Learning to communicate: Managing multiple strands of participation in driving lessons

E. De Stefani (KU Leuven), A.-D. Gazin (Independent researcher)

To be published in: *On the road. Communicating Traffic*. Special Issue of *Language and Communication* edited by E. De Stefani, A. Deppermann and M. Broth (2018).

Abstract:

This article examines how trainee drivers and instructors engage in interaction with each other and with other entities partaking in traffic. Drawing on Goffman's notion of *participation*, the article argues that three strands of participation are at stake, i.e. *intra-unit participation* (taking place within the car), *inter-unit participation* (between traffic participants) and *cross-unit participation* (e.g. between drivers of different cars). The analysis of how trainee drivers and instructors deal with unexpected traffic events shows that these multiple strands of participation are intertwined in a way that is sensitive to the temporal, spatial and praxeological contingences at hand.

Keywords: Driving lessons, Strands of participation, Interaction, Traffic, Italian, Conversation analysis

1. Introduction

In many countries, driver education follows a highly formalized policy, aiming at providing novice drivers with a number of interrelated competences, such as knowledge of the traffic code, practical car operation, etc. Driving lessons are the locus in which trainee drivers learn to apply the acquired knowledge to everyday traffic situations. Recent interactionally oriented work has studied driving lessons as a setting of instruction, strongly focusing on how instructions are produced and responded to (De Stefani and Gazin, 2014; Gazin, 2015; Deppermann, 2015, 2018a, 2018b; Broth et al. 2017, 2018; Levin et al. 2017; De Stefani, 2018). Interaction between drivers and passengers has also been investigated in ordinary driving (Laurier et al., 2008, 2012; Haddington and Keisanen, 2009; Haddington, 2010, 2012, 2013). In-car interaction between multiple participants (occupying front and rear seats, e.g. families with children) has been addressed (Goodwin and Goodwin, 2012; Keisanen, 2012; Noy, 2012) especially in terms of how participants organize multiple courses of action (Mondada, 2012). These studies have not only revealed the complexity of in-car interaction—in which participants have to cope with the spatial restrictions imposed by the “iron cage” (Urry, 2004)—, they have also shown how participants continuously monitor simultaneously occurring activities inside and outside the car and how drivers adjust their traffic behavior to the conduct of other road users. How instructional sequences occurring in the car relate to what ends up as the car's observable traffic-conduct has so far received less attention. Similarly, how drivers communicate with other traffic participants has scarcely been addressed from an interactional perspective (but see Haddington and Rauniomaa, 2014; Deppermann, this issue; Deppermann et al., 2018; Laurier, this issue). Driving lessons allow us to observe how participants manage their engagement in different, though interconnected courses of action, which we might be tempted to identify as pertaining to separate “participation frameworks” (Goffman, 1981; Goodwin and Goodwin, 2004). Pursuing research on participation, this article focuses on how participants practically organize their engagement in what we call different *strands of participation*. Our analyses will demonstrate that, in driving lessons, three interrelated strands come into play: These are visible in the interaction between (i) the instructor and the trainee driver, (ii) the car (as a traffic participant) and other road users, and (iii) inhabitants of different cars: whereas in ordinary car rides the driver can often be seen to assume the responsibility for the car's traffic behavior (e.g. by communicating with other drivers; see Laurier, this issue); in the data analyzed here, it is mainly the driving instructor—sitting in the passenger seat—who interacts with other traffic participants. Being a competent driver comprises the ability to coordinate one's engagement in these different strands of participation. Although these are interrelated, they rely on dissimilar abilities and resources. In-car interaction (i) is mainly achieved through talk and multimodal conduct, and participants alternate instructional talk with bouts of ordinary conversation (see De

Stefani and Horlacher, 2018). Interaction between traffic participants (ii) is regulated by the traffic code. Driving instructors are normatively expected to be experts in traffic behavior, i.e. to detain a higher epistemic status (Heritage, 2012) than trainee drivers. The instructor's k+ (knowing) status is related to specific responsibilities, rights and obligations—such as the right to instruct, to reprimand the trainee driver, but also the obligation to ensure the safe progression of the journey. Trainee drivers, instead, are learning, among other things, how to put into practice their theoretical knowledge of the traffic code in everyday traffic. In contrast, interaction between inhabitants of different cars (iii) is neither regulated by the traffic code, nor is it explicitly taught during the driving lessons we collected. It is however an experience of “traffic civility” (Haddington and Raumiomaa, 2014; Laurier, this issue) largely documented in ordinary driving and a crucial ability of competent drivers. Driving lessons are hence a locus in which different concerns are made relevant and prioritized while the car moves through space, such as teaching/learning how to drive, respecting the traffic code, ensuring a safe journey, identifying and avoiding risky traffic configurations, etc.

In order to examine the participants' engagement in the different strands of participation, we focus on situations in which in-car participants need to rapidly respond to potentially hazardous traffic configurations. The decision about what to do next is based on an instant analysis of the current infrastructural restrictions and possibilities, in order to find a safe pathway through traffic. What we address here are thus potentially problematic, fleeting encounters with other traffic participants. In such circumstances, we observe how in-car interaction is consequential for how traffic participants interact with each other. In this way, we document a less investigated aspect of driver education, namely how trainee drivers learn to communicate with other road users (see Broth et al., 2018, this issue). By doing so, we contribute to ongoing research on participation and intersubjectivity in the fields of conversation analysis and interactional linguistics. This article is also a contribution to research in traffic safety: As Underwood (2007: 1237) states, “[t]o be safe on the roads, one needs to be predictable to other road users [...]” In this sense, learning to act as an accountable road user and learning to anticipate others' actions amount to acquiring specific communicational competences.

2. Data and method

The article is based on a corpus of seven video-recorded driving lessons, with a duration of about 60 minutes each, recorded in the Italian-speaking part of Switzerland. The lessons are given by two different instructors and taken by seven trainee drivers. We have transcribed talk following the Jeffersonian conventions (Jefferson, 2004), whereas multimodal conduct has been transcribed according to Mondada (2014). The participants are identified with the following labels:

INST: instructor
TDVR: trainee driver
TCAR: tuition car, inhabited by TDVR and INST
OCAR: other car, engaging in interaction with TCAR
ODVR: driver of OCAR
PEDE: pedestrian

The method of investigation is conversation analysis (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974), which we use for the analysis of talk as well as for the participants' embodied conduct (Deppermann, 2013). The focus on participation in traffic is indebted to Goffman's (1963, 1971) work on interaction in public space and elaborates on recent work on mobile settings of interaction (Haddington et al., 2013). Mobility is indeed consequential not only for the ways in which participants interact with each other, but also for how we should conceptualize a *participant* and the different strands of *participation* in which they engage.

3. What is a traffic participant?

Traffic participants continuously interact with each other (pedestrians, bicycles, cars, etc.) as they navigate through space. In many cases, such fleeting encounters run smoothly, e.g. when two cars

travel in opposite directions on a two-lane road. On occasion, however, “mobile encounters” (Haddington and Rauniomaa, 2014: 177) require a more stringent adjustment of each participant’s traffic behavior—e.g. in the case of traffic congestion, at complex intersections or when a road is too narrow to allow traffic participants to safely pass. In the latter case, participants engage in a brief encounter and work towards terminating that encounter in a safe and timely manner.

Being mechanical and technological artifacts, cars are controlled by humans, who may use semiotic resources provided by the vehicle (e.g. indicators, horns) and who are constantly deciding on and implementing the car’s behavior in traffic.¹ However, what is visible to other traffic participants is first and foremost the car’s actions—whereas observing in-car activity is only possible in spatial proximity. That being so, cars are regarded—by other traffic participants—as accountable agents in collective traffic. Participation in traffic is a social achievement among co-present mobile entities, which can be described as “vehicular units” (Goffman, 1971) fleetingly engaging in interaction, thereby becoming “participation units” (Goffman, 1963)—and it is precisely the social dimension of traffic that appears to be a major problem in the development of autonomous vehicles, which are expected to “behave in socially appropriate ways” (Vinkhuyzen and Cefkin, 2016: 523). Contemporary traffic involves a plethora of different kinds of participants (pedestrians, cars, skaters, etc.), with distinct material constraints and affordances. If we want to understand how participation is achieved in ordinary traffic, it is necessary to clarify the terminology we use for the purposes of this article. Drawing on Goffman’s (1963, 1971) notion of “unit,” we distinguish three strands of participation that are at stake in traffic interaction:

- (i) *intra-unit participation* is observable within a single vehicular unit. In the case of driving lessons, this strand of participation appears as in-car interaction between the instructor and the trainee driver. The term also applies, for instance, to participation between individuals who recognizably cross a street as a group (e.g. a family). These are “mobile formations” (McIlvenny et al., 2014), whose movement through space is a collective, practical achievement reflexively accomplished by each member of the group. Such formations can also be transient groupings, or “temporary congregations” (Jensen, 2010: 342), for instance when a group of individuals crosses a zebra crossing and dissolves once the other side of the road is reached. In ordinary traffic, we observe thus both fleeting mobile formations and more stable mobile units (such as cars, bicycles, but also a walking couple, etc.). While vehicular units take part in traffic as “singles” (Goffman, 1971), they may incorporate one or more individuals: the minimal requirement for the unit “car” is a driver, but other passengers may be co-present; similarly, a couple or group of pedestrians may be recognizable as a single vehicular unit that is underway together, with a common trajectory.
- (ii) *inter-unit participation* concerns the interaction between different vehicular units in traffic. It is this kind of interaction that the traffic code regulates, e.g. when stipulating who has right of way in a given traffic configuration. This strand of participation may be exemplified, for instance, by a car halting at a zebra crossing and a pedestrian crossing the street.
- (iii) *cross-unit participation* takes place across the boundaries of vehicular units, for instance car drivers interacting with each other visually. The following illustration is taken from Haddington and Rauniomaa (2014): A car stops before a group of persons (one grown-up and five children) crossing the street. While they are crossing, the driver—who has a child as a passenger—and the adult in the group of pedestrians wave at each other, as the following figure shows:

¹ This applies, of course, to traditional cars, whereas in the case of autonomous vehicles the car’s behavior is determined algorithmically (see Vinkhuyzen and Cefkin, 2016).

Figure 1: Driver and grown-up pedestrian waving at each other (Haddington and Rauniomaa, 2014: 179)

In ordinary traffic, waving at each other is a conventional way of expressing gratitude (see excerpt 3, 5 and Laurier, this issue). As this example shows, it is also a way of displaying who is accountable and takes the responsibility of the vehicular unit's traffic behavior: in this case, it is the grown-up pedestrian and the grown-up car driver.

The analytical section of this article will show how these different strands of participation are made relevant in fleeting traffic encounters. More specifically, we show how in-car interaction is consequential for inter-unit participation and how intra-unit participation reflexively relies on the constant monitoring and anticipation of other vehicular units' traffic behavior. If social situations are an "environment of monitoring possibilities" (Goffman, 1963: 243), then traffic interaction epitomizes social life on the road, allowing us to appreciate the organizational complexity of an ordinary activity for many pedestrians, cyclists, drivers, etc.

4. Decision-making on the road

In order to safely move through traffic, drivers have to display to each other their trajectories and upcoming actions, and cars provide specific facilities (such as indicators) for this purpose. At the same time, drivers have to anticipate other traffic participants' upcoming actions, which may be more or less foreseeable (see Deppermann, this issue). Some traffic events (e.g. a sudden full breaking of the vehicle in front) require immediate response in order to safely pursue the journey and drivers have to make rapid decisions on the basis of what they witness and of the infrastructural constraints and possibilities. In the analyses below, we focus on situations in which in-car participants have to rapidly decide on what their car's next traffic action is going to be. Instructors and trainee drivers may have convergent or divergent orientations with regard to how to respond to another traffic participant's action. We first illustrate a case in which they converge in their decision regarding the next traffic action (§ 4.1), and then examine a case of divergent orientation (§ 4.2). In these analyses the focus will be on how intra-unit participation is intertwined with inter-unit participation. Finally, we discuss two cases in which a third strand of participation, namely cross-unit participation, is observable, and where the instructor displays epistemic authority (§ 4.3).

4.1. Convergent orientation towards the "next action"

At the beginning of the first fragment, the driving school car has just crossed an intersection. Another car (OCAR), visible on the road ahead, appears to momentarily halt on the side of the road, with the brake lights on (Fig. 2):

Figure 2: OCAR ahead halts on the road.

Excerpt 1a (15sg2BM2; 26:02–26:22)

```

01      # (2.0)
    fig  #Fig. 2
02 INST ci stiamo gio?
        is there space for us Gio?
03      (0.5)
04 TDVR sì.
        yes.

```

OCAR's brake lights are a publicly witnessable display of its current traffic behavior: OCAR is braking, and eventually halting, on the traffic lane in which TCAR is driving. INST orients to that behavior in l. 02, as he asks TDVR whether there is enough space (for TCAR to pass on OCAR's side). TDVR replies with a 'yes' (l. 04) and INST starts his subsequent turn with an instruction inviting TDVR to orient his gaze to the bottom of the road (l. 06 below). Inadvertently, the passenger of the car ahead opens the right door, thereby creating an obstacle on TCAR's trajectory:

Excerpt 1b (15sg2BM2; 26:02–26:22)

```

05      % (0.3) %
    INST %.....%-->
06 INST %cerca bene in #*fo:ndo%* °n-°# ffrena, (0.2) e
        search well at the bottom °n-° brake, (0.2) and
    INST -->%points forward-%,,,,,%
    TDVR          *right foot from gas pedal to brake pedal*
    TCAR          fslows down-->
    fig          #Fig. 3          #Fig. 4
07      giù frizione >giù frizione giù frizione.<
        clutch down >clutch down clutch down.<
08      (1.8)
09 INST metti-f (.) stai giù colla frizione metti la prima.
        go- (.) stay down with the clutch go into first.
    TCAR          -->fstands still

```

Figure 3: OCAR's right door is opening

Figure 3 shows INST still engaged in producing his initial instruction (l. 06), with a pointing gesture oriented to the end of the road. The figure captures the scene just when INST starts producing the word *f:ondo* 'bottom' (l. 06). At the same moment, TDVR moves his right foot from the gas pedal to

the brake pedal, as a response to what he is witnessing. Shortly after, INST interrupts his ongoing turn and produces a new instruction, using the imperative verb form *frena*, ‘brake’ (l. 06):

Figure 4: OCAR’s right door is open

In this case, both in-car participants converge in displaying which next action is appropriate in the situation at hand, with TDVR’s embodied response slightly preceding INST’s instruction to brake. Indeed, TCAR slows down and eventually comes to a full stop (l. 09). Although there is convergence in treating “braking” as the appropriate action to carry out, INST treats the way in which slowing down should be performed as problematic. As a matter of fact, he produces a further instruction with the words *giù frizione* ‘clutch down,’ which he repeats with an increasing tempo (l. 07). This way of producing an instruction is recognizable as doing correction (Deppermann, 2015), i.e. as formulating an action that TDVR should be doing, but is not doing. The car subsequently comes to a halt (l. 09) and will later move on as soon as OCAR’s door is closed again, thereby clearing the way.

The analysis of this excerpt allows us to show how in-car participants respond to another road user’s traffic action. It illustrates how two strands of participation are intertwined, i.e. TCAR’s response to OCAR’s behavior as an accountable, mobile unit (inter-unit participation) and in-car interaction between the instructor and the trainee driver (intra-unit participation), who align in deciding what TCAR’s next relevant action will be.

4.2. Divergent orientation towards the “next action”

We now turn to a case in which the in-car participants display divergent orientations with regard to the next relevant action. TCAR is driving on a road at the end of which a T-junction is becoming visible. INST has just told TDVR that he will have to go into second gear (from third) as they approach the crossing. Following that, at the beginning of the excerpt INST prompts TDVR to ‘check with the brake’ (l. 01):

Excerpt 2a (15sg2BM2; 32:47–33:04)

```
01 INST    controlla col freno,
           check with the brake,
02          (0.6)
03 INST    ±frena^un po',
           brake a bit,
PEDE      ±-->>walks towards road-->
04          £(0.4)
TCAR      £slows down-->
05 INST    vai giù con la frizione,
           go down with the clutch,
06          (0.3)#
fig       #Fig. 5
```

Figure 5: PEDE is reaching the curb of the sidewalk

INST's initial instruction to 'check' with the brake (l. 01) appears not to be responded to in an appropriate way. Indeed, INST provides a further instruction related to braking, this time using an imperative verb form (*frena^un po'*, 'brake a bit'; l. 03). This instruction addresses TCAR's traffic behavior in the specific infrastructural circumstances at hand. In other words, when approaching a T-junction, TCAR has to slow down. However, while INST instructs TDVR to slow down, a pedestrian is progressively becoming visible on the right-hand sidewalk: she is clearly moving perpendicularly to the road; her trajectory is projecting an imminent crossing of the road (Fig. 5).

TCAR is slowing down, while INST is providing additional instructions to TDVR in order to let him slow down in a safe and correct manner ('go down with the clutch'; l. 05, 'go into second'; l. 07). However, the continuation of the interaction shows that the in-car participants display divergent orientations with respect to what the next relevant action is going to be:

Excerpt 2b (15sg2BM2; 32:47–33:04)

```

07 INST  ∞metti la seconda tirando verso di te,=
          go into second by pulling towards you,=
    PEDE  ∞looks at TCAR/TDVR-->
08 TDVR  =°cosa fa° °questa #[si-°°
          =°what is doing° °this [la- °°
    fig    #Fig. 6
09 INST  [va beh,± (.) facciam passare la
          [well okay, (.) let's let the
    PEDE  -->±stands still-->
10       si°ignoraa°^°eh°. (.)#la signora^anziafna,
          lady cross (.) the old lady,
    PEDE  -->∞,,,,,∞
    PEDE  -->±resumes walking-->>
    TCAR                                     -->±stands still
    fig    #Fig. 7
11       (0.4)
12 INST  metti la prima,
          go into first,
13       (1.9)

```

At l. 07, INST is still engaged in delivering instructions for slowing down in an appropriate way. Note that all of his turn-constructional units (TCUs; Schegloff et al., 1974) at lines 03-07 are produced with a continuing intonation, projecting more to come. In other words, INST is serially organizing the actions that TDVR has to carry out and the continuing intonation at the end of l. 07 makes yet a further instruction expectable. His successive instructions are designed to make TDVR move the car towards the T-junction in an appropriate way. However, while INST produces his TCU at l. 07, PEDE, who has just appeared on the sidewalk, starts interacting with what she perceives as an approaching car. She turns her head and gazes in TCAR's direction, presumably looking at TDVR (l. 07). As Liberman (2013) has shown, looking at the other party is a common ethnomethod that pedestrians use when crossing a road. Pedestrians do not just look casually, but "[do] so in a manner that renders [their] looking as witnessable and recognizable as looking" (Liberman 2013: 22). This is exactly what happens here.

Figure 6: PEDE is gazing at TCAR

PEDE's head turn and gaze reorientation, as well as her walking (Fig. 6), are accountable (see Merlino and Mondada, this issue, for pedestrians' display of accountability). This is visible in TDVR's turn at l. 08, where he displays puzzlement about what PEDE is doing. Clearly, he has perceived PEDE and is now responding to her projected action, i.e. crossing the road where such an action is normatively not expected (in other words, jaywalking). At this point, TDVR is engaged in two strands of participation, i.e. with INST, as he complies with his instructions, and with PEDE, with whom he has established reciprocal visual attention. As a response to PEDE's presence, TDVR can be seen to slow down the car more rapidly, thereby treating PEDE as a traffic participant who is claiming right of way in order to cross the road. INST treats TCAR's decreasing speed as accounting for TDVR's willingness to yield, as his turn at l. 09-10 shows. By starting his turn with *va beh*, 'well okay', INST displays on the one hand that what is coming up is disaligning with his previous projections (l. 03-07); on the other hand he treats giving way as a dispreferred action, which TDVR was not expected to do. TDVR's decision to let PEDE cross is actually breaching the traffic code, since in this situation (in the absence of other infrastructural features, such as a zebra crossing) TCAR would have had right of way over PEDE. INST could thus legitimately rebuke TDVR for this decision. But this is not what he does. By producing *facciam passare la signora* 'let's let the lady pass' he aligns with TDVR's decision, and with the subsequent self-repair *la signora anziana*, 'the old lady' he provides an account for why TDVR's decision can be accepted although it is contravening the law: INST's categorization of PEDE as an 'old lady' opens up a range of *category-bound predicates* (Watson, 1978) that can be imputed to elderly persons (e.g. frailty) and thereby lays out moral grounds for letting her cross at this point, rather than some thirty meters farther at the zebra crossing. Note that PEDE adopts a stationary position at the beginning of INST's l. 09. Her standing still at this point displays that she is treating TCAR's traffic behavior as ambiguous with regard to whether it will drive on or halt in order to let PEDE cross the road. A few moments later (l. 10)—even before TCAR has come to a complete stand still—PEDE withdraws her gaze from TDVR/TCAR and resumes walking (Fig. 7); see also Merlino and Mondada, this issue, on gaze withdrawal.

Figure 7: PEDE is crossing the road

This analysis has shown three strands of participation at work: in-car interaction between TDVR and INST, visual interaction between PEDE and TDVR, both reflexively shaping the interaction between PEDE and TCAR, revolving around which traffic participant "takes the subsequent turn." As soon as

this is settled, cross-unit participation progressively dissolves: PEDE and TDVR disengage from reciprocal gaze (l. 10), and while PEDE is still crossing the road, INST and TDVR engage in instructional talk about how to make the car move again (l. 12).

4.3. Interacting with oncoming cars

The previous excerpt has shown a case in which a pedestrian starts interacting with the approaching car by gazing in its direction. In that case, the pedestrian's displayed way of looking was treated by TDVR as claiming right of way in a situation in which, according to the traffic code, she would not have that right. On occasion, specific features of the infrastructure require vigilant co-operation between the traffic participants in order to safely achieve a passing or a crossing, precisely because the traffic code provides only abstract rules that drivers have to adjust to locally emerging features (see Deppermann, this issue). This is the case in the following fragment, where TCAR drives on a narrow road as an oncoming vehicle (OCAR) becomes visible (Fig. 8):

Excerpt 3a (15sg2PRO3; 34:23–34:37)

```
01      fig      (4.3)#
      fig      #Fig. 8
02 INST  o:kay lui si al%larghe%rà li%#
      o:kay he's going to stretch out there
      INST      %.....%points%-->
      fig      #Fig. 9
03      % (0.2) % (1.8)
      INST  -->% , , , , %
```

Fig. 8: OCAR becomes progressively visible at the end of the road

OCAR comes progressively into sight during the pause at l. 01 and represents a momentary obstacle in TCAR's trajectory, since the road is not large enough to allow the passing of two cars (see Deppermann, this issue). Whereas TDVR remains silent throughout the scene, INST displays awareness of the upcoming problem very early. At l. 02 he formulates what TCAR's next action is going to be (*o:kay lui si allargherà lì* 'okay, he's going to stretch out there'), while pointing to an area where OCAR could dodge out of the traffic (Fig. 9).

Fig. 9: INT points towards area where OCAR will likely pull over

Clearly, INST anticipates a possible solution for the passing problem. More precisely, his turn allows him, on the one hand, to depict the smooth interaction between TCAR and OCAR as the next object of the exercise, on the other hand, by anticipating OCAR's action, to display his traffic experience and epistemic supremacy, with respect to TDVR, in this matter. Moreover, by publicly anticipating OCAR's action, INST warrants TDVR's current traffic behavior, namely driving on, as an appropriate way of dealing with the impending problem. INST attentively monitors OCAR's actions and shortly after produces a real-time account of what he is witnessing (see also Heritage and Stiver's 1999 notion of "online commentary"):

Excerpt 3b (15sg2PRO3; 34:23–34:37)

04 INST #*o non s'al- ah si# s'allarga.*
'or isn't he str- oh yes he's stretching out.
 fig #Fig. 10 #Fig. 11

He first seems to call into question his previous analysis of OCAR's upcoming conduct (*o non s'al-* 'or isn't he str-'; l. 04), as he can see OCAR approaching the free space that could be used to pull over, but still driving straight ahead (Fig. 10):

Fig. 10: OCAR approaching the space where pulling over would be possible

INST then self-repairs his turn while witnessing that OCAR is indeed pulling over in the area that he has previously identified for such a maneuver (Fig. 11). INST's anticipation is confirmed by OCAR's actual traffic behavior. On the one hand, this reinforces INST's epistemic authority—since there is now evidence that INST's anticipation was correct—on the other hand, it ensures the safe passing of the two cars.

Fig. 11: OCAR pulls over and allows TCAR to pass

In the analysis so far, we have identified two strands of participation: in-car interaction between INST and TDVR (intra-unit participation), given that INST's turns were oriented to TDVR, who nonetheless remains silent throughout the excerpt; and coordination between the two cars, traveling in opposite directions (inter-unit participation). Note that in this case, OCAR's "space-offering" (Haddington and Rauniomaa, 2014) emanates from the traffic participants' monitoring of each other's movement in

space and from a real-time analysis of the possibilities and restrictions that the local infrastructure brings forth. Only subsequently does interaction occur between the inhabitants of the respective cars. Indeed, while TCAR is passing OCAR, which has now come to a brief halt, INST waves at OCAR's driver (ODVR) and says *grazie sammy*. 'thank you Sammy' (l. 06; Fig. 12):

Excerpt 3c (15sg2PRO3; 34:23–34:37)

```

05      (0.5)%(0.2)%(0.2)
INST      %.....%open palm-->
06 INST  graz%#ie sammy.%
          thank you Sammy.
INST      -->% , , , , , , , , , , %
fig      #Fig. 12
07      (2.0)
08 INST  o:kay.
          o:kay.
09      (0.3)
10 INST  e mettiam la seconda.
          and we go into second.

```

Fig. 12: INST waving at ODVR

INST's 'thank you' (l. 06) closes down the fleeting encounter between OCAR and TCAR, and after that, INST will resume instructional business with TDVR (l. 08-10). At least two aspects of this closing are worthwhile noticing. First, it is INST who is producing a 'thank you', not TDVR, who is recognizable as the driver for oncoming traffic participants. This is in contrast with what has been observed in ordinary driving, where it is systematically the drivers who engage in waving and thanking at the end of such encounters (see Haddington and Rauniomaa, 2014). In our driving lessons, it is instead always the instructors (whom oncoming traffic participants may at first see as passengers) who do such actions (but see Deppermann, this issue, for an example in which it is the trainee driver who waves at another driver). By waving and thanking ODVR, INST accomplishes at least three interrelated things. Firstly, he engages in interaction with ODVR and thanks him for creating space to pass. This is a manifestation of "traffic civility" (Haddington and Rauniomaa, 2014; Laurier, this issue), a social competence that experienced drivers possess. Hence, secondly, this practice has also a pedagogical component because it socializes TDVR into traffic etiquette. Finally, INST makes himself recognizable as the one who is ultimately responsible for TCAR's traffic behavior. The third strand of participation—between the respective in-car participants (cross-unit participation)—is running only in the last stage of the encounter, i.e. when the inhabitants of the cars are close enough to communicate with each other. Spatial proximity is thus a prerequisite for this kind of participation (see also Haddington and Rauniomaa 2014: 183). INST's turn *grazie sammy*. 'thank you Sammy' (l. 06) with a co-occurring hand wave, is neatly adjusted to the multiple strands of participation we have observed. Indeed, only INST's waving hand (and maybe also his lip movements) is witnessable for ODVR as a display of civility. INST's 'thank you Sammy' is instead hearable only by TDVR, given the restrictions provided by the car's material environment. This allows INST to use a dummy name such as *Sammy* for addressing is thanking to ODVR, who has no auditory access to what INST is saying.

The complexity of traffic interaction emerges also from the subsequent excerpt. TCAR has just entered a narrow road, and INST has just instructed TDVR to turn right at the end of that road. At l. 01 INST is inviting TDVR to perform a routine required whenever TCAR changes direction, which

consists of four successive steps: checking the rear-view mirror (*uno*, ‘one’), the side-view mirror (*due*, ‘two’), the blind spot (*tre*, ‘three’) and setting the indicator (*freccia*, ‘indicator’); see Björklund, 2018.

Excerpt 4a (15sg2PRO3; 26:16–27:00)

```
01 INST    uno, (0.6) #due, (0.4) tre, (0.2) fre*ccia,*
           one, (0.6) two, (0.4) three, (0.2) indicator,
           TDVR                                     *.....*-->
           fig                                     #Fig. 13
02          *(0.3)*(1.2)%$(0.3)%*
           INST                                     %.....%-->
           TDVR  -->*.....*right foot on brake pedal*-->
           TDVR                                     $left foot presses clutch pedal down$-->
```

While INST and TDVR are engaged in carrying out this routine, a vehicle turns into the road from the opposite direction (Fig. 13):

Fig. 13: TDVR is gazing at the side-view mirror, OCAR is turning into the road

OCAR’s appearance at the end of the road conveys a problem, the road clearly being too narrow for two cars to pass simultaneously. Unlike excerpt 3—where OCAR offered space to TCAR by pulling over—this is not an option in the current circumstances, because the infrastructure does not provide an opportunity to dodge out of the way. In this situation, TDVR immediately slows down the car (l. 02), bringing it eventually to a halt shortly after (l. 03). He does so silently and without any instruction from INST’s side, thereby embodying a response carried out on his own initiative. INST, who is monitoring OCAR’s behavior (Fig. 13) remains silent at first, but then—once TCAR and OCAR are in proximity—produces the following turn:

Excerpt 4b (20100315LUsg2VIDPRO3; 26:16–27:00)

```
03 INST    %no #no      %no: va(i) indie+tro.%f#
           no no no: you go back.
           INST  -->%V finger-wag%H finger-wag-----%-->
           OCAR                                     +stands still
           TCAR                                     fstands still
           fig                                     #Fig. 15
           fig                                     #Fig. 14
04          %$(0.7)%$(0.2)%
           INST  -->%-----%, , , , %
```

Fig. 14: INS wagging left forefinger, vertically (“no” gesture)

INST produces first the words *no no no*: while wagging his left forefinger (Fig. 14), in a situation in which he can reasonably presume that ODVR can perceive his gesturing. He subsequently transforms this gesture by bringing his forefinger into horizontal position and by moving it back and forth (Fig. 15). This gesture is recognizably requesting ODVR to clear the road by reversing—as is proven by INST’s co-occurring talk (*va(i) indietro*. ‘you go back’; l. 03) and by ODVR’s response to it (as he will clear the road shortly after; l. 06). On the one hand, INST is addressing his embodied request to ODVR, and he does so while the two cars reach the maximal proximity between each other as they both come to a halt (Fig. 15). Direct gestural communication thus becomes possible. On the other hand, INST’s action is witnessable by TDVR—and TDVR is the only one who actually can *hear* INST’s words—and in that sense INST’s action has both intra-unit and cross-unit relevance.

Fig. 15: INS moving left forefinger back and forth

INST’s words (l. 03) *appear* to address ODVR, as the use of the imperative *va(i)* ‘you go’ (l. 03) shows—but it is virtually impossible for ODVR to actually hear those words. The only reliable witness of INST’s talk is TDVR—who, as we will show later in the analysis, also has to make sense of what INST is saying at this moment. Once again, INST regards it as his task to interact with ODVR, whereas TDVR remains silent throughout the episode. While INST *could* use this encounter as an opportunity to let TDVR interact with ODVR, this does not happen and it is again INST (as in excerpt 3) who displays his epistemic supremacy and responsibility by engaging in interaction with ODVR. In other words, whereas encounters like these could be treated as offering an occasion for training interactional skills between trainee drivers and drivers of oncoming cars, this occasion is not taken at this specific moment.

INST’s request to reverse is produced very early in the course of the encounter and it is INST who initiates interaction with ODVR (not vice-versa). While this temporal antecedence may also be related to practical issues (e.g. both ODVR and INST have their hands on the steering wheels, while INST’s hands are available for gesturing), it sets off a stringent sequential organization of actions: ODVR has to respond in some way to INST’s request, and he can provide two kinds of responses (besides initiating repair), namely complying with the request or not complying with it. The episode continues in the following way:

Excerpt 4c) (15sg2PRO3; 26:16–27:00)

```

05 INST   metti la prima,#
          go into first,
          fig                               #Fig. 16
06        (1.0)+(1.6)$ (0.5)* (0.3)
OCAR      +reverses-->>
TDVR      -->$left foot releases clutch pedal
TDVR      -->*right foot on gaz pedal
07 INST   e andiamo.
          and we go.
08        £(1.4)
TCAR      £moves forward-->>
09 INST   o:kay.

```

INST’s embodied request to reverse comes to an end during the pause at l. 04. ODVR does not produce any kind of immediate embodied (i.e. gestural) response and INST appears to treat that as

foreshadowing compliance with the request. Indeed, at l. 05 he instructs TDVR to go into first gear, thereby displaying his orientation towards what is going to be TDVR's subsequent task, namely starting off again. Towards the end of INST's turn (l. 06), ODVR can be seen to look backwards while placing his right hand behind the headrest of the passenger seat. He is now visibly preparing OCAR's reversing (Fig. 16).

Fig. 16: ODVR is looking backward and preparing reversing

Shortly after, OCAR will clear the road by reversing and TCAR will resume its journey. At the end of the road, TDVR is turning right, thereby complying with the instruction that INST produced before the encounter between OCAR and TCAR occurred. About 20 seconds later, INST comes back to the encounter that has just occurred and comments on it as follows:

Excerpt 4d (15sg2PRO3; 26:16–27:00)

30 INST **però raf**
but Raf
(0.7)
31
32 INST **mi raccomando tu hai un diritto.**
don't forget you have a right.
(0.5)
33
34 INST **non è che uno entra così**
it's not that one comes in like that
35 **come se fosse l'ultimo dei mohicani,**
like if he was the last of the Mohicans,
36 TVDR hh hh
37 INST **e allora tu ti devi smaterializzare^eh?**
and then you have to dematerialize^okay?
(0.3)
38
39 TDVR **sì.**
yes.

INST's words appear as a post hoc account of the preceding episode of interaction and can be described as what Schegloff (2007: 142) calls a "postmortem" (see Broth et al., this issue, for a similar phenomenon identified as "deferred post-event telling"). We have previously observed that INST did not offer the opportunity to TDVR to interact with ODVR while the encounter took place. At this point, however, he seems to make TDVR accountable for not having exercised his "rights" (l. 32) appropriately or at least to remind him his rights as a driver. INST's turn-beginning with *però* 'but' and the use of TDVR's first name (here rendered as *Raf*; l. 32) make expectable some upcoming criticism, which is precisely what INST does next. The Italian expression *mi raccomando*—which we have tentatively translated as 'don't forget'—is typically used to plead the addressee to follow an advice, an order, etc. In this case, INST first says that TDVR possesses a "right" (l. 32) and then exemplifies that right by saying that one does not 'come in like that like if he was the last of the Mohicans' (l. 34-35), thereby clearly referring to the previous encounter with OCAR. TDVR produces some laughter tokens (l. 36), after which INST continues his turn by adding that TDVR cannot be expected to 'dematerialize', i.e. to clear the road, in such circumstances (l. 37). This is recognizable as corrective instructional talk (see Gazin, 2015) addressing TDVR's observed behavior in a close encounter between two cars traveling in opposite directions. TDVR responds to INST's comment with a *sì*. 'yes' (l. 39), thereby displaying understanding and acceptance of the criticism.

Unexpected events may occur at any time in ordinary traffic, and INSTs train TDVRs to constantly monitor the environment ahead of them and to foresee potentially risky traffic configurations. This is visible in the last excerpt of this article. TCAR has just turned left; INST instructs TDVR to proceed straight ahead (l. 01) and then asks her which traffic participant has right of way in the road configuration that becomes progressively visible (Fig. 17):

Excerpt 5a (16sg2PRO6; 41:14–41:32)

01 INST **proseguiamo dritto. (.) chi ha precedenza qua.**
we proceed straight ahead. (.) who has right of way here.
 02 (1.2)
 03 TDVR ***questi# qua che# vengono: *in su. (.) in giù.=**
these here who are coming: up here (.) down here.=
 TDVR **points right---*points left**
 fig *#Fig. 17*
 04 INST **=perfet[to.**
=perfec[t.

Fig. 17: TDVR is pointing towards the road on the right

By asking this question, INST not only checks TDVR's knowledge of the traffic rules, he also makes her aware that a traffic participant might enter or cross the road from the right at any moment. In this way, he manages to ensure that both INST and TDVR converge in what the appropriate response would be, should a traffic participant approach from the right. Hence, his question allows him to prevent the possibility that TDVR might behave against the traffic code (i.e. by not granting the right of way). At l. 03 TDVR points at the intersecting road on the right side and identifies 'those who are coming up/down here' as having the right of way. TDVR's use of plural form *questi qua* (literally 'these here') shows that she is establishing a virtual reference to any road user that might travel on the road she is pointing at, and INST positively assesses this answer (l. 04). Shortly after, a car coming from that road becomes indeed visible (Fig. 18) and the interaction continues as follows:

Excerpt 5b (16sg2PRO6; 41:14–41:32)

05 TDVR **[cioè: (.) sì che vengono di [qua**
[that i:s (.) yes who are coming [this way
 06 INST **[okay# allora frena,**
[okay then brake,
 fig *#Fig. 18*
 07 (0.4)
 08 INST **e giù frizione.**
and clutch down.
 09 (1.0)
 10 INST **metti la prima,**
go into first,
 11 (0.4)

Fig. 18: OCAR appearing on the right

As the car appears, TDVR is still engaged in answering INST's question (l. 05). Whereas up to this moment TDVR was displaying her theoretical knowledge about the traffic rules applying to the specific road configuration at hand, now she has to deal with the factual problem of having to give way to OCAR. In other words, the abstract rules that INST has just elicited from TDVR have now to be put into practice—whereas if no car had appeared, TDVR's knowledge display would have remained merely theoretical. INST's overlapping turn (l. 06) is responsive to the sudden appearance of the car: with his turn-initial *okay* INST manages to display reciprocity of what TDVR just said, while at the same time closing down the question/answer-sequence that he had initiated at l. 01; with the words *allora frena*, ('then brake') he initiates a new course of action, namely a "car-control instruction" (De Stefani & Gazin, 2014), which is aiming at letting TDVR yield the right of way to OCAR. INST produces further instructions as TDVR smoothly brings her car to a halt.

Excerpt 5c (16sg2PRO6; 41:14–41:32)

12 INST e fallo an#dare.
and let him go.
fig #Fig. 19
13 (0.8)#(0.8)
fig #Fig. 20
14 INST sali a punto, (.) e andiamo.
go into biting point, (.) and let's go.
15 (1.6)
16 INST BRAVA.
GOOD (GIRL).
17 (0.2)
18 INST okay hai visto che non capita mai be- (.) però
okay have you seen that it never happens be- (.) but
19 capita sempre?
it always happens?
20 TDVR sì.
yes.

ODVR indeed treats TCAR's halting as giving him right of way. He crosses the road while at the same time producing a hand wave. As Fig. 19 shows, his waving is precisely timed with OCAR's movement and TCAR's position in space. He indeed performs his hand wave in an area of proximity with TCAR, thereby ensuring maximal visibility of his gesture. Again, it is INST who is responding to ODVR's gesture by waving his hand shortly after (Fig. 20).

Fig. 19: ODVR waving his hand

Fig. 20: INST waving his hand

Thanking hand gestures are systematically treated as making relevant a corresponding gesture by the recipient (see Laurier, this issue); they set up a “conditional relevance” (Schegloff, 1968) and thus a sequential organization of actions. That being so, the participant responding to a hand wave (here: INST) will also have to make sure that his gesturing is witnessable by the initiator of the waving sequence. In a setting of mobility, in which traffic participants continuously change their position in space, this may pose a practical problem—for the “responder,” but possibly also for the initiator. The question arises—but we cannot elucidate it on the basis of our data—as to whether ODVR’s initiation of the waving is not only sensitive to locally emerging spatial contingencies but also timed in a way that will enable ODVR to witness the completion of the waving sequence (see Laurier, this issue). Although we do not have access to OCAR’s gaze behavior, Fig. 20 shows that the constellation is such that ODVR should be able to perceive INST’s gesturing.

Once OCAR has crossed the road, INST instructs TDVR to drive on (l. 14) and then addresses a positive assessment to her (l. 16). He subsequently articulates a comment about the traffic situation in which they have just participated: by saying ‘have you seen that it never happens but it always happens’ (l. 18-19) he manages to further legitimize his initial question about who has the right of way (l. 01), while at the same time conveying the necessity of always “expecting the unexpected” in order to be ready to appropriately respond to the ever-changing traffic configurations.

5. Discussion and conclusion

In this contribution, we started from Goffman’s (1981) notions of “participation” and “participation framework,” and our intent was to examine whether, and in what way, these concepts are useful for the analysis of traffic interaction. Goodwin and Goodwin (2004) and Goodwin (2007) have critically discussed the Goffmanian understanding of participation, denouncing, among other things, the “static set of categories” (Goodwin and Goodwin, 2004: 225) that Goffman uses to describe the interactants, and the logocentricity of the model, which privileges the spoken utterance over other embodied resources of interaction. Our analyses revealed that continuous fleeting encounters are constitutive of the “traffic experience.” Because encounters between vehicular units in traffic are transient, the notion of “participation framework”—which Goffman (1981:135) used to describe the relation “of all the persons in [a] gathering”—appears to be inadequate for this ever-changing mobile setting. Moreover, our analyses showed the interactants’ simultaneous engagement in multiple courses of communicative action. We have carved out three strands of participation that are pivotal for traffic interaction, namely *intra-unit participation*, *inter-unit participation* and *cross-unit participation*, the relevance of which we have proven analytically. Whereas the previous literature on traffic interaction has only implicitly addressed this issue, our article provides a novel systematization of interactional conduct observable in traffic, which goes beyond the Goffmanian notions of “byplay,” “crossplay” and “sideplay” (Goffman, 1981: 134). Indeed, whereas Goffman conceptualizes the latter as “subordinate communication relative to a dominant state of talk” (Goffman 1981: 133), the terminology we propose in this article allows for an indiscriminating description of how participants’ organize their engagement in different strands of participation, which escapes a dichotomous view in terms of dominant vs. subordinate participation. This systematization is not intended to be exclusive, and other strands of participation may be observable—e.g. passengers of two different cars interacting with each other, or, as in excerpt 1, a passenger (i.e. not a driver) opening the right-hand door of the car, thereby performing an action that is consequential for traffic. By focusing on unforeseeable, potentially risky traffic configurations, we have addressed events that are ever recurring in traffic and that constitute practical problems for trainee drivers. On the one hand, “[t]he identification of hazards is now recognized as a vital and complex skill that unlicensed drivers need to demonstrate as part of their driving test [...]” (Underwood 2007: 1243); on the other hand, the analysis of fleeting, obstructive encounters offers a locus for the analysis of how traffic participants solve a passing or crossing problem intersubjectively (Deppermann, 2015, this issue). However, our data are collected from the perspective of the inhabitants of the tuition car. This implies certain restrictions—e.g. in-car interactions occurring in oncoming cars are not available for analysis—but allows us also to reflect on one specific kind of in-car interaction, i.e. between instructors and trainee drivers. In dealing with unforeseeable traffic events, in-car participants have the opportunity to display their expertise. Convergence between INST and TDVR in responding to a particular traffic event (excerpt 1) may readily be treated as a “correct” response to the particular traffic event, whereas if INST and TDVR diverge in their orientation as to

what the next action will be, this has to be accounted for and can be treated as a “possible response under the given circumstances,” as in excerpt 2. Encounters with oncoming cars provide the instructor with an opportunity to display his epistemic supremacy, for instance by foreseeing the oncoming car’s traffic behavior (excerpt 3), by commenting on the trainee driver’s conduct in such circumstances (excerpt 4), or by anticipating the possible occurrence of a specific traffic event (excerpt 5). Moreover, it is precisely on the basis of the interaction in which INST engages with the drivers of the oncoming cars that we could show why cross-unit participation is a relevant strand of participation in our data. By doing so, e.g. by waving at other drivers, INST becomes recognizable as the one who is in some way responsible for the car’s driving behavior. Events like these could be used as an instance for teaching traffic etiquette, but instructors do not take this opportunity in our corpus—at least not in an explicit way. But trainee drivers witness how instructors interact with other road users, thereby familiarizing with such conduct. In other words, whereas in our data car operation and implementation of the traffic code are competently taught and learned, cross-unit communication is almost entirely carried out by the instructor. This is, however, an essential communicative practice that novice drivers can observe in driving lessons. What trainee drivers have to learn are complex, intertwined competences, and although we have tried to separate different strands of participation, these are tightly interrelated.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Mathias Broth, Arnulf Deppermann, as well as an anonymous reviewer for comments on earlier versions of this article. All remaining flaws are our responsibility.

Funding

The data stems from a research project entitled “The constitution of space in interaction: A conversation analytic approach to the study of place names and spatial descriptions” financed by the Swiss National Science Foundation (project number PP001-119138). The project was based at the University of Berne (2008-2012) and directed by Elwys De Stefani.

References

- Björklund, D., 2018. Drilling the mirror routine. From abstract looking to mobile practice in driver training. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, xxx–xxx.
- Broth, M., Cromdal, J., Levin, L., 2017. Starting out as a driver: Progression in instructed pedal work. In: Mäkitalo, Å., Linell, P., Säljö, R. (Eds.), *Memory Practices and Learning. Interactional, Institutional and Sociocultural Perspectives*. Charlotte, Information Age Publishing, pp. 113–142.
- Broth, M., Cromdal, J., Levin, L. 2018. Showing where you’re going. Instructing the accountable use of the indicator in live traffic. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, xxx–xxx.
- Broth, M., Cromdal, J., Levin, L., this issue. Telling the other’s side: Formulating others’ thinking in driver training.
- Deppermann, A. (Ed.), 2013. *Conversation Analytic Studies of Multimodal Interaction*. Special Issue of *Journal of Pragmatics* 46 (1), 1–172.
- Deppermann, A., 2015. When recipient design fails: Egocentric turn-design of instructions in driving school lessons leading to breakdowns of intersubjectivity. *Gesprächsforschung – Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion* 16, 63–101.
- Deppermann, A. 2018a. Instruction practices in German driving lessons: Differential uses of declaratives and imperatives. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, xxx–xxx.
- Deppermann, A., 2018b. Changes in turn-design over interactional histories: The case of instructions in driving school lessons. In Deppermann, A., Streeck, J. (Eds.), *Time in Embodied Interaction. Synchronicity and Sequentiality of Multimodal Resources*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. xxx–xxx.
- Deppermann, A., this issue. Intersubjectivity and other grounds for action-coordination in a fragile ecology: Coordinating with oncoming traffic when passing an obstacle.

- Deppermann, A., Laurier, E., Mondada, L., Broth, M., Cromdal, J., De Stefani, E., Haddington, P., Levin, L., Nevile, M., Rauniomaa, M., 2018. Overtaking.
- De Stefani, E., 2018. Formulating direction: Navigational instructions in driving lessons. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. xxx–xxx.
- De Stefani, E., Gazin, A.-D., 2014. Instructional sequences in driving lessons: Mobile participants and the temporal and sequential organization of actions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 65, 63–79.
- De Stefani, E., Horlacher, A.-S., 2018. Mundane talk at work: Multiactivity in interactions between professionals and their clientele. *Discourse Studies* 20 (2), 221–245.
- Gazin, A.-D., 2015. Instructional Sequences in the Moving Car. A Conversation Analytic Approach to Multimodal Interaction in Driving Lessons. PhD thesis, University of Berne.
- Goffman, E., 1963. *Behavior in Public Places. Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings*. New York, The Free Press.
- Goffman, E., 1971. *Relations in Public. Microstudies of the Public Order*. New York, Harper & Row.
- Goffman, E., 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodwin, C., 2007. Interactive footing. In: Holt, E., Clift, R. (Eds.), *Reporting Talk. Reported Speech in Interaction*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 16–46.
- Goodwin, C., Goodwin, M. H., 2004. Participation. In: Duranti, A. (Eds.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Malden MA, Blackwell Publishing, pp. 222–244.
- Goodwin, M. H., Goodwin, C., 2012. Car talk: Integrating texts, bodies, and changing landscapes. *Semiotica* 191 (1/4), 257–286.
- Haddington, P., 2010. Turn-taking for turntaking: Mobility, time, and action in the sequential organization of junction negotiations in cars. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 43 (4), 372–400.
- Haddington, P., 2012. Movement in action: Initiating social navigations in cars. *Semiotica* 191 (1/4), 137–167.
- Haddington, P., 2013. Action and space: Navigation as a social and spatial task. In: Auer, P., Hilpert, M., Stukenbrock, A., Szmrecsanyi, B. (Eds.), *Linguistic Perspectives on Space: Geography, Interaction, and Cognition*. Berlin, de Gruyter, pp. 411–433.
- Haddington, P., Mondada, L., Nevile, M. (Eds.), 2013. *Interaction and mobility. Language and the Body in Motion*. Berlin, de Gruyter.
- Haddington, P., Rauniomaa, M., 2014. Interaction between road users: Offering space in traffic. *Space and Culture* 17 (2), 176–190.
- Haddington, P., Keisanen, T., 2009. Location, mobility and the body as resources in selecting a route. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41, 1938–1961.
- Heritage, J., 2012. The epistemic engine: Sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45 (1), 30–52.
- Heritage, J., Stivers, T. 1999. Online commentary in acute medical visits: A method of shaping patient expectations. *Social Science & Medicine* 49, 1501–1517.
- Jefferson, G., 2004. Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In: Lerner, G. H. (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis. Studies from the First Generation*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 13–31.
- Jensen, O. B., 2010. Erving Goffman and everyday life mobility. In: Jacobsen, M. H. (Ed.), *The Contemporary Goffman*. London, Routledge, pp. 333–351.
- Keisanen, T., 2012. ‘Uh-oh, we were going there’: Environmentally occasioned noticings of trouble in in-car interaction. *Semiotica* 191 (1/4), 197–222.
- Laurier, E., this issue. Civility and mobility: Drivers (and passengers) appreciating the actions of other drivers.
- Laurier, E., Brown, B., Lorimer, H., 2012. What it means to change lanes: Actions, emotions and wayfinding in the family car. *Semiotica* 191 (1/4), 117–135.
- Laurier, E., Lorimer, H., Brown, B., Jones, O., Juhlin, O., Noble, A., Perry, M., Pica, D., Sormani, P., Strebel, I., Swan, L., Taylor, A. S., Watts, L., Weilenmann, A., 2008. Driving and ‘passengerling’: Notes on the ordinary organization of car travel. *Mobilities*, 3 (1), 1–23.
- Levin, L., Cromdal, J., Broth, M., Gazin, A.-D., Haddington, P., McIlvenny, P., Melander, H., Rauniomaa, M., 2017. Unpacking corrections in mobile instruction: Error-occasioned opportunities in driving, cycling and aviation training. *Language and Education* 38, 11–23.

- Lieberman, K., 2013. The local orderliness of crossing Kinncaid. In: Lieberman, K., *More Studies in Ethnomethodology*. New York, State University of New York Press, pp. 11-43.
- McIlvenny, P., Broth, M., Haddington, P., 2014. Moving together: Mobile formations in interaction. *Space and Culture* 17 (2), 104–106.
- Merlino, S., Mondada, L., this issue. Crossing the street: How pedestrians interact with cars.
- Mondada, L., 2012. Talking and driving: Multiactivity in the car. *Semiotica* 191 (1/4), 223–256.
- Mondada, L., 2014. Conventions for multimodal transcription, https://franz.unibas.ch/fileadmin/franz/user_upload/redaktion/Mondada_conv_multimodality.pdf.
- Noy, C., 2012. Inhabiting the family-car: Children-passengers and parents-drivers on the school run. *Semiotica* 191 (1/4), 309–333.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50, 696–735.
- Schegloff, E. A., 1968. Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist* 70 (6), 1075–1095.
- Schegloff, E. A., 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction. A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Underwood, G., 2007. Visual attention and the transition from novice to advanced drivers. *Ergonomics*, 50 (8), 1235–1249.
- Urry, J., 2004. The ‘system’ of automobility. *Theory, Culture & Society* 21 (4/5), 25–39.
- Vinkhuyzen, E., Cefkin, M., 2016. Developing socially acceptable autonomous vehicles. *Ethnographic Praxis in Industry Conference Proceedings*, 522–534.
- Watson, D. R., 1978. Categorization, authorization and blame-negation in conversation. *Sociology* 12, 105–113.