is more important (from the perspective of sociology and social relations) than the other elements of stance acts. Hence, by juxtaposing intersubjective stance with the intersubjective world that it creates (following Garfinkel 1967), I argue that all stance acts exist mainly to achieve intersubjective stance acts. Dialogic Syntax and resonance should be a central element in gaining a comprehensive view of language and interactions, with their finest details, and through them to better understand social life.

## References

Becker, Alton L. 1982. Beyond translation: esthetics and language description. In Heidi Byrnes (ed.), *GURT 1982: Contemporary perceptions of language: interdisciplinary dimensions*, 124–138. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1987. Indirectness and politeness in requests: same or different? *Journal of Pragmatics* 11(2). 131–146.

Clayman, Stephen & John Heritage. 2014. Benefactors and beneficiaries: benefactive status and stance in the management of offers and requests. In Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen & Paul Drew (eds.), *Requesting in social interaction,* 55–86. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Clift, Rebecca. 2006. Indexing stance: Reported speech as an interactional evidential. *Journal of sociolinguistics* 10(5). 569–595.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth. 2014. What does grammar tell us about action. *Pragmatics* 24(3). 623–647.

Dori-Hacohen, Gonen. 2010. 'You nag so much': Description of Confrontational Discourse between two Women. *Hebrew Linguistics* 62-63. 201–230. [Hebrew]

Dori-Hacohen, Gonen. 2014. Establishing social groups in Hebrew: 'we' in political radio phone-in programs. In Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou (ed.), *Constructing collectivity: 'we' across languages and contexts,* 187–206. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Du Bois, John W. 2007. The stance triangle. In Robert Englebretson (ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse: subjectivity, evaluation, interaction,* 139–182. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Du Bois, John W. 2014. Towards a Dialogic Syntax. *Cognitive Linguistics* 25(3). 359–410.

Du Bois, John W. in progress. *Reasons to resonate: Motivating Dialogic Syntax*.

Du Bois, John W. & Elise Kärkkäinen. 2012. Taking a stance on emotion: affect, sequence, and intersubjectivity in dialogic interaction. *Text and Talk* 32(4). 433–451.

Garfinkel, Harold. 1967. *Studies in ethnomethodology*. New Jersey: Practice-Hall inc.

Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hacohen, Gonen, & Emmanuel A. Schegloff. 2006. On the preference for minimization in referring to persons: evidence from Hebrew conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38(8). 1305–1312.

Haddington, Pentti. 2006. The organization of gaze and assessments as resources for stance taking. *Text & Talk* 26(3). 281–328.

Heritage, John. 1984. *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Heritage, John. 2012. The epistemic engine: sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 45(1). 30–52.

Heritage, John & Geoffrey Raymond. 2005. The terms of agreement: indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68. 15-38.

Jefferson, Gail. 2004. Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In Gene H. Lerner (ed.), *Conversation Analysis: studies from the first generation,* 13–31. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Labov, William & David Fanshel. 1977. *Therapeutic discourse: psychotherapy as conversation*. New York: Academic Press.

Maschler, Yael. 2009. *Metalanguage in interaction: Israeli-Hebrew discourse markers*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Maschler, Yael, & Bracha Nir. 2014. Complementation in linear and Dialogic Syntax: the case of Hebrew divergently aligned discourse. *Cognitive Linguistics* 25(3). 523–557.

Mondada, Lorenza. 2011. The management of knowledge discrepancies and of epistemic changes in institutional interactions. In Tanya Stivers, Lorenza Mondada & Jakob Steensig (eds.), *The morality of knowledge in conversation*, 27–57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nir, Bracha, Gonen Dori-Hacohen & Yael Maschler. 2014. Formulations on Israeli political talk radio: from actions and sequences to stance via dialogic resonance. *Discourse Studies* 16(4). 534–571.

Pomerantz, Anita. 1984. Agreement and disagreement with assessment: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In John Heritage & Maxwell J. Atkinson (eds.), *Structures of social action: studies in conversation analysis,* 57–101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Raymond, Geoffrey. 2003. Grammar and social organization: Yes/No interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review* 68(6). 939–967.

Schegloff, Emmanuel A. 1968. Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist* 70(6). 1075–1095.

Schegloff, Emmanuel A. 1972. Notes on a conversational practice: formulating place. In David N. Sudnow (ed.), *Studies in social interaction,* 79–106. New York: MacMillan.

Schegloff, Emmanuel A. 1987. Analyzing single episodes of interaction: an exercise in conversation analysis. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50. 101–114.

Schegloff, Emmanuel A. 1988a. On an actual virtual servo-mechanism for guessing bad news: a single case conjecture. *Social problems* 35(4). 442–457.

Schegloff, Emmanuel A. 1988b. Description in the social sciences I: talk-in-interaction. *IPRA Papers in Pragmatics* 2. 1–24.

Schegloff, Emmanuel A. 2003a. On ESP puns. *Studies in language and social interaction.* In Phillip J. Glenn, Curtin D.LeBaron & Jennifer Mandelbaum (eds), *Studies in language and social interaction: in honor of Robert Hopper,* 452–461. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Schegloff, Emmanuel A. 2003b. The surfacing of the suppressed. In Phillip J. Glenn, Curtin D.LeBaron & Jennifer Mandelbaum (eds.), *Studies in language and social interaction: in honor of Robert Hopper,* 204–223. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis* Cambridge University Press.

Stivers, Tanya. 2008. Stance, alignment, and affiliation during story telling: when nodding is a token of affiliation. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 41(1). 31–57.

Stivers, Tanya. 2013. Sequence organization. In Jack Sidnell & Tanya Stivers (eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis,* 191–209. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.

Stivers, Tanya & Makoto Hayashi. 2010. Transformative answers: one way to resist a question's constraints. *Language in Society* 39. 1–25.

Appendix: The dancing request sequence in its entirety

```
1 Gali:      tzh .hh asi tova?
              Do me a favour?
2 Dorit:     ken.=
             yes.=
3 Gali:      =boyi  lirkod  maxar, bevakas↑ha::.
             come dancing tomorrow, Please.
4            (1.2)
5 Gali:      keyilu bovakasha, I am pleadin,
             I mean please, I am pleading you.((in english))
6 Dorit:     °ow [key.°
             o [key.
7 Gali:          [ani enha::g ad haoman shva es[re mavtixa.
              [I I'll+dri::ve to the ((Dance [club name)) promise
8 Dorit:                                        [at tinhaGali::i. at tinhagi, ken?
```

                                        [you you'll+dri:ve. You you'll+drive, yeah?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 9 Gali: | [ken. | |
| | [yeah. | |
| 10 Dorit: | [baoto shlax? | |
| | [in your car? | |
| 11 Gali: | ken. | |
| | yes. | |
| 12 Dorit: | ad haoman?= | |
| | to ((club name in farther city)) | |
| 13 Gali: | =ani baoto shlax lo yexla lenhog ze: mesubax miday kvar. | |
| | =I in your car can't drive its too complicated altogether. | |
| 14 Dorit: | °ken. ani yoda'at.° | |
| | °yeah. I know.° | |
| 15 Gali: | ke::n. (0.6) baa? | |
| | ye::s. (0.6) coming? | |
| 16 Dorit: | °ani baa.° aniBAa. | |
| | °I am coming.° I am COMIng. | |
| 17 | Ani agid  lax  she'ani | |
| | I am going to tell you that I | |
| 18 | baa vemaxar | |
| | am coming and tomorrow | |
| 19 | ani arimelayi:x telefon, | |
| | I will give you a phone call | |
| 20 | tish/me'/i:: oded ye/a/le::v. | |
| | listen *my boyfriend* will be insulted. | |
| 21 | (0.6) | |
| 22  Dorit: | [ze hakol.] | |
| | [That's it.] | |
| 23  Gali: | [ma XPAt] lanu? | |
| | [Why DO we] care? ((shouts)) | |
| 24 | (0.9) | |
| 25  Dorit: | i ze be'emet kshat omeret et ze [kaxa] | |
| | This is when you say it like [that,] | |
| 26  Gali: |                                       [mehm.] | |
| 27  Dorit: | at cod↑eket lo yixpat lanu.= | |
| | you are ri↑ght, we don't care. | |
| 28  Dorit: | =aval yixpa:t lanu. Mistaber sheken. | |
| | = but we care. Apparently yes. ((we care)) | |
| 29 | .hh niksharnu lagush::sak haze shenikra oded. | |
| | We got attached to this meat loaf called  NAME. | |
| 30 | (2.2) | |
| 31  Dorit: | ex ani mdaberet alav, elohi:m adiri::m | |

|       |        | how do I talk about him, go::od Go::d, |
|-------|--------|----------------------------------------|
| 32    |        | ze haxaver shli yaani.                 |
|       |        | it is My boyfriend I mean.             |
| 33    |        | (0.6)                                  |
| 34    |        | koletet?                               |
|       |        | Do you get it?                         |
| 35    |        | (1.5)                                  |
| 36    | Gali:  | ((unclear singing))                    |
| 37    | Dorit: | [(gush) bimlo muvan hami:la]=          |
|       |        | [(a loaf) with all the meanings of the wor:d.] |
| 38    | Gali:  | =hkivsa hazoti po mikadima,            |
|       |        | =this sheep that is here in front ((New Topic)) |