慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ
Keio Associated Repository of Academic resouces

Title	A corpus-based analysis of categorization of co-construction : from the perspective of stance representation
Sub Title	
Author	西山, 遥(Nishiyama, Haruka)
Publisher	慶應義塾大学大学院文学研究科英米文学専攻『コロキア』同人
Publication year	2021
Jtitle	Colloquia (コロキア). No.42 (2021.) ,p.95- 110
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	英語学・言語学
Genre	Journal Article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00341698-20211220-0095

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

A Corpus-based Analysis of Categorization of Co-construction:

From the Perspective of Stance Representation*

Haruka NISHIYAMA

1. Introduction

In interaction, it is not unusual for some participants to co-construct their conversations. *Co-construction* (Cf. Lerner, 2004), where some participants collaboratively accomplish a single syntactic unit, has attracted much attention from researchers of syntax. In recent years, however, there has also been semantic and pragmatic interest in how a hearer continues the conversation, semantically and pragmatically relating to ongoing conversations produced by a speaker (Haugh, 2010). One of the themes that remain to be analyzed in pragmatics is the significance of pragmatic meaning produced from various types of the hearer's perspective. Although many pragmatics studies have mainly been concerned with the hearer's inference about the speaker intention in utterances, the hearer's pragmatically produced practices that occur independently from their inferences have been underestimated (Culpeper & Haugh, 2014, p. 153). One of these practices is co-construction.

Co-construction occurs in various highly interactive conversations and has different functions. Since not only traditional syntactic interest but also the semantic and pragmatic interest in the content of co-construction have increased, it is necessary to clarify what kind of content is produced by the listener who creates the co-construction. Thus, this study attempted to analyze the types of co-construction with various functions from the perspective of the stance taken by the co-constructor. The results showed that co-constructions beginning with a *which*-clause comprised various types that differed in the degree of representation of co-constructor's stance, in the function of co-construction, and in the perspectives of a co-constructor, and that there was a relationship among stance, function, and perspective. In addition, since there are no or few fixed forms of co-construction, corpora have not been used in previous studies due to the difficulty of searching by form. This study also examined the usefulness of corpus searches based on previous studies using corpora for searching for a form of a *which*-clause. As a result, some of the utterances beginning with a *which*-clause are used as co-constructing parts but they were not frequently employed by a hearer as much as by an original speaker.

* I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Ippei Inoue at Keio University and Professor Ryoko Suzuki at Keio University for their helpful advice and support.

The outline of this paper is as follows. Section 2 introduces the phenomenon of the co-construction in detail as well as some previous studies that focus on it. Section 3 explains how co-constructions were sampled from a corpus and how they were classified depending on Rühlemann (2007)'s categorization about stance. Then, Section 4 elaborates all the sampled 6 cases regarding the degree of a hearer's stance representation and also discusses the relationships among stance, function, and perspective by adopting Szkzepek (2000)'s interactional functions. Finally, Section 5 summarizes this study, presenting some of its limitations as well as some of the prospects it creates for further research.

2. Previous studies

Co-construction[1] refers to an interactional practice in which a hearer collaboratively co-constructs what a speaker is saying—or when multiple participants talk so interactively that the roles of speaker and listener are not clear among them, they become co-speakers and collaborate to build a conversation (Hayashi, 2003, p.1; Ono & Thompson, 1996). The following segment is taken up as an example of co-construction.

(1) An example of co-construction

01 Nina : No, they die down ( )
02 Clarence : Mm. Mm.
03 Nina : most of the ones that we brought seem to have erm
04 Clarence : Survived.
→ 05 Nina : Survived. Which I'm glad.
06 Clarence : Mm. Mm.

(Haugh, 2010, adapted from Rühlemann, 2007)

In this conversation, two people (Nina and Clarence) are talking. In line 03, a speaker, Nina, uttered "Most of the ones that we brought seem to have erm." This utterance included hesitation, "erm," so a hearer, Clarence, added "Survived" in line 04 to complete the sentence: "Most of the ones that we brought seem to have survived." In response to this, in line 05, the original speaker, Nina, agreed by repeating "Survived," which Clarence proposed as a potential coming word. Then, Nina expanded the utterance by continuing with "Which I'm glad." In other words, in the interaction held in lines 03–05, the utterance "most of the ones that we brought seem to

[1] Hayashi (2003) called the same phenomenon as co-construction "joint utterance construction."

have survived" was produced by both participants. The phenomenon that the conversation is produced collaboratively by multiple participants is called co-construction.

Co-construction includes two types: *completion* and *expansion* (Hayashi, 2003, p. 25, 173; Ono & Thompson, 1996, p. 72, 78; Rühlemann, 2007, p. 100). Completion refers to cases where "the next speaker completes a syntactic unit that the first speaker has left incomplete" (Rühlemann, 2007, p. 100), whereas expansion is defined as cases where "the first speaker articulates an utterance that is syntactically complete and the next speaker expands the first speaker's utterance into a longer syntactic unit, e.g., by adding a prepositional phrase or a dependent clause" (2007, p. 100). Taking up example (1) again, Clarence's utterance "Survived" in line 04 can be categorized as completion because he completed a single unit continuing from Nina's previous turn in line 03. Also, Nina's utterance, "Which I'm glad," can be said to correspond to expansion in that she added a new relative clause to an already syntactically complete unit.

Regarding expansion, Rühlemann (2007) pointed out that an utterance beginning with a *which* relative pronoun tends to be expansion, as seen in example (1). Moreover, Rühlemann carried out a corpus-based analysis of expansion. Concretely, after sampling expansions from the BNC corpus by searching for utterances beginning with "which," a comparative analysis was conducted between the *same-speaker sentence relatives* (henceforth, *SSRs*)—the expansion of a *which* relative clause produced by the original speaker—and the *next-speaker sentence relatives* (henceforth, *NSRs*)—the expansion of a *which* relative clause produced by a different speaker—in the point of words, phrases, and interactions that frequently occur before or after expansions and a speaker's stance[2] in expansions toward previous utterances. As a result, it was revealed that, in SSRs, a speaker shows a marked tendency to present their affective and epistemic stances overtly or covertly as in (1) above, while, in NSRs, a listener tends to take a rather neutral stance toward what the original speaker says in the preceding conversation. However, in the research, Rühlemann mostly discussed the results of SSRs rather than NSRs and described only a few instances of NSRs (though 104 cases of SSRs and 86 cases of NSRs were found). Therefore, this paper focuses on NSRs to explore an actual practice of a hearer's expansion and analyzes the stance of hearers in NSRs and how they develop conversations with their stances.

[2] Here, the term *stance* means "the speaker's opinion about the position or event in question" (Rühlemann, 2007, p.108) (Cf. Biber & Finegan, 1989; Thompson & Hunston, 2000).

3. Methodology

3.1. Data

In this study, following Rühlemann (2007), which sampled expansions from the BNC corpus, data of expansions were collected from Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English (SBCSAE). There were two main reasons for choosing this corpus as a data resource. One reason is that because the corpus consists of 60 conversations of various types, it was possible to sample NSRs that may occur in a variety of conversational situations. The other reason is that the transcriptions and the audio data of the conversation were available, making it easier to follow the context of the conversations surrounding expansion and to analyze the phenomenon.

To extract the object for analysis, the following procedure was used. First, as mentioned in previous studies, since utterances beginning with a *which* relative pronoun tend to be expansions, utterances beginning with "which" were searched for in the SBCSAE. In the corpus search—namely, under the condition of the search expression of "which" at the beginning of a sentence—some unapplicable utterances were also searched for, such as SSRs—expansions produced by the same person as the original speaker—and interrogative sentence beginning with an interrogative "which." Thus, by eliminating these utterances, only expansions produced by the next speaker—that is, NSRs—were analyzed.

3.2. Categorization

In this study, the categorization of the stance used by Rühlemann (2007) for sentence relatives (SRs)—namely, expansions with a *which* relative pronoun, including SSRs and NSRs—was employed (Table 1).

Table 1

Types of Stance

Type of stance	Detailed subtype
OS (overt stance)	Affective stance
	Epistemic stance
CS (covert stance)	
SN (stance-neutral)	Expansion function
	Affirmation function

(Adapted from Rühlemann, 2007, p. 109)

OS (overt stance) refers to an explicit expression of stance, and it is divided into two subtypes: *affective stance* (speaker's emotional attitude toward the object) and *epistemic stance* (speaker's attitude regarding their own certainty toward the object). Next, CS (covert stance) is defined as an implicit expression of stance, including indirect agreement or disagreement. Finally, SN (stance-neutral) is a relative clause that does not express the overt or covert stance of the speaker. According to Tao and McCarthy (2001), who studied non-restrictive relative *which*-clauses in terms of the effects of their interactional factors in conversation, SN has two further subtypes;[3] *expansion* refers to "the addition of information offered by the speaker as topically relevant, i.e. about the same person or object, or as a projection of the informational needs of the listener" (2001, p. 663), whereas *affirmation* is defined as non-restrictive *which*-clauses that "confirm that an event or action referred to in the previous utterance has/has not in fact occurred, is/is not occurring, or will/will not occur" (2001, p. 665).

Based on these previous studies, this paper adopted two subtypes of SN, namely Expansion[4] and Affirmation. Although Rühlemann had treated them as a single category at the time of counting, i.e., without separating Expansions from Affirmations, this investigation established these subcategories in advance in the stage of counting, on the basis of the claim that SN is a distinctive feature of NSRs, the object for analysis in this study, and that SN has two types of usage: Expansions and Affirmations. Furthermore, this study did not employ other subcategories that Rühlemann had used. Rühlemann established two further subclassifications of Affective and Epistemic: respectively, good/bad for Affective and certain/uncertain for Epistemic. However, in the first place, the NSRs examined in this study were said to be difficult to show OS. Hence, in this study, analysis was carried out utilizing the categorization listed in Table 1.

[3] Tao and McCarthy (2001) termed another function of non-restrictive relative *which*-clause that represents overt stance as Evaluation. Of these three types of Evaluation, Expansion, and Affirmation, Rühlemann (2007) employed the latter two terms to refer to the SN's subtypes without using the term of Evaluation.

[4] In this paper, Expansion written with the capital initial letter refers to the particular phenomenon proposed by Tao and McCarthy (2001), employed as the category in the analysis, and seen in Tables 1 and 2, which is distinguished from the expansion used to refer to the phenomenon generally.

4. Results and discussion

This section explains how the sampled NSRs are various in the point of stance (4.1) and discusses the relationship among stance, function, and perspective by employing interactional function of co-construction by Szczepek (2000).

4.1 Types of stance in sampled NSRs

First of all, as a result of sampling NSRs from the SBCSAE, only six cases were identified as NSRs from all 60 conversations in the corpus. Indeed, the corpus comprised some particular types of conversation in which a hearer had not actively participated in the conversations, such as sermons and lectures. However, the corpus also contained many conversations in which a hearer had participated in interaction with their responsive actions. Moreover, in the corpus, SSRs occurred more frequently than NSRs, although SSRs were not within the reach of the research object and the number of the SSRs cases was not counted. In short, NSRs, expansions by a *which* relative clause, can be regarded as a phenomenon that does not occur so frequently.

Regarding the six cases of NSRs, their types of stance are listed below in Table 2.

Table 2

The Types of Stance Seen in Sampled NSRs

Type of stance	Detailed subtype	Number of cases: (Example number)
OS (overt stance)	Affective stance	1: (2)
	Epistemic stance	1: (3)
CS (covert stance)		0
SN (stance-neutral)	Expansion function	2: (4) (5)
	Affirmation function	2: (6) (7)
Total		6

The following paragraphs describe each case in the order of the table. First, as for OS, cases (2) and (3) correspond to affective stance and epistemic stance, respectively.

(2) Coloring homework at school (from SBCSAE19)

689.BRET : ⌊ I'll color this in at school ⌋ .
690.FRAN : (.) XXXXX ⌉ .
691.BRET : At school you can ⌈ color it in .

692.FRAN : ⌊ Yeah so anyway that was real sudden ⌋ .
693.BRET : cause they have the big markers ⌉ .
694.FRAN : (..) Last week .
695.FRAN : (..) Last Thursday as a ⌈ matter of ⌉ fact .
696.BRET : ⌊ Hm ⌋ .
697.FRAN : ⌈ Well ⌉ .
698.MELI : ⌊ How are you ⌋ gonna make the strings .
699.MELI : Are you ⌈ gonna leave the little white ⌉ areas ?
700.FRAN : ⌊ &{l=X This past Wednesday &}l=X ⌋ .
701.FRAN : (..) &=in .
702.BRET : (..) I'm just ⌈ gonna make ⌉ the lines here .
703.FRAN : ⌊ &=THROAT ⌋ .
704.JAN : (.) &{l=X What do you say &}l=X .
705.BRET : (.) &=in (.) I'll ⌈ do ⌉ &{l=VOX some⌈thing: &}l=VOX ⌉ .
706.MELI : ⌊ What- ⌋ +/.
→ 707.MELI : ⌊ Which sounds ⌋ better .
708.MELI : (.) &{l=READ I bet it was fun for him when he awoke &}l=READ (..)
or &{l=READ I bet it was fun for him when he awakened &}l=READ .

In case (2), conversation among family members at home, BRET, who was doing her coloring homework, said that she would color the rest at school in lines 689, 691, and 693. In response to this, the listener MELI asked BRET in lines 698 and 699 how she would make the rest of the work in progress. Then, BRET answered that she would just draw lines (702). MELI evaluated BRET's answer as a good plan "Which sounds better" (707). This is the expansion and NSR of a *which*-clause. In other words, in case (2), MELI expressed her own affective stance toward BRET's preceding utterances.

(3) People addicted to New York (from SBCSAE51)

406.BERN : She's asking if they have th:ey should have an addiction to New York .
407.SEAN : Or +...
408.FRAN : Oh New Yorkers Ano⌈nymous ⌉ .
409.SEAN : ⌊ Or if they have ⌋ like a special kind of like yeah .
410.FRAN : (..) ⌈ Yeah⌋⌈: ⌉ .
411.ALIC : ⌊ &{l=X Didn't ⌋ ⌊ matter ⌋ ⌈ X &}l=X ⌉ +...
412.BERN : ⌊ But they ⌋ ⌊ do ⌋ ⌈ have a .
413.SEAN : ⌊ But in fact .
414.BERN : they do have an AA .
415.SEAN : AA is dif- +/.
416.SEAN : complete⌋ly different in New ⌈ York City ⌉ .
→ 417.BERN : which is ⌉ ⌊ different ⌋ .
418.SEAN : than it is ⌈ anywhere else ⌉ in the world .
→ 419.BERN : ⌊ That's right ⌋ .

420.FRAN : (..) &=in Well the Vil⌈lage ⌉ ⌈ is ⌉ +...
421.BERN : ⌊ Don't you ⌋ ⌊ think ⌋ ?
422.SEAN : ⌊ Much ⌋ ⌈ more exciting ⌉ .

On the other hand, in case (3), a hearer produced an expansion by showing an epistemic stance. In this extract, participants were talking from line 406 about those who had an addiction to New York, who were mentioned by "they." The four people compared the addicts' attitude toward living without being obsessed by New York to that of Alcoholic Anonymous (AA), a group of people trying to break free from alcoholism. In response to SEAN's previous utterance from lines 413 to 416 "But in fact AA is completely different in New York City," BEAN said "which is different. That's right" (417, 419). This utterance could be treated as an explicit statement of the epistemic stance, or OS, of the hearer BEAN, who agreed with SEAN's utterance.

Subsequently, in the cases of SN, where a hearer did not specifically express a stance, the cases for Expansions of the category are (4) and (5).

(4) Tesla coil getting power wirelessly (from SBCSAE17)

369.MICH : He wanted a world power system &=in that you could um (..) tap into the air basically and get power anywhere on earth .
370.MICH : (..) &=in and um (.) &=in ⌈ &=lengthened y- ⌉ +...
371.JIM : ⌊ that's what the ⌋ Tesla coil was about ?
372.MICH : Yeah .
373.MICH : (.) but e- the problem was that it (.) it uh &=in it interfered with um &=SWALLOW (..) well matter .
374.MICH : &=laugh I [% laugh] mean y- +/.
375.MICH : it was n:ot a clean broadcast system .
376.MICH : Like everything in the room if you had a Tesla coil in the middle of the room all the metal objects would be receiving it constant⌈ly ⌉ .
377.JIM : ⌊ M⌋hm .
378.MICH : &=in &=lengthened So (.) it wasn't really a very efficient either .
379.MICH : (.) Because you'd have to have a- +/.
380.MICH : &=in an immense amount of power being broadcast so that a few points could receive (.) you know their share of it .
381.MICH : (..) &=tsk ⌈ &=in ⌉ .
382.JIM : ⌊ now what ⌋ about if they +/.
383.JIM : ʔi- with the superconductor .
384.JIM : Will that change all that ?
385.MICH : (..) &=tsk I don't know .
386.MICH : (.) He was dealing with it being (..) basically energy and being sent through the air uh you know: like light .
387.JIM : like (.) yeah .

388.JIM : Like tapping right into just the energy of the earth or something .
389.JIM : ⌈ &{l=X alright &}l=X ⌉ .
390.MICH : ⌊ yeah ⌋ .
→391.MICH : which doesn't really ʔuh (.) ⌈ require ⌉ a conductor .
392.JIM : ⌊ yeah may- ⌋ +...

In case (4), two speakers were talking about the physics of the Tesla coil, describing it as a device to get power wirelessly anywhere on earth. In response to JIM's question "now what about if they with the superconductor? will that change all that?" (382–384), MICH answered that he did not know and described that Tesla had been dealing with the coil being basically energy and being sent through the air like light (386). In line 388, JIM likened Tesla coil to something "Like tapping right into just the energy of the earth or something," with which MICH agreed (390) before developing the contents of JIM's utterance by saying "which doesn't really require a conductor" (391). JIM's preceding conversation in line 388 was produced in the flow of the "like" at the end of the utterance started by MICH in line 386, which suggested that MICH was developing the story as the original speaker.

(5) Treatment for an animal in a veterinary hospital (from SBCSAE18)

164.MARC: (..) &=in No I was just trying to &=ex figure out what [% laugh] we spent already .
165.LIND : Mm .
166.LIND : (..) Mm .
167.MARC: Let' see XXXXXX (..) We've already spent fifty for him and I &{l=X want him &}l=X to spend another hundred .
168.LIND : (..) Well .
169.MARC: But that's better than pins .
170.LIND : (..) ⌈ Right .
171.MARC: ⌊ And surgery ⌋ .
→172.LIND : Which would ⌋ be another (..) two hundred or .
173.KRIS : (..) Yeah .
174.KRIS : It's more ⌈ for a surgery ⌉ .
175.MARC: ⌊ to spend ⌋ .
176.LIND : (..) Any +/.
177.LIND : pretty much ⌈ any time you can ⌉ +...
178.MARC: ⌊ And that one ⌋ really (.) you know I don't think it would benefit from pins .
179.LIND : ⌈ M-m ⌉ .
180.MARC: ⌊ because ⌋ we'd have to undo it .

Similarly, case (5) included a hearer's expansion of previous utterances by a speaker without expressing any stance. This conversation was held among workers in a veterinary

hospital, where they were discussing treatment for the animals. In line 167, MARC said that they had already spent fifty (although judging from the conversation, it was not clear what they had spent fifty on) so he proposed to spend another hundred because this proposed treatment would be better than that using pins (169). After that, a hearer, LIND, agreed with MARC's proposal because the treatment using pins would need another two hundred (172). Although in the previous utterance LIND can be said to take a hearer position, she had the same level of knowledge as the prior speaker, MARC, such that she could develop the conversation further instead of MARC.

Two cases of the other subcategory of SN, Affirmations, are elucidated below.

(6) More red wine (from SBCSAE32)

1.TUCK : You guys all +/.
2.TUCK : All drinking the same thing ?
3.TOM3 : (.) M-m .
4.TOM1 : I know Tommy⌈'s having ⌉ the red wine .
5.TOM3 : ⌊ No ⌋ .
6.TOM1 : You want some ⌈ more ⌉ ?
7.TUCK : ⌊ Tom ⌋ ⌈ what do you want ⌉ .
8.TOM3 : ⌊ Mhm ⌋ .
9.TOM3 : (.) ⌈ Yeah I'll ⌉ have a little ⌈ more Tuck ⌉ .
10.TOM1 : ⌊ Sure ⌋ .
11.TOM2 : ⌊ Sure ⌋ .
12.TOM2 : ⌊ Course he wants ⌋ red wine .
13.TUCK : Red wine ?
14.TOM3 : (.) Mhm .
→ 15.TOM1 : ⌈ Which is right ⌉ there .
16.TUCK : ⌊ XXX ⌋ .
17.TOM2 : Everybody [% laugh] wants [% laugh] ⌈ red wine ⌉ .

In case (6), three people (TOM1, TOM2, and TOM3) were drinking together, and then TUCK asked them what they would drink next. TOM3 answered that he would have a little more of the red wine that he had been drinking (9), which TOM1 expanded by continuing "Which is right there" (15). TOM1's additional remark is an NSR. The preceding conversational flow of TOM3 wanting to drink red wine was created by TOM3 (9), TOM2 (12), and TUCK (13), when TOM1 was not the main speaker. However, TOM1 was there with the red wine, so he had common ground with TOM2, TOM3, and TUCK. This was why he could continue with the ongoing conversation as one of the co-speakers.

(7) Too strong girlfriend (from SBCSAE47)

189.FRED : (.) &=in (.) What what does uh (.) your (..) sisters say .
190.RICH : (..) N- they tell me to stay away from her don't even call or anything .
191.FRED : (..) Yeah⌈: ⌉ ?
192.RICH : ⌊ Wait ⌋ till she calls you and everything .
193.RICH : But ʔuh you know that's not right .
194.FRED : (..) Yeah .
195.FRED : That's hard ⌈ man ⌉ .
196.RICH : ⌊ I mean ⌋ if she accepts me calling her and she doesn't tell me &{l=VOX don't call me &}l=VOX or .
197.FRED : &=in &=lengthened They're telling you that why .
198.FRED : To like uh .
199.RICH : Cause they feel that she's gonna get too strong by me you know uh ⌈ kissing ⌉ her ass .
200.FRED : ⌊ Oh ⌋ .
201.RICH : ⌈ or something or or or ⌉ .
202.FRED : ⌊ Exactly ⌋ .
203.RICH : ⌈ crawling ⌉ back .
204.FRED : ⌊ I see ⌋ .
205.RICH : and begging her ʔuh (.) you know .
206.FRED : &=in ⌈ &=lengthened .
207.RICH : ⌊ for me to come back or ⌋ .
208.FRED : She gonna get ⌉ the upper hand .
209.RICH : (.) Exactly .
→ 210.RICH : Which which you know ʔuh: she probably already does .
211.RICH : But (..) &=in (..) ⌈ um ⌉ .
212.FRED : ⌊ Yeah⌋: .

In case (7), which was a conversation between friends, a speaker, RICH, consulted a hearer, FRED, about RICH's sisters' desire for RICH to distance himself from his girlfriend. From line 199, RICH mentioned the relationship between him and his girlfriend: "she's gonna get too strong by me kissing her ass and begging her." After FRED in line 208 said "She gonna get the upper hand," RICH answered in the affirmative (by "Exactly" in 209) and produced an NSR to emphasize that she had "already" gotten the upper hand (210). Although RICH was a hearer for FRED's previous utterance in line 208, originally RICH was a speaker of the topic and the whole conversation was based on the information that he had known. This background made it easy for him to expand the conversation, which can relate to the establishment of this NSR.

4.2 Different interactional functions of NSRs

In the previous subsection, how various the sampled NSRs are in terms of stance. However, in the first place, co-constructions including NSRs also differ in their functions (Szczepek, 2000).

Therefore, in this section, the cases described so far are discussed again, adapting Szczepek's functional aspects of co-construction, including expansions to explore the relationship among different factors that relate to features of co-construction: stance, function, perspective.

Szczepek (2000) found that there were four broad interactional functions in co-construction by showing the extracts from English conversation data including natural conversations held between friends and families, for example. Since the above cases included some types in the point of stance representation, they were also categorized according to interactional functions proposed by Szczepek to observe that a stance, function, and perspective taken in NSRs can be related to each other. According to Szczepek (2000), largely four types of interactional function are as follows: (1) *Duet*, where co-speakers construct a conversation, having shared knowledge and floor; (2) *Showing understanding*, which refers to the type of phenomenon in which a hearer constructs a conversation to show a speaker their understanding of what the speaker said; (3) *Borrowing*, which means that a hearer inserts their thought by borrowing words from the speaker mid-utterance; and (4) *Eliciting information*, which denotes that a speaker encourages a hearer to complete the ongoing utterances of the speaker and to accomplish the co-construction. Adapting these functional categories to the above cases, each case is classified as in Table 3.

Table 3

Categorization of the Cases from Stance and Interactional Functions in NSRs

Type	Detailed subtype	Interactional functions			
		Duet	Showing understanding	Borrowing	Eliciting information
OS	Affective			(2)	
	Epistemic		(3)		
CS					
SN	Expansion	(5)	(4)		
	Affirmation	(6)	(7)		

It is remarkable that Szczepek suggested that these four functional categories have something to do with the perspectives of a co-constructor. In the Duet, where multiple participants construct a conversation as co-speakers, they can be said to have the perspectives of both speaker and hearer. Regarding Showing understanding, a hearer constructs a conversation as a response to the preceding utterances of a speaker. In other words, co-construction is made from the perspective of the speaker in order to show a hearer's

understanding enough to represent what the hearer thought the first speaker wanted to say. Moreover, in Borrowing and Eliciting information, a hearer, a co-constructor in this case, participates in the conversation, retaining the perspective of the hearer because the content expressed in co-construction is what the hearer wanted to say rather than what the original speaker wanted to say. From the result of categorization considering cooccurrence of stance types and interactionally function types, it was found that these functions and perspectives of co-construction and expansion are regarded to relate to the stances of a co-constructor. In short, as seen in case (2), where a hearer produces a co-construction from the perspective of themself as a hearer, the uttered NSR expresses OS because of the necessity of showing the listener's obvious attention to what the original speaker had said. On the other hand, in cases of (3), (4), and (7), where the original speaker co-constructs the conversation again after and based on the hearer's response to the previous utterances by the speaker, it is obvious that the speaker's story is of interest to themself and can be regarded as correct. This influences the tendency that the original speaker need not display their favorable stance toward their own utterances and, as a result, the NSRs take a neutral standpoint. The same is true in the case of co-speakers building up a conversation, namely in cases such as (5) and (6) in this study. There, since multiple speakers can build up a conversation, it is suggested that a participant who has temporarily handed over the floor to another co-speaker can sufficiently claim the validity and legitimacy of the utterances simply by showing the same neutral stance as that of the original speaker.

Therefore, depending on what perspective a co-constructor takes in the conversation, the required (or preferred) degree of presentation of the collaborative stance—that is, how collaborative stance should be taken toward the preceding conversation will differ—from OS (the most collaborative one) to SN (the less collaborative one, at least explicitly), and the function of the co-construction itself, will also differ.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, the qualitative analysis of the sampled cases from the corpus suggested the relationship among stance, function, and perspective in the expansion by a *which*-clause, an NSR. It is an original point of this paper to discuss the connection between stance and interactional function of co-construction. The connection suggests that co-construction is employed for a variety of purposes, which can be seized from a hearer's stance and its interactional function. These two axes of stance and function (as seen in Table 3) can be useful for understanding or describing co-construction deeply enough to divide a category based on a single axis into more specific types, although in some analytical situations, categorization by a

single axis can be enough. However, the number of cases analyzed in this study was so small that it is necessary to make sure that the same tendency and relationship will be confirmed when a similar classification is conducted with more research cases in the future. With the increase in the number of research cases, it is expected that there will be more and more complicated cases, such as the present case (3), in which the original speaker strongly agreed with what the hearer said, resulting in the original speaker's presentation of an Epistemic OS. Thus, it is important to re-examine whether the current categorization is also adequate for more cases. Moreover, because the NSRs were not seen in many cases in this search, it is assumed that an NSR does not occur so frequently in general, although this assumption can be proven to be true after searching for a larger corpus or other data resources. Also, of course, an expansion in co-construction is not limited to the utterance beginning with a relative pronoun of "which." Hence, it is necessary to collect examples of expansions other than the NSRs focused on in this study and to understand and analyze this phenomenon as a more general conversational behavior. Collecting more examples and expanding the scope of research objects will contribute to revealing more types of co-construction mechanisms and tendencies in their usage.

References

Biber, D., & Finegan, E. (1989). Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. *Text – Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, *9*(1), 93–124. https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1989.9.1.93

Culpeper, J., & Haugh, M. (2014). *Pragmatics and the English language—Perspectives on the English language*. Red Globe Press.

Haugh, M. (2010). Co-constructing what is said in interaction. In E. Nemeth T., & K. Bibok (Eds.), *The Role of data at the semantics-pragmatics interface* (pp. 349–380). De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110240276.349

Hayashi, M. (2003). *Joint utterance construction in Japanese conversation*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Lerner, G. H. (2004). Collaborative turn sequences. *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 225–256). John Benjamins Publishing.

Ono, T., & Thompson, S. A. (1996). Interaction and syntax in the structure of conversational discourse: Collaboration, overlap, and syntactic dissociation. In E. Hovy H., & D. Scott R. (Eds.), Computational and conversational discourse: Burning issues – an interdisciplinary account (pp. 67–96). Springer.

Rühlemann, C. (2007). *Conversation in context: A corpus-driven approach*. Continuum.

Szczepek, B. (2000). Functional aspects of collaborative productions in English conversation. *InLiSt – Interaction and Linguistic Structures*, *21*, 1–36. http://www.inlist.uni-bayreuth.de/issues/21/index.htm

Tao, H., & McCarthy, M. J. (2001). Understanding non-restrictive *which*-clauses in spoken English, which is not an easy thing. *Language Studies*, *23*(6), 651–677. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0388-0001(00)00026-7

Thompson, G., & Hunston, S. (2000). *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. Oxford University Press.