

# **UCLA**

## **UCLA Previously Published Works**

### **Title**

On the diversity of 'changes of state' and their indices

### **Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0453p1t1>

### **Author**

Heritage, John

### **Publication Date**

2016-10-01

### **DOI**

10.1016/j.pragma.2016.09.007

Peer reviewed

Commentary

# On the diversity of ‘changes of state’ and their indices

John Heritage

Department of Sociology, University of California Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA

Available online 24 September 2016



It is now nearly 50 years since Victor Yngve drew attention to a variety of response particles (such as *yes*, *uh huh*, *oh*, *okay* and so on) that he characterized as “back channel” communication, indicative of attention or interest (Yngve, 1970:568). In a disciplinary context in which spoken language was not much considered, and pragmatics itself was still in *statu nascendi*, this was a remarkable and far-sighted observation. The ensuing years have seen an extraordinary efflorescence in the study of particles and, while Yngve made no attempt to differentiate them, contemporary studies have instantiated a wholesale recognition of the diversity of particles and their functions, both within and between languages. Our increasing grasp of this diversity has permitted ever more nuanced understandings of sequential order in conversation, and of interaction across cultures.

Change-of-state tokens have definitely participated in this expansion. Research began with English *oh* and *ah* (Heritage, 1984; Aijmer, 1987; Aston, 1987; Schiffrin, 1987). Though these scholars began from independent starting points and used somewhat different methods, their convergence on general aspects of *oh* and its functioning was striking, and contrasted with the diversity of opinions on other English particles, for example, the turn-initial particle *well* (see Heritage, 2015, forthcoming, for an overview). The rapid convergence was enabled, perhaps, by the fact that *oh* exhibits a semantic core that is highly stable, though subtly particularized, across contexts. Thus when I first started to work on *oh*, it was possible to believe that most languages had an *oh*-like object, resembling English *oh* in terms of functioning. I was disabused rather thoroughly of this view in 1988 when Marja-Leena Sorjonen, then a graduate student at UCLA, said that it was hard for her as a Finn to understand how English speakers got along with just a single particle. This comment foreshadowed her own work on response particles (Sorjonen, 2001), and Aino Koivisto's subsequent dissection of the functions and affordances of a cluster of particles serving change-of-state functions in Finnish (Koivisto, 2013, 2015a, 2015b, this issue). The disclosure of this differentiation is now proceeding apace in multiple languages, as the present issue of the *Journal of Pragmatics* testifies.

## 1. Background: English *Oh*

English *oh* has a number of properties that it will be useful to register before proceeding further. (i) *Oh* can appear as a stand alone item, constituting a self-subsistent turn constructional unit (Sacks et al., 1974), and it can also be deployed as a turn-initial item, prefacing a more extensive turn at talk (Heritage, 1998, 2002). (ii) It is in very frequent usage: According to Norrick (2009), *oh* is the second most common turn-initial object in English conversation (after *yeah*), and the third most common free-standing object (after *yeah* and *okay*). (iii) Its positioning within the turn is structured through a ‘linear syntax’ (Hakulinen, 1993) of turn-initial objects, in which *oh* normatively precedes *well*, and *well* normatively precedes ‘attention getting’ items such as *look*, *listen* and address terms. (iv) In terms of sequences, *oh* participates in what Schegloff (1996) calls positionally sensitive grammar. It can appear in all three primary sequential positions (Heritage, forthcoming): (a) in first position it is generally used to introduce a relatively abrupt shift from some ongoing action to another (Jefferson, 1978; Heritage, 1984; Bolden, 2006); (b) in second position, responsive to a first action, it communicates a variety of stances depending on the nature of the preceding action (Heritage, 1998, 2002); and (c) in third position it tends to be used to close

E-mail address: [heritage@soc.ucla.edu](mailto:heritage@soc.ucla.edu).

off the preceding sequence (Heritage, 1984; Schegloff, 2007). In the first two positions *oh* overwhelmingly appears in conjunction with additional turn components, while in the third it may, but need not, appear in free-standing form. (v) Finally, as the editors of this special issue note, there is a clear cross-linguistic clustering of change-of-state particles around the “open, rounded vowels *a* and *o*” (Heinemann and Koivisto, this issue: 4). This is possibly because these vowels are readily amenable to lengthening, and to prosodic variation that can offer fine-grained, but non-propositional and ‘off record’, differentiation of response. And, as the editors also note, following Couper-Kuhlen (2009), this differentiation of response may be of particular value for languages that, like English, are relatively sparsely outfitted with lexically differentiated change-of-state resources.

I believe that I am correct in saying that all, or almost all, contemporary work on changes-of-state proceeds under the aegis of Goffman's concept of response cries (Goffman, 1978). Goffman defined response cries as “signs meant to be taken to index directly the state of the transmitter” (Goffman, 1978:811), and used this term to describe vocalizations such as *ouch*, *brrr* and *eeuw* (expressions of pain, cold, and disgust respectively). Goffman's definition is a very careful one, designed to handle the fine line between the unmediated expression of subjective states and communicative action designed to express their unmediated expression. The expression “signs meant to be taken” is crucial here, because it places response cries unambiguously within the category of conventional signs, or in Grice's (1957) terms meaning<sub>nn</sub>, rather than natural signs that directly express feelings or communicate other ‘mental events’ after the fashion discussed by Darwin (2009 [1872]). It may be added that *oh*, like Goffman's other above-mentioned examples, is conventionalized and integrated into the linguistic system of English. It is something that has to be learned and its semantics acquired by speaker-hearers. This stands in contrast to cries or grunts that are neither integrated nor learned nor conventionalized in this sense (Dingemans et al., 2013), and are in fact much closer to natural signs. Goffman's conceptualization is generally compatible with notions of linguistic stance (Du Bois, 2007, see also Kärkkäinen, 2003; Wu, 2004).

## 2. Function

In writing about English *oh* in 1984 and subsequently, I was at pains to stress its functional opacity outside the semantic change-of-state core, and indeed it was this that Sorjonen's comment (mentioned earlier) registered. There are, after all, so many additional shadings that can be expressed: discovery, learning, remembering, recognition, realization, registration, and delayed versions of the last four of these, being corrected, repair and so on. And these shadings can have their own emotional laminations (surprised, excited, disappointed, sad, and so on), and may be variously positioned in socio-cognitive space – for example, supportive or affiliative to the interlocutor or otherwise, believing or disbelieving, empathic, sympathetic, etc. These elements of stance can ‘bleed’ ever wider. When one contemplates the combinatorial possibilities, even the rich variety of change-of-state tokens available to Finnish speakers (such as *aa*, *aha*, *ai*, *aijaa*, *ai nii*) seem to pale into insignificance, and it becomes necessary to recognize that here, as elsewhere in language use, the indexical and reflexive properties of usage have to carry the main load.

As it turns out, most languages seem to have at least two change-of-state tokens, most of which have been presented by analysts as standing in contrastive relations with one another. However these tokens chop up the conceptual and affective ‘possibility space’ afforded by the change-of-state proposal along distinctive dimensions and in very different ways, with the consequence that it will almost always be misleading to translate change-of-state tokens from one language into another – a consideration that also applies to most other turn-initial particles (Heritage and Sorjonen, forthcoming).

Moreover, because their ‘semantics’ are so abstract, change-of-state tokens are highly dependent on context, co-text and intonation in order to be understood as expressing specific cognitive and affective shifts. Accordingly, we can ask:

- i) How much context do we need to grasp the import of particular tokens, as expressing, for example, ‘surprise’ (Wilkinson and Kitzinger, 2006), or ‘disappointment’ (Couper-Kuhlen, 2009).
- ii) How is the semantic space of English *oh* divided up in other languages such as Mandarin (Wu, 2004; Wu and Heritage, forthcoming), Japanese (Hayashi, 2009; Hayashi and Hayano, forthcoming; Endo, 2015), Finnish (Koivisto, 2013, 2015a,b, this issue), German (Golato, 2010, 2012; Golato and Betz, 2008),
- iii) How do individual particles collocate and interact with other particles to generate distinctive types of changes-of-state (Betz and Golato, 2008; Emmertsen and Heinemann, 2010; Koivisto, 2013).
- iv) What is the role of phonetic-prosodic features, for example lengthening and intonation, in modifying or extending some ‘baseline’ change-of-state understanding in different languages (Reber, 2012; Thompson et al., 2015:64–80). Is this something that can be generalized across languages?
- v) Under what circumstances does the indexical field (Eckert, 2008) evoked by a change-of-state token vary? For example, *oh*-prefaced responses to questions indicate the question's inappropriateness and the respondent's resistance to expanding a response (Heritage, 2002), but Danish *nå* (Heinemann, 2009, this issue), and Mandarin *ou* cannot be deployed to this effect (Wu, 2004).

- vi) How do different turn-initial change-of-state tokens, both within and across languages, shape understandings of the action performed by the turn content that follows (Heritage, 2002; Seuren et al., this issue).
- vii) How are we to analyze the fact that while some change-of-state tokens (e.g., English and Dutch) can function in first, second, and third positions, others can only appear in third position, and yet others only in second position? What is the role of borrowing, grammaticalization, and historical change in the different configurations of change-of-state tokens and the constraints on their deployment that lie before us today?

I have come to believe that change-of-state tokens are effectively infeasible as indicators that their speakers have undergone some kind of shift in knowledge, information, orientation or awareness. At the same time, however, these tokens evoke an ‘indexical field’ of possibilities (to use Eckert’s (2008) useful expression) in terms of which the change-of-state may be anchored, specified, and understood by a recipient. Change-of-state indexical fields may embrace a comparatively wide range of possibilities which, as the contributions to this issue show, may be narrowed by sequential context, by selection among tokens that are distinctive in their specific change-of-state import, and by prosody and its interlocking relationship with sequential context (Wilkinson and Kitzinger, 2006; Couper-Kuhlen, 2009).

In the end, in addition to their fascinating variations, what is striking about these small objects is their ubiquity across languages. This seems to me to derive from two sources: First, the universality of the human experiences they index: finding something out, being told something, surprise, recognition, realization, recollection (and the temporal trajectories and emotional colorations of all these), and more. Second, the significance of communicating these experiences that is so very great. For example, a change-of-state token in third position after an answer confirms that the question you were asked was a real one (and normally conveys as well that your answer is believed). *Oh* and many of the other objects described here and elsewhere contrast in third position with confirmations such as *That’s right* which retroactively communicates that the question you were asked was a ‘known answer’ question, and that the only news you conveyed by answering it was that you knew the answer! Moreover *oh* as a “sequence closing third” (Schegloff, 2007:118–148) lets an answerer know that the answer was sufficient and that they can bring it to a close (something that may be a relief for both questioner and answerer!).

Though he may not have had these particular experiences and their communication in mind when he wrote this passage, I find Levinson’s (2000:xiv) account apt for the issues we are addressing here:

Current perspectives on the relation between universal human nature and cultural factors often seem to me to be inverted: for example, language is held to be essentially universal, whereas language use is thought to be more open to cultural influences. But the reverse may in fact be far more plausible: there is obvious cultural codification of many aspects of language from phoneme to syntactic construction, whereas the uncoded, unnoticed, low-level background of usage principles or strategies may be fundamentally culture-independent . . . Underlying presumptions, heuristics and principles of usage may be more immune to cultural influence simply because they are prerequisites for the system to work at all, preconditions even for learning language.

These remarks hold good for what I take to be a universal of language usage: the role of third position in the defense of intersubjectivity (Schegloff, 1992). While the particles with which we are concerned here are a vital resource (in first and second position) for the nuanced expression of subjective experiences and for the projection of stance, in a context where any third turn in a sequence confirms or disconfirms the understandings that inhabited the production and treatment of the first, they are also part of the warp and weft of intersubjectivity itself.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Trine Heinemann, Aino Koivisto and Marja-Leena Sorjonen for their comments on an earlier draft of this commentary.

## References

- Aijmer, Karin, 1987. *Oh and Ah in English conversation*. In: Meijis, W. (Ed.), *Corpus Linguistics and Beyond*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 61–86.
- Aston, Guy, 1987. *Ah: a corpus-based exercise in conversational analysis*. In: Morley, J., Partington, A. (Eds.), *Spoken Discourse*. Università di Camerino, Camerino, pp. 123–137.
- Betz, Emma, Golato Andrea, 2008. *Remembering relevant information and withholding relevant next actions: the German token achja*. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41 (1), 58–98.
- Bolden Galina, 2006. *Little words that matter: discourse markers “so” and “oh” and the doing of other-attentiveness in social interaction*. *Journal of Communication* 56, 661–688.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, 2009. *A sequential approach to affect: the case of ‘disappointment’*. In: Haakana, M., Laakso, M., Lindström, J. (Eds.), *Talk in Interaction – Comparative Dimensions*. Finnish Literature Society, Helsinki, pp. 94–123.

- Darwin, Charles, 2009. (1872) *The Expression of Emotions in Man and Animals*. Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth.
- Dingemanse, Mark, Torreira, Francisco, Enfield, N.J., 2013. Is “Huh?” a universal word? Conversational infrastructure and the convergent evolution of linguistic items. *PLOS ONE* 8, e78273.
- Du Bois, Jack, 2007. The stance triangle. In: Englebretson, R. (Ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 139–182.
- Eckert, Penelope, 2008. Variation and the indexical field. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12, 453–476.
- Emmersen, Sofie, Heinemann, Trine, 2010. Realization as a device for remedying problems of affiliation in interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 43 (2), 109–132.
- Endo, Tomoko, 2015. Independent experience, empathy and affiliation: *ah* in Japanese talk-in-interaction. In: Presentation at IPrA 2015, Antwerp, Belgium.
- Goffman, Erving, 1978. Response cries. *Language* 54 (4), 787–815.
- Golato, Andrea, 2010. Marking understanding versus receipting information in talk: *Achso*. and *ach* in German interaction. *Discourse Studies* 12 (2), 147–176.
- Golato, Andrea, 2012. German *oh*: marking an emotional change of state. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45 (3), 245–268.
- Golato, Andrea, Betz, Emma, 2008. German *ach* and *achso* in repair uptake: resources to sustain or remove epistemic asymmetry. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 27, 7–37.
- Grice, H. Paul, 1957. Meaning. *Philosophical Review* 67, 53–59.
- Hakulinen, Auli, 1993. The grammar of opening routines. In: Shore, S., Vilkkuna, M. (Eds.), *Sky 1993: Yearbook of the Linguistic Association of Finland*, 15. Helsinki, pp. 149–170.
- Hayashi, Makoto, 2009. Marking a ‘noticing of departure’ in talk: *Eh*-prefaced turns in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41, 2100–2129.
- Hayashi, Makoto, Hayano, Kaoru, A-prefaced response to inquiry in Japanese. In: Heritage, J., Sorjonen, M.-L. (Eds.), *Turn-Initial Particles Across Languages*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia (forthcoming).
- Heinemann, Trine, 2009. Two answers to inapposite inquiries. In: Sidnell, J. (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Comparative Perspectives*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 159–186.
- Heritage, John, 1984. A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In: Atkinson, J.M., Heritage, J. (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 299–345.
- Heritage, John, 1998. *Oh*-prefaced responses to inquiry. *Language in Society* 27 (3), 291–334.
- Heritage, John, 2002. *Oh*-prefaced responses to assessments: a method of modifying agreement/disagreement. In: Ford, C., Fox, B., Thompson, S. (Eds.), *The Language of Turn and Sequence*. Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 196–224.
- Heritage, John, 2015. *Well*-prefaced turns in English conversation: a conversation analytic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics* 88, 88–104.
- Heritage, John, Turn-initial particles in English: the cases of *Oh* and *Well*. In: Heritage, J., Sorjonen, M.-L. (Eds.), *Turn-Initial Particles across Languages*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia (forthcoming).
- Heritage, J., Sorjonen, M.-L. (Eds.), *Turn-Initial Particles across Languages*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia (forthcoming).
- Jefferson, Gail, 1978. Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In: Schenkein, J. (Ed.), *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 219–248.
- Kärkkäinen, Elise, 2003. Epistemic Stance in English Conversation: A Description of Its Interactional Functions, with a Focus on “I Think”. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Koivisto, Aino, 2013. On the preference for remembering: acknowledging an answer with Finnish *ai nii(n)* (“oh that’s right”). *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 46 (3), 277–297.
- Koivisto, Aino, 2015a. Displaying now-understanding: the Finnish change-of-state token *aa*. *Discourse Processes* 52 (2), 111–148.
- Koivisto, Aino, 2015b. Dealing with ambiguities in informings: Finnish *aijaa* as a “neutral” news receipt. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 48 (4), 365–387.
- Levinson, Stephen C., 2000. *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Norrick, Neal R., 2009. Interjections as pragmatic markers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41, 866–891.
- Reber, Elisabeth, 2012. *Affectivity in Interaction: Sound Objects in English*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Sacks, Harvey, Schegloff, Emanuel A., Jefferson, Gail, 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50, 696–735.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., 1992. Repair after next turn: the last structurally provided for place for the defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *Am. J. Sociol.* 95 (5), 1295–1345.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., 1996. Turn organization: one intersection of grammar and interaction. In: Ochs, E., Thompson, S., Schegloff, E. (Eds.), *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 52–133.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis, 1*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Schiffrin, Deborah, 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Sorjonen, Marja-Leena, 2001. *Responding in Conversation: A Study of Response Particles in Finnish*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Thompson, Sandra, Fox, Barbara, Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, 2015. *Grammar in Everyday Talk: Building Responsive Actions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Wilkinson, Sue, Kitzinger, Celia, 2006. Surprise as an interactional achievement: reaction tokens in conversation. *Soc. Psychol. Q.* 69, 150–182.
- Wu, Ruey-Juan Regina, 2004. *Stance in Talk: A Conversation Analysis of Mandarin Final Particles*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Wu, R.-J., Heritage, J., Particles and epistemics: convergences and divergences between English and Mandarin. In: Lerner, G., Raymond, G., Heritage, J. (Eds.), *Enabling Human Conduct: Naturalistic Studies of Talk-in-Interaction in Honor of Emanuel A. Schegloff*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia (forthcoming).
- Yngve, Victor H., 1970. On getting a word in edgewise. In: Campbell, M.A. (Ed.), *Papers from the Sixth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistics Society*. Department of Linguistics, University of Chicago, Chicago, pp. 567–578.