The interactional history of examples and parentheses: Note-taking practices in multiparty interaction among attendees of a mutual-help group for Chronic Fatigue Syndrome (CFS) sufferers

Elwys De Stefani, Paul Sambre, Dorien Van De Mierop (KU Leuven)

To be published in: *Language and Dialogue* (2016), 6/1

Abstract: In this article, we set out to examine how participants organize their note-taking while engaged in multiparty interaction. We first describe the collective display of affiliation as an interactional practice that allows note-takers to identify recordables and to legitimize their writing. We then focus on the use of examples (*e.g.*) and parentheses in the written notes. While style guides recommend the use of examples and parentheses to indicate subsidiary information, we describe the interactional history that leads to such scriptorial practices in collaborative writing. The analyses show that both examples and parentheses may originate from various interactional practices (*e.g.* listing, instruction, epistemic disputes) and that they may relate to highly salient topics of the interaction. We use the methods developed in conversation analysis, which we extend to the analysis of multimodal phenomena of interaction.

Keywords: Note-taking, examples, parentheses, affiliation, multiparty interaction, conversation analysis, mutual-help groups, Chronic Fatigue Syndrome

1. Introduction

Participants in (institutional) meetings often take notes, which may serve as a personal record of the meeting, as a provisional record that an appointed person produces in order to subsequently work out ‘official’ minutes, etc. In this article, we examine note-taking practices in meetings of a mutual-help group for persons suffering from Chronic Fatigue Syndrome (CFS) and for their friends and family. One of the main purposes of these meetings is to provide reports of the problems CFS patients experience in their everyday lives to an institution related to a national health insurance company, which uses these reports to better assess the needs of people suffering from this disease. The practices we observe in these meetings are different from individual note-taking with respect to (at least) three aspects.

Firstly, the notes are taken in the course of small-group discussions about CFS-related issues. Secondly, notes are not taken for personal use; rather, they are designed to be read and evaluated by a third party. Thirdly, they are instructed both by a facilitator (who assigns a topic to each group) and by a preprinted form (see § 3) on which the participants take notes. In this setting, taking notes is a fundamentally social practice: Participants collaboratively construct a written text through interactional practices. Nissi (2015) also speaks of *shared text production* when analyzing how, in a meeting, a facilitator collects results of group-work discussions and writes them down, thus producing a collaboratively approved text document. In this contribution, we zoom in on a prior phase in multiparty interaction, i.e. we examine how participants engaged in group-work cooperate in order to produce a written document. As Stivers, Mondada & Steensig (2011, 20-22) have shown, displays of alignment and affiliation are primary resources for achieving cooperation. As we will show, in small-group discussions displays of affiliation on the one hand allow participants to identify potential *recordables* and on the other hand legitimize note-takers to write down what has been said (see also Mondada, this issue). While different kinds of *interactional* resources are available to participants in order to pursue a common course of action, note-takers can avail themselves of *scriptorial* resources when writing down a piece of text. This article focuses on two recurrent scriptorial practices, namely the use of examples and parentheses in a collaboratively produced text. Conventionally, readers interpret language material put into brackets and/or preceded by abbreviations such as *e.g.*, as providing some sort of additional information. Correspondingly, the Oxford English Dictionary defines the lemma *example* as “a typical instance; a fact, incident, quotation, etc. that illustrates, or forms a particular case of, a general principle, rule, state of things, etc.”. Similarly, the reference dictionary for the Dutch language defines the word *voorbeeld* ‘example’ as something that is “presented, given, shown, said in order to serve as further explanation, and better understanding”¹. In a similar vein, according to a reference manual for Dutch writing, round parentheses should be used to add an explanation, an addendum, a reference (see Renkema 2008, 368), while the Chicago Manual of Style describes parentheses with respect to syntax as setting off “text that has no grammatical bearing to the rest of the sentence” (§ 6.92). In short, the literature describes examples and parentheses mainly with regard to their discursive (syntactic, argumentative) properties in written texts, which are treated as static artifacts of human communication. Third party readers (such as the agents of the institution for which these notes are produced) are very likely to give a conventional reading to these elements. In this article, we analyze the

¹ “Wat gesteld, gegeven, getoond, gezegd wordt om tot nadere verklaring, tot beter begrip te dienen.” (Van Dale 2005: 3992-3993)

different interactional contingencies under which a recordable is put into writing either as an example or between parentheses. We describe, in other words, the *interactional history* of these scriptorial resources, and thereby show that a variety of interactional practices can crystallize, in a written document, as exemplifications and/or bracketed words. This will allow us to demonstrate that what appears as mere additional information in a written document actually reflects a practical solution that note-takers may choose in order to deal with various interactional practices that participants engage in, such as listing, dictating, or displaying epistemic disputes.

Methodologically, we proceeded as follows: We first pinpointed occurrences of examples and parentheses in the written notes and then examined the video recordings of the meetings in order to identify the interactional trajectories that led to these scriptorial practices. The corpus consists of seven video recorded meetings of a mutual-help group for CFS-sufferers (ca. 3 hours each) and of the notes that the participants produced during their group-work. We provide the relevant data in the original language (Flemish Dutch) as well as in English.

2. Writing *in* and *as* interaction

This article uses conversation analysis (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974) as a method of investigation for analyzing the interactional trajectories that lead to the use of the scriptorial resources mentioned above. While talk-in-interaction is the main domain of research in conversation analysis, practices of writing are highly relevant both as a *method* of investigation and as an *object* of analysis.² As a matter of fact, the rendering of talk in transcripts (Jefferson 2004; Hepburn & Bolden 2013) is an analytical procedure whereby analysts transform the temporality of the spoken word into the spatiality of the written document, and which is frequently carried out collaboratively. But writing is also an observable activity that takes place while people interact, e.g. in professional meetings, in classrooms, or during (police) interrogations. In these settings, participants produce written documents that serve a double purpose: On the one hand, they provide a report of an ephemeral event (discussion, lecture, etc.) that has taken place. On the other hand, such documents comply with expectations in terms of accountability and can therefore be regarded as evidence that the participants have taken their assignment seriously (Tusting 2010).

Writing while interaction is unfolding has been described as a problem of coordination (Pitsch 2007) of different co-occurring activities. It often takes place while multiple participants are

² Incidentally, conversation analysis has also been used for the analysis of written texts, such as letters (Mulkay 1986) or psychiatric reports (Knauth & Wolff 1991).

engaged in multiactivity (Mondada 2014), typically in classrooms or other pedagogical settings (De Gaulmyn, Bouchard & Rabatel 2001; Pitsch 2007; Lund, Dyke & Girardot 2009). These studies have shown that students' notes are not an accurate transformation of the spoken word (or transposition of text written on the blackboard) into a written document designed for personal use. Rather, students adapt their scriptorial practices to locally emerging interactional contingencies. Similar observations arise from the analysis of police interrogations (Meehan 1986; Van Charldorp 2014), during which a police officer produces a record of the interrogation. Komter (2006) shows, for instance, how talking and writing (typing) are reflexively contingent upon each other in these settings.³ Practices of writing are sometimes constitutive of specific settings of interaction. While in university lectures students may or may not take notes, in police interrogations or professional meetings certain participants with specific institutional identities (officers, secretaries, etc.) are expected to produce written reports or minutes of an interactional event. Similarly, in the setting analyzed for this article, taking notes is not optional. Rather, each group has to produce a written report of their discussion that will subsequently be available to readers who are not physically attending the meeting. Hence, writing is not only done *during* concurrent interaction, but it is itself a *practice of* interaction. By examining how interactional practices are intertwined with the activity of taking notes, we offer a close look at the collaborative achievement of a written document.

3. The setting: Talking about Chronic Fatigue Syndrome (CFS)

Medical literature describes CFS as a debilitating disease, whose hallmarks are persistent fatigue, muscle aches, sleep disorders, etc. that may leave sufferers housebound or, in severe cases, bedridden. To date, no biomedical examination has been able to correctly detect the disease, which is therefore diagnosed on the basis of positive clinical symptoms and by excluding pathologies (tumors, depression, etc.) that could possibly be responsible for those symptoms (see Fukuda *et al.* 1994). Its diagnostic indeterminacy is problematic both for medical professionals and for patients and has led, on the one hand, to a multiplication of labels used to describe similar pathologies, and, on the other hand, to contrasting conceptualizations of possible somatic or psychological etiologies (see De Stefani & Sambre, submitted). Within the human sciences, the ways in which patients affected by CFS deal with the disparate aspects of their disease have been discussed from the perspective of discursive

³ Other recent studies in writing and text production (Jakobs & Perrin 2014; Cislaru 2015) are mainly preoccupied with modeling processes of writing.

psychology (Horton-Salway 2001, 2002) and discourse analysis (Guise, Widdicombe & McKinlay 2007; Guise, McVittie & McKinlay 2010; Grue 2014 a, b).

The everyday experiences that CFS sufferers have in their social, institutional and professional encounters are at the heart of the discussions that take place during the meetings of the mutual-help group we observed. In these meetings, a representative of an institution related to a national health insurance company first presents the results of previous patient-surveys. Subsequently, the president of the mutual-help group and facilitator of the assembly separates the attendees into small groups and assigns a topic to each group. The participants are asked to discuss their experiences as CFS-patients with regard to work, costs, treatment, understanding/empathy, and to collaboratively fill out a sheet of paper, which contains the following preprinted pieces of text:

Thema:

‘Topic:’

1. Welke acties zijn nodig?

‘Which actions are needed?’

2. Wat kunnen we zelf organiseren om deze acties te realiseren?

‘What can we organize ourselves in order to realize these actions?’

Each of the two questions is followed by empty lines, on which the participants are expected to write down their answers. The different groups organize themselves freely with respect to who is taking notes and may adopt different solutions for this task. While in many groups one participant turns out to be the only note-taker (ex. 1 to 3), in others several participants are taking notes simultaneously (ex. 4).

4. Analysis

We start the analytical part of this article with an illustration of an ordinary case of note-taking, in which the participants converge towards treating specific portions of talk as recordable items. In this fragment, the recordables are produced in response to a previously formulated question. As the note-taker writes these down, her co-participants produce additional language material that she will record as examples (§ 4.1). We then look at a case in which incidentally emerging (i.e. non-responsive) language material ends up being dictated to the note-taker as an exemplification of the topic discussed (§ 4.2). The subsequent section

(§ 4.3) illustrates how the note-taker uses both scriptorial resources – examples and parentheses – as a practical solution for dealing with epistemic asymmetries that her co-participants make relevant. The last excerpt (§ 4.4) examines a group in which multiple participants take notes and where some language material is added between parentheses while the participants are comparing notes.

4.1. A collective display of affiliation

Within conversation analysis, the notion of *affiliation* is generally used “to describe actions with which a recipient displays that s/he supports the affective stance expressed by the speaker” (Lindström & Sorjonen 2013, 351). Displays of affiliation or disaffiliation are thus inscribed in responsive actions (Steensig & Drew 2008) and their verbal and multimodal manifestation is sensitive to the main activity in which participants are involved. For instance, in her study on nodding in storytelling, Stivers (2008) draws a distinction between displays of *alignment*, by which participants support the progress of the activity at hand, and of *affiliation*, which entails endorsement of a co-participant’s (affective) stance (see also Stivers, Mondada & Steensig 2011, 20-22). Furthermore, the notion of *agreement* (Lindström & Sorjonen 2013; Mondada, this issue) is often mobilized to describe affiliative responses.

We start the analytical section of this article by showing that the public display of affiliation is, indeed, an interactional resource that participants orient to for the identification of recordables and for legitimizing note-takers to write. The first fragment is taken from a discussion between five participants, one of which remains silent most of the time. We join their interaction as Lieve recalls the topic that the facilitator assigned to them, which she reformulates as ‘the additional costs that people with CFS have to (1.3) deal with.’ (1-2):

Ex 1a) CFS111029_3 (02:26-03:51)

01 LIE	(...) maar het gaat ook over, (0.7) wat zijn de (...) but it's also about, (0.7) what are the <u>additional</u>
02	<u>meerkosten</u> waar mensen met cvs mee te maken (1.3) krijgen. costs that people with CFS have to (1.3) deal with.
03	(2.3)
04 MAR	°ja° da ge: veel moet (0.5) uit handen (geven). °well° that a lot of things you have to (0.5) hand (over).
05	(0.5)
06 LIE	[ja [yes
07 AN	[ja [yes

08 (0.3)
09 AN vooral: [()
above all [()
10 LIE [d() vooral ja=
[d() above all yes=
11 AN =ja.
=yes.
12 (0.8)
13 MAR *j[a•
y[es
MAR *adopts writing posture-->
Figure •Figure 1
14 LIE [eh dat veel moe [uit handen geven.
[uh that you have to [hand over a lot of things.
15 MAR [ik moet hier wel gaan schrijven zeker.
[I'm gonna have to write down here surely.
16 LIN (((laughs))
17 LIE [awel (.) ja:•
[well (.) yes:•
Figure •Figure 2
18 *(0.6)
MAR -->*writes-->>

Lieve's recall of the topic that the group is discussing (01-02) is formatted in a way that makes it understandable as a question: A 0.7s pause (01) separates Lieve's previous talk from the subsequent TCU, which is constructed as an interrogative main clause (*wat zijn de meerkosten waar mensen met cvs mee te maken (1.3) krijgen.*/'what are the additional costs that people with CFS have to (1.3) deal with.' (01-02). At l. 04 Marie provides a candidate answer to that question (*°ja° da ge: veel moet (0.5) uit handen (geven).*/'°well° that a lot of things you have to (0.5) hand (over).'). After a short pause, Lieve and An affiliate with Marie's answer with agreement tokens (*ja*/'yes', 06-07) and then elaborate on that answer (9-10). After a brief pause (12), Marie, i.e. the person who provided the candidate answer, self-selects with a *ja*/'yes' (13) and at the same time adopts a writing posture, visible in the reorientation of her gaze towards the sheet of paper in front of her and in her lowering the right hand on the paper.

Lieve overlaps Marie's *ja*/'yes' and reformulates Marie's initial answer (14) almost literally. This is a further display of affiliation by which the participants transform Marie's *candidate* answer into a *recordable* answer. Marie formulates her upcoming writing with the words *ik moet hier wel gaan schrijven zeker.*/'I'm gonna have to write down here surely.' (15), thereby orienting to the collective display of affiliation as an activity that entitles her to take notes. Both Linda's laughter at l. 16 and Lieve's *awel*-prefaced *ja*: – roughly corresponding to 'well

(.) yes:.’ in English (17) – show that these co-participants treat Marie’s preceding turn not just as projecting an agreement as a preferred next action, but that this agreement is also self-evident. In other words, the collective display of affiliation that occurred after Marie’s candidate answer (6-14) is accountable as sufficient grounds for recording what has been said. It is after these agreement tokens that Marie actually starts writing (18).

Figure 1: Marie moves her hand downwards

Figure 2: Marie starts writing

We join the interaction 34 seconds later: Marie is still writing and will continue doing so throughout the whole excerpt below.⁴ After a long pause, Lieve reformulates Marie’s answer that found everyone affiliating (see 04-14) and then specifies that it ‘costs really a lot.’ (32-33) to ‘hand over things’. She thereby links back (De Stefani & Horlacher 2008) to the previously discussed topic, making it again available for further elaboration:

Ex 1b) CFS111029_3 (02:26-03:51)

- 31 (5.6)
 32 LIE inderdaad ja dingen uit- uit handen geven kost wel
indeed yes handing ov- over things costs really
 33 [heel veel.
[a lot.
 34 AN [ja.
[yes.
 35 (0.5)
 36 LIE en als ge- ja.
and if you- yes.
 37 (0.5)
 38 LIE als ikik kijk naar mijn eigen (.) tuin
if I look at my own (.) garden
 39 (0.8)
 40 LIE da stuk=

⁴ Given that the note-taker (Marie) is sitting with her back towards the camera, her writing is not directly accessible. The analyses of ex. 2-3 will allow us to describe how talking is intertwined with writing more in detail.

that bit=
 41 AN ja,=
 yes,=
 42 LIE =uit [handen gegeven.
 =handed [over.
 43 AN [awel alles ja
 [well everything yes
 44 (1.2)
 45 LIE t- in huis een stuk
 t- inside the house a bit
 46 (0.5)
 47 MAR ja.=
 yes.=
 48 AN =ja.
 =yes.
 49 (0.5)

Lieve's reformulation (32-33) is received with an immediate display of affiliation (*ja./*'yes.', 34), after which she elaborates on the topic. She initiates a turn containing a generic you (*en als ge- ja./*'and if you- yes.', 36), then accomplishes a self-repair by which she replaces the 'you' with an 'I'. Her contribution at l. 38 (*als ikik kijk naar mijn eigen (.) tuin/*'if I look at my own (.) garden') is thus hearable as grounded on her personal experience. Her turn is recognizably formatted as an *if/then* construction: An's *ja./*'yes,' at l. 41 indeed occurs at the end of the first component of what Lerner (1991) describes as a compound TCU, precisely after the words *dat stuk/*'that bit' (40). An shapes her *ja./*'yes' as a continuer (Schegloff 1982), as the 'continuation' intonation shows, thereby displaying alignment, i.e. supporting the development of the action (Stivers 2008). Lieve latches the second component to An's continuer as she says *uit handen gegeven./*'handed over.' (42). Overlapping with that turn, An responds to Lieve with the words *awel alles ja/*'well everything yes' (43), thereby displaying affiliation. After a 1.2s pause, Lieve adds a further element that she presents as *t- in huis een stuk/*'t- inside the house a bit' (45). Subsequently, both Marie – who is still taking notes at this moment – and An produce agreement tokens (*ja./*'yes.', 47-48). In this excerpt, Lieve can be seen to construct a list with two entries, organized around tasks that she 'handed over' and that concerned her garden (38-40) and not further specified pieces of work inside her house (45). As we have seen, both items of Lieve's list are followed by displays of affiliation (43, 47-48), and indeed, both items appear in the notes that Marie is taking:

1. Welke acties zijn nodig?

- n1 *kosten -> taken die jezelf niet kan uit
n2 handen geven -> aan professionals:
n3 ik kost heel veel geld.
n4 bv. tuinonderhoud, schilderwerken.

1. Which actions are needed?

* *Costs -> tasks that you can't do yourself*
hand over -> to professionals:
costs a lot of money.
e.g. gardening, painting.

Figure 3 Marie's notes

If we compare the linguistic material that eventually materializes in the notes with what the participants said in their interaction, we observe the presence of previously unmentioned units (e.g. *taken die jezelf niet kan*/'tasks that you can't do yourself'; n1), but also elements that occurred in the interaction, such as the expression *uit handen geven*/'(to) hand over' (n1-n2). It is precisely this formulation that the note-taker has introduced herself (4) and that her co-participants repeatedly affiliated with (6-11, 34, 43). Similarly, we find in the notes the two elements that Lieve introduced at l. 38-40 and at l. 45 and that were also responded to with affiliation. However, while Lieve introduces these elements as items of a list, Marie writes them down as 'examples': *bv. tuinonderhoud, schilderwerken*./'e.g. gardening, painting.' (n4). The exemplification of Lieve's contributions is achieved via the initial token *bv.*/'e.g.' and with the nominalization of more complex constructions: *als ik ik kijk naar mijn eigen (.) tuin*/'if I look at my own (.) garden' (38) is rendered as *tuinonderhoud*/'gardening' (n4), whereas *t- in huis en stuk*/'t- inside the house a bit' (45) is rephrased as *schilderwerken*/'painting' (n4), where Marie's interpretation of tasks related to the interior of the house becomes visible.

A first observation emerging from this analysis emphasizes a recurrent practice in collaborative note-taking, which consists of writing down what co-participants have affiliated with in a displayed and embodied way. In this excerpt it is the note-taker herself who orients to the necessity of recording what has been said. We can schematically represent ex. 1a as follows:

1. Formulation of a question (1-2)
2. Formulation of a candidate answer (4)
3. Collective display of affiliation (6-14)
4. Decision to write down (15)

A second observation relates to the interactional history of examples in a written report of a discussion. The analysis has shown that what ends up as a series of examples in notes may originate in an interactional list. In other words, the scriptorial resource consisting in exemplification allows note-takers to record what participants in interaction present as a list. Moreover, the transformation from an interactional list to a series of written examples entails, on the one hand, a structural reduction that note-takers operate on different levels: Syntactical constructions are reduced to lexical noun phrases; marks of subjectivity (as in ‘if I look at my own (.) garden’, 38) are removed; the dynamic, interactional establishment of the recordables is dismissed in favor of a static wording. On the other hand, note-takers may alter the very content of the list items: The note-taker transforms the referentially vague formulation *t- in huis en stuk* /‘t- inside the house a bit’ (45) into *schilderwerken* /‘painting’ (n4). Clearly, the note-taker may write down items as examples that have never been actually uttered in the course of the interaction.

4.2. The progressive emergence of recordable examples

The analysis of ex. 1 has shown a case in which the words ending up as written examples originate from a responsive environment. One participant asks a question, another party provides a candidate answer to which several members of the group respond with a display of affiliation. The subsequent elaboration of the candidate answer crystallizes as examples in the notes. The analysis of the following excerpt illustrates a different interactional history of two written examples. Bert, the facilitator, has assigned the topic ‘treatment’ to a group of five persons and is himself taking part in their discussion throughout the whole fragment. The excerpt starts as Erna informs the other participants about an event that Thibaud, a CFS-sufferer, has organized. While uttering her turn, she employs the word *Irisbrilla*, a proper name that will eventually materialize as an example in the written notes.

Ex. 2a) CFS11112_7 (02:09-04:57)

01 ERN

thibaud heeft zo'n driedaagse georganiseerd voor mensen

thibaud has organized such a three-day event for people

02 met c[vs: (.) s[amen [met die van irisbrilla.
with c[fs: (.) to[gether [with the one from irisbrilla.

03 BER [is't echt? [°ah j[a.°
[is it true? [°oh y[es.

04 JOS [oh: fijn.
[oh: nice.

05 BER euh: hoe noemt ze ze nu wee[r °euh°.°
uh: what is she she called aga[in °uh.°

At l. 01-02 Erna explains that Thibaud has organized an event for CFS-sufferers together with another person from Irisbrilla, which used to be the name of an association taking care of people with CFS. Bert responds to this announcement with a news receipt (03), while Josiane produces a positive assessment (04). At l. 05 Bert produces a first display of forgetfulness, thereby assigning “a position of salience” (Goodwin 1987, 116) to the name of the person that Erna refers to at l. 02 with the word *die*/‘the one’. However, no one orients to Bert’s display of forgetfulness at this point. The interaction continues first with a brief discussion about Thibaud’s e-mail address. During this time, Hilde, the note-taker, momentarily leaves the table to grab some coffee. After 18 seconds, the interaction continues with Bert still displaying his difficulties in retrieving the name he is looking for.

Ex. 2b) CFS11112_7 (02:09-04:57)

(0.4)

32 BER .hh[h irisbrilla- ik ben-

.hh[h irisbrilla- I'm-

34 ERN [.hh ik zie'em morgen ik zal't hem [zeggen.

[.hh I see him tomorrow I will tell [him.

35 BER [ja je mag het hem

[yes you can

36 zeker zeggen. .h euh: (.) irisbrilla wacht ik ben aan het

certainly tell him. .h uh: (.) irisbrilla wait I am

37 denken wie dat dat euh:::::=

thinking who that it uh::::=

Figure •Figure 4

38 WAN =ik heb er ook al van gehoord ja[:.

=I've also already heard of it yes[:.

39 ERN [°ja° [maar da's-

[°yes° [but that's-

40 BER [maar da bestaat

[but that doesn't

41 niet m[eer hé?

exist anymore huh?

42 ERN [da bestaat niet meer da wou [()]

[that doesn't exist anymore (she) wanted [()]

43 BER [ze heeft
[she has

44 [dat stilgelegd.]
[stopped it.]

45 WAN [nee: wa- euh:]:[m
[no: wa- uh:]:[m

46 ERN [da was een gewe[ldige vrouw.
[that was an ama[zing woman.

47 WAN [wacht
[wait

48 WAN ja[:
yes[:

49 BER [ja: ja >ja ja ja ja<
[yes: yes >yes yes yes yes<

At l. 33 Bert reintroduces the name of the association, Irisbrilla, but gets overlapped by Erna, who announces that she is going to see Thibaud the day after and that she will let him know something that Bert and Erna discussed earlier (34). Bert first affiliates with this plan and then recasts the name Irisbrilla, to which he anchors his forgetfulness (*irisbrilla wacht ik ben aan het nadenken wie dat dat euh:::/irisbrilla wait I am thinking who that it uh:::/* (36-37). In this way, Bert displays his momentary lack of knowledge, and at the same time invites participation in his search for the correct name. Indeed, all co-participants orient their gaze towards Bert, as the following figure shows:

Figure 4: Co-participants looking at Bert.

By displaying uncertainty, Bert manages to transform the name search into the main activity of the interactants. The following lines show that the participants engage in the collective solution of the name search by exhibiting and refuting knowledge. Indeed, Wanda, a participant who previously did not participate in the development of this topic, self-selects and announces that she has already heard of ‘it’/er (38). Subsequently, both Erna and Bert

display their understanding of ‘it’/er as referring to the association Irisbrilla, of which they say that it does not exist anymore (39-42). At l. 43-44 Bert reformulates the closing of Irisbrilla as something that ‘she’/ze is responsible for, and by that means reorients the discussion to the so far name-less person. While Wanda displays her engagement in the collective name search by uttering *wacht*/‘wait’ (45, 47), Erna describes that person as a *geweldige vrouw*/‘amazing woman’ (46). Both Wanda and Bert respond to this positive assessment with tokens of agreement (48-49).

At this point of the interaction, the participants have transformed what initially occurred as an accidental piece of information (02) into their main topic of discussion. Subsequently, Wanda will be the one who finds the person’s family name (not reproduced), after which the participants go on searching for her first name. We join the interaction again about 18 seconds later. Hilde, the note-taker, has just returned to the table and is now sitting next to Wanda. In the beginning of the following fragment, Wanda addresses her turns to Hilde (until 102), whereas Erna is talking to Bert.

Ex. 2c) CFS11112_7 (02:09-04:57)

93 WAN [want *daar [is inderdaad*&₁
[because there [is indeed&₁
WAN *.....*-->
94 ERN [toen was die haar man
[back then her husband was
95 heel slecht. had die hartproblemen of [wat.&₂
very bad. he had heart problems or [what.&₂
96 WAN &₁nood aan *schrijf da* ook maar op.*
&₁need for write that down too.
WAN -->*points----*,,,,,,,,,,,,,,*
97 HIL *[wat?
[what?
HIL *grabs pen
98 WAN [.hhh
[.hhh
99 ERN &₂[daar was iets mee toen (tot dat ze-)
&₂[there was something with (him) back then (until she-)
100 WAN [een centrum (.) waar cvs patiën[ten euh:m .h&
[a center (.) where CFS patien[ts uh:m .h&
101 JOS [ja:::
[yes::
102 WAN &kunnen samenko*[men om te relaxen om om. .hh [euh::
&can come toget[her to relax to to. .hh [uh::
HIL *writes-->>
103 ERN [elke els °’t was zoiets°

[elke els °it was something like that°

104 BER **[°els°**
[°els°

105 °ja elk-°
°yes elk-°

106 WAN **elke of zo[iets ja:**
elke or something like that yes:

107 ERN **[°xxxxx° ja:: [zoiets was't.**
[°xxxxx° yes:: [it was something like that.

108 BER **[°k weet het niet meer. Sophie.**
[I don't know anymore. Sophie.

109 **(0.5)**

110 WAN **sophie.**
sophie.

111 ERN **[sophie**
[sophie

112 BER **[sophie heister[kamp is't.**
[sophie heister[kamp it is.

113 ERN **[sophie.**
[sophie.

114 **(0.2)**

Let us first focus on Wanda's turn at l. 93-96, occurring while the participants' main activity consists in finding the first name of the manager of Irisbrilla. At l. 93 Wanda disengages briefly from Erna and Bert and turns to Hilde, who is sitting on her left and who has been temporarily absent. By saying *want daar is inderdaad nood aan*/'because there is indeed need for' (93-96) Wanda relates the topic around which the interaction is currently evolving to the first question the group is expected to address (*Welke acties zijn nodig?*/'Which actions are needed?', see § 3). The establishment of a link between a topic of discussion and the question printed on the form allows Wanda to account for the subsequent directive formulation *schrijf da ook maar op.*/'write that down too.' (96) that she addresses to Hilde. Wanda embodies her directive action with a gesture pointing the paper form lying on the table. The pointing gesture is initiated very early in the turn (93) and reaches its stroke phase (Kendon 2004) as Wanda produces the verb *schrijf*/'write' (96). Hilde immediately grabs the pen, while formulating the open class repair initiator *wat?/°what?°* (97). This repair initiation problematizes, on the one hand, the referentially vague formulation that Wanda has chosen ('write that down too.', 96), on the other hand it allows Hilde to present herself as someone who has momentarily withdrawn from the interaction and who has missed the further development of the discussion for that reason. Wanda then formulates what she regards as 'needed', namely *een centrum (.) waar cvs patiënten euh:m .h kunnen samenkomen om te relaxen*/'a center (.) where CFS

The other participants eventually find the name they have been looking for, Sophie Heisterkamp (112). Once the name is found, the participants go on mentioning different ‘facts’ they know about Sophie Heisterkamp. About 54 seconds later, a longer schisming (Egbert 1993) occurs: While Erna and Bert discuss the whereabouts of Sophie Heisterkamp, Hilde and Wanda continue talking about centers for people with CFS. In the following excerpt we reproduce only the interaction occurring between the latter. Hilde has stopped writing and is now commenting on the need for a specific center dedicated to CFS-patients:

171 HIL (da heb ik ook al) dikwijls gedocht.=
(that I've also already) often thought of.=

172 WAN =ja:=
=yes:=

173 HIL ge zoudt zo eens ergens naartoe moeten gaan voor rust.
you should go somewhere once for peace.

174 WAN *.hhh schrijf *ma- gelijk bijvoorbeeld iris*bril•la.* (.)
.hhh write ma- like for example irisbrilla. (.)

WAN *.....*points-----*,,,,,*
Figure •Figure 5

175 *schrijft *da ma *bij *[bijvoorbeeld *ir•isbrilla.
write that too [for example irisbrilla.
WAN *.....*points*,,,,*
HIL *turns pen-----* *writes "v.b."-->
Figure •Figure 6

176 HIL [wat?
[what?

177 (0.5)*
HIL --->*

178 HIL ir?
179 (0.7)
180 WAN iris (.) brilla.
181 (.)
182 WAN +[maar da bes*taat nie meer hé?=
[but that doesn't exist anymore huh?=
WAN +looks at Hilde's writing hand-->

183 HIL *[i?
HIL *writes "I"--*
184 HIL =i*:ris?
HIL *writes "ris"-->

185 (0.3)

186 WAN ris,
 187 (0.4)
 188 WAN **brilla.***
 HIL -->*
 189 ***(2.5)***
 HIL *writes "Brilla"*
 190 WAN **sophie heister+kamp. (.) hette die ma da- die is**
sophie heisterkamp. (.) was her name but tha- she
 WAN -->+
 191 **daar*mee gestopt.**
stopped with that.
 HIL *writes "Sophie Heisterkamp"-->>

In l. 171-173 Hilde displays her affiliation with what she has just written down, thereby orienting towards a development of the topic. At l. 174 Wanda self-selects and produces a directive action that is similar to the one we observed in excerpt 2c: She starts her turn with a audible inbreath followed by the verb *schrijf* 'write' and simultaneously initiates a pointing gesture. This time, Wanda overtly formulates what she expects Hilde to write down, by saying *gelijk bijvoorbeeld irisbrilla.* 'like for example irisbrilla.' (174). However, Hilde does not immediately respond to Wanda's directive (see Figure 5). This absence of response prompts Wanda to reformulate her instruction at l. 175: During this second formulation, Hilde adopts a writing posture by turning the pen and then actually starts writing (see Figure 6).

Figure 5: Hilde and Wanda looking at each other, Hilde not writing

Figure 6: Hilde starts writing

It is noteworthy that Hilde writes down the information provided by Wanda in different portions, or installments (Clark & Schaefer 1989): Shortly after producing the open class repair initiator *wat?* 'what?' (176), Hilde writes down the abbreviation *v.b.*, which stands for Dutch *voorbeeld* 'example' (whereas the abbreviation *bv.* used in ex. 1 stands for

bijvoorbeeld ‘for example’). As soon as she has completed this part of the writing, Hilde initiates a repair (*ir?*, 178), which Wanda understands as a request for repetition of the association’s name (180). Wanda delivers her reformulation in two segments, separated by a short pause, and starts monitoring Hilde’s writing right after that (182). Hilde writes the first letter of the association’s name while uttering *i* with an upward intonation (183). At l. 184 she produces the unit *i:ris?* again with an interrogative prosody, while at the same time writing down the corresponding graphemes. Wanda, who is attentively monitoring Hilde’s writing, utters *ris*, (186), which can be heard as validating Hilde’s note-taking. While Hilde is ending the annotation of *Iris*, Wanda repeats the following segment *brilla*. (188), which Hilde writes down during the subsequent pause (189). Wanda is still monitoring her neighbor’s actions and as soon as Hilde stops writing she self-selects and adds the name of the person who chaired the association (190-191). A few seconds later, Hilde writes down *Sophie Heisterkamp*.

Figure 7: Hilde’s notes⁵

In this excerpt we observed two instances of writing instructed by the note-taker’s neighbor. In the first case (ex. 2c), Wanda solicits Hilde to write down a statement in reply to the question ‘which actions are needed?’ relative to the topic of ‘treatment’. In the second case (ex. 2d), the same participant instructs Hilde to extend her notes by adding an example. This excerpt contrasts in many respects with what we observed in ex. 1: Firstly, the material that ends up as recordable comes about incidentally (ex. 2a), whereas in ex. 1 it is elicited via a previous question, i.e., sequentially, as a second action. The different sequential environments account for the different interactional treatment: In ex. 1 the initial question makes a

⁵ The words *Iris Brilla* and *Sophie Heisterkamp* are names that we invented for purposes of anonymization and that we inserted in the reproduction of the original note.

(candidate) answer conditionally relevant, and subsequent displays of (dis)affiliation expectable. In contrast, transforming an incidentally produced item of talk into a recordable statement requires much more interactional work. In particular, in ex. 2 the mention of the name *Irisbrilla* (02) gives rise to a sequence in which the participants search for the name of the founder and chair of that association. This shift in activity has consequences in that the participants thereby progressively establish aspects related to *Irisbrilla* as the main topic of conversation (ex. 2b). Secondly, while in ex. 1 the note-taker takes the initiative to write down what has been the object of a collective display of affiliation, in ex. 2 it is the person sitting next to the note-taker who instructs her to write down specific words that emerged in the discussion. Rather than reflecting the materialization of a collectively affiliated-with recordable, this practice leads to recording a statement that one specific participant (Wanda) regards as relevant. Thirdly, while in ex. 1 the items recorded as examples emerge from an interactional, affiliated-with list, in ex. 2 it is the note-taker's neighbor who formulates the recordables *as* being examples (ex. 2d, 174-175). Fourthly, similar practices of dictation unveil discrepant epistemic stances (Heritage & Raymond 2005): While Wanda adopts a knowing stance by dictating and monitoring Hilde's writing, the latter displays her lack of knowledge, for instance by soliciting repetition of the words to be written down (178-184). As the following excerpt will show, note-takers may use specific scriptorial resources precisely to come to terms with displays of epistemic asymmetries between the participants.

4.2. Dealing with epistemic disputes

Knowledge displays and the management of epistemic asymmetries (Heritage & Raymond 2005; Stivers, Mondada & Steensig 2011) are recurrently observable practices in group-work interaction. In the following fragment we examine how a note-taker deals with conflicting displays of knowledge among the participants. The excerpt is taken from the same interaction, in which Hilde is taking notes for the group. Hilde has just reformulated the question 'what actions are needed?' for a participant who has just joined the discussion, Erna, and then rapidly recaps two points that she has already written down (not reproduced). The fragment starts with the candidate answer that Erna subsequently provides:

Ex. 3a) CFS111112_6 (01:25-03:26)

01 ERN

[.hh ik weet nie maar

[.hh I don't know but

02

misschien (0.3) meer internationale samenwerking.

perhaps (0.3) more international collaboration.

03 WAN **ja ja (.) heel zeker**
 yes yes (.) abso[lutely

04 ERN **[omdat in heel wat scandinavische**
 [because in many Scandinavian

05 **landen sta[an gewoon vee:l verder met cvs.**
 countries the[y're mu:ch more advanced with CFS.

06 WAN **[ja**
 [yes

07 WAN **in noorwegen,**
 in Norway,

08 ERN **ja[:**
 ye[s:

09 WAN **[euh hebben *ze een: medicamen[t**
 [uh they have a: medicin[e

HIL *writes "meer internationale samenwerking"-->>

10 ERN **[ja.**
 [yes.

11 WAN **euh: [ontdekt,**
 uh: [discovered,

12 ERN **[(al geweten.)**
 [(knew that.)

13 WAN **.hh rituximab,**

14 **(0.4)**

15 ERN **m[hm**

16 WAN **[.hh en dat is toevallig gekomen**
 [.hh and that happened by chance

The beginning of this episode is similar to what we observed in ex. 1: One participant formulates a question (not reproduced), another participant, Erna, provides a candidate answer (*meer internationale samenwerking*./‘more international collaboration’, 01-02), after which a further participant, Wanda, displays affiliation with that proposal (*ja ja (.) heel zeker*./‘yes yes (.) absolutely’, 03). At l. 04 Erna provides additional explanations with respect to the candidate answer she has just formulated, by saying that research about CFS is much more advanced in ‘Scandinavian countries’ (04-05). Wanda produces an agreement token in overlap with Erna (*ja*./‘yes’, 06) and then further elaborates Erna’s talk: She introduces *noorwegen*./‘Norway’ (07) as a country where they ‘discovered’ (11) a medicine that can be used for treating CFS, and that she names at l. 13 (*rituximab*,). In developing Erna’s talk, Wanda exhibits her knowledge about the topic. Hence, she can be seen to position herself with regard to Erna as someone with an equivalent epistemic stance. The reciprocal and public display of knowledge is clearly at stake also for Erna, who affiliates repeatedly with Wanda’s observations, e.g. at l. 10 (*ja*./‘yes.’) and at l. 12 (*al geweten*./‘knew that.’). While

Wanda elaborates on the research in Norway, Hilde starts taking notes (09): Just like in ex. 1, the note-taker treats the public and repeated display of affiliation as an accountable, observable practice that legitimizes her taking notes. Indeed, it is at this point that Hilde starts recording Erna's candidate answer in precisely the same wording (*meer internationale samenwerking*; see Figure 8 below, n1). Wanda subsequently goes on recounting how medical professionals discovered 'by chance' (16) that Rituximab could be used for treating CFS. We join the interaction 24 seconds later: Hilde has stopped writing during Wanda's long explanation, and Wanda is now talking about the use of Rituximab in her home country:

Ex. 3b) CFS111112_6 (01:25-03:26)

29 WAN .hh da's een medicament, (.) wat ook bij reuma wordt
.hh that's a medicine, (.) that's also used for

30 gebruikt en hier in België .hh (.) sommige: ziekenhuizen
rheumatism and here in Belgium .hh (.) some: hospitals

31 *sommige dokters mogen het gebruiken voor reuma,* .hh maar
some doctors may use it for rheumatism, .hh but

HIL *writes "(vb.)-----"

32 het mocht nie gebruikt worden voor cv[s].
it could not be used for CF[S].

33 HIL [welk land
[which country]

34 was da [zegde?=
*was that [you say?=
35 ERN? [()*

36 WAN =noorwegen.=
=Norway.=

37 ERN =eigenlijk *is 't algemeen de scandinavische
**writes "Noorwegen"-->*
=actually it's in general the Scandinavian

38 lan[den he (ik bedoel) ()
cou[ntries huh (I mean) ()

39 WAN [ja ja maar vooral noorwegen=
[yes yes but especially Norway=

40 ERN =ja.=
=yes.=

41 WAN =*noorwegen j[a.
=Norway y[es.

HIL -->*writes "_ _ _"-->

42 ERN [ja.
[yes.

43 (1.1)*(0.7)
HIL -->*

In l. 29-32 Wanda explains that in Belgium medical professionals may use Rituximab for the treatment of rheumatisms, but not for curing CFS. While Wanda produces her turn, Hilde adds to her previous writing the elements (*vb.* – i.e. an open parenthesis and the abbreviation *vb.* standing for ‘example’. The note-taker can be seen here to organize her *inscriptional space* (Mondada 2011) so as to host additional text that she categorizes as an ‘example’. Hence, this action can be seen as preparatory with respect to Hilde’s self-selection in l. 33-34, where she selects Wanda as a recipient for her question *welk land was da zegde?/‘which country was that you say?’*. Wanda immediately replies with *noorwegen/‘Norway’* (36), but Erna – who had formulated the initial candidate recordable – latches an alternative answer to Wanda’s turn, namely *eigenlijk is ‘t algemeen de scandinavische landen/‘actually it’s in general the Scandinavian countries’* (37-38). At the same time, Hilde starts writing down the name *Noorwegen* on her paper. Wanda and Erna can be seen here to engage in an epistemic dispute, as is also visible in Wanda’s subsequent agreement-prefaced disagreement (Pomerantz 1984) *ja ja maar vooral noorwegen/‘yes yes but especially Norway’* (39). Interestingly, Hilde orients towards this discrepancy of knowledge by adding to her notes four short dashes (41, Figure 8, n2), which can conventionally be read as trailing off a potentially extensible list of examples (see Klein & Grund 1997).

A few seconds later, Wanda orients her gaze on the notes that Hilde has just taken, thereby taking advantage of the physical proximity to the note-taker (see Nissi 2015, 2):

Ex. 3c) CFS111112_6 (01:25-03:26)

```

46          (2.0)#(2.1)
WAN          #looks at Hilde's notes-->
47 WAN      samenw*erking *voorbeeld noor*wegen *schrijf maar# b*ij*
           collaboration example  Norway          just add
WAN          *.....*pts "Noorwegen"*.....*pts blank space*,,*-->
WAN          -->#
48          *(.)* rituximab.
WAN          -->*,*,*
49          (0.5)
50 WAN      r[i
51 MAR      [re?
52          (0.3)
53 WAN      er (.) i *(0.4) te (0.2) i (1.3) ix::: (.) ri (0.3)
           ar (.) i (0.4) tee (0.2) i (1.3) ex::: (.) ri (0.3)
HIL          *-->writes-----*-->
54          *tu (0.2) nee euh* er (.) i (.) te (.) u (0.6) ritu
           tu (0.2) no uh ar (.) i (.) tee (.) u (0.6) ritu

```

```

HIL      -->*-----*
55      *(0.3) xi (0.7) 'n ix: (0.2) i (0.2) mab. (0.2) met
        (0.3) xi (0.7) an ex: (0.2) i (0.2) mab. (0.2) with
HIL      *writes-->>
56      een be:.
        a bee:.
57      (2.2)

```

At l. 47 Wanda starts reading aloud Hilde's notes, which at this point already contain the elements *samenwerking voorbeeld noorwegen*/'collaboration example Norway'. Her reading is also embodied by a pointing gesture oriented towards the word *Noorwegen*. Her finger then moves towards a blank space on the sheet of paper, as she utters the words *schrijf maar bij*/'just add (in writing)' (47). Hence, in this case Wanda's attentive monitoring of Hilde's note-taking allows her to check the notes for completeness and to instruct the note-taker to add a further element, namely the name of the medicine *rituximab*. (48). The actual transformation of this piece of talk into a written unit is highly collaborative and involves practices of dictation, monitoring and repair (50-56), the latter being also visible in the actual note, where some letters have been overwritten (n2).

n1 Meer internationale samenwerking (vb. Noorwegen
n2
n3 Ritaxinab

-	<i>More international collaboration (ex. Norway</i>	----
	<i>Rituximab.</i>	

Figure 8: Hilde's notes

The analysis of this excerpt allowed us, on the one hand, to corroborate our earlier point about displays of affiliation being one practice that note-takers orient to when deciding not only *what* they should write down but also *when*. On the other hand, we were able to show that things that end up as examples in the notes are treated as highly relevant aspects of the topics discussed as the interaction unfolds. Indeed, while *noorwegen*/‘Norway’ (n1) appears in the notes as ‘just’ an exemplification of the request for more international collaboration, in the course of the interaction it is around the name of this country that Wanda and Erna have their epistemic dispute. Notably, a trace of this divergence is visible in the notes. Indeed, the four dashes (n2) are a scriptorial resource that the note-taker employs in order to deal with the epistemic discordance that she has just witnessed. Rather than completely dismissing Erna’s

alternative answer ('in general the Scandinavian countries', 37-38), Hilde adds a referentially void item, namely four dashes, as a further example.

4.4. The adjustment of individual notes by multiple note-takers

With the last excerpt we turn to a more complex case: Whereas in the previously analyzed groups only one participant was taking notes, the following episode is taken from a discussion on the topic 'costs and treatment' in which several participants are taking notes. The group consists of five participants, three of whom have been taking notes 'privately', i.e. – differently from what we observed in the previous excerpts – without orienting to the necessity of a collective display of affiliation. At a certain point in the interaction, one of the note-takers, Loes, asks Veerle to read out loud what she has written down so far. Veerle reads the different items on her notes aloud, introducing each of them with a *dan*/'then'-prefaced format. Let us first look at her notes:

1. Welke acties zijn nodig?

n1 *kosten v. productie v. voedings-supplementen*
 n2 *Bundelen v. ervaringen v. CFS-patiënten*
 n3 *Terugkijken in kosten v. voedings-supplementen*
 n4 *Terugkijken meer therapieën*
 n5 *Sparten terugkijken (volledig)*

Costs and research -> food supplements
Collecting experiences " from CFS patients
Contributions to costs food supplements
Pay back more therapies
Pay back sporting (fully)

Figure 9: Veerle's notes

In the final text, each item occupies one line. Veerle reads them out following the vertical order in which they appear in her notes. Before focusing on the unit between parentheses (*volledig*/fully, n5), we briefly clarify how Veerle accomplishes her reading. The following fragment relates to 1. n2 of her notes:

Ex. 4a) CFS211115_3 (24:43-27:12)

01 VEE euh:: dan euh bundelen van ervaringen *(.) euh van de
 uh:: then uh collecting experiences (.) uh with the

LOE *writes-->>

02 **voedingssupplementen °°euh f-°° bij de mensen,**
 food supplements °°uh f-°° from the people,

03 **(0.4)**

04 LOE **ah [ja**
 oh [yes

Among other things, this fragment illustrates one way in which co-participants may respond to Veerle's reading. At l. 04 Loes formulates an *ah ja*/'oh yes': In this way, Loes exhibits, on the one hand, her understanding of Veerle's turn as corresponding to one list item, on the other hand she affiliates with that item as being legitimately recorded. Furthermore, Loes starts writing down in the midst of Veerle's ongoing turn (01). This excerpt allows us to highlight again that displays of affiliation are fundamental practices for participants engaged in taking notes. Indeed, in cases in which affiliation is not displayed right away, as in the subsequent excerpt, the proposed item can be treated as problematic. The following fragment shows how Veerle's co-participants respond to the item retrievable at l. n5 of her notes:

42 VEE [DAN sporten terugbetalen hebbe kik ook
[THEN paying back sporting I have also
43 MAR [dus dan moet ik ()
[thus then I have to ()
44 (0.2)
45 VEE [voor mensen-
[for people-
46 LOE [(wa hebde;watte)?
[(what do you have;what)?
47 VEE sporten.
sporting.
48 (0.3)
49 LOE sporten.
sporting.
50 VEE .hh [allez ik krijg nu wel een] (.) vijftien euro, .hhh&
.hh [well I really get now some] (.) fifteen euros, .hhh&
51 MAR [ja:: ja sporten.]
[yes:: yes sporting.]
52 VEE &euh[::]
&uh[::]
53 TOM [van de zieken[kas ja.
[from health insu[rance yes.

Ex. 4c) CFS211115 3 (24:43-27:12)

Marleen has just explained to her co-participants that she relates sporting to yoga and relaxation. At l. 113 she displays uncertainty about how to write down her specific understanding of the term ‘sporting’. In response to that, Veerle recasts what she has written down with the words *ja ik heb sporten terugbetalen.* / ‘yes I have pay back sporting.’ (115) – a construction which is syntactically specular with respect to her first formulation at l. 42 (*DAN*

sporten terugbetalen hebbe kik ook), but which encompasses both the words *sporten terugbetalen* as they figure in her notes (n5) and their presentation as something that ‘she has’ (*ik heb, hebbe kik*). While looking again at her notes, Veerle finds them to be incomplete: Indeed, at l. 117 she introduces the item *volledig*/‘fully’ with an emphatic prosody, thereby formulating what she is going to add to the text at the same moment. As l. n5 of the notes shows, she adds the word ‘fully’ between brackets, while producing an account (*s- kost al geld genoeg*./‘s- costs already enough money.’ (119). Note that Loes depicts the word *volledig*/‘fully’ as inappropriate when she says that she ‘does not know’ whether a full reimbursement can be expected (121-123). Both Loes and Veerle hence treat that idea as a laughable (121-123).

In the analysis of this excerpt we focused first on a specific use of notes that we did not observe in the previous fragments: Here, the participants orient to Veerle’s notes as an accountable record of the discussion-so-far. As Veerle recaps her notes, she offers language material to her co-participants on which they can draw to update their own notes. But by reading her own notes she is also verifying their correctness and completeness. The latter activity becomes clearly visible when Veerle adds the unit (*volledig*)/‘(fully)’ to a line of her notes which reads *Sporten terugbetalen*/‘Pay back sporting’. On the one hand, this practice allows us to observe the extensibility of written text produced in interactional settings. On the other hand, it documents a further occurrence of parentheses in a written document. Again, in a conventional reading of l. n4 (*Sporten terugbetalen (volledig)*/‘Pay back sporting (fully)’), the element put between brackets could be understood as being aside of the main point, as a less important piece of information. However, if we look at the interactional environment in which this element has been written down, we can provide a situated, contextualized description of the contingencies that allowed for the production of this piece of text. Firstly, emerging as an add-on, the element (*volledig*)/‘(fully)’ is added ‘late’ to an existing portion of text. Due to the linearity of written language, positioning (*volledig*)/‘(fully)’ at the end of an existing line appears to be the most economical ways to extend that line of text. Secondly, there is syntax: In Dutch, the words *Sporten terugbetalen*/‘Pay back sporting’ constitute a grammatically complete sentence. Additional adverbial expressions would conventionally be placed in second position, resulting in sentences such as *Sporten volledig terugbetalen*. Seen this way, the linear constraint of written text production conflicts with both the constraints provided by the inscriptional space and with the constraints of canonical sentence construction. Hence, by using parentheses when adding the element *volledig* to the existing

text line, Veerle can be seen to orient towards different kinds of constraints. In other words, the extension (*volledig*) appears to be a practical solution that Veerle adopts to cope both with the linearity of the written word and with rules of grammar. Thirdly, the response that Veerle gets from Loes as she formulates the element *volledig* (137) might also account for the use of parentheses: Indeed, both Loes and Veerle end up treating that word as a laughable. This might provide additional grounds for Veerle to write down that word between parentheses.

5. Conclusion

The analyses above aimed at describing practices of joint note-taking in a mutual-help group for CFS-sufferers. We pursued the question of how interactants collaboratively constitute recordables, i.e. language material to be placed on written record, and focused on two widely used scriptorial practices, namely the use of examples and parentheses. We have shown that note-takers orient to the collective display of affiliation to identify recordables and to legitimize their writing. By recurrently displaying affiliation, participants orient to the written notes as a report of their discussion, documenting the shared, affiliated-with considerations of the group. Differences have emerged with regard to the participatory involvement of note-takers, who may write silently while the co-participants continue the discussion (ex. 1), who may be instructed to take notes (ex. 2, 3), or who may request reformulations of what has been said in order to complete their notes (ex. 3).

We observed different kinds of interactional histories that lead to putting in writing a recordable. Ex. 1 and 3 documented cases in which recordables originate from a responsive environment: A participant formulates a question, another participant offers a candidate answer. If that answer is followed by a collective display of affiliation, then it may legitimately be written down (for similar cases see Mondada, this issue). What ends up as a recordable may also start as an incidental piece of information that participants gradually transform into a salient topic of conversation (ex. 2).

With regard to the use of examples and parentheses, our analyses confirm and at the same time contradict the conventional readings of these scriptorial resources as described in the literature, where they are treated as serving similar purposes, namely as devices allowing for the introduction of additional information of secondary importance.⁶ Indeed, the idea that parentheses and tokens such as *e.g.* are generally used to add ‘supplementary information’ to

⁶ For instance, with regard to parentheses Pétillon-Bouchon (2002: 78) observes that these are generally seen as adding language units that are ‘accessory’ and ‘suppressible’ (“[...] la parenthèse semble caractérisée par deux traits définitoires [...]: l’accessoirité et la suppressibilité.”).

a text (see § 1) is in line with some of the cases we observed: In ex. 2 and 3 the note-taker's neighbor overtly uses the verb *bijschrijven* 'to add in writing' in the instructions she formulates; in ex. 4 one participant reads her notes aloud and finds them incomplete, and then introduces additional material that she puts in brackets. At odds with conventional readings, our analyses have also shown that examples and parentheses are mainly used for recording aspects of the discussion at hand that participants treat as particularly relevant – and certainly not as subsidiary information. Furthermore, we have shown that these scriptorial resources may serve as practical solutions for the note-takers' problem of putting in writing various kinds of interactional events: In ex. 1 the note-taker transforms an interactional list into a series of written examples, which she renders as lexical noun phrases that may or may not reflect the wording used by the interactants. Ex. 2 shows a case in which a participant instructs the note-taker to write down an item *as* an example, thereby dictating the exact wording of the recordable. Conversely, in ex. 3 it is the note-taker who identifies a potential recordable, which she categorizes as an example and which she starts writing down by opening a parenthesis. Her request for clarification gives rise to an epistemic dispute between two participants, with which she comes to terms by employing a further scriptorial resource, i.e. by using four dashes. With the last excerpt we showed that parentheses may be used for expanding the notes while checking their completeness and correctness.

By examining the interactional, multiactive setting in which notes are produced, we described the procedural aspects of note-taking. We have shown that taking notes cannot be understood as a mere transformation of talk into written text. Hence, by describing the *legitimate history* (Garfinkel 1967, 114) of notes, this article contributes to our understanding of written reports as an interactional, situated and collective product.

References

- Arminen, Ilkka. 1998. *Therapeutic Interaction: A Study of Mutual Help in the Meetings of Alcoholic Anonymous*. Helsinki: Finnish Foundation for Alcoholic Studies.
- Bülow, Pia H. 2004. "Sharing Experiences of Contested Illness by Storytelling." *Discourse & Society* 15 (1): 33–53.
- Cislaru, Georgeta (ed). 2015. *Writing(s) at the Crossroads*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Clark, Herbert H., and Edward F. Schaefer. 1989. "Contributing to Discourse." *Cognitive Science* 13: 259–294.
- De Gaulmyn, Marie-Madeleine, Robert Bouchard, and Alan Rabatel (eds). 2001. *Le processus rédactionnel. Écrire à plusieurs voix*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- De Stefani, Elwys, and Anne-Sylvie Horlacher. 2008. "Topical and Sequential Backlinking in a French Radio Phone-in Program. Turn Shapes and Sequential Placements." *Pragmatics* 18 (3): 381–406.

- De Stefani, Elwys, and Paul Sambre. Submitted. "De la définition aux pratiques définitoires: l'interaction autour du syndrome de fatigue chronique dans un groupe d'entraide", *Langages*.
- Egbert, Maria. 1993. *Schisming: The Transformation from a Single Conversation to Multiple Conversations*. PhD Thesis. University of California: Los Angeles.
- Fukuda, Keiji et al. 1994. The Chronic Fatigue Syndrome: A Comprehensive Approach to its Definition and Study." *Annals of Internal Medicine* 121: 953–959.
- Garfinkel, Harold. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gill, Virginia Teas, and Felicia Roberts. 2013. "Conversation Analysis in Medicine." In *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, ed. by Jack Sidnell, and Tanya Stivers, 575–592. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodwin, Charles. 1987. "Forgetfulness as an Interactional Resource." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50 (29): 115–130.
- Grue, Jan. 2014a. "A Garden of Forking Paths: A Discourse Perspective on 'Myalgic Encephalomyelitis' and 'Chronic Fatigue Syndrome'." *Critical Discourse Studies* 11 (1): 35–48.
- Grue, Jan. 2014b. "Technically Disabled, Ill for all Practical Purposes? Myalgic Encephalopathy/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome Discourse in Norway." *Disability & Society* 29 (2): 213–223.
- Guisse, Jennifer, Chris McVittie, and Andy McKinlay. 2010. "A Discourse Analytic Study of ME/CFS (Chronic Fatigue Syndrome) Sufferers' Experiences of Interactions with Doctors." *Journal of Health Psychology* 15 (3): 426–435.
- Guisse, Jennifer, Sue Widdicombe, and Andy McKinlay. 2007. "'What is it Like to Have ME?': The Discursive Construction of ME in Computer-mediated Communication and Face-to-face Interaction." *Health: An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Social Study of Health, Illness and Medicine* 11 (1): 87–108.
- Hepburn, Alexa, and Galina B. Boden. 2013. "The Conversation Analytic Approach to Transcription." In *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, ed. by Jack Sidnell, and Tanya Stivers, 57–76. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Heritage, John, and Geoffrey Raymond. 2005. "The Terms of Agreement: Indexing Epistemic Authority and Subordination in Assessment Sequences." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68: 15–38.
- Horton-Salway, Mary. 2001. "Narrative Identities and the Management of Personal Accountability in Talk about ME: A Discursive Psychology Approach." *Journal of Health Psychology* 6 (2): 247–259.
- Horton-Salway, Mary. 2002. "Bio-psycho-social Reasoning in GP's Case Narratives: The Discursive Construction of ME Patients' Identities." *Health. An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Social Study of Health, Illness and Medicine* 6 (4): 401–421.
- Jakobs, Eva-Maria, and Daniel Perrin (eds). 2014. *Handbook of Writing and Text Production*. Boston/Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Jefferson, Gail. 2004. "Glossary of Transcript Symbols with an Introduction." In *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*, ed. by Gene H. Lerner, 13–31. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kendon, Adam. 2004. *Gestures: Visible Action as Utterance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Klein, Wolf Peter, and Marthe Grund, M. 1997. "Die Geschichte der Auslassungspunkte: Zu Entstehung, Form und Funktion der deutschen Interpunktion." *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 25: 24–44.
- Knauth, Bettina, and Stephan Wolff. 1991. "Zur Fruchtbarkeit der Konversationsanalyse für die Untersuchung schriftlicher Texte." *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 20 (1): 36–49.

- Komter, Martha L. 2006. "From Talk to Text: The Interactional Construction of a Police Record." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 39 (3): 201–228.
- Lerner, Gene H. 1991. "On the Syntax of Sentences-in-progress." *Language in Society* 20: 441–458.
- Lindström, Anna, and Marja-Leena Sorjonen. 2013. "Affiliation in Conversation." In *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, ed. by Jack Sidnell, and Tanya Stivers, 350–369. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Lund, Kristine, Gregory Dyke, and Jean-Jacques Girardot. 2009. "Multimodal Reformulation during Shared Synchronous Note-taking and its Potential Pedagogical Consequences for Teachers and Students." In *Actes du colloque "Echanger pour apprendre en ligne"*, Grenoble, 4-6 June 2009, ed. by Develotte, Christine, François Mangenot, and Elke Nissen. <http://epal.u-grenoble3.fr/actes/pdf/epal2009-lund-et-al.pdf> (accessed 28 October 2015).
- Meehan, Albert J. 1986. "Record-keeping Practices in the Policing of Juveniles." *Urban Life* 15 (1): 70–102.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2011. "The Interactional Production of Multiple Spatialities within a Participatory Democracy Meeting." *Social Semiotics* 21 (2): 289–316.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2014. "The Temporal Orders of Multiactivity: Operating and Demonstrating in the Surgical Theatre." In *Multiactivity in Social Interaction: Beyond Multitasking*, ed. by Haddington, Pentti, Tiina Keisanen, Lorenza Mondada, and Maurice Nevile, 33–75. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Mulkay, Michael. 1986. "Conversations and Texts." *Human Studies* 9 (2/3): 303–321.
- Nissi, Riikka. 2015. "From Entry Proposals to a Joint Statement: Practices of Shared Text Production in Multiparty Meeting Interaction." *Journal of Pragmatics* 79: 1–21.
- Pétillon-Boucheron, Sabine. 2002. *Les détours de la langue: Étude sur la parenthèse et le tiret double*. Paris/Louvain: Peeters.
- Pitsch, Karola. 2007. "Koordinierung von parallelen Aktivitäten. Zum Anfertigen von Mitschriften im Schulunterricht." In *Koordination. Analysen zur multimodalen Interaktion*, ed. by Reinhold Schmitt, 411–446. Tübingen: Narr.
- Pomerantz, Anita. 1984. "Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: Some Features of Preferred/Dispreferred Turn Shapes." In *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, ed. by J. Maxwell Atkinson, and John Heritage, 57–101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Renkema, Jan. 2008. *Schrijfwijzer*. Den Haag: Sdu Uitgevers.
- Sachs, Lisbeth. 2001. "From a Lived Body to a Medicalized Body: Diagnostic Transformation and Chronic Fatigue Syndrome." *Medical Anthropology* 19 (4): 299–317.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. 1974. "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn Taking for Conversation." *Language* 50: 696–735.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1982. "Discourse as an Interactional Achievement: Some Uses of 'uh huh' and other Things that Come Between Sentences." In *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*, ed. by Deborah Tannen, 71–93. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Steensig, Jakob, and Paul Drew. 2008. "Introduction: Questioning and Affiliation/Disaffiliation In interaction." *Discourse Studies* 10 (1): 5–15.
- Stivers, Tanya. 2008. "Stance, Alignment, and Affiliation during Storytelling: When Nodding is a Token of Affiliation." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41 (1): 31–57.

- Stivers, Tanya, Lorenza Mondada, and Jakob Steensig. 2011. "Knowledge, Morality and Affiliation in Social Interaction." In *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*, ed. by Tanya Stivers, Lorenza Mondada, and Jakob Steensig, 3–24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- The Chicago Manual of Style*. www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/ (accessed 30 October 2015).
- The Oxford English Dictionary*, <http://www.oed.com/> (accessed 30 October 2015).
- Tucker, Ian. 2004. "'Stories' of Chronic Fatigue Syndrome: An Exploratory Discursive Psychological Analysis." *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 1: 153–167.
- Tusting, Karin. 2010. "Eruptions and Interruptions: Managing Tensions between Writing and other Tasks in a Textualized Childcare Workplace." In *The Anthropology of Writing: Understanding Textually Mediated Worlds*, ed. by David Barton, and Uta Papen, 67–98. Continuum: London.
- Van Charldorp, Tessa C. 2014. "'What Happened?' From Talk to Text in Police Interrogations." *Language & Communication* 36: 7–24.
- Van Dale Groot woordenboek van de Nederlandse taal*. Utrecht/Antwerpen: Van Dale.
- Wojcik, Woitek, David Armstrong, and Richard Kanaan. 2011. "Chronic Fatigue Syndrome: Labels, Meanings and Consequences." *Journal of Psychosomatic Research* 70 (6): 500–504.