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**ABSTRACT**

Conversation, as a type of observable linguistic behavior is an important target of language documentation as it provides significant insight into the nature of spoken language that elicited sentences and monologic discourse may not provide (Mithun, 2014). The Basic Oral Language Documentation (BOLD) is a method of language documentation whose purpose is to orally annotate language use. In this sense, conversations, being the most basic form of language use, should find space not only in the collection, but also in its oral annotation. Yet, there have been no studies on how the oral method of annotation can be applied to conversations and to what extent it would provide useful data for analysis.

BOLD was developed to increase the speed of documentation by a purely oral approach in transcribing and translating the texts. This method was tested for field use by (Reiman, 2010) with positive feedback and for phonological analysis by (Unseth, 2012). Building on these previous studies, this thesis explores the applicability of BOLD for conversations. In doing so, BOLD was applied in three conversational data collected from a language documentation project in Guinaang, Kalinga. These texts then were analyzed using Conversation Analysis (CA) as framework to produce a basic description of the conversational structure of Guinaang. Advantages and challenges of using the oral method for conversations were identified to evaluate the
oral method. The findings suggest that a further annotation after BOLD has been applied will increase the usability of BOLD data for conversational analysis.
บทคัดย่อ

การสนทนา คือพฤติกรรมเชิงภาษาศาสตร์ประเภทหนึ่งที่สามารถสังเกตได้ และเป็นเป้าหมายสำคัญในการจัดเก็บข้อมูลทางภาษา บทสนทนาสามารถนำมาใช้เพื่อวิเคราะห์การสนทนา และข้อความที่ถ่ายทอดโดยบุคคลใดบุคคลหนึ่งอาจไม่สามารถนำมาใช้ได้ในลักษณะนี้ (Mithun, 2014). การบันทึกข้อมูลภาษาพูดแบบพื้นฐาน (Basic Oral Language Documentation – BOLD) เป็นวิธีการที่ใช้ในการจัดเก็บข้อมูลโดยมีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อ "อธิบายลักษณะการใช้ภาษาผ่านทางวิชาการ" (Moeller, Boerger, Reiman, & Self, 2016) ด้วยเหตุนี้ เมื่อจากประสบการณ์เป็นรูปแบบพื้นฐานที่สุดในการเรียนรู้ภาษาจะมีบทบาทไม่เพียงในการจัดเก็บข้อมูล แต่ในการกระบวนการอภิปรายทางวิชาการอีกด้วย อย่างไรก็ตาม ไม่มีการศึกษาเกี่ยวกับกระบวนการอภิปรายผ่านทางภาษาในแง่ของการประยุกต์ใช้กับบทสนทนา และขอบเขตของข้อมูลซึ่งเป็นประโยชน์ต่อการวิเคราะห์ภาษา

BOLD ถูกพัฒนาขึ้นมาเพื่อเพิ่มความเร็วในการจับเก็บข้อมูลโดยกระบวนการที่ผ่านทางทางภาษาอย่างสืบทอดในการแสดงความและการแสดงความ วิธีการนี้ถูกทดสอบสำหรับการจัดเก็บข้อมูลภาษาผสมโดย เรย์แมน (Reiman 2010) ซึ่งได้รับผลตอบรับทางวิชาการในการวิเคราะห์ด้านสังคมศาสตร์โดย อันเซท (Unseth 2012) จากผลการศึกษาเหล่านี้ ผู้วิจัยจึงได้มีการศึกษาการบันทึกข้อมูลภาษาพูดแบบพื้นฐาน (BOLD) อย่างที่ผ่านกระบวนการประยุกต์ใช้กับบทสนทนาที่กำลังดำเนินอยู่ ในงานวิจัยข้างต้น BOLD ถูกประยุกต์ใช้กับบทสนทนาสามรุ่นที่เกิดขึ้นระหว่างโครงการจัดเก็บข้อมูลทางภาษาในเมืองกินาอัง จังหวัดคาลิงกา บทสนทนาเหล่านี้ถูกวิเคราะห์โดยการใช้เครื่องมือวิเคราะห์การสนทนา (Conversation Analysis) เพื่อแสดงให้เห็นถึงลักษณะพื้นฐานของโครงสร้างการสนทนาในเมืองกินาอัง วิจัยนี้ได้สรุปข้อสังเกตประโยชน์และความท้าทายในกระบวนการจัดเก็บภาษาผ่านภาษา
โดยมีข้อเสนอแนะว่ากระบวนการในการอธิบายภาษานอกเหนือจาก BOLD เป็นสิ่งจำเป็นในการวิเคราะห์การสนทนา โดยกระบวนการเหล่านี้ได้มีการอธิบายโดยละเอียดในงานวิจัยฉบับนี้
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1P</td>
<td>First person plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>First person singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D</td>
<td>Second person dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td>Second person singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>Third person plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3S</td>
<td>Third person singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>Absolutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLD</td>
<td>Basic Oral Language Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DET</td>
<td>Determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGIDS</td>
<td>Expanded Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPH</td>
<td>Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>Ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>Exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIST</td>
<td>Existential Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPP</td>
<td>First Pair Part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPF</td>
<td>Imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inc.</td>
<td>Incomprehensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK</td>
<td>Linker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWC</td>
<td>Language of Wider Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Question Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP</td>
<td>Second Pair Part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCU</td>
<td>Turn Construction Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRP</td>
<td>Transition Relevance Place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**GLOSSARY**

**Oral Transcription**
An activity where a native speaker of the target language listens to an original recording of a speech event and produces a phrase-by-phrase, careful re-speaking in the vernacular.

**Oral Translation**
An activity where a native speaker translates verbally the phrase-by-phrase careful-speech recording into a language of wider communication (LWC).

**Primary Data**
A critical edition of the raw data which includes the correction of a second person; intended to serve as the basis for further research into the language or culture

**Raw Data**
An original source of data such as a document or recording
Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 Background
My motivation for writing this thesis started several years ago when I first got involved in language documentation, after receiving a short training in it. In my pursuit to capture the different ways of speaking of a speech community, I usually went to the field looking for people whom I can record while they told stories, jokes, gave advices, greetings, etc. in the most ‘natural’ way. With little success in finding natural examples of these different speech acts, I later learned that examples of ways of speaking occur in natural contexts and in social situations, and not in isolation through elicited sentences. Few years later, my interest in natural ways of speaking led me to the study of conversations—the most basic way of human social interaction. When people tell jokes, curse, transact, tell stories, etc. it usually involves at least two people, in a conversation.

The collected conversations, as part of the language documentation corpus, need to be transcribed and translated in order to be accessible to other researchers. One method that I have been using is the Basic Oral Language Documentation (BOLD) method which aims to increase the speed of documentation by using oral means of transcribing and translating texts by native speakers. It has been tested by Reiman (2010) for field use and Unseth (2012) for phonological analysis, but there have been no studies on how the oral method of annotation can be applied to conversations. This lead to my interest in applying and testing BOLD for conversations.

This thesis, then deals with conversations on two levels. First, it describes how an oral methodology of language documentation can be applied to conversational data, presenting the implications for BOLD methodology when it is applied to multi-participant communicative events. I offer an evaluation on the usability of this method for the anlaysis of conversation. Second, it is about conversations in that it involves a preliminary description of the conversational structure of Guinaang, a dialect of Kalinga in the Philippines. I describe the turn-taking system, sequential organization and repair system of the language.
1.2 Objectives

There are three main objectives of this thesis. They can be categorized as methodological, empirical and descriptive. In terms of my focus, the first will be primary and the others secondary.

1.2.1 Methodological Objective

*To examine the applicability of oral annotation method to conversational data.*

The primary aim of this research is to test whether the oral method of annotating texts produces adequate primary data for a discourse analysis of conversations. Since no research has been done to test the extent to which oral annotation can be used in the analyses of conversation, the results of this test may well be significant in the sense that the methodological procedure of BOLD may be improved or be seen to be limited in its use.

1.2.2 Empirical Objective

*To broaden the empirical basis for descriptive research in Guinaang Kalinga by providing annotated conversational data in audio and video format.*

The basis of previous linguistic research on Guinaang Kalinga was largely restricted to written narratives and elicited texts produced more than two decades ago. However, reasons for the absence of naturally occurring spoken language data in Guinaang include the fact that available technology during that time didn't allow the recording of conversations in ways that current technology is capable of doing. This thesis seeks to extend the current available data in Guinaang to include primary data of spoken language, particularly conversations in digital audio and video format.

1.2.3 Descriptive Objective

*To provide an initial description of the conversational structure of Guinaang Kalinga, focusing on turn-taking, adjacency pair and repair system of the language.*

Current descriptive outputs of Guinaang Kalinga are in the lower level of language hierarchy (grammar and phonology). The theoretical objective of this thesis is to provide a preliminary description of the fundamental structure of conversation of Guinaang Kalinga, using conversation analysis as the analytical tool.
1.3 Research Questions
To meet my primary objective, (methodological objective 1.3.1) the following research questions will be answered in this thesis:

1. To what extent does the BOLD method adequately provide data for analysis of conversation?

2. If it is lacking, what steps can be added to oral transcription and oral translation so that the primary data can be useful for conversational analysis?

The process of answering the above questions will require analysis of data in a specific language, Guinaang Kalinga. But beyond providing the examples for answering the questions, this data in turn will provide another benefit of this research, which will be the collecting and analyzing of conversational data in Guinaang. This will help me to meet my secondary objectives 2 and 3 as well.

For the descriptive objective, I considered some basic structure of conversation used by participants to maintain organization and orderliness in social interaction. The following are the topics that I will focus on:

1. Turn-taking - how do participants figure out when to begin and when to stop talking

2. Adjacency Pairs - in what ways do participants’ utterances bear close relationship with each other?

3. Repair - what are some strategies participants use in doing repair?

1.4 Scope of the Research
This thesis study was based on three recorded conversations gathered in 2014 during the Pasil Language Documentation Project\(^1\). More data could have provided better analysis of the language use of the community. However, research time was

\(^1\) In 2014, a Language Documentation project was done by SIL as response to the request of the Vice Mayor. The goal of the project was to collect samples of actual language use of Pinasil in audio and video format. The corpus contains word lists, grammatical paradigms, narratives and conversations. Cultural practices were also part of the documentation.
limited since the thesis was written in the researcher’s hometown, away from the native speakers since access to them is very limited.

1. The research is based on the data using the BOLD technique

2. The conversations are analyzed on the framework of Conversation Analysis, particularly on (1) turn-taking (2) adjacency pairs (3) repair organization

1.5 Organization of the Thesis

The next three chapters provide context for the study. Chapter 2 is a discussion about the broad topic of language documentation. Under this topic is an overview of one of the proposed language documentation methodology, the BOLD method which this thesis has attempted to test. Chapter 3 provides an overview on Guinaang Kalinga and its speakers. Chapter 4 on the other hand is a discussion on Conversation Analysis (CA), the approach with which the Guinaang texts were analyzed. Chapter 5 presents the methodology of the study. Chapter 6 analyzes the conversational structure of Guinaang Kalinga. The analysis focuses on the turn-taking, adjacency pairs and repair system of the language, based on four conversational texts from different speakers. Chapter 7 describes the application of BOLD in a language documentation project, as well as the advantages and challenges of BOLD for the analysis of conversation. Chapter 8 presents a discussion on the implications of the results to BOLD method. Chapter 9 presents a diagram of the suggested workflow for documenting conversations using the BOLD method. Chapter 10 concludes this thesis by discussing the results of this study.
Chapter 2
Language Documentation and the BOLD Method

2.1 Introduction
This chapter presents an overview of language documentation, the BOLD method and the researcher's language documentation project which utilizes BOLD. Section 2.2 provides the theoretical foundation for language documentation, as well as its brief history and current issues in its methodology. Section 2.3 provides an overview of the proposed methodology of BOLD.

2.2 Language Documentation
Language documentation is a relatively new subfield of linguistics that deals with the creation of lasting, multipurpose records of languages. Himmelmann (1998), who is often credited with catalyzing language documentation, defines its aim as "...to provide a comprehensive record of the linguistic practices of a given speech community." Woodbury (2003), another major scholar working in the field of theorizing language documentation, adds that documentary linguistics is “concerned with the making and keeping of records of the world's languages and their patterns of use” (p.35). Later, he provides a more detailed definition: “the creation, annotation, preservation and dissemination of transparent records of a language.”

According to Austin (2012), “the major goal [of language documentation] is the creation of well-organized, long-lasting corpora that can be used for a variety of purposes, including theoretical and practical needs, such as language and cultural revitalization.”

This discipline has developed as a response to the language endangerment crisis that began more than two decades ago. In 1991, the Linguistic Society of America (LSA) hosted a symposium on endangered languages, at which Krauss estimated that in the global situation, only 10% of languages are safe, up to 50% may be already moribund and the rest are in danger of becoming moribund before the turn of the century (Krauss, 1992). A featured article of this symposium urged the linguistics community to “[rethink] our priorities, lest linguistics go down in history as the only...”
science that presided obliviously over the disappearance of 90% of the very field which it is dedicated” (Krauss, 1992).

To achieve the goal of language documentation, that is to create a lasting, multipurpose record of language, Himmelmann (2006) proposes a basic format for language documentation, composed of primary data and the apparatus.

Table 1 Basic format of a language documentation (Himmelmann, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Data</th>
<th>Apparatus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recordings/recordings of observable linguistic behavior and metalinguistic knowledge (possible basic formats: sessions and lexical)</td>
<td>Per session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metadata</td>
<td>For documentation as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- time and location of recording</td>
<td>Metadata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- participants</td>
<td>- location of documented community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- recording team</td>
<td>- project team(s) contributing to documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- recording equipment</td>
<td>- participants in documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- content descriptors</td>
<td>- acknowledgements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annotations</td>
<td>General access resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- transcription</td>
<td>- introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- translation</td>
<td>- orthographical conventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- further linguistic and ethnographic glossing and commentary</td>
<td>- ethnographic sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- sketch grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- glossing conventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- indices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- links to other resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary data includes audio and video recordings of communicative events, while the apparatus is additional information ‘attached’ to each original recording, such as metadata, transcription, translation, grammatical gloss, further ethnographic glossing and commentary.

Himmelmann (2006) suggests that primary data should include evidence for the language use of a speech community, which he called observable linguistic behavior. This provides examples of how people communicate with each other, ranging from everyday, casual talks to elaborate rituals. The other type of primary data is metalinguistic knowledge, which refers to the ‘tacit knowledge that speakers have about their language.’ This may include linguistically-based taxonomies, kinship
systems, morphological paradigms and expressions of numbers. Himmelmann also suggests to include a brief linguistic description of the language in order to provide context for the corpora.

2.2.1 Documentation versus Description

In theorizing language documentation, Himmelmann (1998) argues for a distinction between description and documentation. As noted by Austin (2006), Himmelmann made it clear that they differ in terms of goals, areas of interest, research methods, workflows and outcomes. Language description focuses on linguistic structures and systems, and typically aims to produce grammar, dictionaries and collections of texts. Language documentation, on the other hand, is the representation of a range of types of language use. In other words, although description is, in some ways, based on documentary work, in Himmelmann’s view, the production of grammars and dictionaries and collection of texts, in the traditional sense, should not be the aim of documentation.

Himmelmann (1998) describes five main features of language documentation which makes it distinct from mainstream linguistics: First is language documentation’s focus on primary data. The goal is to make the data available to a wide range of users. The second feature discussed is its explicit concern for accountability. Since primary data is intended to be available to a wide range of audiences, an analysis can be evaluated by anyone. The third main feature is its concern for long-term storage and preservation of primary data. It finds value in gathering relevant metadata, knowledge recording and processing primary data. Fourth is working in interdisciplinary teams, that is, experts from different fields can collaborate in order to create a fuller documentation. Finally, the fifth main feature is its collaboration with the speech community. The speakers of the language themselves should be involved in the process of the documentation.

Austin (2006) elaborates on this distinction, particularly on how documentation and description treat data. The latter’s concern is the production of grammars and dictionaries whose audience is primarily linguists. Data, in this case, serves to exemplify and support the linguist’s analysis, typically presented as edited, isolated sentences and often without source or attribution. On the contrary, data in language documentation is placed at the center of concern. Its main research goal is data collection, representation and diffusion. In this sense, dictionaries and text collections serve as dependent (by)products that annotate and comment on the
documentary corpus. Furthermore, the audience for language documentation is wider, including not only linguists and researchers from other areas such as anthropology, musicology or oral history, but also members of the speech community whose language is being documented.

2.2.2 Components of language documentation

Austin (2006) lists five activities in a documentation research: (1) recording of media and text (including metadata) in context; (2) transferring this data to a data management program. This involves moving files from storage media to computer hard drives with a certain data management system (file and folder naming); (3) adding value—transcription, translation, annotation and notation and linking of metadata to the recordings. (4) Archiving - creating archival objects and assigning them access and usage rights. (5) Mobilization – creating, publication and distribution of outputs for a range of different users. Of the five components mentioned above, this thesis is primarily concerned with the third, adding value to the original text by means of annotation, which will be discussed in section 2.2.6.

2.2.3 Collecting Data

As mentioned earlier, primary data is composed of communicative events, which can be categorized as either observable linguistic behavior or metalinguistic knowledge. In terms of collecting communicative events, Himmelmann (1998) also distinguishes between three types of communicative events that are ideal² for field-based documentation: Observed Communicative Events (OCEs); Elicitation (E); and Staged Communicative Events (SCEs). Lüpke (2010) provides a detailed discussion on collecting them particularly on the usefulness of each type in linguistic analysis. She argues that these different event types and subtypes do not yield the equivalent data, and an ideal corpus “will balance the different types collected with a range of speakers to create a maximally informative and diverse corpus” (Lüpke, 2010).

² Himmelman (1998:27) includes what he calls ‘natural’ communicative events which are unaffected by external interference. Such events, according to him are not amenable to documentation.
However, since this thesis is concerned with naturally occurring conversations, only OCE is relevant. Lüpke (2010) discusses two types of OCEs: monologues and interactive discourse. He argues that data from these natural communicative events “have a high ecological validity regarding the naturalness of high-frequency segmental and suprasegmental phonological, morphological and syntactic phenomena” (p.66).

Himmelmann (2006, p.18) comments on the limitations of documenting based on the dictionary-grammar format, a well-established practice among structural linguists that relies heavily on elicitation. This format treats language as an abstract system and even the best structural grammar falls short of the goal of presenting a lasting, multipurpose record of a language. The five major issues listed by Himmelmann are: (1) grammars do not represent how language is actually spoken; (2) data contained in grammars and dictionaries are not verifiable (3) grammars usually only contain statements on grammatical topics that are known and reasonably well-understood at the time of writing the grammar; and (4) grammars provide little that is of direct use to non-linguists, including the speech community, educators and researchers in other disciplines.

Ideally, naturally occurring communicative events are the primary object of language documentation (Woodbury, 2003). They are rarely monologues, but rather involve at least two participants (Schultze-Berndt, 2006). However, Amery (2009) and Sugita (2007, 2011) note a lack of interactional data among the materials.
gathered in the field. For example, Amery (2009) observes that the description of indigenous Australian languages has typically focused on structural properties of language, while conversations in everyday life were ignored. Sugita (2007) also notes the lack of consideration of interactional data among young researchers documenting endangered languages. Reflecting on archived materials, he also notes that conversational data seems to be neglected (Sugita, 2011).

Now, conversations are being given importance in language documentation. Workshops and conferences are held to train linguists in handling the multimodal nature of language. For example, at the LSA annual meeting in 2014, the Center for Endangered Languages and their Preservation (CELP) held a tutorial on documenting conversations. The presentations in this tutorial, which are available in their website, are worth mentioning in this study. “The Value of Good Conversation” by (Mithun, 2014) focuses on the importance of conversations for linguistics, while (Rosenblum & Sammons, 2014) presents about techniques for collecting and analyzing conversational texts. Their presentation is particularly relevant to this study in that it discusses the application of BOLD method to conversational data.

The Institute of Collaborative Research (CoLang), formerly Infield, has been holding trainings since 2008 for linguists, graduate students, and native speakers of minority languages to equip them with a range of skills needed to document, maintain, and/or revitalize minority languages. In 2016, CoLang held a workshop on using video cameras as the default recording device in language documentation, which began with a session on the fundamental nature of face-to-face of conversations as the basic mode of language use. This is because the multimodal nature of language use—the accompanying nods, hand gestures, eye movements, etc.—can be best captured by video. Therefore, as the course introduction on the website suggests,

“Language documentation projects as well as any linguistic research project documenting and investigating dimensions of conversational language use should record video” (Seyfeddinipur & Levine, 2015).

2.3 Annotating Spoken language

Audio and video recordings in language documentation corpora are made useful and accessible to potential users who do not know the language by tagging ‘additional information,’ generally called annotation. How detailed an annotation should be is a matter of debate. Minimal annotations may only consist of a transcription and free
translation, while more elaborate types may also include interlinear glossing and grammatical and ethnographic commentaries (Himmelmann, 2006).

Schultze-Berndt (2006), Bird & Liberman (1999) all agree that linguistic annotation is an umbrella term used to describe data that is associated with an audio or video recording of a communicative event. Schultze-Berndt even goes so far as to say that it “may represent aspects of a communicative event for which no recording exists” (p.213). Linguistic annotations may include transcriptions, ethnographic information, physical contexts and paralinguistic and extralinguistic cues, such as prosody and gesture. Time-aligned annotations are also practiced in corpus linguistics which share its over-arching goals with language documentation (Cox, 2011).

Schultze-Berndt (2006) discusses three main levels of linguistic annotation: transcription, translation and grammatical annotation: (1) transcription, “the symbolic representation of the formal or significant side of the linguistic expressions used in a communicative event” (2) translation, a type of annotation that attempts to capture in terms of one or more metalanguages, the meaning and function of a communicative event; (3) grammatical annotation, which is comprised of annotations related to structural aspects of complex signs. The annotations are displayed in interlinear or multi-tier formats and time-aligned with the same segment of audio and/or video data.

A suggestion for interlinear glossing can be found on the website for E-MELD (Electronic Metastructure for Endangered Languages Data):

“the model typically used in IGT (interlinear glossing text) incorporates three tiers: a transcribed (either phonetically or orthographically) text, a gloss and a free translation.” (EMELD, 2005)

According to it, the three-tiered glossing should be minimum because a mere translation of the text will make the data too ambiguous and less useful for the future or even present generations of linguists. (Bow, Hughes, & Bird, 2003) describe a 4-level model which incorporates text, morpheme, word and phrase levels, summarizing components of each level.

(Nathan, 2011) adds that from archiving point of view, audio and video materials should be accompanied by text-based annotations (including metadata) so that users can list, sort and search media content easily, without having to listen to entire recordings in order to discover what is on them.
2.3.1 Transcription

The most basic type of annotation is the transcription of the linguistic utterances contained in a recording (Himmelmann, 2006). In transcribing spoken language, one of the decisions to be made is how to represent ‘relevant features’ of a speech event. According to Schultze-Berndt (2006), transcription of segmental information can be either orthographic, phonemic or phonetic. In addition, non-segmental information can be transcription of prosody and transcription of paralinguistic and non-linguistic phenomena. To these she adds another type: transcription representing multi-speaker and multilingual discourse. Non-linguistic and para-linguistic aspects can be easily transcribed. Examples include hesitations and filled pauses (e.g. *uhm*), laughter and significant changes in vocal quality (e.g. whispering). In transcribing multi-speaker and multilingual discourse, Berndt mentions that it is common to indicate speaker change (turns) and overlapping speech in discourse analytic framework.

(1) Transcription of multi-speaker discourse (Schultze-Berndt, 2006)

a. Representation of multi-speaker discourse in the discourse-analytic tradition

   A: Now that we have the [side door] fixed,
   B: [that’s kind of]—

b. Representation of multi-speaker discourse in a multi-tiered format

```
\sp A
\orth now that we have the [side door] fixed,
\sp B
\orth [that’s kind of] –
```

Example 1a shows transcription of conversation typical in the discourse and conversation analytic approach. Example 1b shows its equivalent in multi-tiered format.

Another relevant issue in transcription is breaking down spoken discourse into smaller units such as words and intonation units. With regard to segmenting words, Himmelmann (2006) first argues that although defining what a ‘word’ is varies across languages, it would be wrong to conclude that ‘word’ is not a useful unit or that the variation among speaker intuition about wordhood is totally arbitrary.
He adds that for segmenting utterances into word-sized chunks, the primary source of information will be native speaker intuition. Native speakers in many literate societies have clear ideas about wordhood although perception is largely based on the orthography that they are familiar with. In non-literate societies, speakers are able break down utterances into word-like sizes when they dictate an utterance to an outside researcher. He also emphasizes that

“the documentation should include clear evidence as to how native speakers handle word boundaries, both in the clear and the unclear cases. This may be done by including recordings of acts of ‘dictation’ (for example, recording a transcription session where the native speaker listens to a previously made recording and dictates it in workable chunks to the transcriber)” (p.255).

Schultze-Berndt (2006) reminds the reader that there should be a balance between completeness of annotation and the time and effort involved in producing annotations (which can be easily underestimated). She adds that annotation is an ongoing process and can be produced or corrected multiple times by one or multiple authors.

**2.3.2 Translation**

Schultze-Berndt, (2006) also discusses important issues in translation. One major decision to be made is choosing the metalanguage for glossing and translating. Possible language of translation includes (1) second dominant language for the speaker (typically the lingua franca in the area); (2) official language of the country; (3) a standard language variety (in case of documentation of a non-standard dialect); (4) the native or dominant language of the researcher; (5) language of the academic affiliation of the researcher; and (5) a global language such as English.

She also discusses different styles of translation—morpheme by morpheme, gloss and free translation. One difficulty mentioned lies in the fact that many times, the researcher, who is often not a member of the speech community, is given the burden of translating from the local language to another language which is also not his/her native language. The author then suggests that free translation from a documentation project be taken only as a clue to the meaning and analysis of the documented utterances. In addition, the researcher has to choose between a free translation and a literal translation, although it is possible to include both in separate tiers. Thirdly, she argues that information on the non-linguistic context of the utterance should be included on a separate tier.
2.4 BOLD Method

SIL (previously “Summer Institute of Linguistics”) developed and proposed Basic Oral Language Documentation (BOLD), a methodology of documentation for the purpose of increasing the speed of the documentation process so that more languages can be documented in their cultural contexts before they are lost (Boerger 2011:210).

BOLD was first formally presented by Simons (2008) at the 5th National Language Research Symposium at De La Salle University, Manila. According to him, BOLD’s oral technique in documentation was inspired by Woodbury’s (2003) running “UN style” translation of Cup’ik materials, where he intended to avoid producing any written transcription or analysis during the documentation process. Simons presented the idea that a documentary corpus can be collected in a short period of time by using a purely oral approach. Additionally, he developed a language documentation course that has been offered at the Graduate Institute of Applied Linguistics since 2009 (Boerger 2011).

Figure 2 Oral annotation process of BOLD (Reiman 2010:261)

**BOLD’s Distinctive method: Oral annotation**

BOLD’s most distinctive feature is found in its oral method of annotation. Reiman (2010), who field-tested BOLD in 2009 in Kasanga [ccj], describes, in more detail, BOLD’s three types of annotation. The first type is oral transcription, also referred to as “careful speech.” It is meant to provide a clearer interpretation of the text. After recording a communicative event, a native speaker listens to the recording, pausing the player at breath or phrasal breaks and then “respeaking” the segment in a slower and more comprehensible manner, while a second recorder is running. This is done repeatedly, until the entire audio file has been transcribed. This process creates a new file which contains the original recording, plus the careful speech. The second type of annotation is the oral translation, which follows the same process as the oral transcription. The same or another native speaker listens to the original recording and orally translates it into a language of wider communication. BOLD’s final type of annotation is the analytical or oral discussion. A speaker discusses “linguistic,
cultural or contextual issues that arise” (Boerger, 2011). using a language of wider communication. This may include any background information that is not accessible to non-native speakers, such as implied information, cultural knowledge, and folk taxonomies (Reiman 2010).

In her article “To BOLDly Go Where No One Has Gone Before,” Boerger (2011) further discusses the distinctive characteristics of BOLD. According to Boerger, one characteristic is that it is basic, in the sense that it is intended only to produce a minimum corpus in a language that can serve as a foundation for further work, or as a time capsule in case no further documentation can be done (p.210). Another characteristic of BOLD is that it is oral, meaning the whole corpus is intended to be purely oral, including its annotations. Thirdly, it is breadth first, in that it intends to gather a wide range of naturally occurring communicative events, and elicited lists by making everything oral and thus postponing the written transcription and analysis. Boerger estimates that the time required for a minimum corpus to be completed is less than two months.

Each article by the developers of BOLD (Simons 2008, Reiman 2010, Boerger 2011) vary in what they prescribe as constituting a documentary corpus, team composition, time in the field, and whether analysis is part of BOLD. Unseth (2012) gives a summary of these parameters of BOLD, according to each phase.

Table 2 Summary of BOLD phases (Unseth 2012:151)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Data</strong></td>
<td>Communicative events</td>
<td>Communicative events</td>
<td>Communicative events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wordlists</td>
<td>Wordlists</td>
<td>Wordlists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semantic domains</td>
<td>Semantic domains</td>
<td>Semantic domains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grammatical paradigms</td>
<td>Analytical discussions</td>
<td>Grammatical paradigms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analytical discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oral discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annotations</strong></td>
<td>Informed consent</td>
<td>Informed consent</td>
<td>Informed consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Situational metadata</td>
<td>Situational metadata</td>
<td>Situational metadata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral transcription</td>
<td>Oral transcription</td>
<td>Oral transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral translation</td>
<td>Oral translation</td>
<td>Oral translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written transcription</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oral translation Word-level glossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access Materials</strong></td>
<td>Introductory Document</td>
<td>Introductory Document</td>
<td>Introductory Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table of Contents</td>
<td>Table of Contents</td>
<td>Table of Contents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unseth (2012) notes that Boerger (2011) clarifies some misconceptions relating to how BOLD was described by Reiman in 2010. Unseth’s summary shows that there were certain details that Reiman (2010) failed to emphasize, yet both Simons and Boerger agreed were important aspects of BOLD method.

### 2.5 Previous Evaluation

#### 2.5.1 Unseth (2012)

One test of BOLD method was completed by Unseth (2012). In her thesis, she utilizes the BOLD method throughout her phonological study of Laari. By producing a phonological analysis out of the BOLD data, she establishes that BOLD is useful for phonological analysis, as claimed by the developers. She presents difficulties encountered in using the BOLD method and offers suggestions for improvements. After Reiman’s test of BOLD’s applicability in the field, it was further tested by Unseth (2012), particularly in its usability for phonological analysis. Unseth’s phonological study was largely based on wordlists and paradigms, both part of the BOLD design. Unseth found the word list in audio and video format to be beneficial because both the data, as well as the speaker’s external articulators, could be viewed instrumentally. Transcribing while eliciting the word list was not crucial to the project, but proved beneficial, because the speaker was able to give analytical comments, such as pointing out minimal pairs. Unseth concluded that paradigms, on
the other hand, were helpful for analysis and producing a written transcription, but could have been more optimally utilized, had the analysis been done during fieldwork. The researchers delayed analysis in order to test a purely oral method which does not include analysis in the field. This negatively affected their understanding of the language’s tones.

In transcribing communicative events, Unseth encountered four difficulties: (1) producing written transcription from a purely auditory source; (2) hearing phonological differences, such as tone and length (with and without the use of tools, such as spectrograms); (3) determining word breaks; and (4) analyzing morphophonemic changes. Despite the oral transcriber’s input, not all word breaks were able to be distinguished. Furthermore, the oral transcriber’s attempt to produce ‘phonemic’ transcription made it difficult to identify the morphophonemic changes.

In glossing the text, there were challenges such as (1) a lack of one-to-one correspondence between the original text and the translation and (2) differences in the forms of words in wordlists and communicative events; (3) words in the text not appearing in the wordlist; and (4) the inability to deduce word meaning from free translation because the word relates to multiple parts or large segments of the gloss.

In studying communicative events, Unseth compared her own gloss of a text (using a wordlist) with a gloss by a native speaker. The comparison showed that the two texts appeared to be very similar, demonstrating that outside researchers can produce a correct gloss with some study. However, Unseth admits that her own gloss lacks some grammatical information that is difficult to deduce without previous knowledge of the language. Examples of glossing difficulties that she faced include contractions, (i.e. words that are often contracted in communicative events appear as a different form in a wordlist) and misplaced word breaks, (i.e. when the researcher fails to divide words in the right place).

Unseth also finds oral transcription to be both a benefit and a detriment to phonological analysis. It is beneficial because of the native speaker’s intuition for identifying what the underlying form is without asking. However, the fact that the phonological processes may be abrogated when speaking slowly and clearly can be a detriment for the analyzation process. Observing phonological processes in the normal speech recording and comparing it with the slow speech is not useful, especially when the recording is difficult to hear. She concludes that “BOLD has a potential to be a documentary methodology but also needs improvements in several areas” (p.183).
2.5.2 Rosenblum and Sammon (2014)

Rosenblum and Sammon’s tutorial presentation at the LSA Annual meeting in 2014 is available in PDF format online. The presentation, entitled “Documenting multimodal interaction: workflows, data management, and archiving” covers a wide range of issues in documenting conversations. It focuses on BOLD as one of the annotation methods and discusses the workflow from recording to orally annotating conversational data to archiving. Using the documentation project of Michif and Kwak’wala, both highly endangered languages in Canada, as research context, it discusses issues and challenges in oral annotation such as (1) the number of oral annotators-- all participants as oral annotators vs. one oral annotator and (2) the treatment of oral annotations as primary or secondary sources.

The benefits of adapting the oral method that is mentioned includes: (1) it reduces bottlenecking in transcription, (2) it distributes workloads by allowing people less trained in linguistics or less-familiar with the language to participate in documentation and (2) it invites collaboration with community language workers and students.

Bold’s oral annotation adapts the setup described by Reiman (2010) which uses two recorders for recording and playback, an arduous task that can be facilitated by a software such as Saymore.

In conclusion, BOLD claims that its purpose is "to orally annotate language use" which can be applied to any oral discourse (Moeller et al., 2016). In this sense, conversation, being the basic and primary mode of language use is a target of BOLD. Secondly, as a method of language documentation whose goal is to capture the linguistic practices of a community, BOLD includes conversations as one the communicative events in the corpus. This is in line with one of BOLD’s characteristics, that it intends to include as many and as varied speech acts in its corpus (Boerger, 2011). After all, conversations provide a wealth of linguistic information which narratives and elicited data may not provide. Not recording them is missing many aspects of language structure and use (Bowern, 2008, Mithun, 2014). In terms of revitalization, conversations can provide language functions and speech formulas which speakers need in reteaching the language (Amery, 2009).
2.6 Summary

In this section I presented the definition of language documentation, its purposes and how it should be done, according to scholars. I also briefly presented its history, particularly how documentary linguistics rose as a separate discipline, more specifically, from descriptive linguistics. This section highlighted two central tasks in language documentation, collecting and annotating, with an emphasis on spoken language. Spoken language, with conversations as its prototype, is undoubtedly an important target of documentation. However, it is noted to be lacking in focus in present documentation projects, and its annotation comes with difficulty.

This chapter also presented a promising method of documentation, the BOLD method, which attempts to speed up the process of collecting data by taking advantage of the oral means of transcription and translation by native speakers. It presented the difficulties of transcription, glossing and analysis, using the BOLD method for phonological analysis. The usability of the oral data from BOLD has been tested in phonology, but little has been researched concerning potential application for conversational data.
Chapter 3
Introduction to Guinaang Kalinga

3.1 Introduction
The Philippines is a multilingual and multicultural country consisting of 175 languages (Lewis, Simons, & Fennig, 2016) with a population of more than 100 million (Philippine Statistics Authority, 2016a). Among the ethnic groups are the Kalingas who occupy a central position in the interior of northern Luzon. Within the people collectively referred to as Kalinga are different sub groups with their own unique languages, one of which is the Guinaang tribe who speaks the language variety under consideration in this thesis. This chapter introduces the Guinaang Kalinga language and its speakers. Section 3.2 presents the speakers of Guinaang Kalinga variety and their geographical location. In section 3.3 the language family classification is presented. Section 3.4 surveys the literature on Guinaang. Section 3.5 is a brief grammatical description of the language that is relevant to this study.

3.2 Guinaang Kalinga and its Speakers
The Kalinga province is part of the Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR) and lies at 121°17’ east longitude and 17°26’ north latitude. It is a landlocked province bounded by the provinces of Apayao on the north, Cagayan and Isabela on the east, Abra on the west and mountain province on the south. The province has a total land area of 3,231.30 square kilometers of rugged and sloping terrain with mountain peaks ranging from 1,000 to 2,500 meters above sea level. It covers 16.80% of the total CAR’s land area. It has a total population of 213,000 (Philippine Statistics Authority, 2016b) and is politically divided into seven municipalities: Pasil, Balbalan, Lubuagan, Pinukpuk, Tanudan, Tinglayan and Rizal.

The Guinaang tribe is found in the municipality of Pasil, occupying five of the fourteen villages or barangays of the municipality. These villages are Guinaang, Malucsad, Pugong, Galdang and Bagtayan, which has a total population of 2,921 (Philippine Statistics Authority, 2016b). It is the biggest subtribe of Pasil. Although they collectively identify themselves as Guinaang by virtue of their tribe or as an
Ipasil by their municipality, they also differentiate themselves from the other members of the tribe by their home village. Thus, they are also known separately as Iguinaang, Ipugong, Imalucsad, Igaldang, and Ibagtayan.

The Guinaang tribe is said to be the original settlers and the ‘purest’ of all the tribes in Pasil. They are recognized by the other tribes in Pasil as the best in doing the Salidummay, a traditional singing in Kalinga. Most government institutions of Pasil are located Sitio Amdalao in Brgy. Guinaang.

As with other Kalingas, the Guinaang people are mostly rice farmers. In recent years, electricity has been installed and the roads have been paved making transportation easier. Nevertheless, there are still villages that are only accessible by foot. Despite this, mobile telecommunications and internet are available in most areas.
3.3 Language Name

*Kalinga* [kaliŋga] or *Kinalinga* [kinaliŋga], as the people call their language, is an Austronesian language and a member of the Central Cordilleran family of northern Philippines, in coordinate with Itneg. Reid (1974) classifies Kalinga as part of the central Cordilleran subgroup of Philippine languages.
The term Kalinga covers numerous languages and dialects with varying degrees of intelligibility: Butbut, Limos, Lower Tanudan, Lubuagan, Mabaka Valley, Madukayan, Southern Kalinga and Upper Tanudan Kalinga. Guinaang is listed as a dialect of Lubuagan Kalinga with ISO 63:93 language code knb (Lewis et al., 2016). The Guinaang variety also has toponyms associated with the place where it is spoken. When speaking with other Kalinga speakers from outside Pasil, they would refer to their language as Pinasil to differentiate it from other Kalinga languages. From here on, I will refer to the variety spoken by the Guinaang tribe as Guinaang Kalinga or simply Guinaang.

3.4 Previous work on Guinaang Kalinga

3.4.1 Sociolinguistic Survey

Gonzales (2015) reports on a language survey conducted in Pasil, Kalinga whose purpose was to determine whether there was a possible need for vernacular literature in the language. The goals of the survey were to (1) evaluate the vitality of the varieties spoken in Pasil; (2) determine which variety should be selected for language development; and (3) determine the extensibility of Lubuagan materials to speakers in Pasil.

---

Figure 4 Proto Central Cordilleran (Reid, 1974)

---

3 Lubuagan is a neighboring town of Pasil, where Guinaang is spoken.
The study revealed that the Pinasil language is at the level of stable orality. Children learn their language at home from their parents, although majority of the people in Pasil are bilingual to Ilocano. Although bilingualism is increasing, people use Ilocano only for Ilocano visitors and for government functions.

In terms of extensibility of materials from Lubuagan, the study found that people from Pasil’s attitude towards using written materials in Lubuagan is low, in spite of minimal lexical difference between Lubuagan and Pasil. Gonzales therefore recommended a language development in Pasil, using a Pasil variety. Her study concludes that the Guinaang variety is the best choice for language development for Pasil, as it has the largest population, prestige, existing institutions and facilities and has published written materials.

### 3.4.2 Grammar Overview

#### 3.4.2.1 Introduction

Richard Gieser is one of the first to produce a linguistic analysis of Kalinga which he based on his data from Guinaang. In 1950s, he made the first phonological analysis (Gieser, 1958), and a few years later he wrote a grammatical sketch (Gieser, 1963). He published a collection of stories (Gieser, 1987) which he collected during his stay in Brgy. Guinaang.

The aim of this section is to present a basic overview of some key aspects of Kalinga grammar. It is meant orient readers who are not familiar with Philippine languages to some of the grammatical structures in the text and to facilitate reading of the examples. The analysis of conversation necessitates an understanding of the basic structure of language since the conversational structure deals with grammatical structure of the language.

This is section is a condensed version of Gieser (1958, 1963, 1987) with some variation. A thesis written by Saggers (1991) on Linimos, another variety of Kalinga is a great resource for this summary. This section covers the basic phonological, morphological and syntactical structure of Guinaang.

---

4 In EGIDS scale, stable orality is labelled vigorous, which refers to the situation where the language is used orally by all generations and is being learned by children as their first language.
### 3.4.2.2 Phonology

Guinaang Kalinga has eighteen segmental phonemes (Gieser, 1958), which consist of fourteen consonants and four vowels. They are presented in table 2.

#### Table 3 Guinaang Kalinga consonant phonemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stops vl</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>(k)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vd</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricatives</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasals</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>η</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laterals</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semivowels</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are thirteen native consonantal phonemes and one velar plosive consonant (k) used in loanwords: b, d, g, l, m, n, η, p, s, t, w, y, and ?. The vowels include a, i, o, and u.

#### Table 4 Vowel Phonemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guinaang phonology is straightforward, apart from some very interesting sounds that are worth discussing. Among the consonants, /b/, /d/, and /l/ have phonetic variants. Gieser (1958) describes the distribution of these phonemes and its variants.


---

^5 Gieser (1958) analyzes this as a voiceless bilabial palatalized stop [p^p], but the researcher reanalyses it as [p^by] for the reason that there seems to be a clear aspiration after the voiceless bilabial.
The /d/ has two variants, [d] and [čˇ]. The phone [d] occurs only in syllable-final position⁶: *ugud* [ʔu.gud] ‘speech, language’, *amod* [ʔa.mod] ‘very’, *ud* [ʔud] ‘locative marker’. Finally, [čˇ] occurs before high vowels i and u, while [ǰ] occurs before lower vowels a and o: *dila* [či.la] ‘tongue’ adu [ʔa.ju] ‘many’ dalan [ja.lan] ‘road, path’

The /l/ has two variants: [l] occurs word initially, in sequence with [i], and in geminates. *langit* [la.ngit] ‘sky’, *dila* [či.la] ‘tongue’, *manbolbolloy* [mambolbolloy] ‘to play house’. [ð], a voiced interdental approximant occurs (1) intervocalically when neither vowel is i: *boloy* [pʊoðoy] ‘house’, *ulog* [ʔʊðog] ‘snake’, *bulun* [pʊuðun] ‘companion’, (2) syllable final after a, o and u: *altib* [ʔað.tib] ‘scissors’ *omol* [ʔo.moð] ‘loud, excited talking’. Gieser (1963) describes the manner of articulation as ‘fronting of the tongue in a way that causes the blade to approach, but not contact, the alveolar ridge, while the tongue-tip either is protruded between the teeth behind the lower lip or remains behind the lower front teeth’

According to Gieser (1970), the phoneme /k/ is not original in Guinaang, but came to usage through borrowing from Ilocano and other dialects of Kalinga ‘whose pronunciations in this area usually retain k’. In the data, very little instances of k can be found. Words that originally have k, such as Ilocano loanwords and personal names are pronounced with glottal stop. For example, *Condesa* [kondesa] is pronounced [ʔunčısa].

**Syllable patterns**

The syllable, a basic phonological unit of Guinaang comprises a nucleus consisting of a consonant and a vowel, and an optional final margin consisting of a consonant.

The segmental phonemes combine with the two basic syllable patterns, CV and CVC, where C represents any consonant and V any vowel. The two basic syllable types are CV: [nu] ‘if’ and CVC [man-] ‘actor focus prefix’.

---

⁶ Interestingly, some words with ending in [d] are found to alternate with the same word with a voiced palatal fricative [ǰ]: [ʔugad] ~ [ʔugudǰ] ‘speech, language’, [ʔanad] ~ [ʔanadǰ] ‘later’, [ʔud] ~ [ʔudǰ] ‘locative marker’.

⁷ The [d] sound was originally analyzed as [H] by Gieser (1958) which he described as a ‘central resonant oral, produced by relaxing the tongue and placing the tip either behind the lower front teeth, or behind the lower lip. Also commonly known as ‘Kalinga-L’, its Lubuagan dialect orthographically represents it as y (barred y). Recently, (Olson, Mielke, Sanicas-Daguman, Pemble, & Paterson, 2010) argues that the sound which exist in at least 9 languages in the Philippines, should be properly described as ‘voiced interdental approximant with egressive pulmonic air’ and its symbol ð be included in IPA.
Guinaang roots display different combination of syllable types. Most Guinaang roots are mostly disyllabic or trisyllabic. The canonical form of Kalinga roots is CV.CVC (Gieser, 1972).

**Table 5 Syllable types in Guinaang, Kalinga**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Type</th>
<th>Syllable Type</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>monosyllabic</td>
<td>CV</td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>‘determiner’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CVC</td>
<td>?on</td>
<td>‘yes’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disyllabic</td>
<td>CV.CV</td>
<td>ta.?u</td>
<td>‘1p’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CV.CVC</td>
<td>su.yop</td>
<td>‘sleep’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CVC.CVC</td>
<td>?al.gaw</td>
<td>‘day’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CV.CV</td>
<td>?aw.ni</td>
<td>‘later’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trisyllabic</td>
<td>CV.CV.CV</td>
<td>?a.da.ni</td>
<td>‘near’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CV.CV.CV</td>
<td>ti.gam.mu</td>
<td>‘what is nown’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CV.CV.CVC</td>
<td>sis.si.wit</td>
<td>‘bird’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stress**

Stress in Guinaang is significant, i.e. words with identical segments differ in meaning because of stress falling on different syllables, e.g. *bálat* ‘banana’ vs *balát* ‘soup’, *sánga* ‘anger’ vs. *sangá* ‘branch’ and *áwit* ‘fish hook’ vs *awít* ‘burden, load’.

**Phonological Processes**

**Assimilation**

One common form of assimilation occurs with the verbal prefix *man*- Before bilabial and velar consonants, the affix final n assimilates to the point of articulation of the following consonant to become m or ŋ. Before l and w the affix final n completely assimilates to become l and w

**Complete assimilation**

Another verbal prefix maN- exhibits internal fusing assimilation when attached to a root. The final consonant of the prefix becomes fused with the initial consonant of the root, retaining the nasality of the final consonant of the prefix and taking on the point of articulation of the initial consonant of the root.

\[\text{maN } + \text{pe’nal } \rightarrow \text{mame’nal} \quad \text{‘to plant seed’}\]
Vowel reduction

Another common form of assimilation is vowel reduction. The general principle seems to be that the vowels o and u are lost wherever, were they to remain they would form the peak of an unstressed open syllable between two syllables. This can be illustrated with the root lotop ‘dive’ and putod ‘cut’:

\[
\text{lo'}top + \text{-om} \rightarrow \text{lotpom} \quad \text{‘you dive after it’}
\]

3.4.2.3 Morphology

Word Classes

Lexical items can be distinguished between open class or content words and closed class or function words. Function words signal often elusive grammatical or interactional meanings and form small, closed classes with regard to their grammatical properties. Gieser (1963) calls the former inflectable stems and the latter particles. In what he calls inflectable stems, Gieser categorizes between forms that can occur with and without inflectional affixation. A class of words that can appear as bare inflectable stems are (1) nouns\(^8\) which can be morphologically indicated with number and possession, and (2) elements with deictic function such as interrogatives, indefinites (uchum ‘some’, osa ‘another’) and inclusives (amin ‘all’). Guinaang verbs consist of a root and affix indicating voice and aspect.

Noun Morphology

Nouns in Kalinga, as stated can appear as basic form, indicating singularity and inflected form for number and possession. Nouns are pluralized by either of two patterns (1) \(C_1V_1\) sunod ‘sibling’, susunod ‘siblings’ and (2) \(C_1V_1C_1\): lakay ‘man’ lallakay ‘men’ They can also be inflected for possession: paltug ‘gun’ ~ paltug\(\tilde{u}\) ‘my gun’, ulu ‘head’ ~ ulu\(\tilde{u}\) ‘my head’. Table 6 shows the possessive pronouns in Guinaang.

Table 6 Possessive pronouns in Kalinga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(^{st}) person</td>
<td>-ko</td>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>-tau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-k</td>
<td></td>
<td>-mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(^{nd}) person</td>
<td>-no</td>
<td></td>
<td>-yu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(^{rd}) person</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td></td>
<td>-cha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^8\) Gieser did not explicitly labeled them nouns.
Verbal Morphology

Verbal morphology in Guinaang, as in other Philippine languages is a rather complex system which has posed a problem for grammarians and syntacticians (Reid, 1992, Kroeger, 2007). Guinaang verbs are marked for voice and aspect. The voice-marking affix in the verb indicates the syntactic role of the subject NP, while the role of other NPs is indicated by case markers. This will be explained in section 3.4.24

3.4.2.4 Syntax

Basic Sentence pattern in Kalinga

The basic sentence in Kalinga consists of a predicate with an optional topic. Predicates express the action or the state. Kalinga, like other Philippine languages is a predicate initial language.

(2)

Um-uchan  
AF-rain  
‘it rained’

(3)

Nan-sagana = cha  
AF.PERF-prepare = 3p  
‘they prepared’

Voice and Aspect

Guinaang voice system consists of at least four voices or focus: actor (AF), and the non-actor voices can be categorized into at least three distinctions: patient focus (PF), referential focus (LF) and instrument focus (IF)\(^9\). Verbs in AF are marked with either the -um- or man-, PF with -on, LF with -an and IF with i-. The verb in (AF) takes one core argument in the absolutive case, while the non-actor voices, the “undergoer” argument takes the absolutive case. For each voice, two aspects can be

---

\(^9\) The so-called voice-marking affixes have been variously labelled among different authors. The (1) active voice are sometimes called “actor focus” and the non-active or “passive” voices are called (2) “goal/object/patient/theme/direct focus”, (3) “instrument/associative focus”, (4) “locative/referent” focus and “benefactive focus”. Gieser uses the terms “subjective” for actor focus, “objective”, for patient focus “referential” for locative and benefactive focus and “instrumental” for instrument focus, following McKaughan, 1958)
distinguished. When verbs in AF are expressed with maN-, the initial m in the prefix changes to n in perfective aspect, i.e mambayu ‘pound’, nambayu ‘pounded’. For the three non-actor voices, the infix -in- is attached, i.e inggaw ‘stay’, ininggaw ‘stayed’.

In the actor focus, the “topic is the originator of the action (McKaughan 1958). Actor focus verbs tend to produce intrantistive clauses.

(1) -um-oy-a? sichi
   AF -go- 1S.ABS there
   ‘I am going there’

The patient voice “signifies that the topic is the goal of the action” (McKaughan 1958) and takes the suffix for the imperfective and -in- -on for the perfective aspect. In the patient focus, as in other passive/non-actor focus, the verb takes two arguments—the actor in the ergative case another in absolutive case.

(2) b-in-ayu-om chin pagoy (Saggers, 1991)
   -PERF- chop- PF =1S.ERG ABS rice
   ‘I chopped down the tree’

(3) p-in-ukpok =?u chin ?ayu (Saggers, 1991)
   -PF- chop =1S.ERG ABS wood
   ‘I chopped down the tree’

In the referential focus, the topic is the location of the action. The verb takes the affix –an, -in- -an, and ma- -an. The instrument focus signifies that “the topic is indirectly involved in the action either as the cause of it, or the instrument used to effect it” (McKaughan 1958). (Saggers, 1991) suggests that ‘locative’ means not only simple locative, but locative source and goal, and the dative case role, as in Tagalog.

(4) ?-in-imos-an Juan si ama –na
    PERF-ask-IF John.ERG DET father-3S
    ‘John asked his father’

The verb in instrument focus takes one of the three affixes ?i-. It signifies that “the topic is indirectly involved in the action either as the cause of it, or the instrument used to it” (McKaughan 1958).

(5) i-pokpok-nu nat badang
    IF-cut-2S.ERG DET machete
    ‘cut it down with the machete’
3.4.3 Orthography
At the moment of writing, there is no official orthography yet. However, there has been different systems used. The first is the one used in the Guinaang translation of the New Testament books more than 30 years ago. Copies of the translated materials have not been seen by the current generation of speakers so it was not really used. Among some people who have seen it complained that they find it difficult to read. One reason is that it is phonemic and they do not readily associate some symbols with how the sound is articulated in their language. Another probable reason for its unpopularity is that very few people in that time had a need to write. Another writing convention is the working orthography developed with Translators Association of the Philippines (TAP) in 2015 which they are now using in the NT translation and in the schools. Prior to this, an almost similar orthography was being developed for the MTB-MLE program by the grade school teachers of Guinaang tribe led by Mrs. Judith Sagayo in 2012.

3.5 Summary
In summary, this section has presented an overview of Guinaang and its speakers. The speakers of Guinaang, although they consider themselves as being part of the larger grouping called Kalinga, have their own unique way of speaking which provides them a distinct identity as a speech community. In some cases, communication among Kalinga subgroups is possible without switching to another language and in some cases Ilocano is used as a lingua franca. Filipino, the national language is learned in school and in media mostly by younger generation. The same is the case with English although some older generation who were educated during the American period appear to have a high fluency in using it.

Early works on the language documented the existence of a distinct variety of Kalinga spoken in what is now Pasil. Text collections provided evidence for the language use of Guinaang. Guiser’s grammatical analysis served as one of the earliest analysis of Kalinga languages. Gonzales’ language survey describes the current sociolinguistic situation and documents the ‘language use’ of Guinaang in relation to dialects and languages in their linguistic repertoire.
Chapter 4
Conversations and Conversation Analysis

4.1 Introduction
As mentioned in chapter 2, conversations have received little attention in language documentation until recent years. In this chapter, I will discuss CA and its contribution to linguistics and it will conclude by mentioning some works related to this study.

4.2 The analysis of conversation
Given the basic role of conversation in human social life, conversation is regarded as the basic, most common form of language use. Levinson (1983) considers it the prototypical kind of language use since it is the form children are first exposed to, while for (Schegloff, 1979a), it is the “primordial site of interaction.” Firth (1935) advocated conversation as the subject of linguistic inquiry because “it is here we shall find the key to a better understanding of language and how it works”. Warren (2006), quoting Svartvik and Quirk (1980: 11) who estimates that over 99% of all speech is conversation, argues that any description of language cannot ignore the way it is used in its most prevalent form.

Despite this, there has been a prejudice against the study of conversation, a prime example of which is Chomsky. He argued that linguistic performance, the actual use of language, is too disorderly and therefore not worthy of serious study (Wooffitt, 2005). The goal of linguistics, for Chomsky is the study of the underlying linguistic competence, the term he used to refer to the native speakers’ tacit knowledge of syntactic structure. For him:

“Linguistic theory is concerned with an ideal speaker-hearer in a completely homogenous speech community, who knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest and errors (random characteristics) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance.” (Chomsky, 1965, p.3)
Chomsky’s influential view of language delayed the study of spoken interaction and meant that the study of conversation was left to ethnographers and sociologists (Warren, 2006). However, even in anthropology, there was a time that conversations were considered less important than other discourse types despite the influence of Malinowsky who recognized the importance of everyday interaction. Keating & Egbert (2004) note that for more than half a century most anthropologists and linguistic anthropologists who looked at language in context concentrated on language that occurred in ritual performances because such institutional sites are more elaborate in terms of the cultural metadiscourses that make up a coherent system of beliefs, and, in the Durkheimian tradition, a “site of tremendous ideological power” (Silverstein, 1998).

Everyday conversation is now regarded as a highly organized structure which participants locally manage turn-by-turn in real-time (Sacks, Jefferson, & Schegloff, 1974). In this light, the study of conversation has gained interest among scholars in different fields such as anthropology, sociology, linguistics, ethnology, communication studies, psychology, cognitive science, philosophy, and other fields investigating the emergence of shared meanings. Ethnographers turn to conversations to get a deeper understanding of the shapes and meanings of cultural worlds because “In every moment of talk, people are experiencing and producing their cultures, their roles, their personalities” (Moerman, 1988).

The definition of ‘conversation’ varies greatly between different authors and there is no widely accepted definition of conversation as a speech event (Warren, 2006). Although conversation has been synonymous to ‘spoken language’, literature on conversation have used terms such as ‘casual talk’ and ‘everyday speech’ or ‘informal discourse’. Eggins & Slade's (2005) category of conversation distinguishes between casual and pragmatic conversation. They refer to casual conversation as a talk that is not motivated by clear pragmatic purpose, such as buying and selling transaction. Linguistically, pragmatic conversations differ from casual conversations in terms of length; that is, casual conversations tend to be shorter since the conversation stops once the transaction is finished, and in terms of formality; meaning casual conversations are more informal and colloquial while pragmatic conversations tend to be more formal and polite.

Levinson (1983) provides four defining characteristics of conversation: free-speech, two or more participants, alternating speech, and mostly occurring outside institutional setting such as religious services, law courts and classrooms. In the book “Features of Natural Conversation”, Warren (2006) provides nine ‘features’ of
conversation which serve to distinguish this genre from other specialized discourse
namely multiple sources, determination of discourse coherence, language as doing,
co-operation, unfolding, open-endedness, artifacts, inexplicitness and shared
responsibility. In his study, he proposed a definition of conversation:

“A speech event outside of an institutionalised setting involving at least two
participants who share responsibility for the progress and outcome of an
impromptu and unmarked verbal encounter consisting of more than a
ritualised exchange” (Warren, 2006 p.11).

4.3 Conversation Analysis
Conversation Analysis is a detailed study of talk-in-interaction that grew out of the
tradition of ethnomethodology. It was carried out by Harvey Sacks in the 1960s who
was inspired by the works of two sociologists, also known as ethnomethodologists,
Harold Garfinkel and Ervin Goffman. The aim of the ethnomethodology that they
established was to find out the ‘set of techniques that the members of the society
themselves utilize to interpret and act within their own social worlds’ (Levinson,
1983). For Garfinkel, the key to understanding social action is to study the
commonsense knowledge, which ordinary members of a culture employ to produce
and recognize intelligible courses of action in an interaction. These are the
background assumptions that underlie our social behavior. Since people’s
understanding of the social world cannot be elicited, social knowledge is analyzed
through studying instances of social interaction (Duranti, 1997). Later on, Erving
Goffman further developed the emphasis on studying actual instances of social
interaction, “where he demonstrated that it was possible to study everyday events
and situations and to discover from these non-trivial information about how human
beings engage in sociality” (Liddicoat, 2007).

Therefore, what ethnomethodology attempted to achieve in describing people’s
common sense reasoning and procedures in human interaction, CA has solved
through the analysis of recorded data of talk in interaction (Kino, 2014). Goffman’s
and Garfinkel’s work drove the development of CA which investigated the
orderliness of everyday life. In his series of lectures in 1960s, Sacks (1992) created a
system for examining social action which sought to investigate social order produced
in daily talk. CA sees ‘talk’ as a basic and constitutive feature of human social life
(Sidnell, 2010), and is generally concerned with describing the structure,
orderliness, organization and sequential patterns of interaction. It is premised on the
notion that talk is structurally organized and ‘context-shaped’ and ‘context-renewing’ (Heritage, 1984b). CA looks at everyday conversations and from a detailed analysis, it examines how participants manage their interactions (Paltridge, 2006). CA is a well-established research tradition with a distinct set of methodological features and analytic procedures that avoid premature theory construction. Studies in CA follow an inductive approach, i.e., they are empirically based studies that require the use of recordings of naturally occurring conversations as the basic data, arguing that the richness of empirical detail of recordings can never be reproduced by imagination of anyone (Have, 2007). Seedhouse (2005, p.166-67) summarized the basic principles of CA:

1) There is order at all points in interaction. Contrary to the dominant linguistic view in the 1960s that conversation was too disordered to be analyzed, talk in interaction is systematically organised, deeply ordered and methodic.

2) Each contribution to interaction is context-shaped and context-renewing. Contributions to interaction are understood only by reference to the sequential environment in which they occur and in which the participants design them to occur. They also form part of the sequential environment in which a next contribution will occur.

3) No order of detail can be dismissed a priori as disorderly, accidental, or irrelevant (Heritage, 1984b, p.241): CA has a detailed transcription system, and a highly empirical orientation.

4) Analysis is bottom-up and data driven: The data should not be approached with any prior theoretical assumptions, regarding, for example, power, gender, or race; unless there is evidence in the details of the interaction that the interactants themselves are orienting to it.

4.3.1 CA as a suitable approach for conversations

Enfield & Levinson (2011) explains that as language science tries to discover the basic infrastructure of language, it has come to understand that, based on the growing cross-linguistic evidence, social-interactional system is more basic, as opposed to semantico-grammatical systems as it is widely assumed in linguistics. This system includes structures that are essential to conversations—turn-taking, repair and recipiency. One of the approaches that aligns to this view is CA. Stivers & Sidnell (2013) argue that CA is a well-suited approach for describing the structure of social interaction, as embodied by everyday conversations as well any naturally
occuring social interaction. In fact, Levinson (1983, p.216) states that, “It seems reasonable, then, to turn to CA as the approach that, at least at present, has most to offer in the way of substantial insight into the nature of conversation.” According to Hakulinen & Selting (2005), CA is recognized to be the best suited methodology for describing spoken interaction.

### 4.3.2 CA and linguistics

Linguistic approach in studying spoken language differs from the sociological CA in different ways. Eggins & Slade (2005, p.7) clearly explains this contrast:

> “while sociologists ask ‘how do we do conversation?’ and recognize that conversation tells us something about social life, linguists on the other hand ask, ‘how is language structured to enable us to do conversation?’ and recognize that conversation tells us something about the nature of language as a resource for doing social life.”

The connection between CA and linguistics began in the 1970s when Sacks et al., (1974) wrote their seminal article ‘A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn Taking for Conversation’ which argued about the important role of syntax for turn-taking and other organizational systems of talk in interaction. This exploration in the organization of everyday talk eventually grew to a more detailed study of language, thereby establishing a relationship between CA and linguistics. Syntactic units are considered important resources for constructing turns. Other grammatical resources mentioned as possible units that make up a turn are lexical, phrasal, and clausal constructions. Later on, Schegloff (1979b) further explored the relationship between syntax and conversation, arguing that syntax should be considered as a resource that is deployed and exploited for the organization of turns and sequences in conversation.

Fox, Thompson, Ford, & Couper-Kuhlen (2012) trace the development of studies that integrate CA in Linguistics into three phases. The mid-1980s to early 1990s saw the start of growing interest in observing language in its natural habitat’, that is the connected, contextualized discourse. For example, scholars in discourse-functional syntax started to pursue the interactional role of grammar. Significant works in this phase were Auer (1984), Houtkoop-Steenstra & Mazeland (1985), and Fox (1987). In the 1990’s, the term grammar and interaction began to be used (e.g. Couper-Kuhlen, 1992, on the prosody of repair). In the early 2000’s, a new term, Interactional
Linguistics (IL), was introduced to capture the growing community of linguists studying sound as well as grammar from a distinctly interactional approach.

4.3.3 Case studies in linguistic CA

4.3.3.1 Japanese
The book Turn-taking in Japanese conversation (Tanaka, 1999) explores the interaction between grammar and conversation from the perspective of conversation analysis. Particularly, it focuses on the projectability patterns of turns in Japanese in comparison to English. The study uses both qualitative and quantitative methods which show that the postpositional grammatical structure and the predicate-final orientation in Japanese regularly result in a relatively delayed projectability of the possible point at which a current turn may become recognizably complete in comparison to English. Prior to such points, projectability is often limited to the progressive anticipation of small increments of talk. However, participants are able to achieve smooth speaker transitions with minimal gap or overlap through the use of specific grammatical and prosodic devices for marking possible points at which a transition may become relevant.

4.3.3.2 Mon
Umaporn Sungkaman (2006) described the conversational patterns in Mon, a language spoken in Thailand, using the framework of CA. Particularly, the author analyzed the conversation structure in the sense of (Levinson, 1983) focusing on the (1) Overall organization, (2) Turn-taking organization and (3) repair strategies.

The result of the study shows that although Mon follows the universal pattern of conversation which includes an opening section, topic section and a closing section it differs in some details. For example, the proposed opening section by Levinson (1983) contains four sequences: a summons-answer sequence, identification-recognition sequence, greeting sequence and “how-are-you” sequence. Mon’s opening section differs in the sequence, in that an identification sequence marks the beginning of the conversation instead of a summons-answer, and it ends with a small talk instead of how-are-you.
The turn-taking system in Mon proves that system varies from culture to culture. In speaker selection for example, social status plays an important role—it was observed that the older person or a person of high status tends to hold the floor and select the next speaker. Repairs are mostly self-repairs, suggesting that it may be due to other-initiated repairs being rude in Mon culture.

4.3.3.3 Wichita
Analyzing the conversational structure of an endangered language based on a previous recording has been done by Mirzayan (2008). Using a 42-year old recording of a conversation in Wichita, an indigenous American language, he analyzed conversational strategies of Wichita speakers on how they correct themselves while talking. The 28-minute conversation was digitized, and the first 15 minutes were transcribed using ELAN and Praat to carefully time the turns and actions, including the pauses and overlaps, after which he categorized the cases of self-repair according to emerging patterns from the data. Articulatory cutoff, lexical perturbations and syllable lengthening were identified as the most common means of self-repair initiation. The less frequent ones were lexical items and micropauses.

The primary significance of this study in this thesis is the methodology employed in transcribing and analyzing a previously recorded conversation in a language other than the researcher’s. The person who recorded the conversation in 1966 has provided a transcription and has written grammars and articles on the language. Further transcription contingent to the analysis of repair (turns, actions, pauses, overlaps) were aided by native speakers who are, fortunately still accessible.

4.3.3.4 Philippine languages
Presently, CA inspired studies concerning Philippine languages are still relatively few. An example of these is Language Choice in Interracial Marriages by (Dumanig, 2010). Although he does not focus on grammar, he used CA as one of the frameworks to analyze the patterns of code switching among Filipino and Malaysian couples. His findings reveal that word choices between and within turns create an impact on the speaker. He notes that code-switching occurs in various interactions at home because they function to compensate and soften the previous utterance, minimize a face threatening act, and establish solidarity among others.
In his article “A little Ilocano grammar as it appears in conversation”, (Streeck, 1996) explores the interaction of grammar and conversation in Ilocano by examining a few grammatical phenomena, namely sound expansion, *kwa* and *nga* as they appear in contexts of repair. They are analyzed with regard to their role in the prospective organization of interaction, i.e their implication in the management of turn-taking and turn-expansion. He found that although they are semantically empty forms, they are used in interactionally pivotal places and play pivotal interactional roles.

### 4.4 Summary

This chapter presented the different disciplines that study conversations. Conversation is a worthy target of study as evidenced by the various disciplines which look at conversation—sociology, anthropology, and linguistics. It has also presented the contribution of conversation to each of them, particularly in linguistics. Finally, this chapter argues that conversations should occupy a larger focus in the documentation of languages.

In conclusion, what this chapter has emphasized is that, as Eggins & Slade (2005) put it, one of CA’s major contribution is to make everyday interaction a worthy subject of academic research. Conversation is a dynamic activity of interacting and co-operating participants.
Chapter 5
Methodology

5.1 Introduction
This chapter outlines the methodology employed in this study. The steps undertaken are (1) collecting conversations; (2) oral annotation of the texts; (3) analyzing the conversation using the annotated text; (4) evaluating the BOLD method.

5.2 Data Collection
In this research the face-to-face conversations chosen for study involved groups of family members talking. The conversational texts on which this thesis is based were collected as part of the Pasil Language Documentation project in 2014. Three naturally occurring conversations were recorded from speakers of the Guinaang tribe, which consists of five villages. Participants in all conversations are speakers of Guinaang variety from Pasil, Kalinga. Table 6 gives a summary of the recorded data and the speakers involved. Among the three conversations, two were audio recorded conversations from barangay Guinaang while the last one was video recorded in Tabuk City. The data were recorded using the Zoom H2 audio recorder and Canon Vixia HF200 video recorder. The recording Details of the recorded conversations is summarized in the table below:

Table 7 Participants in conversational text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pascuala's House</td>
<td>Brgy. Guinaang</td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conversation with Nathan</td>
<td>Brgy. Guinaang</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Delfin's conversation</td>
<td>Brgy. Guinaang</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although all participants were aware of the presence of the recorder and the researcher, the conversations are natural in the sense that topics were not predetermined and taking turns was not preallocated. Since participants carried out the conversation at their homes, and each are talking with their family members, all three conversations were carried out in a relaxed and informal atmosphere.
Although the conversations shows high degree of familiarity among participants, they are different to each other due to variation of the participants’ profile in the diads: the following is more detailed information on each recorded conversation.

**Conversation A** -- The first conversation lasts about 40 minutes, but only the first 8 minutes were transcribed and analyzed. Two speakers, a mother and a daughter are casually talking while preparing dinner for the whole family with whom I stayed during the data collection. The mother, PS is around 65 years old whose occupation is farming, and the daughter is 23 years old who was seeking employment. The recording took place at the dining area of the house, specifically at the cooking area, sitting on the floor on a small stool. NV, the daughter has the recorder with her with a lapel microphone clipped on her shirt. The voice of her mother, and even her father can be picked up quite audibly. The researcher was present and visible to the participants while they were talking. Other people who are present in the conversation are the father and some neighbors who come and go and talk with one of the participants.

The conversation revolves around topics relating to the daughter’s job application, and ordinary village life such as traditional healing for a certain sickness, the town event that the mother is supposed to go to after the dinner, and the food that they are preparing for an occasion. An important feature of this conversation is how the interactants switch (back and forth) between topics while both are cooking—this showcases the interactant’s turn taking and topic management strategies. Further, since this is a conversation between mother and child who have close relationship, a lot of utterances rely on shared background information.

**Conversation B** – This whole conversation which lasts around 35 minutes was taped recorded inside the house of participants after supper, on a Sunday evening. After attending the service of the church to which the participants belong, I was invited to visit their house for dinner. The couple agreed to be recorded while talking to each other and to their 5-year old grandson whom they are rearing. This multiparticipant conversation revolves around daily village life such as farming. The conversation begins with the couple discussing how embarrassing their messy house is to the visitors, and then the couple discussed an important issue—how they could get people to harvest for them. In the rest of the segment, the couple take turns in talking with the boy about his schooling. The researcher was present at the beginning of the conversation, but eventually left in order to prevent the Observer’s Paradox.
Conversation C – This conversation was recorded inside the house of my language consultant on a weekday before lunch time in October 2014. The whole taped conversation lasts 40 minutes, but only 8 minutes of it were analyzed and used for this study. The conversation is between DF, a 40-year old single man, and his parents who are both around 70 years old. In this conversation, DF just got home from work and opens the conversation by asking his parents if the food has been already cooked. In the rest of the conversation, the participants talk about the result of the father’s visit to the doctor and the happenings in the community such as death and cultural practices. Unlike the other samples, this conversation exhibits talk among adults.

5.3 Oral Annotation
The recordings were annotated using the BOLD method described in Reiman (2010): A native speaker listens to each recording in 1-2 second chunks of speech which he repeats slowly and carefully into another recorder to produce an oral transcription of the original speech. The file that is created in the oral transcription is then given to another native speaker who translates each segment into a language of wider communication. Both the purpose and the process of oral annotation were discussed with the native speaker at the beginning. There were three language helpers who contributed in the oral translation phase, all of which are native speakers of Guinaang. They were given the choice of what target language in the oral translation to use. The texts were transcribed and translated using Saymore. This process is outlined in more detail in section 7.1.2

5.4 Data Analysis
Using the annotated text produced from the oral annotation stage, I described the structure of Guinaang conversations, focusing on its turn-taking, sequential (adjacency pairs), and repair organization. In areas where the BOLD data did not provide adequate information, further annotation was done with another native speaker.

To do this, first, I listened to each audio file created in in the oral annotation stage—the oral transcription and oral translation files for each speaker were transcribed. Second, to analyze other aspects of the interaction, such as pauses, gaps, and overlaps, the data from the oral annotation stage (in written form) were time-
aligned with the original recording. Third, the texts for both speakers were arranged according to how they take turns in the conversation, similar to a script of a play. Lastly, the Jefferson Transcription System was applied to the transcript.

**Table 8 Most Common Symbols used in the Jefferson Transcription System**  
(adapted from Lerner, 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbols</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>A full stop inside brackets denotes a micro pause, a notable pause but of no significant length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.2)</td>
<td>A number inside brackets denotes a timed pause. This is a pause long enough to time and subsequently show in transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[]</td>
<td>Square brackets indicate the point where overlapping speech occurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>Arrows surrounding talk like these show that the pace of the speech has quickened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;&lt;</td>
<td>Arrows in this direction show that the pace of the speech has slowed down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Where there is space between brackets denotes that the words spoken here were too unclear to transcribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((( )))</td>
<td>Where double brackets appear with a description inserted denotes some contextual information where no symbol of representation was available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underline</td>
<td>When a word or part of a word is underlined it denotes a raise in volume or emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>When an upward arrow appears it means there is a rise in intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>When a downward arrow appears it means there is a drop in intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>An arrow like this denotes a particular sentence of interest to the analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITALS</td>
<td>where capital letters appear it denotes that something was said loudly or even shouted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hum(h)our</td>
<td>When a bracketed ‘h’ appears it means that there was laughter within the talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>The equal sign represents latched speech, a continuation of talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>::</td>
<td>Colons appear to represent elongated speech, a stretched sound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.5 Evaluation of BOLD**

In this stage, I documented the corrections that have been made in the oral annotation in order to examine the oral annotation process. The data from the oral transcription and translation was compared with the corrected annotation,
identifying the ‘errors’ in the transcription and translation. This forms the basis of my evaluation of the advantages and challenges of BOLD for conversation analysis.
6.1 Introduction
This chapter discusses the conversational structure of Guinaang, divided in three main sections. In Section 6.2, I analyze the turn-taking organization, discussing the turn-construction unit and the turn-allocation component. Section 6.3 discusses the adjacency pair and sequence organization of Guinaang, identifying the types of adjacency pairs as well as their expansions. Section 6.4 analyzes the repair system of Guinaang, looking at the self-initiated and other-initiated repair as well as the linguistic devices used.

6.2 Turn-taking Organization
An obvious observation about conversation is that participants take turns in talking: a person A starts to talk, stops; and another person B, talks and stops; and so on, creating an A-B-A-B distribution of turns. According to (Sacks et al., 1974), conversations are organized into turns, which are the basic analytic unit in conversation analysis. They propose that the system that governs turn-taking is a set of rules with ordered options which operates on a turn-by-turn basis. Levinson (1983, p.297) calls it the ‘local management system.’

The model of turn taking according to Sacks et al. (1974) focuses on two components: The first one involves understanding how turns at talk look like or how they are constructed. This is the “turn constructional component”. The second one is the “turn allocation component” which involves understanding the ways the next speaker can come to take the next turn: either the current speaker selects another speaker or the current speaker selects himself.

6.2.1 Turn-Construction Component
One way to analyze a conversation is to describe how turn-taking works. Sacks et al note that turns are constructed out of units, called Turn Construction Units (TCU) which can be determined by either grammar, intonation, or action. An important
characteristic of these units is their projectability which allows the next speaker to anticipate or predict where these units will be completed. Each TCU is a coherent, self-contained utterance, recognizable in context as ‘possibly complete’, thus establishing a transition relevance place (TRP). TRP is a space where change of speaker is a possibility, which may or may not be realized at any TRP (Clayman, 2012). Conversations are composed of turns-at-talk where participants monitor the unfolding course of a turn to locate points within it where it is possibly complete (Sidnell, 2010).

![Figure 5 Association Between TCU and TRP (Clayman, 2012)](image)

The figure above illustrates the association between the completion of TCU and TRP. It also shows the nature of the transfer of turns: At speaker A's first TCU there arises a TRP, where turn transition becomes relevant, but in this case it does not occur since speaker A continues and extends his turn with another unit of talk (A's 2nd TCU). At the second TRP, a possibility of speaker change occurs again, this time turn-transition does occur, as speaker B prepares and begins his turn precisely when appropriate.

A turn can be made up of a single unit, called one-unit turn, or multiple units, which are called multiple-unit turn. The example below shows that participants don’t always talk in ‘sentences’ but use a wide variety of structures to construct their turn.

(4) **Lunch (Liddicoat, 2007, p.55)**

1. Joy: hh. so we decided tuh go to that place th' s jus' opened up.
2. Harry: where's that

Turns in the example above can contain complete sentences, such as ‘so we decided tuh go to that place th' s jus' opened up’, and ‘where's that’, as well as prepositional phrase in (3) ‘over near dee jays’. The phrasal TCU in 3 is considered complete at the point where it occurs and an appropriate contribution to the prior utterance. Although TCUs are defined structurally, TCUs are not structurally defined syntactically such as those typically used in grammatical accounts of language, which are often context free. TCU's on the other hand are context sensitive and determining its ‘well-formedness’ can only be made in context.
In Guinaang, the size of the turn construction units varies—it can be a word, phrase or sentence. Consider the example below that shows the different sizes of TCUs. In this segment, Delfin (DF) a middle-aged man went home around noon to his parents’ house where he lives. The conversation starts as soon as he enters the house. In line 01 he asks what was cooked for lunch and whether it’s already cooked or not.

(5)

01 DF: *Inun intipoynu?* What did you (SG) cook?

02 MT: *Ugwelas* Beans

03 FT: [Ugwelas] Beans

04 DF: *Ugwelas?* Beans?

05 DF: *Nauto?* Cooked?

06 FT: *Ti?* The?

07 DF: *a iyasug nu?* or you have just boiled them?

08 FT: *Navayag (1.5) haon avo nangiyasug* Long time ago (1.5) I (am the one) who boiled them.

Defining what a turn is and describing it are largely based on structural criteria—syntactic or intonational, although speaker intentions have been taken into consideration. The turn in line 01 is a well-formed clause, therefore it is syntactically complete, having a verb intipoy and an actor nu. It is in a form of a question, using the Wh question ‘what’ and perceived as such as evidenced in the responses in lines 03 and 04. The same is true in line 09, which is composed of two TCUs. The second TCU, *ha’on avo nangiyasug* ‘I’m the one who cooked (them)’ is also a well formed clause.

It can be observed that lines 03 and 04 are made up of single lexical items. More interestingly, linguistic forms that are not traditionally considered as ungrammatical in isolation can be stand alone as a turn, as in line 07. Here, the mother (MT), to whom the prior question nauto ‘cooked?’ was not clear, clarified by asking with a case marker ti ‘the’ in a rising tone. Also, the extract above shows an example of a multi-turn TCU. The father’s (FT) response in line 09 consists of two turns, separated by a long pause of 1.5 seconds. The segment above illustrates that turn size varies, ranging from a single lexical item to sentential length. Below, to answer the question what constitutes a turn in Guinaang conversation, I will classify the distribution of unit types according to syntax.
As mentioned above, turn-constructional units can be identified in terms of syntactical terms such as lexical, phrasal clausal and sentential construction. The list below illustrates that single word, phrase, clause and sentence can appear as possible turns in Guinaang.

6.2.1.1 Single lexical turns
The segment below shows examples of single lexical turns.

(6)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td><em>Vinalvalattana!</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Attomanan!</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Aw-am agay i noa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td><em>Naya?=</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td><em>=Umm</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, NV and her mother PS were cooking, and the mother just put water in the pan, to NV’s surprise, exclaiming *vinalvalattana!* Which literally means, ‘she souped!’ The word is composed of the word valat ‘soup’ and the clitic pronoun na ‘3P’. She thought it was too much water, based on her next turn *attomanan* ‘too much’. NV then suggests to put something into the pan but didn’t specify exactly what. The mother clarifies with a one-word reply *naya* ‘this’ with a rising intonation, represented by a question mark.

NV affirms, but instead of using the word *O* ‘yes’ she says ‘uhmm’. Similarly, many single word turns do not contain utterances without referential meaning, but they are utterances with interactional functions. Examples of this in English are ‘oh, uhuh, and yeah’.

Also admissible are turns with lexical items as small as locative markers, as in the example below. RS is talking to her 7-year old grandson NT who said in the prior turn that he found some batteries. Her reply *udch*, translated as ‘where’ is not a content question word but a locative marker. The boy understood this as a question, hence his reply *chi* ‘these’, a deictic pronoun.

(7)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td><em>Udch?=</em></td>
<td><em>Where?=</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td><em>=Chi!</em></td>
<td><em>=these!</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.1.2 Phrasal construction

In this fragment, NV is asking why a certain neighbor made rice cake and brought it to another house (line 01), to which the mother (PS) replies in line 02, paman? Ay, it ti, nayan na, sivit ‘why? Oh, the, this…sivit’ which is clearly not a complete sentence but a phrasal construction, a noun phrase in particular. This is enough as an answer to the question ‘why’ for NV, as evident in the ‘ah’ in her reply in line 03, signifying she understood the answer, followed by a noun phrase sivit JS ‘JS’ sivit?’ with rising intonation, which signifies asking a question.

(8)

01 NV  Ma (.5) it nanay-otan yu hinon nanay-otan cha Roda'n inmoy na iniyoy wancha vagni? (.8) Why (.5) did they (make) chal-ot, Rhoda made chal-ot that they brought to Vagni (.8)

02 PS → Paman? (.2) it ti, nayan na (2) SIVIT=

03 NV → =Sivit ah, ah. Sivit JS?

= Sivit, oh oh. Sivit of JS?

6.2.1.3 Clausal Construction

Below is a segment of the conversation between PD and his grandson NT. In a previous talk, the grandparents were listing things about their house that need to be improved. Nathan, on line 04, mimicked the grandma’s utterance of tabla ‘floor’ impulsively, followed by 4 seconds of silence. The father continued the child’s speech, in the context of the mother’s speech about the house in the next turn ha’pon nasamentu ‘not cemented’ which can be constructed as a clause.

(9)

01 NT  Tabla (4) Floor

02 RS  Ha’pon nasamentu Not cemented

---

10 Sivit is a traditional custom where a person, usually a child who has an unexplainable sickness or disability is brought to a relative who they believe knows how to heal the kid by telling him or her what to do. In this case the boy has speaking disability and the neighbors were making rice cakes for this ‘event’.
Many turns in Guinaang conversation are composed of clauses and sentences. In fact, a majority of turns found in the data are what traditional grammar says are independent clauses or sentences composed of a topic and a predicate. The segment below provides examples of complete sentence turns.

\[(10)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\rightarrow & \quad 01 \quad \text{NV} \quad \text{Na, pagbiit lang nat} \quad \text{oh, that won’t take very long.} \\
\rightarrow & \quad 02 \quad \text{PS} \quad \text{Icholnatnu yan.} \quad \text{Heat it up first} \\
\rightarrow & \quad 03 \quad \text{NV} \quad \text{Ma’ ummoyan papa?} \quad \text{Where did papa go?} \\
\rightarrow & \quad 04 \quad \text{PS} \quad \text{Umoym mangala taong mam voan i akit} \quad \text{Went to get some leaves}
\end{align*}
\]

Each turn in the segment above are complete sentences, of different types: declarative, imperative and interrogative. Here, the mother and the daughter are conversing while cooking. NV told her mother *pagbiit lang nat* ‘that (cooking) will be quick’ in line 01, preceded by an expletive *na*. The mother replies *icholnatnu yan* in line 02 a command to heat something up, probably a food previously cooked that will be served at the dinner. After a long silence, NV starts a different topic, by asking a question where the father went. *Ma’ ummoyan papa* ‘where did papa go is also a complete sentence. To this, the mother answers the question, ‘umoym mangala taong mam voan i akit ‘he went to get some leaves’.

### 6.2.1.5 Complex sentence construction

Very rare examples can be found in the data on complex sentences such as below. Here, an if-then sentence is constructed by Nhovie in line 02 as a reply to the question whether she will come back. The sentence begins with the if clause which begins with *nu* ‘if’.

\[(11)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PS} \quad & \quad \text{asi agay nu osan navigat?} \quad \text{You will just (go) the next day?} \\
\text{NV} \quad & \quad \text{nu kaugud-u ma’m Birkin vigat, inyoon ti inyak man-resign.} \quad \text{If I can talk to Ma’am Virgin tomorrow, I’ll go home and I’ll resign}
\end{align*}
\]
The examples above show that turns can be constructed by the different syntactic units similar to the ones identified by Sacks et al, providing evidence that syntax can determine turn construction units, hence it allows the next speaker to project completion points. Moreover, turn transfers after each unit-type with little or no gap (see example 8) provides further evidence for this.

6.2.1.6 Functional Turns

The different kinds of syntactic structures listed above cannot account for all the types of turns in the data. (Edelsky, 1993) defines interactional turn as “an on-record speaking utterance resulting from an intention to convey a message that is both referential and functional.” In the data exists a number of turns to which the functional part of Edelsky’s definition applies. These include utterances that function as feedback (backchannels) such as uhuh and yeah in English, small talk that performs certain interactional functions.

The short segment below is a great resource of examples of functional turns. Throughout the whole conversation, RS and PD can be observed parent-talking to NT—giving advice, lecturing, and eliciting responses. In this particular segment, RS is talking to their grandson, NT, about their work on the farm. In previous talk, Nathan insists to come with them into the field, but she convinces him to stay at home while she goes to the field of Wala to harvest, since he can’t walk far (line 01). She also suggests he go with his friend JS to visit neighbors. She repeats the line ‘so that I’ll harvest at Wala tomorrow’ in line 08, but adds an enticing reward ad intau mangan wancha Wala ‘and we’ll eat at Wala’s’. The kid answers o ‘yes’ to both iterations of requests. The particles in focus are in bold type.

(12)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>you can’t walk, stay here ok? So I can go harvest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Harvest of Wala, [ok?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>[you (pl) and…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>You and GS (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Who visit neighbors’ house (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>ok? =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>Yes =</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.1.6.1 Backchannels

Backchannel signals, also known as continuers in CA are signals that the channel is still open and indicates at the same time that the listener does not want to take the floor. They are utterances that “add to the quality but not the semantic content of the conversation” (Berry, 1994), hence they don’t receive or require a response and the purpose is only to show listenershio.

**Affirmation: Uhm, uhm**

In line 10 above, RS utters *uhm uhm* after NT’s yes. This can be understood as an acknowledgement of RS to NT’s response. It can be observed throughout the whole talk that the grandparents are eliciting responses from the child. Although RS’s *uhm uhm* acknowledges NT’s response and it does not seem to indicate that it wants to hold the floor at that point, the floor becomes open, as evidenced by the overlap of NT and RS in lines 11 and 12.

**Affirmation: Uhm**

Contrast RS’s response to DF’s *uhm* in the example below, where his father is currently telling a story. In this segment, the father has just begun a topic marked by *mavigat ot immyok an Nola* ‘the next day I went to Nora’ in line 01. DF shows his listenership and follows the unfolding of the story in line 04, latched to the previous turn of the father with no gap.

In contrast to RS’s *uhm* where the floor is opened up, DF’s *uhmm* is a feedback to encourage the speaker to continue further with the story. This is evident in the unbroken rythm of story telling of the father despite DF’s *uhm*. 
The next day, I went to Nora (and said) “oh, shall we go?” “yes, we shall”

Don’t worry, the only (thing) I listed are our grandchildren

At Nora’s

Also the Guimba family

**Affirmation: O**

While O has a primary meaning of ‘yes’ and is commonly translated as such in the data when it occurs after a yes-no question, it also functions as a feedback of acknowledgement, the same way ‘yeah’ works in English. In the data particularly in the second conversation, this is more frequently used by the child as a response to his grandparents’ talk. In (14) observe that NTs replies in turns 03, 04, 08, and 10 are preceded by utterances constructed as “declarative” sentences, not yes-no questions nor a command. His responses don’t seem to signify a desire to hold the floor, but rather just to give an acknowledgement.

**Affirmation: O**

While O has a primary meaning of ‘yes’ and is commonly translated as such in the data when it occurs after a yes-no question, it also functions as a feedback of acknowledgement, the same way ‘yeah’ works in English. In the data particularly in the second conversation, this is more frequently used by the child as a response to his grandparents’ talk. In (14) observe that NTs replies in turns 03, 04, 08, and 10 are preceded by utterances constructed as “declarative” sentences, not yes-no questions nor a command. His responses don’t seem to signify a desire to hold the floor, but rather just to give an acknowledgement.

**Affirmation: O**

While O has a primary meaning of ‘yes’ and is commonly translated as such in the data when it occurs after a yes-no question, it also functions as a feedback of acknowledgement, the same way ‘yeah’ works in English. In the data particularly in the second conversation, this is more frequently used by the child as a response to his grandparents’ talk. In (14) observe that NTs replies in turns 03, 04, 08, and 10 are preceded by utterances constructed as “declarative” sentences, not yes-no questions nor a command. His responses don’t seem to signify a desire to hold the floor, but rather just to give an acknowledgement.

(14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>avo-avot nan voloy tau (2)</td>
<td>Our house is full of holes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>hapu'vo machalusinan, mangngitit [nan tabla] (2)</td>
<td>It's not even cleaned, the wooden floor is [blackish (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>O [yes]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>hapu gay masukatan (2)</td>
<td>Can’t even be replaced (renovated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>sissiya gay'a lawi-lawing nan voloy tau</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>mavain agay ichan visita tau</td>
<td>Embarrassing to our visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Ilan chan aisaw</td>
<td>They will see it dirty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.1.6.2 Ay

Another functional turn that can be seen in example (15) is very much similar to the use of ‘Oh’ in English. Heritage (1984a) concludes that the basic canonical use of ‘oh’ is not to indicate surprise but rather a change-of-state from not-knowing to knowing. The token ay in the example and in other instances in the whole data show that ay has similar characteristics with ‘oh’. In example (12) line 13, ay comes as a response of RS to the NT’s “informing” after a series of o ‘yes’ responses. Another instance of this is shown in (15), where ay is again used as a reactive token. The ay in these examples is a rare case in the data though: it is a free standing one, not followed by additional components.

(15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>Oh</th>
<th>Oh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Naid pon a-ug-ugud u?</td>
<td>I don’t have someone to talk to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ 3</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Ay!</td>
<td>Oh!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Hhhh</td>
<td>Hahahah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, this section has explained the concept of turn-taking system in conversation. Participants monitor the unfolding course of a turn to locate points of possible completion, at which speaker transition is relevantly possible. This is called the Transition Relevant Place (TRP). At each TRP are a set of rules that operate for next speaker selection. Turns in Guinaang can be composed of different linguistic units, lexical, phrasal, clausal and sentential units.

6.2.2 Turn-Allocation Component

Turns are distributed in conversation differently from other human activities (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974). For example, in bowling, who bowls first and second is preallocated, decided in advance. The same is true with other speech events such as debates. In classroom conversations learning a foreign language, an impromptu conversation has similar preallocated turns where students drop into a fixed pattern of going around the circle (Donald, 2011). In contrast, naturally occurring conversations are locally managed, that is, turns are decided in “real-time” or the moment to moment flow of interaction. When talking, participants orient themselves to the set of rules of speaker transition at transition relevant places. This set of rules can be summarized as (from Sidnell 2010 p.43): A next speaker may have been selected to speak next by the current turn (e.g. an addressed question). If this is the case, the one selected should speak at the first point of possible completion. If however, no speaker has been selected by the current turn, at its
possible completion any other party may self-select. If no speaker has been selected and no other party self-selects at the possible completion of the current turn, the current speaker may continue.

Levinson (1983:298) slightly modifying that from (Sacks et al., 1974) states formally the rules that operate on turn units. (C = current speaker, N = next speaker)

Rule 1 – applies initially at the first TRP of turn

(a) If C selects N in current turn, then C must stop speaking, and N must speak next, transition occurring at the first TRP after N selection

(b) If C does not select N, then any party may self-select, first speaker gaining right to the next turn

(c) If C has not selected N, and no other party self-selects, under option (b) then C may (but need not) continue

Rule 2 – applies at all subsequent TRPs

(a) When Rule 1(c) has been applied by C, then at the next TRP Rules 1 (a)-(c) apply, and recursively at the next TRP, until speaker change is effected.

In other words, in “selecting the next speaker”, either the current speaker can select the next speaker or the next speaker self-selects. However, these two possibilities are not equally present at every end of TCU (Liddicoat, 2007).

6.2.2.1 Current Speaker Selects Next Speaker

There are various techniques used by the current speaker to select the “next speaker”. Addressed questions, for example tend to initiate a speaker change and at the same time put a constraint on what type of appropriate response is expected from the next speaker. This can be shown in the example from Guinaang.
Consider the case above where the current speaker (PL) selects the addressee to take the next turn by asking a question. In turn, NL responds in line 2 by asking a question, thus selecting her PL as the next speaker.

Aside from asking addressed questions, using address terms is another way to select the next speaker. In the example below, PL is talking to NL while NL can be heard using her cellphone for texting. In T3, NL selects UG as the next speaker. She does this by using a command form *winu* followed by the name of the co-participant. Although addressing by itself does not select the next speaker, the combination of the type of talk in which the address form is embedded and the address term does select the next speaker (Liddicoat, 2007).

Another case of address forms being used as a strategy to select the next speaker is found in the segment below (in bold type). Previous to this segment, NV and PS are talking to each other about going to the dance event at the municipal hall, but has something else to do. PS then asks her husband SL who is sitting at a distance from the two what to do. This was not replied to by the intended hearer, hence creating a slot in line 02.
(18)

01 **PS** magan inon chi chi *Surround* na paana inya' maasalidsid
What to do, *Surround* I'll go to the dance

02

03 **NV** *umoy ano ma'isalidsid papa*
She said she'll go join the dance, *papa*

04 **SL** *(unintelligible)* *(unintelligible)*

05 **NV** *Hhhhhh*

06 **PS** it naya mam pay un ma'wa
Here, I'm gonna do it now!

Notice how the current speaker in line 01 selects her husband as the next speaker by (1) using his name to address her, definitely “joking around” by the intentional alteration from *Solano* to *Surround* (due to [l] → [r] alternation) and (2) asking a question which puts a constraint on the next speaker to answer. Since SL didn’t respond at the appropriate slot for some reason (probably unheard), NV tries to save her mother’s face by paraphrasing her mother’s action, namely asking permission. As the current speaker, she selects again SL as the next speaker by using a kinship term *papa* ‘father’, a common diminutive address form for fathers in the Philippines. To this, SL appropriately responds in Line 04 (untranscribed due to incomprehensibility).

6.2.2.2 Next Speaker Self Selects

When the previous talk does not select anybody as the next speaker, any participant can self-select himself as the next speaker. In the example below, because of the long silence that precedes the talk, there was no participant selected as the next speaker. DF then self selects himself as the next speaker by initiating the talk.

(19)

01

02 **DF:** Ot
What’s up

03

04 Chumat agasnu nu?
Where is your medicine?

05 **MT:** Chichas chi

06 **DF:** Isusulo’ nu vo?
Are you hiding it?
DF in line 02 makes use of *ot*, a common turn beginning to break the long silence. Many times in the conversation, it is used as a discourse connector ‘and then’. He follows it up with a question regarding the medicine that his father is supposed to take. The 2nd person singular pronoun *nu* in line 04 is addressed to his father, thus selecting him as the next speaker. Interestingly, the mother in line 05 self-selects herself as the next speaker to answer the question in the previous turn. DF doesn’t mind this and acknowledges MT’s answer by his follow up question to his father ‘are you hiding it?’.

In multi-party conversations where the first pair part does not indicate the addressee, both addressee may self-select. Example (2) shows both addressee answering to the same question which led to simultaneous speech.

(20)

01  **DF**:  *Inun intipoy nu?*  What did you cook?

02  **MT**:  *Ugwelas*  Beans

03  **FT**:  *[Ugwelas]  [Beans

04  **DF**:  *Ugwelas?*  Beans?

Although questions are used to give the floor to the next speaker, there are cases when it is ambiguous who the next speaker is. The absence of a clear address form, and using 2nd person singular *-nu* opens the floor to the two addressees, causing simultaneous speech in line 03 and 04.

### 6.3 Adjacency Pair and Sequence Organization

As what has been shown in the previous chapter, interaction is sequentially organized on a turn-by-turn basis. Turns at talk is an action shaped by the previous utterance and what the speaker does in his turn. Given this, analysts were determining how conversations could stop. An exploration to answer this question paved the way to a very significant analysis of interaction, that is that conversations are organized into sequences of paired actions, or adjacency pairs.

(21)

A:  Are you free tomorrow?

B:  Yup

This is an example of an adjacency pair, particularly a question-answer type. Although they are produced by different speakers, they form a unit which seems to have a structure. Adjacency pairs are structures which CA views as a basic
component of interactions. Instances of pair types include greeting-greeting, question-answer, offer-acceptance/refusal, and so on.

An adjacency pair, in its basic, minimal and unexpanded form is composed of two turns that are defined by the following characteristics: (1) Adjacent; (2) produced by different speakers; (3) ordered as first pair part (FPP) and a second pair part (SPP); and (4) typed so that a particular first pair part provides for the relevance of a particular second pair part (or some delimited range of second pair e.g., a complaint can receive a remedy, an expression of agreement, or a denial as its second).

According to Sacks et al., (1974) the production of first pair part makes relevant a particular action to be done next, while the second pair part complies with the constraint of the adjacency pair structure and shows the understanding of what action is being done in the previous utterance.

6.3.1 Types of Adjacency Pairs

6.3.1.1 Question-Answer

In Guinaang, the sequential organization of adjacency pairs can be found. One example is the Question (Q) and Answer (A) sequence.

(22)

1  NV  …ma’ yachin vakvakota? …Who is that old woman?  (Q)
    Q  that  old.woman

2  PS  I Chapul  Chapul  Chapul  Chapul  (A)

The dialogue in (22) is between the mother (PS) and her daughter (NV). Structurally line 1 begins with ma’ a question word, followed by a noun phrase yachin vakvakota ‘that old-woman’ indicating that the whole turn is an act of question. Line 1 forms the FPP of the QA adjacency pair which naturally creates the expectation for an appropriate second pair to the pair type—an answer. The utterance in line 2, I Chapul, a noun phrase that contains a person’s name Chapul is prefixed by a personal case marker i. PS’ utterance of a person’s name as an answer to the who question indicates her correct understanding of the FPP in Line 1.

In Guinaang, there are several ways of producing a question found in the text. An answer response in the second pair part gives evidence that the FPP is a question.
As seen in the example above, one is the use of Question word *ma’* which in many occurrence in the text means ‘what’. The SPP contains answers that provide new information. Consider the example in the following adjacency pairs:

(23)  
1 NV  *ma’ usalon yu vo?*  
Q  use  3P  PRT  
*What will you use?*  (Q)  

2 NV  *Man-ain*  
AF-cloth  
*(traditional) skirt*  (A)  

(24)  
1 DF  *ma’ in-uatou=na?*  
Q  cause-die=3P  
*What did he die of?*  (Q)  

2 FT  *...graben sakitnan  asthma*  
*...His asthma is severe*  (A)  

Line 1 in both examples contain interrogative sentences using *ma’*. In other cases, *ma’* is used to form other content questions such as as *ma’ ummoyon* ‘where’, *ma’ inon* ‘how’

(25)  
1 NV  *ma’ ummoyon papa?*  
Q  went  papa  
*Where did papa go?*  (Q)  

2 PS  *U moy  nangala taong.*  
went  got  leaf  
*Went to get leaves*  (A)  

(26)  
1 PS  *ma’ inon chichi?*  
Q  how  that  
*How is that*  

2 NV  *Uhm.*  
*Uhm.*  

3 PS  *Ay, gingaa’ agay si  Yole, ta  siyan mangwa*  
Ay, call-1S just DET Yole so  3S  do  
*Ay, I’ll call Yole so she’ll be the one to do it.*  

In the example above, *ma’ inon chichi* literally translated as ‘how is that’, can also mean ‘what to do’. The two participants are talking about their situation where they had to prepare rice cakes but at the same time they had to go to the dance event. Line 1 is a question eliciting for NV’s opinion on what to do. Line 2 creates a slot for answer, but for some reason NV didn’t respond appropriately, hence PS answered her own question in line 3.
Ma’ also appears in the question ‘whose’

(27)

1 RS ma’ hin uwa chi? Whose is this?
   Q DET owner this

2 PD In’uwa chi? Whose is this?
   DET owner this

3 RS Wancha le(.)levi? Of Levi (and others)?

Another is the use of hinu, a variant of which is inu usually translated as ‘what’.

(28)

1 DF Inun intipoy yu? what did you cook? (Q)
   what cook.PERF 2p

2 MT Ugwelas Beans (A)
   beans

In the context of repair, nu ‘what’ appears as a stand-alone question to ask for a clarification of the previous utterance.

(29)

1 MT Inggawan cha Tomasa?
   Stay 3p Tomasa
   ‘They stayed at Tomasa?’

⇒2 DF Nu?
   what
   What?

3 MT Nu ancha Tomasa!
   If there.3p Tomasa
   ‘If they stayed with Tomasa!’

4 DF Ha’ pagi
   NEG EMPH
   ‘Not yet’
The content question words *paman* and *taman* ‘why’ appear in the text. For example:

(30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NV</th>
<th>Taman = yu impa-sivit?</th>
<th>Why did you take him to sivit?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why = 2p</td>
<td>cause-sivit</td>
<td>Why did you have him Sivit?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.1.2 Request for Permission-Refusal

Another type of adjacency pair found in the data is *request for permission*. In this pair, the FPP consists of an action understood as requesting for permission (P) and the SPP is the appropriate response to accept or reject; in this particular example, reject (R).

(31)

1 NT | *Intaku, umaliya’* | *(P)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>go.1p.inc</td>
<td>join-1s</td>
<td>Let's go, I'll join</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 NV | *yanu maachadchalan = a inggaw-a* | *(R)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>able.to.walk = 2S</td>
<td>stay-2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘You can’t walk, stay (here)’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this context, the grandmother (RS) is talking to the grandson (NT), a 7-year old boy about the couple’s plan to go to the field on the next day. Line 1 consists of two parts: an invitation (*Intaku* ‘let’s go’) and a statement of joining (*umaliyak* ‘I’ll join’). Since it is uttered by a 7-year old child, the whole turn can be considered an indirect speech act of asking permission to join them. The response in line 2, an act of rejection, confirms this conclusion. An implied ‘no’ can be understood in the whole response in *yanu maachadchalan-a* ‘you can’t walk’, hence the suggestion to just stay at home is made by the *inggaw-a vigat, pay?* ‘you stay tomorrow, ok?’

6.3.1.3 Summons-response

Another type of adjacency pair that is rarely found in the text is summons (S)-response (R). Summoning by calling somebody’s name puts a constraint on that
person to answer. Tanaka (1999) notes that terms of address can serve as a summons in a summons-response adjacency pair. The example below illustrates this:

(32)

1 NT Lola! (S)
   Grandmother
   Grandma!

2 NV O? (R)
   Yes
   Yes?

6.3.2 Adjacency Pair Expansion

6.3.2.1 Minimal Expansion

In cases where adjacency pair sequences come to have three turns, and when the third turn does not itself initiate an adjacency-pair sequence, the third turn is usually an example of what has been termed minimal expansion (Schegloff, 2007).

An example of a minimal expansion is a change-of-state marker such as ‘Oh’, which signals a claim to have been informed by the SPP action (Heritage, 1984a). Assessments of the SPP action, whether negative or positive, are also considered an expansion (Schegloff, 2007).

(33)

1 NV Ma (.5) it nanay-otan = yu hinon nanay-otan cha Roda'n inmoy na iniyoy wancha vagni? (.8) Where did you make chal-ot? What’s the reason that Roda made the chal-ot which she gave to Vagni?

2 PS Paman? (. ) ay (.) it ti, nayan na (2) SIVIT Why? Oh, this, sivit

3 NV Sivit a, ah. Sivit JS? Ah, Sivit. Sivit of JS?

4 PS O Yes.
6.3.2.2 Insertion Sequence

As mentioned earlier, adjacency pairs are sequences composed of only two turns: a first and second pair part. This becomes more complex when adjacency pairs are expanded. An expansion can precede, intervene or follow the base sequence. Each form of expansion is significant for participants whether in terms of indicating stance, managing affiliation or alignment, or dealing with issues of intersubjectivity (the understanding of the preceding turn displayed by the current speaker).

It can be expanded before the occurrence of FPP, in between FPP and SPP, or after the SPP. This can be illustrated schematically in figure 6 below:

---

In the data, an adjacency pair can be expanded by an insertion of another adjacency pair between the FPP and SPP. In the example below a confirmation-confirmation pair is expanded by another Question-Answer pair.

(34)

1 PS Ot asi-a wot agay imoy?
   So later-2s just go
   ‘So you’ll just go later?’

2 NV Udch?
   to

3 PS Udchu chi
   to there

4 NV Nu umoyon si Levi paan
   When will.go art Levi already
   When Levi leaves

   inyoon, inya = k voan nu, pangulay foggaan
   I’ll go, go = 1s emph when, come what may
   ‘I’ll go, I go anyway when…come what may’
Line 1 and 4 comprise the base adjacency pair. Line 1 is a question of confirmation based on the previous talk. It begins with *ot*, a continuer marker similar to ‘therefore’ or ‘so’, followed by *asi agay imoy* ‘you won’t go’ reveals the speaker’s understanding of the other speaker’s message. The turn ends with a rising tone which indicates that it is a question, confirming if her understanding is correct.

However, rather than providing the SPP, NV at line 2 initiates a repair question *udch* ‘to’ to clarify the meaning of the question in line 1. This makes line 2 an FPP of another adjacency pair. In line 3, PS responds to the recent question simply with *udchu chi* ‘there’. Then, in line 4 NV answers the question in line 1 as its SPP.

(35)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td><em>Ona ichi yan iya' nato, chit chiyan:</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How's the one who died, is he the one:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td><em>Umali ud bulu?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>went  to Bulu?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td><em>Hi Malino?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is it Malino?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td><em>O</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td><em>O!</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td><em>ma' iyatoyna</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What did he died of?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td><em>nilausan min ilana masasakit</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We already saw his sickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td><em>Graben sakitnan asma</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How bad was his asthma!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guinaang speakers, based on the data presented, orient themselves to the normative model of adjacency pairings. It was found that most FPPs receive their SPPs although not always immediately. In the data, Questions are always provided by an Answer even in insertion sequences, which reveal that given the FPP, the SPP is expected, and its absence or delay is noticeable. This is evident in the follow-up questions following the silence at the SPP slot.
6.4 Repair
The goal of this section is to describe the specific ways participants deal with trouble in conversation, specifically, identifying repair strategies found in Guinaang texts. It intends to answer the following questions: What are the structures of self-initiated and other initiated repairs in Guinaang? What are the repair mechanisms used by participants?

6.4.1 Introduction
When we communicate, we sometimes encounter problems of hearing, speaking and understanding. Talk-in-interaction is a joint activity of several participants is obviously filled with troubles such as mishearings, non-hearings, misspeakings and misunderstandings, etc. So, in order to make sure that they do not seriously damage the conversation, participants have recourse to a “repair mechanism”. Sidnell (2010) gives an example: if a person says that they are going to have a siesta, someone might respond by asking ‘a what? The first speaker could then repair the reference either by repeating some portion of the original utterance (e.g. siesta) or by substituting another word (e.g. nap).

Repair refers to an organized set of practices through which participants in conversation are able to address and potentially resolve such problems of speaking, hearing or understanding (Sidnell, 2010). The defining characteristic of conversational repair is that the current activity is put on hold; the interactant deals with the trouble, and then the main activity is resumed after the problem is resolved. Repaired segments of talk, or the problem that the repair addresses is called the troubled source. This is different from the cause or basis of trouble which can be anything from ambient noise or failing hearing to an esoteric word choice. However, not all repairs involve errors made by the speaker at all. For example, when a speaker grapples for a word because the appropriate lexical item is not available (Liddicoat, 2007).

Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks (1977) proposed a model of the mechanism for repair in conversation which makes a central distinction between who initiates repair and who makes the repair, classifying them into four types. Repair can be initiated by the speaker of the repairable (self-initiated repair) or it may be initiated by its recipient (other-initiated repair). In addition, a repair can be made by the speaker of
the repairable item (self-repair) or it may be made by the recipient of the item (other-repair). In combination, these are the possible four types of repair:

- **Self-initiated self-repair** (SISR) in which the speaker of the repairable item both indicates a problem in the talk and resolves the problem.

- **Self-initiated other-repair** (SIOR) in which the speaker of the repairable item indicates a problem in the talk, but the recipient resolves the problem.

- **Other-initiated self-repair** (OISR), in which the recipient of the repairable item indicates a problem in the talk and the speaker resolves the problem.

- **Other-initiated other-repair** (OIOR) in which the recipient of the repairable item both indicates a problem in the talk and resolves the problem.

### 6.4.2 Types and Positions of Repair

#### 6.4.2.1 Self Repair

Since all repairs involve a break, however small, in the continuity and progress of talk, a central question is how do recipients parse a self-repaired talk. How do they know that what follows is a correction of what was said, instead of a continuation? (Sidnell, 2010). Repairs do not tend to be corrected explicitly by recipients, but are made ‘visible’ and the relevance for their repair is established (Ferencík, 2005). Self-repair is made possible by “technology” of repair which consists of practices of marking its initiation and completion, for locating the repairable, and for performing operations on them (Romaniuk & Ehrlich, 2013).

**Preference for Self-repair** (Summarized from (Sidnell, 2010))

A main finding of the early work on repair suggests that there is a preference for self-correction. Schegloff et al. (1977) observed that there are vastly more occurrences of self-repair than other-repair. In their paper, they described the local organization that favors self-repair over other-repair. First, the authors argue that the main reason is that the position for self-correction precedes positions for other correction across a repair opportunity space. The current speaker, since he already has the floor, is in the position to both initiate and execute the repair. Another reason for the tendency towards self-repair is the fact that the other speaker typically only initiates repair-- they leave it up to the current speaker to repair the
trouble source. In fact, when other-repairs occur, they are modulated by phrases such as “I think

The data shows that Guinaang exhibits 4 types of self-initiated repair: word search, hesitations, replacement, repetition, abort and restart. Other-initiated repair includes open class, question word, repetition, and confirmation.

### 6.4.3 Self-Initiated Repair

#### 6.4.3.1 Word search

Betz, (2008) provides a detailed discussion on word search. Quoting (Schegloff et al., 1977) she defines word search as an activity wherein a speaker actively searches for an item e.g. a lexical item or a larger structural unit, that is unavailable to him at the point in the conversation at which it is due. During a word search, the speaker puts the activity on hold to attend to the problem. Once the problem is resolved (recovery of searched-for item), they return to the main sequence of the activity.

Hence, word search can be divided in to three phases: (1) search initiation (2) search process, and (3) resolution of search. A repair initiator typically marks the beginning of the word search. This can come in a form of gaze (away from participant), cut offs, pauses, non-lexical speech perturbations such as lengthened “uh” in English. During the search process varies which has varied length and complexity, speakers typically use lexical or non-lexical elements. The resolution of a word search, which is projected in the talk preceeding the search initiation. Co-participants, by attending to the speaker's projection, can guess a possible outcome. If it fits the projection, the speaker may mark it, however it resembles the searched-for-item, as a “stand-in” or place holder for it.

This common type of repair is found in the data when the current speaker breaks the flow of his turn because s/he is grappling for the next word. An example is the segment below, where RS is making a command to her husband to make *aloy*.

---

11 a wooden frame for hanging harvested rice stalks.
Prior to this turn the husband just finished his turn to talk with the kid (line 01-03), marked by *umm* (line 03), signaling to RS that it was his turn to talk. Fulfilling this ‘responsibility’ to start a new turn at the appropriate moment, RS launches, in line 04, a talk deviating from the current topic and a different recipient (NT). Searching for the right word to start the sentence, she used the filler *chan nayan na*, ‘these’. As a side note, this exemplifies that utterances are context-shaping and content-shaped, understood through their sequential placement in their local environment.

Below is another example of word search. Unlike the example above where the speaker grapples to start the whole sentence, the speaker is searching for a special term that refers to a certain cultural practice. Here, the participant puts the activity on hold, starting with *it ti* ‘the’ with lengthening (represented by a comma). A glottal stop at the end of *ti* marks a break (represented by a ‘-‘), and starts the word search by using the filler *nayan na*. Still failed to locate the term, she pauses for approximately two seconds. Finally, she locates the appropriate word and utters it with a slightly increased loudness.

(36)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>Monday vigat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monday tomorrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘It’s Monday tomorrow’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>O!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Yes!’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>Umm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>04</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>chan nayan na () inka oon  chit aloy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These go make DET aloy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These () go and make the frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ta awni ad avo nu hapun migopcha</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>because later</em> then again when NEG ready*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘coz I’m afraid it won’t be ready again’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(37)

**PS:** *Itti:: nayan na (1.8) SIVIT*

  DET that sivit

  *the, what do you call it (1.8) SIVIT*
6.4.3.2 Abort and replace
The example below shows a similar phenomenon where the speaker has started to mention a name, aborts it and repairs it. Here, the speaker is mentioning a name, realizes she made an error, and aborts her initiation which is incomplete. She then initiates another repair strategy, namely word search: using a lengthened filler a:, pauses to recollect the right word, and then mentions it with a slightly higher loudness.

(38)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{FT} & \quad \text{invaga’ pay ancha vi (.) a: (.5) Alimag} \\
& \quad \text{told = 1s still obl.3pl Alimag} \\
& \quad \text{I told vi (.) a…Alimag’}
\end{align*}
\]

6.4.3.3 Abort and restart (caused by overlap)
Repairs can be caused by simultaneous speech, where a speaker pauses to give way to the other one. A reason for this is that that participants are oriented to one-person-at-a time talk; thus, one person breaks avoid overlaps. The talk below contains two examples of repair caused by overlapping speech where one of the speakers starts but aborts a word and continues it in the same or next turn.

In this segment, both RS and PD are talking to their 7-yr old grandson NT cooperatively, that is, they take turns in talking to him. Prior to this talk, the child has just excitedly informed them that he found some batteries. In line 01, RS asked ‘whose are these? Whose are these batteries?’ continuously and rapidly without breaking. This turn is composed of two grammatically complete clausal TCUs. Monitoring RS's possible completion points, the husband, PD, attempts to launch a turn after the first TCU (line 02) but is slightly delayed, producing another overlap with the second TCU. Since the current speaker has the right to the floor, PD cuts his TCU at the first morpheme ma, a question particle, pauses and continues it anyway with a slightly diminished loudness. (He stops there, leaving it an incomplete TCU?) and letting RS finish the second TCU.
After a pause of one second from the last turn, PD attempts to complete what he started which he aborted twice in line 02, and this time is successful without interruption. Almost the same time as PD starts this turn, RS also starts but is slightly delayed. She seems to attempt to hold the floor by completing the utterance despite the overlap, but PD didn’t ‘give-way’. RS breaks at the first syllable, pauses and continues. Upon continuing, PD hasn’t finished the whole turn, so RS pauses again. By this time, RS has recognized the completed turn so she finishes up the utterance to completion.

6.4.3.4 Self-correction

Another type of self-initiated repair is one which is prompted by error correction. The context of this segment the father is telling a story of an event where they went to a wake. His son DF asked how many joined him and the father was recalling and identifying each one in order to figure out how many were. At line 04, he concluded then that, including all he mentioned, he is the fifth. A couple of seconds later, at line 06 he made a self-correction when he realized there were more people, as seen in line 07. The repair solution (walu ami ‘we’re eight’) frames the trouble source ‘I’m the fifth’ as meaning there were five of them. Notice that self-correction here does not mean correcting a linguistic error, but correcting a proposition that the speaker previously uttered.
The self-correction in line 06 uses an initiator *ay*, followed by the correction.

(40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td><em>Inag un mag-asawa (.5)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>The <em>Inag</em> couple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td><em>Cha nora an [inc.]</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Nora</em> and [inc.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td><em>chuwachat saon na maalima</em></td>
<td>They’re two and I’m the fifth (one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>[cough]</td>
<td>[cough]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>→ FT</td>
<td><em>Ay, walu ami (.5)</em></td>
<td>Oh, we’re eight (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>→ FT</td>
<td><em>chicha’ man-iina ay cha, (.)</em></td>
<td>They, the mother-and-kids oh, (.) the three-Salome and her children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Salomen man-iinan tulu</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.3.5 Expansion

Expansion means that the speaker of the repaired turn tends to expand the repairing turn by giving more explanations or examples to clarify the notion that has been mentioned in the repaired turn (Al-Harahsheh). In the example above, the father has just corrected himself that they were eight instead of five (line 06). Line 07 is another repair solution targeting line 6 as a trouble source. He expands *walu* ‘eight’ by breaking down the additional three persons: *chicha’ man-iina* (they, the mother-and-kids). A further expansion is followed, which is initiated by *ay* again. This time, the repair solution clarifies the category *chicha* ‘they-mother-and-kids’ by identifying the name of the mother.

6.4.3.6 Replacement

The term replacement, or “replacing” (Schegloff, 2013) refers to a speaker’s substituting for a wholly or partially articulated element of a TCU-in-progress another, different element, while retaining the sense that “this is the same utterance”. An example of this is found in the Guinaang text in the segment below where PS is preparing for a cultural dance presentation and her daughter asked where her earring was. An overlapping speech occurred between the mother’s (PS) answer, which was uncompleted, and the daughter’s expansion of the previous TCU.

In line 03, PS successfully completes the abandoned TCU. However, she breaks the activity and initializes the repair with *ay* followed by a glottal stop and a short
pause. The replacement of *inawit* ‘(hand) carried’ is a repair solution to the trouble source *inala* ‘taken’. Both words are synonymous to each other and can be said to belong to the same category of verbs. The verb that follows, *inusal* ‘used’ can be analyzed as an expansion rather than a replacement of *inawit*, i.e., that Inoy took and used the earring for the pageant.

(41)

01    NV    ummat illingnu? (.8)  [awa’ avot isayawnu!]

Where earing = 2S    EXIST again boast = 2S

Where’s your earing? [you have sth to boast of again

02    PS    [inala- inalan Inoy chit yachi

took took Inoy DET this

[tok—Inoy took it

03 →  ay- (. ) inawit, *inusalna chit queen na.*

ay- carried used.3S DET pageant.3S

‘ay- (. ) she carried it, used it in her pageant’

In summary, Guinaang speakers exhibit self-repair initiators in order to solve “problems” in speaking such as word search, simultaneous speech, truth claim and word choice (in the case of replacement). Repairs are mostly initiated by the expletive *ay!* followed by a short pause.

6.4.4 Other Initiated Repairs (OIR)

According to (Schegloff et al., 1977), the study of other-initiated repairs is an important domain to human communicative competence, as well as a crucial part of a system of practices that people use to deal with problems of speaking, hearing and understanding in social interaction.

6.4.4.1 Minimal OIR sequences

Guinaang OIR sequences generally conform to the basic three-turn sequence pattern expected in English and other languages (Schegloff et al. 1977) where after speaker A produces the trouble source (T-1), speaker B makes an other initiation repair (T0), followed by a repair solution (T + 1) by speaker A. This is illustrated in (42)
In this example, the repair is initiated by the question marker *nu* with a rising intonation, and the producer of the trouble source repeats her original turn with some modification.

### 6.4.4.2 Non-Minimal OIR sequences

The basic OIR sequence can be expanded when a repair solution is not immediately successful such that it becomes the trouble source for a next OIR. For example, the OIR itself is not clearly understood, becoming a trouble source for an extended OIR sequence. An example from English data illustrates this:

(43): (Kendrick, 2015)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jam:</td>
<td>Right, when are you ready?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ker:</td>
<td>Ready for what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jam:</td>
<td>To do the boost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ker:</td>
<td>What boost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jam:</td>
<td>Out the room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guinaang data exhibits this non-minimal sequence. In this instance, there are more than two speakers participating in the OIR sequence. Hence, multiple other-initiations of repair can occur.
In this section, I present some linguistic resources available in Guinaang Kalinga for initiating repair. Other-initiated repair can be analysed in different formats. One of them is the inventory of five formats for repair initiation by (Schegloff et al., 1977) when they worked on other-initiated repairs in English. These can be summarised as:

- **Huh?** and **What?**
- Question words *who*, *where*, and *when*
- Partial repeat of the trouble-source turn plus a question word;
- Partial repeat of the trouble-source turn;
- **Y’mean** plus a candidate understanding of the prior turn

They also claim that these major forms of other-initiation have “natural ordering” based on their relative “power” or “strength” to locate a repairable. At one end of the scale are open-case initiators such as “what” and “huh”, which indicate only that the hearer has detected some trouble in the previous turn and does not locate any repairable component within that turn. A more specific type of initiator are the question words “who?”, “where?” and “when?”. When these question words are paired with a repeat of some portion of the previous turn (e.g. the *what?*), the
power to locate is increased. The repeated portion can also be used without the question word. Finally, at the other end of the scale is the most specific type of repair initiator where the hearer mentions his understanding of the prior turn, preceeded by “y’mean”.

Open class Wh-word Repeat + Wh-word Repeat Understanding

WEAKER

STRONGER

Figure 7 Typology of other-initiation forms (Sidnell 2010)

In a cross-linguistic study of other-intiated repair, Dingemanse & Enfield (2015) wrote a typology of conversational structures based on other-initiated repair. One issue addressed in their study is categorizing these repairs cross-linguistically. According to them, the five formats devised by Schegloff et al. cannot be used as cross linguistic categories for many reasons, one of which is that the formats of Schegloff et al. were based from generalisations about social interactional practices of certain varieties of English, which do not and were not meant to capture all relevant properties of repair initiators in other languages. For example, Mandarin Chinese has two distinct formats involving repetition: the *question-intoned repeat* and the *a-suffixed repeat*. The first one is used for clarification, but the second one is for confirming. A third format ‘candidate for understanding’ does not use repeated material, but makes confirmation relevant. Thus, the authors used a basic format for repair imitation which leaves room for language-particular descriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other-Initiated Repair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests that indicate some problem with the prior talk while leaving open what or where the problem is exactly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>Interjection</em>. An interjection with questioning intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>Question-word</em>. An item from the larger paradigm of questions words in the language. Usually a thing interrogative, sometimes a manner interrogative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>Formulaic</em>. Expressions not incorporating interjection or question word, often managing social relations or enacting politeness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Restricted** |
| Restrict the problem space in various ways by locating or characterising the problem in more detail. |
| • *Request type*. Typically done by content question-words often in combination with partial repetition |
| • *Offer type*. Typically done by a repetition or rephrasing of all or part of T-1. |
| • *Alternative question*. Repair initiator that invites a selection from among alternatives. |

Figure 8 Some basic format types for other-initiation of repair (Dingemanse & Enfield, 2015)
Since the definition of repair in general is dealing with “recurrent problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding, other-initiated repairs can also be analysed according to the trouble-source repair targets. (Svennevig, 2008) categorizes them into three: problems of hearing, problems of understanding and problems of acceptability.

Problems of hearing amounts to a construal of the linguistic form of the utterance, that is, its lexical, syntactic and prosodic features.

Problems of understanding involve understanding such things as the action being performed by the utterance, the referents being invoked by the referring expressions, and the implicatures being conveyed by the wording.

Problems of acceptability concerns the correcting of an “error” not only in terms of the contribution as a linguistic utterance (e.g. “there’s a mistake”) but also as a conversational action. This includes different things such as the truth of the claims made, or the speaker’s right to perform the action in question or the relevance of the utterance to the current situation.

6.4.4.3.1 Open Class Repair

A common type of other-initiated repair is initiated by an open class interjection with a rising intonation, such as ha? in Guinaang. In this segment, the repair targets the trouble source caused by mishearing. Here, the mother and daughter are talking about going to the dance while they have to prepare rice cakes for another event. The mother asks what should she should do. The daughter's response comes in a form of a question, which the mother didn’t hear. She then used the repair initiator ha with a rising intonation. The daughter understood this as a signal to repeat the question, which she did in line 11.

(45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>Umali. Ay, ona ma’ innok yachin (.) ot ma</th>
<th>Coming. Oh, what should I do (.) but</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Gato’ a ossiya gay imoy ya?</td>
<td>Why are you going, anyway?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Ha?</td>
<td>Ha?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Gato’ a ossiya gay imoy ya?</td>
<td>Why are you going?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4.4.3.2 Question-Word

Repairs prompted by, for instance, problems in understanding can also be initiated by question words such as *nu* ‘what’ with a question intonation, as shown in the example below. The speaker of the trouble source repeats but slightly modifies the form of the question.

(46)

`MT  Inggawan = cha Tomasa?`

stayed = 3p Tomasa
‘They stayed at Tomasa?’

→ `DF  Nu?`

What?

`MT  Nu ancha Tomasa?`

if *EXIST* Tomasa
are they with Tomasa?

`FT  Ha!’ pag[i!`

NEG yet
‘not yet’

Troubles in understanding are not always repair initiated by the common Wh-question words such as ‘what’ ‘where’ and ‘who’. Participants can use functional words such as the locative markers *ud* to ask ‘where’ or case markers such as *ti* to ask ‘what’, as the examples below provide.

(47)

`PS  ot asi awoy agay imoy?` Then you'll just go later?

→ `NV  Ud?` To?

`PS  Ud chu chi?` To there?

(48)

`DF  Nauto?` Cooked?

→ `MT  Ti?` The?

`FT  a iyasug nu?` or you have just boiled?
A. Partial repeat of the trouble source turn

In this segment, the mother and daughter are talking about a neighbor who is having a sivit, a traditional way of healing a child’s disability. In line 01, the mother used a term unfamiliar to the co-participant, hence a repetition in line 02. The turn is a syntactically incomplete TCU and intonationally incomplete (not rising tone to signal a question), the mother understood it as a request for an expansion of the word. Her response in line 03 repairs the trouble-source logoy with a repetition of the word followed by an explanation.

(49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>And (1.8) I don’t know really (.) if he recovered from his logoy and his tuti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Hi (.5) logoy</td>
<td>The (.5) logoy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Logoy ancha nan yachi un chat chaan agay ya noa (.5) chat tuti na (2 ) hapun masalimuwat chan ugucona</td>
<td>“logoy” is when you can’t…the speaking disorder…(can’t) understand his words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.4.3.3 Offering a candidate

In this segment, there are two instances of repair found: the first one using question word, and the second one offers a candidate of understanding. 

(1) In line 02, PS answers the question ‘why’ in line 01 by telling what kind of event was happening, which explains the production of the rice cakes. However, before answering, she begins with a confirmation about what is being solicited. She initiates the repair by the question paman ‘why’ and makes a repair solution herself.

(2) In line 03, NV recognizes PS’s answer, but confirms whether the sivit is of a certain person. This seems to be confirming which sivit is being referred to, hence the question ‘the sivit of JS?’ to which the mother affirms in line 04.
(50)

01 NV  Ma (.5) it nanay-otan yu
       hinon nanay-otan cha
       Roda'n inmoy na iniyoy
       wancha vagni? (.8)

02 PS  Paman? (.) ay (.) itti,
       nayan na (2) SIVIT

03 NV  Sivit ah, ah. Sivit JS?

04 PS  O.

Why (.5) did they (make)
chal-ot, Rhoda made chal-ot
that they brought to Vagni
(.8)

Why? (.) Oh, the, that (2)
SIVIT

Sivit, ah ah. The sivit of JS?
Yes.

In summary, trouble sources and other-initiated repair strategies are illustrated in
the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hearing</th>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Confirmation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open class</td>
<td>Ha?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question word</td>
<td>Nu? ‘what’</td>
<td>Nu? ‘what’ Or markers such as ud? ‘to?’ and ti? ‘the?’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial repeat</td>
<td>Repetition of the lexical item</td>
<td>Repetition + additional information with rising tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering a candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.5 Linguistic devices for repair

6.4.5.1 Elongated vowels: (i::, a::, u::)

Guinaang speakers lengthen the vowel to indicate a problem in finding the next
word. It occurs in specific locations, particularly with the last vowel of the word
before the trouble source. Streeck (1996) who observes a similar phenomenon in
Ilocano, describes sound-stretches as 'self-initiators of repair, forward-looking',
broadcasting the difficulty which the speaker experiences or anticipates in producing
the next part of the turn.
In this example above, the stretched vowel is on the last vowel of the personal pronoun *wancha*, which is supposed to be followed by a person’s name, to indicate possession. The lengthening of the vowel is translated as the English filler *uhm*, since its function is comparable to the elongated vowel. The location of the sound-stretch reveals the nature of the trouble source. In the example above, the sound stretch, occurring in an oblique personal pronoun, indicates that the problem is access to a nominal.

Sound stretches which occurs in clause-initial conjunctions reveal the speaker’s difficulty in constructing the whole clause. Consider (52):

(52)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Ta::imosok nu:: nun ummoyan. Inon chit ummoyan cha'chi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In order to <em>uhm</em> ask whether <em>uhm</em> where she went to. How’s the place they went to.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.4.5.2 Holding the floor device: *(chan) nayan na*

Repair initiators can also come as fixed expressions, such as *chan nayan na*, which also indicates trouble of finding the next construction. Its short form *nayan na* is shown in example below.

(53)

| 1  | NT | O! | Yes! |
| 2  | PD | Monday vigat | It’s Monday tomorrow. |
| 3  | NT | O! | Yes! |
| 4  | PD | Umm | Umm |
| 5  | RS | *chan nayan na*, *inka oon chit aloy ta awni ad avo nu hapun migobcha* | *Uhm*, go make aloy, coz I’m afraid it won’t be ready again. |

The ‘main’ content of her turn starts with *inka oon chit aloy…*, ‘go make aloy…’ preceded by *chan nayan na*. Occurring at the beginning of the turn, *chan nayan na* is used as a device to take the floor. Notice how RS, who is not part of the exchanges of turn (between PD and NT) in lines 1-4, interrupted the dialogue and took the floor in line 5. Wanting to take a turn, yet not ready with what she has to say—namely a command to her husband, her turn is prefixed with *chan nayan na*. 
Not only is this expression used as a device to take the floor, but also to hold one while initiating a repair.

(54)

```
PS  Paman? (.) ay (.) it ti, nayan na (2) SIVIT
    why   oh  the, uhmm,   sivit
```

In (54), *nayan na* occurs before the trouble source *sivit*, with two seconds of silence in between them, indicating that it involves a word search.

### 6.4.5.3 Place-holder: *noa*

Guinaang conversations are filled with many occurrences of *noa* [noʔa], which appears in different locations. *Noa* is a semantically empty root which has an interactional function. It is a particle that has equivalents in different Philippine languages; such as *ku’an* in Cebuano, *kwa* in Ilocano and *kwan* and *ano* in Tagalog.

Consider the occurrence of *noa* in the example below, where *noa* is attached with a pronoun *cha* ‘their’, occurring in an N slot in a NP. *Noa* is used in lieu of a word which was not readily accessible to the speaker.

(55)

```
1  NV  Yo apom chi tot   She's not your relative
2  PS  (cough) Iinakay! Noancha ina chi (Cough) What the! That
    EXPL  what = 3P mother that   (person) is mother's what.
```

*NV* in line 1 is teasing her mother by negating her mother’s claim that a certain person is her relative. In line 2, the mother defends her claim by saying *noancha ina chi* which literally means, ‘That (person) is their what’ (where ‘their’ includes mother; and ‘what’ refers to a relative).

In the example below, *noa* replaces an adjective.

(56)

```
PS  chummagat illing-u chin noa tot iya Where is my earring, the what one,
    oyat nan-illing ut yachin chakol so that I can use it as earring, the big
    one
```

The speaker asked a question *chummagat illing-u* ‘where is my earring’, followed by a phrase to modify the earring, *chin noa* ‘the what one’. Again, *noa* is used in lieu of a word that the speaker can’t produce at the time of utterance, namely an adjective. The speaker repairs it in the same turn, by making explicit what *noa* refers to, namely *chakol* ‘big’.
In the example below, *noa* occurs in a verb slot.

(57)

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{NV} & \text{Innakay! Lam pa i man(.)man noa} \\
& \text{navon yachi?} \\
& \text{Gosh! Look, she’ll she’ll what} \\
& \text{it again.}
\end{array}
\]

*Noa* replaces a verb as evidenced by the verbal prefix *-man* that attaches to it. It is interesting to note that in the previous example, the trouble source *noa* is not repaired (it was not made explicit what it refers to) while the example above is repaired. The reason is that in (57), the referent of *noa* can be inferred from the context while in (56) the other speaker may not be able to guess it, i.e which earing she is referring to.

Aside from initiating a trouble source, *noa* has an interactional function which fits what Tanangkingsing (2009) refers to as placeholders which “enables a speaker to finish an action before an appropriate word can be found in the process of word search (p.579)”
Chapter 7
Applying the BOLD Method

In the previous chapter, I presented an initial description of the conversational structure of Guinaang using the data from the BOLD project. In this section, I discuss the applicability of BOLD method for the analysis of conversational texts in Guinaang. First I present my application of BOLD method in a language documentation project from which the conversational data is a part. Secondly, I present how BOLD was used in the analysis of Guinaang conversations, discussing the benefits and challenges of BOLD in producing (1) a basic annotation for language documentation and (2) CA transcription from which the analysis was based on.

7.1 Applying the BOLD Method in Guinaang, Kalinga

The *Pinasil Language Documentation* project was done carefully following the BOLD design. I attend the short courses in 2010 and 2014 which gave me ample familiarity with the method. Both of these workshops included adequate hands-on training for the oral annotation method of BOLD. This does not imply, however, that this project demonstrates what an ideal BOLD project should look like. The project is simply an attempt to apply BOLD within the constraints of time and situation inherent to Guinaang culture. The project tried to first exemplify the three characteristics of BOLD—basic, oral and breadth first.

My prior relationship to the language group was established in 2010 during the language assessment on vitality on Guinaang (Gonzales 2015), which led to the choice of the language community as a possible target language for a documentation. Aside from this, results from the assessment indicated that the community, in a desire to establish their identity and develop written materials in their language, showed that a language documentation is perceived need in this community.

The whole project lasted about three months, from September to December 2014. The documentation team consisted of two primary field researchers: Levi Cruz, the author of this thesis and Ryn Jean Gonzales who works with SIL as a language surveyor. Both researchers were involved in the language survey in Kalinga which
covered Guinaang. Other people from the community who were involved in the data collection and contributed to the oral and written annotation were two single men, Delfin Guimba and Antonio Servillano.

7.1.1 Recording the primary data

The primary data consists of audio and video communicative events, lists and cultural events. The intention was to collect a variety of communicative events of different genres to capture the language use of the community. We also planned to document cultural events unique to Kalinga. Word lists and grammatical paradigms were also part of the plan to document.

Communicative events mostly consist of monologic speech of native speakers recorded in different situations. Most of these events, however, were held inside their homes, where they were comfortable to tell a story at their convenient schedule. Delfin served as an insider and helped introduce us and explain the purpose of the recording. The recorded communicative events consist of 20 narratives, 2 songs and 4 conversations.

We gathered elicited lists using the 500 Philippine word list and 500 grammatical sentences used by Constantino. Each word of the word list and the sentences were in Tagalog and translated to Guinaang prior to recording.

Two naturally occurring cultural events were recorded during the project: A funeral practice and a traditional healing event. Not all communicative events were orally transcribed and translated due to time limitations and availability of speakers. On the other hand, for this thesis, conversations were given priority.

The corpus design was not solely a product of the researchers’ plan, but attempts were made to include also what the community wanted documented. Thus, the idea of the documentation was presented to the local government during weekly meetings. During these meetings, ideas on what items to document, scope of the documentation and the key people to ask assistance from were elicited from the leaders. However, the collection method was in some ways opportunistic, that is, events were collected as they occurred and became available for recording. Among the communicative events, the community leaders showed most interest in collecting recordings of traditional and personal stories relating to their culture and history. Video recordings of actual cultural events were also highly valued as part of the
corpus. When asked who could contribute the stories, they suggested the names of old people who know the culture, history and language the best.

Aside from involving the community at the beginning of the project, another type of collaboration was involving different people to contribute to the recordings. For ethical reasons, the researchers made sure that the speakers who volunteered were informed and consenting to the activity in which they participated.

7.1.2 Annotation of Texts

After each recording, I backed up the file into Saymore, a file management software that works in line with the BOLD method (See Figure 9). Here, I filled-out appropriate situational, technical and contributor metadata. Then I explained the purpose and the process of the oral annotation to the transcriber carefully. To explain more clearly how it works, I shared a sample recording of an oral annotation to the annotator. Then, once ready, the language helper provided the slow speech annotation: first he listens to the original audio file, and repeats slowly and carefully each segment onto a recorder, using Saymore. Another speaker listens to both original and slow speech recordings and produces a phrasal translation of each chunk spoken in the previous step. I show in Figure 9 the technical setup of the oral annotation process.

Figure 9 Screenshot of Saymore, a data-management software for language documentation
There were three language helpers who contributed in the oral translation phase: Delfin, a 40-year-old man, Florendo, a 20-year-old male student, and Sunny a 25-year-old male office worker. All of them are native speakers of Guinaang.

The oral annotators had three options for the target language. The first one was the regional language, Ilokano, the national language Filipino, and English which is another official language in the Philippines. Among the three, Ilokano was the one they are most comfortable with, followed by Filipino. The instruction given to the translator was to translate each segment orally in any of the three. At the end, the language of choice of all the annotators was Filipino. At the time of this writing, not all communicative events are annotated. Mostly, conversations were orally transcribed and translated for the purpose of this thesis.

The texts were transcribed from the oral annotation in Saymore in order to later produce a final product of a time-aligned, multi-tiered transcription of the conversation.

7.1.3 Archiving
As the project is still in the process of completion, the archival stage will be done at a later time. The researcher plans to store the digital corpus within SIL’s archive in Manila.
7.2 Applying BOLD for Conversation and CA

People who analyze conversations, particularly conversation analysts, begin with recording naturally occurring talk as their primary source and then transcribing it “in order...to see the transient and complex nature of talk captured in an easily usable, static format” (Liddicoat, 2007). However, a conversation analyst interested in working with recordings of a language other than his own, and whose speakers are already inaccessible faces a unique challenge. With BOLD annotations accompanying the recordings of conversation, how much sense can the analyst make of the conversation in order to analyze it?

To answer this question, I prepared a conversation analytic transcript (CA transcript, henceforth) of the Guinaang conversations using the data from the oral annotations. The CA transcript is usually multi-linear (Sidnell, 2009) containing (1) the original talk, represented phonetically or orthographically, (2) morpheme-by-morpheme English gloss, and a (3) an idiomatic translation of the original.

7.2.1 Advantages of BOLD

7.2.1.1 In Producing a Written Transcription

In producing an annotation, BOLD’s obvious benefit is the speed it provides in arriving at a transcription and translation. For example, the oral transcription of a 30-minute text took approximately 8 hours to complete. It has been estimated that for every hour of recorded text, it may take up to 20 hours (Crowley, 2007) to 60 hours (Bowern, 2008) of work to produce a written annotation.

In the process of producing a written transcription of the text, the oral transcription was found to be helpful most of the time. In most cases, the oral transcriber made an accurate slow speech version of the original speech, providing helpful lexical boundary clues. This confirms that oral annotation can provide ‘clear interpretation’ of the normal speech, as suggested by Reiman (2010) and Boerger (2011). Consider an actual example from the BOLD data (Figure 9).
In the figure above, the original speech is compared to the oral transcription. First, it shows that the oral transcription is a slower version of the original speech. The duration of the utterance *ot umali’a voan ichi?* ‘so are you joining there’ in the original speech is 1.14 seconds while in the oral transcription is 2.43 seconds, almost twice as long as the original. Second, it shows that the original utterance was enunciated carefully; each word is clearly separated, giving clues to word-breaks. Third, it shows that the oral transcription is a ‘clearer’ version of the original, in that the oral transcriber spoke each word consistently louder than the original.

Related to this, another way that the oral transcription provides a clear interpretation of the original speech is when contracted words are spelled out.

(58)  
| Written Transcription                           | Oral Transcription                           
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Nippon</em> met <em>an mangchonan sia Natan</em></td>
<td><em>Naid pon</em> met <em>an mangchonan sika Natan</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none also ? take.care 2s Natan</td>
<td>none also ? take.care 2s Natan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘There’s no one to take care of you, Natan’

The underlined pair of words above shows that the form *nippon* is composed of *naid* and *pon*. Although this information is particularly useful for (morpho)phonemic
analysis, it is a disadvantage in transcribing phonetically the surface form since the oral transcription reveals the underlying form of the words. Unseth (2012) made this observation in her phonological study of Laari.

Further, it can reveal the oral transcriber's interpretation of a 'more correct' form of an utterance. In Guinaang, the verb in 'go', when inflected with the pronoun kami 'we', becomes [iŋkami]. A variation of this form [ʔami] is also used by some speakers, and is found in the conversational data.

(59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Oral transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ta i'=ami maapangu ?an lulum pay</td>
<td>Ta in=kami makapangu kan lulum, pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so go = 3P (EXCL) harvest OBL grandmother ok</td>
<td>so go = 3P (EXCL) harvest OBL grandmother ok</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘so that we can go harvest to your grandma, ok?’

In listening to the oral transcription, one can notice that the transcriber enunciates each ‘word’. As the underlined pair shows above, taitami is repeated as ta inkami. Later, the transcriber commented that in normal speech, speakers sometimes say i’ami [ʔami] to mean inkami [iŋkami], which is the more common form and which other subdialects use. This also explains the transcriber’s repetition of [ʔan] as [kan]. These cases can reveal either variations within Guinaang or the speaker’s intuition about the underlying form.

7.2.1.2 In Producing Gloss and Free Translation

Supplying Word Gloss

As mentioned earlier, providing an interlinear gloss is a standard practice both in language documentation and in conversation analysis in languages other than English. Although the oral translation in Guinaang is a phrasal, free translation, in some cases BOLD was helpful in supplying word glosses. This is because the translator used Tagalog as the target language. Since Tagalog and Guinaang are both Philippine languages they have similar syntactic structures which helped me deduce the meaning of words. Consider the comparison of the original and the oral translation in (60):
Having the same word order, the meaning of each word can be deduced from the oral translation. Further, morpheme breaks were also easily deduced from the oral translation because Tagalog has a similar set of affixes. However, this poses a potential disadvantage if the target language used has a structure different from the language being documented.

**Clarifying the meaning of the text**

Oral translations generally provide ‘more’ information than what is said in the original text. Implied information, for example, is made explicit in the oral translation. I consider this helpful in my analysis of the text, but not so much in providing word glosses. In the following examples, the word *pangalan* ‘name’ is made explicit, which is not in the original text. In the original, *ma yachin vakvakota* ‘who is that old woman’ is translated as ‘what’s the name of the old one’.

### (60)

Original:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Um-ali = ‘a</th>
<th>Upupa</th>
<th>vigat?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPF-join</td>
<td>2S</td>
<td>Upupa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa-sali</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>ba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oral Translation:

‘will you join (to) Upupa tomorrow?’

Another example of ‘clarification’ made by oral translation is illustrated in the example below: a turn is composed of a transitive verb *cholnat* ‘heat’ which usually requires a direct object. In casual conversations, the omission of an argument is possible, even becoming unnecessary when the context is clear between the participants.

### (61)

Original:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ye! ma yachin vakvakota</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ye! Q that old.woman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oral translation:

*Anong pangalan ng matanda* |

What name DET old

‘what’s the name of the old one?’
(62)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{icholnat} &= \text{nu} & \text{Original} \\
\text{heat.up} &= 2s \\
\text{‘you heat’} \\
\text{ipaint} \quad \text{mo} \quad \text{ang ulam} & \quad \text{Oral translation} \\
\text{heat} \quad 2s \quad \text{DET viand} \\
\text{‘heat up the viand’}
\end{align*}
\]

The oral translator added the direct object of the verb, making it clear what was asked to be heated. This is valuable in that it provides ‘what’s going on’ in each line. The participants switched to different topics as the conversation flows, and the oral transcriber, being a native speaker has a better intuition as to the contextual clues which non-speakers of the language do not have.

**Functional Meaning of Expressions**

The meaning of certain fixed expressions can only be understood by their function. The meaning of the expression *ma’ inon chichi*, literally ‘how is that’, is made clearer. In the context, the speaker was confronted with a problem of going to an event while they had yet to finish a task. The question was addressed to her husband. The meaning of the sentence was difficult to deduce from the literal meaning.

(63)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ma’ inon chichi} & \quad \text{Original} \\
\text{How that} \\
\text{‘How is that’} \\
\text{Anong gagawin ko?} & \quad \text{Oral translation} \\
\text{What will.do 1s} \\
\text{‘what should I do?’}
\end{align*}
\]

The oral transcription, however, made it clear what the speaker meant by the question *ma’ inon chichi*. The translation *anong gagawin ko* ‘what will I do?’ is meaningful as it gives the pragmatic meaning of the utterance.

Another example of how an oral translation can give a clearer meaning of an utterance is shown below. In this context, the speaker reacted to what she saw while she was cooking with her mother.
(64)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Vinal-valat-an = } & \text{na!} & \text{Original} \\
\text{PERF- soup = } & \text{3s} \\
\text{lit: she's making it a soup} \\
\text{Ang dami mong nilagay na tubig} & \text{Oral translation} \\
\text{How plenty 2s put LK water} \\
\text{‘you put a lot of water’}
\end{align*}
\]

In the example below, \textit{chaayu an GS} simply means ‘you and GS’, but the oral translator understood that the speaker meant it as a command that the other person should join the speaker going to the farm.

### 7.2.2 Disadvantages of BOLD

#### 7.2.2.1 In Producing a Written Transcription

(65)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{chaayu an JS} & \text{Original} \\
3p \text{ and JS} \\
\text{‘you and JS’} \\
\text{Sasama ka para kayong dalawa ni GS} & \text{Oral Translation} \\
\text{will.join 2s so.that you(pl) two DET GS} \\
\text{‘You will join so that (it will be) the two of you and GS’}
\end{align*}
\]

**Skipped turns or words**

There were difficulties encountered in producing a written transcription of the conversations. First, I found that a number of turns were skipped\(^\text{12}\) in the oral transcription, although they were pre-segmented. This caused many words or phrases in the text to be without transcription, which may negatively affect an accurate analysis of the conversation, since turns are shaped by the previous turn and forms the context of the next turn. In the analysis of adjacency pairs, for example, the second-pair-part is explained in relation to a first-pair-part.

---

\(^{12}\) There are possible reasons for skipping the turns, one of which is technical issues in the software.
Segments that do not have a corresponding oral transcription can be classified as a regular turn, backchannel turns such as uh uh, uhmm or those that occur in overlapping speech. An example of ignored overlapping speech is found in (60).

(66)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Ha’pon</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Ha’pon (.) hapon hi: noa</td>
<td>No (.) not, because she lacked age akit tawonna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the segment above, there is an overlapping speech between DF and FT, indicated by the square brackets. The oral transcriber skipped DF’s turn in line 1 probably because he considered it unnecessary to transcribe or failed to hear it.

Another type of skipped turns is those that occur in repairs. Sometimes speakers launch a turn but it is to correct his speech. There are cases where the oral transcriber skips the aborted word. Consider the example below:

(67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DF</th>
<th>umaton wancha:: inggaw omya wancha: Speedy ot</th>
<th>Original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>umaton wancha: Wala</td>
<td>Oral transcription</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inggaw omya wancha Speedy, umaton wancha Wala

DF’s turn begins with a troubled source umaton wancha:: ‘transferred to’ which he aborted and restarted with a new sentence. This repaired segment was not orally annotated.

Secondly, in other cases, turns were transcribed but the original and the transcription do not exactly match, that is, some elements were skipped. Elements that were left untranscribed are either utterances that the transcriber did not consider as necessary to repeat for careful speech or he missed them. Examples of these are expletives (ay!), laughter (hhh), non-linguistic vocal sounds (tsk) and some discourse particles (adcha, ot). Below is an example of elements that were skipped (in bold).

(68)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O?</th>
<th>ot icht a (.) un iya gat asim mangchonan it</th>
<th>Written Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yana omcha</td>
<td>Oral Transcription</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Iyat ah ah iyagat asi mang-mangchonan hit yana omya
Discourse particles, which are significant in conversation analysis also tend to be left out in oral transcription. In (69), the oral transcription did not include *ad cha* ‘and then’.

(69)

\[ O, \textit{ad cha amod chan aam tau nu mampango tau Natan} \quad \text{Written Transcription} \]
\[ O \textit{amod chan aantaku nu mampango taku} \quad \text{Oral transcription} \]

‘yes, and we have many people to exchange labor with if we will have our harvest, Natan’

**Modified turns**

Another difficulty encountered is when the oral transcriber modifies completely the whole turn. Although native speakers have high sensitivity in hearing their own language, there are cases that the oral transcriber reproduces a different form due to mishearing of the original, or a result of the oral transcriber’s desire to ‘improve’ the text. For example, in (70) the oral transcriber modified the whole sentence.

(70)

\[ Taman osiya gingaan \quad \text{‘why did you not call (them)’} \quad \text{Written transcription} \]
\[ Paannu inka inayagan \quad \text{‘why did you not go invite (them)’} \quad \text{Oral transcription} \]

Although the oral transcription has a similar meaning with the original, the transcription is completely different from the original. Some turns were also changed, but only partially. This happens when, for example the transcriber changes the discourse particles.

(71)

\[ \textit{ti awni ad inka nan at-atipa’las} \quad \text{Written transcription} \]
\[ ‘maybe later, you’ll roam around’ \]
\[ \textit{Avo ad inka nan aatipa’las} \quad \text{Oral transcription} \]
\[ ‘you’ll roam around again’ \]

Modification in the transcription can also happen when the transcriber mishears an affix. For example, Guinaang verbs are marked for aspect. The verb *oy* ‘go’ can have an infix *in* + *um*, resulting in the form *imoy* ‘went’, or it can have an infix *um*, resulting in the form *umoy* ‘will go’. The example below shows that the oral transcriber can mistranscribe a verbal affix (*umoy* instead of *imoy*) which can affect the meaning of the whole sentence.
A number of similar mistranscriptions are found in the text. These are not caused by the oral transcriber's correction or clarification by producing the underlying form (e.g. nippon → naid pon; i’a → inka), as discussed in 7.2.1.1. Table 10 shows more examples of transcription errors caused by the oral transcriber’s mishearing of the original text.

**Table 10 Examples of misrecognition in oral transcription**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written transcription</th>
<th>Oral transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. imoy</td>
<td>umoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. oom-on</td>
<td>oom o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. mangala</td>
<td>nangala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. yachin pay inkamin</td>
<td>yachin pon inkamin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Inta vigat</td>
<td>Asi ta vigat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minor mistranscriptions such as these, when added altogether were time-consuming to correct. A possible cause of this is the low quality of the original recording which made it difficult for the transcriber to hear the words clearly. There are cases that even the best possible quality of the recording has sections with unclear speech.

Another type of mistranscription that was found in the text is when the oral transcriber adds words that are not necessary.

**Statistical Analysis of Oral transcription errors**

To see how much the ‘errors’ described above affected the overall written transcription process, I first looked at each turn in two of the conversations that I used in my analysis, and then counted the number of times each error occurred in the data. Counting the errors in terms of turns was significant since more or less, a transcription segment corresponds to a conversational turn. This also shows how many turns were affected by each type of error, as shown in Table 11 Frequency of each type of error in oral transcription.
Table 11 Frequency of each type of error in oral transcription

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Types of Errors</th>
<th>B. Frequency</th>
<th>C. Percent of Turns Affected</th>
<th>D. Percent of Errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>whole turn</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some word(s)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overlap(s)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repair(s)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>backchannel(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discourse connector(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misheard word(s)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>added word(s)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paraphrased whole turn</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paraphrased a portion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>replaced word(s) with synonyms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Errors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Turns with Errors</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of turns</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows each type of transcription error (column A) and the number of times they appear among the 195 turns observed (column B). It also shows how much, by percentage, turns are affected by each error (column C). Column D shows how much each error accounts for the total amount of error.

The table reveals that 91 turns (47%) out of 195 contain errors of any sort. This shows that almost half of the total number of turns contains at least one error of some sort. The three most frequent errors are whole turn skip, skipped word(s), and misheard word(s).

However, I counted the number of elements or words that are affected by all the errors in order to see how many words were transcribed using the slow-speech. Figure 12 Words affected by transcription errors shows the types of errors discussed above and the percentage of words that each affected in transcription process.
There are 854 tokens/words in the two conversations in question. Of these, *skipped whole turns* affected 8% of the total words; *skipped words* 6%; *misheard words* 3%; and so on. Overall oral transcription errors affected 221 words or 26% of the total. It is interesting to note that this means a large proportion of the conversation, in terms of the number of words, were orally transcribed correctly, or have a good equivalent oral transcription.

7.2.2.2 In Producing Gloss and Free Translation

*Overlapping Speech*

Firstly, one weakness of the Guinaang oral translation is that—just as there are segments without transcriptions as described in 7.2.1.2, there are also segments without equivalent oral translation. It should be noted that the lack of oral translation for some segments was not caused by the absence of oral transcription since the annotator orally translated from the original recording. One example of a segment without translation is overlapping speech, illustrated in (73).
In (73), NV’s turn in the first line is composed of two TCUs, separated by a pause. The first one is a question ummat illing nu? ‘where is your earring?’ while the second one is a comment. PS replies to the question almost exactly at the same time the 2nd TCU was launched by NV, creating an overlapping speech. Looking at the oral translation, it can be seen that the two TCUs of NV were translated. However, the overlapping simultaneous speech made by PS was not given a translation.

Repairs
Repairs are another type of segments that can be skipped in the oral translation process. As demonstrated in chapter 6, conversational repair is one of major areas of investigation in CA, since it is a common practice in spoken language, which therefore is important to be included in the transcript. In the Pinasil project, some false starts in the recording were not given an oral translation. For example, in the original recording, the speaker aborted his TCU, and corrected himself by inserting a phrase.

(74)

1 DF: umaton wancha:
   transferred to
   ‘transferred to...’

2 inggaw omya wancha: Speedy ot stay should’ve to Speedy but
   ‘should’ve stayed with Speedy but’

3 umaton wancha: Wala
   transfer to Wala
   ‘transferred to Wala’s’

DF: Lumipat siya kina Wala
    Transfer 3s to Wala
    ‘He transferred to Wala’
Notice that the oral translation in (74) did not contain the incomplete TCU (line 1), as well as the first part of the repair solution (line 2). What was only translated was line 3. Having only one equivalent phrase made it difficult for me to supply the gloss of each word in the untranslated segments.

**Combining two TCUs**

Another source of difficulty in glossing is when a turn with more than one TCU is paraphrased, combining the two TCUs. The example below shows a turn by a grandfather talking to his grandson. The turn consists of two TCUs: the first one is a statement and the second one is a question. The oral translator disregarded the first TCU (underlined text).

(75)

_Inkami pay Guinaang, inilam payaw = cha Guinaang?_  
_Original_

*will go still Guinaang, saw field = 3p Guinaang?*

_‘We’ll go to Guinaang, did you see their field in Guinaang?’_

_Nakita mo ba yung palayan nila doon?_  
_Oral translation_

_‘did you see their field there?*_

Secondly, having no one-to-one correspondence between the original and the translation, as observed by Unseth (2012) also caused difficulty in glossing. In some cases, the meaning of words particularly nouns, pronouns and verbs could be deduced quite easily, but generally determine the meaning of the rest of the words in the sentence from the oral translation alone was quite a challenging task.

The mentioned strength of oral translation section 7.2.2.1 for the analysis of the text can also be considered a weakness in providing the interlinear gloss. That is, the freer the phrasal translation is, the less it reflects the structure of the original, which is valuable for glossing. In this case, further help from the native speaker was necessary to supply the meaning of words. For example, it was difficult to gloss the sentence in the original shown below based on its oral translation:

(76)

_ek piok garud un siat mangwa_  
_Original_

*_want = 1S then 2S.DET do_*

_‘I want then that you do it’*_

_Ikaw na lang ang gagawa_  
_Oral translation_

_‘it is you who will do it’*
In paraphrasing the original, the words in the first clause *eh piok garud* ‘I want then’ and portion of the second clause *un siat* ‘that you (be) the’ were left untranslated. Instead, the two clauses were joined together as one. Therefore, I had to determine the meaning of each the words that were not translated, with another native speaker. Thirdly, related to this, when the oral translator paraphrased certain sentences, some words are added that caused confusion in glossing.

(77)

Ma’ iyatoy = na

Q cause.death = 3s

What did he die of?

Ano daw yung ikinamatay niya

What did they say he died of?

Fourth, another difficult aspect in glossing is determining the meaning of discourse particles. Spoken language especially Guinaang is rich in particles that do not have content meaning, but play an important role in conveying the speaker’s attitude to what is being said. Determining the meaning of these function words is crucial to the understanding of the whole sentence. For example, notice the difference between sentence a and b below.

(78)

a. Anchi battery!  
   EXIST battery  
   ‘There’s battery!’

b. Anchi battery gayam!  
   EXIST battery so  
   There’s battery, *(I didn’t know before)*

The exact meaning of particles such as this were difficult to determine from the oral translation either because some particles in Guinaang do not have a comparable equivalent in Tagalog, or the oral translation did not contain its equivalent. In (79) are particles (in bold type) do not have equivalent in the Tagalog translation.
Spoken Guinaang is abundant with particles such as *voan*, *yan*, and *avo*. Relying on the Tagalog translation, I was not able to immediately determine their meaning of each particle. Further, even though there are equivalent particles in the oral translation, some particles function differently, so when a certain particle appears without an equivalent one in the Tagalog translation, it became difficult to guess the meaning.

To illustrate this, consider the meaning of the Guinaang particle *ot*. It appears in different positions in the sentence and functions in various ways. One usage of *ot* seem to be as conjunction to indicate a contrast with what has already been said, similar to *but* in English. In other cases, *ot* appears at the beginning of the turn. The free translation that follow each example are taken from the oral translation.

Consulting with a native speaker, I found that ‘*ot*’ may have a similar meaning to *but*, *so*, or *then*.

Words from the elicited wordlist were not very helpful in supplying the meaning of words in the conversational text. Among the 500 wordlist collected, the words that appear in the text are mostly pronouns, articles and conjunctions. Words such as *si’a*
‘you’, chaayu ‘you (pl), hiya ‘s/he’ an ‘and’ hinu ‘what’ taman ‘why’, lafi ‘night’ and iki ‘leg’ are examples of the few words in the word list that appear in the text.

### 7.2.2.3 In Annotating Multi-Speaker Events

One implication of the multi-participant, interactive nature of language for BOLD is that each speaker’s utterances should be orally transcribed and translated separately. This is because during normal conversations, participants often speak at the same time—resulting in overlapping speech. This means that a segment may contain two or more speakers' utterances that are subject for annotation. To illustrate this, I show the relationship between the speech in waveform and an overlapping speech segment between two participants, as illustrated in Figure 13.

![Figure 13 Illustration of speech in wave form and in conversation model](image)

In 13, (1) shows a wave form representation of typical recording where speech can be broken down into smaller segments. Normally, in a single-speaker recording, annotations are inserted after a segment (defined by phrasal breaks) on silences; (2) represents the two speakers’ activities in a conversation, showing silences and overlaps. Since BOLD’s annotation processes the text linearly, its current state cannot annotate two utterances at the same time (during overlaps), either by the play-and-pause method or through Saymore.

Thus, if human interaction is characterized by a clear one-speaker-at-a-time taking of turns, the annotation process will treat conversations the same way as it treats monologues. However, since overlaps normally occur, creating simultaneous speech, inserting annotations after every segment of each speaker is yet beyond BOLD’s
capacity. This does not, however, conclude that BOLD is incompatible with multi-participant texts, but it does entail that a further work is necessary, that is adding a recording session for each additional speaker. I present a possible workflow to aid this process in section 9.2.

7.3 Summary
In this chapter I examined how the BOLD method was applied in a language documentation project in the Philippines, highlighting the compilation and oral annotation of the corpus. Using the conversational texts, I also presented the advantages and disadvantages of the oral method of transcription and translation in coming up with a written transcript useful for the analysis of conversation. I found the oral method is a faster way of transcribing a text, and can provide a valuable basis for creating a written transcription and gloss. On the other hand, I identified errors in the oral annotation that posed a challenge in creating a written conversation transcript. The next chapter will discuss the implications of these findings for the BOLD method.
Chapter 8
Discussion of the Findings

8.1 Introduction
This thesis began with the idea that conversation is one example of observable linguistic behavior which is an important target of language documentation, although it has been neglected in this domain until recently. Conversations provide significant insight into the nature of spoken language which elicited sentences and monologic discourse may not provide (Mithun, 2014). BOLD, being a method of language documentation, claims that its purpose is to orally annotate language use. In this sense, conversations, being the most basic form of language use, should find space not only in the collection, but also in its oral annotation. Yet, there have been no studies on how the oral method of annotation can be applied to conversations and to what extent it would provide useful data for analysis.

The objective of this thesis was to examine the applicability of the BOLD method to conversations. Chapter 7 described how the application of BOLD in a language documentation project, and how the BOLD data was used for the analysis of conversation, as exemplified in chapter 6. In this chapter I discuss the implications of this study for each of the components of the BOLD method.

8.1.1 Implication of this study for BOLD Method
Conversation Analysis has received attention worldwide, in different disciplines, including linguistics, for its theoretical and empirical approach to the study of spoken language. As previously discussed, CA views language from the social-interactional perspective, and is concerned with the detailed study of talk-in-interaction. The CA approach is regarded as the most appropriate for, and the one that can offer the most substantial insight to, linguistic interaction. (Hakulinen & Selting, 2005, Levinson, 1983). Therefore, CA was chosen as the framework in this study, both in the analysis of conversation and in evaluating the adequacy of the orally-annotated data for analysis.
Because CA assumes that social interaction is orderly at a minute level, its methodology employs a detailed transcription of naturally occurring interaction, to aid the investigation of the of turns and sequences. Thus, in evaluating BOLD for conversations, its orally-annotated data was used to create a CA-transcript, which was needed for the analysis of the conversational structure of Guinaang (Chapter 6), and it was noted where the BOLD data was advantageous or presented challenges in creating such transcripts (Chapter 7).

Based on the nature of BOLD processing, and the described difficulties and errors found in the BOLD method for creating a CA-transcript, I was able to identify two main implications for BOLD method. First, in applying BOLD for conversations, one needs to annotate each speaker separately; and secondly, after the oral annotation, a further annotation with a native speaker is needed.

8.1.1.1 Implication #1: Additional Steps in Oral Annotation

(Lüpke, 2009) stated that annotating conversations is generally "more complex" than annotating monologues. This was apparent while applying BOLD to conversational data, more steps were required than if BOLD had been applied to monologues, since texts were orally annotated separately according to speaker, as explained in section 7.2.3. As previously mentioned, this is necessary because conversation participants sometimes speak at the same time, resulting in simultaneous speech, which neither the pause-and-play technique described by Reiman (2010), nor the computer-facilitated (Saymore) annotation can handle at present. Since it has been estimated that in normal conversations, up to 13% of speech occurs simultaneously with that of the other speaker, ignoring this leaves out a significant portion of the conversation.

This, nevertheless, also implies that the oral method can be applied to multi-participant communicative events.

8.1.1.2 Implication #2: Need for Further Annotation

Oral Transcription

In chapter 7, I identified the errors in the oral transcription and translation made by the native speaker. For oral transcription, the amount of errors—almost half of the turns containing one, may imply that every application of BOLD to conversations will contain such an amount. There are, however many factors that affect the
accuracy of the oral transcription, such as quality of the original recording and the amount of training received by the annotator. Nevertheless, they are possible errors that can be expected in a BOLD project which need to be corrected. Taking this into account, a further, post-BOLD annotation is necessary in order to supply the correct transcription of each speaker’s utterances, and thus improve its usability.

In the Guinaang case, errors can be categorized into two: skips and modifications, where the former refers to errors wherein a whole utterance or part of it are skipped, and the latter refers to errors wherein the whole utterance or part of it are annotated but modified (see table 11). The most frequent type of transcription error found was (1) skipped whole turn, affecting 9% of the total turns; (2) skipped words, 13%; and (3) misheard words, 8%, accounting for one third of the total number of turns. This indicate that a significant amount of words is orally mistranscribed which can affect the overall annotation process.

Further, among the types of errors identified, we can distinguish between those that can be easily minimized and those that are inherently difficult to avoid. Errors such as (1) mishearing and those that involve (2) overlaps, and (3) repairs (false starts, aborted TCUs) are the ones that are difficult to avoid. They are particular to annotating everyday spoken language, and as such they should be given more attention. The rest of the types of errors-- skipping, and modification of turns and words are more transcriber-related errors rather than to the nature of conversations, and therefore can be minimized by spending more time in the training of the annotator.

First, misheard words abound in the Guinaang oral transcription (see table 10). Just as mishearings naturally occur in real life conversations, this type of error is prone to occur in oral transcription. Aside from poor quality of recording, spoken language at a natural pace from a recording pose a challenge to the accuracy of the annotators’ interpretation of what he hears. These errors can be minimized by a more careful listening on the part of the oral annotator.

Secondly, turns that occur in overlaps are prone to be ignored or misheard, as they can be difficult to be heard clearly because of the interference of the other speaker’s utterance. Moreover, there were cases when only a native speaker could interpret the indistinguishable word within the overlap.

Thirdly, related to the second, errors involving repair such as false starts, aborted TCUs and words, stutters and fillers also pose a challenge to oral transcription. This
is because the oral transcriber is oriented to provide a clear, edited version of the original, leaving out elements which he thinks are ‘errors’ in speaking. Quite the opposite, the repair system of language points to the orderliness of social interaction; and therefore, is crucial to be represented in the transcript. For example, if a speaker launches a turn and aborts it, leaving an incomplete word, there is a likelihood that it will not be included in the oral transcription. For CA, knowing what word it could have been is important.

**Oral Translation**

In Unseth’s (2012) test of BOLD for phonological analysis, ‘meaning’ was not considered as important as it is in semantic or syntactic study. In the study of conversations, however, meaning plays a more important role. Users of the documentary data, such as linguists or any analyst will access the meaning of the text through the provided gloss and free translation. Providing an accurate translation, then, is a crucial task undertaken by the documentary researcher.

In 7.2.2, I identified the difficulties encountered in making interlinear gloss from the oral translation. Generally, as Unseth observed, the biggest difficulty in glossing the text was caused by the lack of word-for-word correspondence between the original and the translation. The difficulty was reduced, however, because the target language has similar structure as the source language, which helped me to deduce the meaning of each word.

The errors identified in this study were (1) skipped whole turns, overlaps and repairs, (2) combining two TCUs into one, and (3) discourse particles. For skipped whole turns, further investigation is needed to determine the source of this error, however it is suspected that they were caused by technical problems in the software. Overlaps and repairs, on the other hand, were ignored by the oral annotator as they were probably treated as unimportant. The translation of discourse particles was problematic because of the lack of comparable equivalence in the target language, as shown in the analysis of Guinaang conversations in Chapter 6.

**Limitation of BOLD**

In summary, the BOLD data in this study failed to provide the necessary detail which is required to create a useful conversational transcript. In Guinaang conversations, the BOLD data contained errors which made the transcript difficult to make sense of, let alone analyze it. Therefore, this study suggests that a further annotation be done to improve the usability of the data for CA analysis.
Talk is a collaborative activity of speakers, which unfolds turn-by-turn. This means that, as mentioned earlier, a speaker’s turn is shaped by the previous turn and at the same time, shapes the next turn. Relating this to BOLD, a skipped or mistranslation of a single turn, for example, may affect the interpretation of the previous or next turn. Further, the oral annotation produced audio files relating to the original event, oral transcription and translation of each speaker. Reconstructing a transcript from these files, the conversations, most of the time did not make sense due to the errors in transcription and translation.

8.1.2 Suggested Further Annotation for Conversations
After the oral annotation has been done, this study suggests that a further annotation be done that contains the following:

- Original audio recording
- Written transcription
- Written translation
- Correction of a native speaker

This suggestion agrees with Unseth’s (2012) recommendation to add a written transcription and translation in order to make the corpus more useful for (phonological) analysis. For conversations, a written component is also helpful even for an initial analysis in the field. This allows putting together the utterances of each speaker in respect to their turn-by-turn organization (A-B-A-B turn-taking) from the oral annotation files of each speaker. This in turn will aid the next annotator to correct the mistakes of the oral annotation. This is outlined in section 8.2.4.

A written, time aligned annotation such as this is certainly time consuming, which is the reason for designing BOLD—to speed up the annotation process by delaying the written component, as well as analysis, so that more time can be spent in recording communicative events. Therefore, this may process may be applied on selected conversations only, if time does not permit.

8.2 Other issues within the BOLD method
Aside from the implications for BOLD method discussed above, I will discuss other issues in the BOLD method in this section.
8.2.1 Language Choice

A crucial issue that was faced in this study was the choice of target language of the oral translator. In language situations like Guinaang, a compromise has to be made between (1) the translator's facility in the target language and (2) wider accessibility to the data. In an optimal situation, the translator of the minority language is highly bilingual in a language that is widely accessible to as many users as possible, such as English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL LG</th>
<th>NATIONAL LG</th>
<th>INTERNATIONAL LG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ilokano</td>
<td>Tagalog/</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facility          Wider accessibility

**Figure 14 Factors in Choosing the Target language in Oral Translation**

In reality, however, although English is one of the official languages in the Philippines, its usage is restricted for intellectual and business needs (Gonzalez, 2003). Tagalog/Filipino, being the common language between the researcher and the oral translator, was chosen as the target language, although the best choice in terms of language facility was Ilokano. Had the translator chosen Ilokano as the target language, the researcher would have had to have it retranslated to Filipino or English. Although this may be a weakness on the part of the researcher, it is more likely the trend for the future that more people can access Filipino and English than Ilokano. As a principle, choosing the language in which the oral translator is more proficient is more beneficial.
8.2.2 Collecting Conversations

Naturalness
Collecting conversations, being the ‘quintessence’ of naturalness (Lüpke, 2009) was a challenging task. It required the availability and consent of at least two speakers at a given time and recording their interaction as it naturally occurs. Bowern (2008) suggests to, with permission, either leave the recorder on and go somewhere else while the speakers talk or to ask permission to record at some future time without their knowledge. Moeller et al. (2016) suggest to do the recordings in their authentic environment, even at the expense of recording quality.

I utilized these suggestions while collecting Guinaang conversations. In order to determine the most effective way of attaining natural conversations in Guinaang, we recorded them in a variety of ways. First, conversations were recorded by teaching a native speaker, a mother in particular, to manipulate the recording device, and then allowing her to record during moments where family interaction was taking place such as in the morning when all members were present. The data from the first attempt appeared to be unusable because of its low quality; she received little training on recording technique (placement of the recorder, etc.) with the result that second attempt was successful. The native speaker was given more time to become familiar with the recorder. Also, a conversation was recorded by letting one of the participants carry the recorder in her pocket while an earset mic was clipped to her ears, capturing both her voice and the other participants’ speech. The researcher was present during the conversation. Finally, another conversation was recorded by setting up the recorder before the conversation started and leaving the participants alone to talk. All three types of ways of collecting conversations yielded naturally occurring conversations in that the topics and turn-taking were not pre-arranged.

Quality
Lüpke (2009) observes that field recordings of conversations are not always of good quality. This is true for recorded Guinaang conversations. First, in trying to prioritize naturalness over quality, the recording device was used as discreetly as possible, placed at a less-than-optimal distance from the speakers, collecting both the speech and background noise. This also caused some portions, particularly when the speakers speak softly, to be unintelligible, both to the researcher and the oral annotator. Nevertheless, a majority of the utterances were audibly clear to the native speaker who did the annotation. Secondly, the documentation of the conversation lacked a video component, which can also be considered a weakness of this study. Environmental situations in Guinaang did not allow video recordings, as
participants were available only at night time which rendered video recorders useless because of a lack of proper lighting.

8.2.3 Segmenting spoken language
Segmenting the continuous flow of spoken language is a major issue in language documentation (Himmelmann, 2006), e.g breaking down into words, phrases, intonation units etc., for representing aspects of the language in written transcription. While this also applies for BOLD, segmenting the text into speech segments (Reiman, 2010) e.g breaking it down into smaller “chunks” serves as preparation for oral transcription. A claimed advantage of BOLD is that, when done properly it can “yield intelligible speech segments that are useful for analysis” (p.263). In theory, this is done by inserting oral annotation in “natural breaks” in the text. In practice this is done, manually, by playing and pausing the original at phrase breaks; and through computer-based technology by digitally creating time-stamps on the audio file through software such as Audacity or Saymore, defining the beginning and end of a segment. Problems in oral annotation occur when segments do not correspond to natural breaks.

In this study, texts were pre-segmented by the researcher. Since the comprehension of the text was still low at that stage, the unit that served as guide for segmenting the text was speaker turns. Many the utterances were clearly identifiable, short, bounded by the next-speaker’s turn. Most turns in Guinaang are composed of 1 to 4 words. This range turned out to be a good size of segment which the oral annotator can process in slow-speech accurately. Speaker turns, because they are often syntactically, pragmatically or intonationally complete units, can be considered natural speech segments. Therefore, in pre-segmenting a text, annotations can be inserted after each speaker-turn.

There are cases, however where the speaker extends his turn, making it longer than what the annotator can orally annotate at one time. Speakers extend their talk by increments or by adding new turn construction units or TCUs (Schegloff, 1996). An example of how Guinaang speakers extend their talk is shown below:
In lines 3 and 8, FT extends his talk by adding another TCU. Ideally each TCU should be contained in different segments. However, they were segmented together since visually they form one unit; there is no noticeable gap separating them. This seemed to affect the accuracy of the annotation of these lines---many errors in transcription or translation occurred in segments with more than one TCU. To avoid this, a more careful pre-segmentation should be done by the researcher, and if possible a native speaker can be trained to do the task.

8.2.4 Analytical Discussion

Analytical discussion is the third type of oral annotation and one that has received the least attention. It provides a venue where a native speaker can discuss linguistic, cultural or contextual issues that arise, and is done either in the vernacular or in LWC. For conversations, recording an oral discussion can provide details that may compensate the shortcomings of the oral transcription and translation, while explaining cultural concepts found in the text. This study is limited in that it did not include recorded oral discussion as a source of information for producing a conversational transcript. However, a session with a native speaker was done in addition to the oral transcription and translation to help me understand more each line in the conversation. Since previous articles on BOLD do not include in-depth discussion oral discussion, this is where I see a systematic application of oral discussion for conversations.

Recall that CA analyzes language in terms of the design of utterances and the turn-by-turn unfolding of interaction. In an oral discussion, a native speaker can talk about, possibly with another native speaker, guided by the researcher, each turn or
set of turns in the conversation. This would mean that (1) the analytical discussion involves playing from the original file (instead of the oral transcription and translation); (2) the transcription and translation have already been written, (and time-aligned with the original audio file) so that the researcher can follow while the conversation is being played. While the native speaker fills in the gaps or corrects erroneous annotation or translation, he can also explain cultural concepts found in the text.
Chapter 9
Towards a Workflow of BOLD for Conversations

9.1 Introduction
In this chapter, I present a model that shows my proposed annotation process for conversation considering the suggestion given previously.

9.2 Possible Annotation Process for Conversation Using BOLD

Figure 15 Annotation Process for Conversation Using BOLD

COMPONENTS OF LD
- Collecting
- (BOLD) Annotation
- (Further) Annotation
- Archiving

TASKS
- Recording
- Data Management
- Pre-segment
- Oral Transcr
- Oral Transl
- Oral Discuss
- Time-aligned, written annotation (with correction)
- Analysis (CA- Transcript)

SOFTWARE
- Saymore
- Audacity
- Saymore
- ELAN
- * speaker
Language documentation, as an activity involves the tasks of (1) collecting, (2) annotating and (3) archiving linguistic data. Figure 15 illustrates an overview of the process of documentation for conversation with respect to the annotation process suggested in this study, from data collection to archiving (and to the CA-analyst end-user). This diagram divides the annotation process into two steps: The Oral Annotation and the other one, the ‘Further Annotation’ as suggested in this study. Further, each task as well as the software tools to perform them are shown. Although there are other computer programs that can accomplish these functions, this process particularly uses Saymore and ELAN. The two significant changes that this study suggests for BOLD method are highlighted in dotted boxes.

1. Data Collection
The data collection involves recording of naturally occurring conversations, ideally with video. The original audio and video files, along with the relevant metadata are stored in a computer, using Saymore for data management. In preparation for the oral annotation, the audio files are segmented into smaller chunks for each speaker.

2. Oral Annotation
Once ready, native speakers can begin the oral transcription and translation for each speaker. There are at least four files produced at this stage—two audio files for oral transcription, and another two for oral translation.

3. Further Annotation
This study suggests a further annotation be done after the oral transcription and translation. The audio files produced for each speaker in the oral annotation stage can be transcribed (into written form) and put in multi-tiered format, time aligned with the original file, which then can be used for a session with a native speaker where any corrections needed can be done. As suggested in section 8.2.4, this can also be used as stimulus for oral discussion, in addition to or in lieu of the ‘editing’ session. The ELAN file is saved into Saymore along with the original and all the oral annotation files. Finally, all the files relevant to the conversation can be archived.

This model is not entirely new. The additional annotation resembles the one described by Schulz-Berndt (2006), which was discussed in chapter 2. This study however, showed why the use of both the oral method and the additional annotation is useful and advantageous for documenting conversations, and how they be applied in a single workflow.
9.3 Conclusion

This chapter presented a workflow of documentation that uses oral methodology for conversation, and that which incorporates the suggestion of this study. The contribution of this study for the annotation process for conversation is (1) annotating the text per speaker; and (2) adding a further step of annotation after the oral transcription and translation. By adding these additional components, I believe BOLD can increase its usability for conversation analysis.
Chapter 10
Conclusion

10.1 Introduction
This chapter will present the conclusion and recommendations. Section 10.2 summarizes the important findings.

10.2 Summary of the Study

10.2.1 Background
This thesis was conducted as an evaluation of BOLD method for conversations. BOLD was developed to increase the speed of documentation by a purely oral approach in annotating the text. This method was tested for field use by Reiman (2010) with positive feedback and for phonological analysis by Unseth (2012). Building on these previous studies, this thesis explores the applicability of BOLD for conversations.

This study aimed to answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent does the BOLD method adequately provide data for analysis of conversation?

2. If data is lacking, what steps can be added to oral transcription and oral translation so that the primary data can be useful for conversational analysis?

10.2.2 Methodology
To carry out this study, these steps were followed.

(1) conversations were collected within a language documentation project;

(2) among other communicative events, naturally occurring conversations were collected and annotated following closely the BOLD design;
The BOLD annotated data was used to produce a transcript that was used for an initial analysis of the conversational structure of Guinaang, using the CA approach. The analysis attempted to describe the turn-taking, adjacency pair, and repair organization of Guinaang Kalinga.

In areas where the orally-annotated data has gaps or is found erroneous, further annotation was done with a native speaker to supply the information necessary for analysis. The edited transcript was then compared with the transcript based on BOLD annotation. This was done to determine where BOLD was advantageous or challenging in creating such transcript.

10.2.3 Findings

10.2.3.1 BOLD

Findings for Research Question #1

After having applied the BOLD method to conversations and using the data for the analysis of conversations, this study concludes that:

1. The oral annotation method of BOLD can be applied to any communicative event, including multi-participant ones.

2. The advantages of BOLD, as claimed and observed by previous studies (Reiman 2010, Unseth 2012) hold true for multi-participant communicative events.

3. There are also disadvantages for using BOLD for conversations. Because of these disadvantages identified, a purely oral BOLD does not result in primary data that is adequate to a basic analysis of conversation using the CA approach.

Findings for Research Question #2

In order for BOLD to be optimally useful for conversations, this study has identified a further step that needs to be incorporated in the method, namely, a written, time-aligned multi-tiered transcription based on the original recording.
10.3 Contributions of this research
The whole study provides a methodological, descriptive and empirical contribution particularly in research in language documentation and in Guinaang, Kalinga.

10.3.1 Methodological
The primary aim of this research was to examine the applicability of oral annotation method to conversational data to test whether the oral method of annotating texts produces adequate primary data for the analysis of conversations. Since no prior research has been done to test the extent to which oral annotation can be used in the analyses of conversation, the results of this test may well be significant in the sense that the methodological procedure of BOLD may be improved or be seen to be limited in its use.

Further, this study has identified errors in oral transcription and translation of Guinaang conversations, which can be potential challenges in future BOLD projects. This study, particularly the suggestions on how to minimize errors, may serve as guide for BOLD practitioners when dealing with conversational data.

10.3.2 Empirical
This study has provided preliminary description of how Guinaang speakers communicate in everyday life, based on observations driven by empirical data. It has provided a preliminary description of the conversational structure of Guinaang, Kalinga, focusing on its turn-taking, sequential organization and repair system.

In addition to this, the data collected adds to the current available data in Guinaang to include primary data of spoken language, particularly conversations in digital audio and video format.

10.4 Limitations and Recommendations
While I argue in this study that the evidence presented in this study suggest that a purely oral approach in annotating conversations may contain gaps and errors in the transcription and translation which therefore recommend a post-BOLD annotation, it can be argued that more native speakers' annotation, and in different projects could have been compared to determine whether the errors found are also evident across
various native speakers. This is certainly valid question and thus points out a potential limitation of this study. The available native speakers who were willing and qualified to do the tasks during the time of fieldwork were limited. Therefore, future research would benefit from analyzing the output of various annotators.
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Appendix A
SAMPLE OF INTERLINEARIZED CONVERSATION

1 PS: Oh

2 NV: Naid pon a-ug-ugud = u?  
none pon a-RED-talk = 1s.gen  
‘I don’t have someone to talk to’

3 PS Ay!  
Ay!  
EXPL

4 NV Hh[hh

5 PS [Ot umal = a voan ichi   
so come = 2s just there  
‘just come join (us) there’

6 NV Hh

7 PS He is also coming here

8 PS Umali. Ay!, ona ma’ inno = k it yachin (. ) ook (ku)ma   
Coming. Ay! ? Q can = 1s that do-1s hopefully  
‘Will join. Ay! By the way, what should I do with’

9 NV Gato = ’a ossiya gay imoy ya?   
why = 2s because go still  
‘why would you even go there’

10 PS Ha?   
Huh?

11 NV Gato = ’a ossiya gay imoy ya?   
why = 2s because go still  
‘why would you even go there’

12 PS Asi ta pagay oon nu noa   
later 1d just do when what  
‘Let’s do it later when uhmm’
13 NV Nu?
   when?
14 PS Mangulin tau
   go back tau
   ‘(when) we get back’
15 PS Upoyon ta pagaan
   soak-on 1D just
   ‘let’s just soak it’
16 NV [Masuyop, panagsusuyop vo’an
       M-suyop, panag-su-suyop voan
       sleep, time to sleep already
17 PS Awni vo’an
   later just
   ‘just later’
18 (3.5)
19 NV [Taman ossia…?
   why
20 PS [unintelligible
21 NV Sum agan, umitar agan
   like-2S just embarrass just
   ‘you’re like, you’re embarrassing me’
22 NV Nakay na
   EXPL
   ‘oh no!’
23 PS Hhh Maimis = ’a gay in
   Hhhh smile = 2S ?
   ‘Hhh this is funny’
24 PS cha cha ayavyasa in…
   EXIST pumpkin in
   Those are squash
25 NV Nu?
   What
26 PS Ti?
   DET
   ‘The?’
27 NV Ti?
   DET
   ‘The?’
28 PS Nauto-t tipoy [nu ad
   PERF.cook-DET viand 2S
   ‘your viand is cooked’
29 NV [Aw-a = m i noa
   put -an = 2S DET what
   ‘put the uhmm’
30 (6.5)
Appendix B

**ORAL TRANSCRIPTION AND TRANSLATION OF A GUINAANG CONVERSATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transcript of original</th>
<th>Transcript of slow-speech</th>
<th>Oral Translation (Tagalog)</th>
<th>Oral Translation (in English)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PS: Oh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NV: Naid pon a-ug-ugud u?</td>
<td>Sinong kausap mo</td>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t have someone to talk to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PS Ay!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oh!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NV Hh[hh</td>
<td>Hhh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hahahah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PS [Ot umali-a voan ichi?</td>
<td>Ay, ot umali-a voan ichi?</td>
<td>Ay, sumama ka sa akin doon</td>
<td>Are you going (with me)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NV Hh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PS He is also coming here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He is also going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PS Umali. Ay, ona ma’ innok yachin (. ) ot ma</td>
<td>Coming. Oh, I'm wondering what to do (.) but</td>
<td>Where are you going?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NV Gato’ a ossiya gay imoy ya?</td>
<td>Bakit ka kasi pupunta</td>
<td>Why are you going, anyway?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PS Ha?</td>
<td>Ha?</td>
<td>Ano?</td>
<td>Ha?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>NV Gato’ a ossiya gay imoy ya?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Why are you going?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>PS Asi ta pagay oon nu noa</td>
<td>Ah, asi ta pagay oon nu</td>
<td>Saka ko na lang gagawin</td>
<td>Let’s just do it when noa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NV Nu?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>PS/ NV</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Mangulin tau</td>
<td>When we get back</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Upoyon ta /pagaan</td>
<td>Let's just [soak it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>[Masuyop, panagsusuyop vo’an</td>
<td>Tulog muna ako [Sleep, it's time to sleep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Awni vo’an</td>
<td>Just later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>[Taman o sia…?</td>
<td>Bakit ka kasi pupunta [Why do you…?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>[unintelligible</td>
<td>[unintelligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Sum-agan, umitag agan</td>
<td>Pabayaan mo na yan</td>
<td>You’re making a big deal out of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nakay nah</td>
<td>Oh no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Hhh Maimis agay in</td>
<td>You just smiled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Nacha cha ayavyasa in…</td>
<td>There, there’s the squash…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Nu?</td>
<td>Huh?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Ti..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Ti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Nautot tipoy [nu ad</td>
<td>Nautot tipoy</td>
<td>Your food is [cooked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>[Aw-am i no-a</td>
<td>Lagyan mo ng ano [put stuff on it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6.5)</td>
<td>(6.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Umali ya’</td>
<td>Sasama ako</td>
<td>I'll join you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Osiya nin voan ot awni tot, mangan tau</td>
<td>oh, maybe. Just a moment and we'll eat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Na, asi-a pay?</td>
<td>Ikaw ang bahala</td>
<td>Here, you do it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Icholnat nu</td>
<td>Icholnatnu</td>
<td>Ipainit mo yung ulam</td>
<td>Heat it up (the food)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Ma’ yanata?</td>
<td>Ano yan</td>
<td>What’s that?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>itti tipoy yan</td>
<td>The viand first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Cho, si-a?</td>
<td>Ikaw na muna</td>
<td>Ok, you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>OOM-ON</td>
<td>Oom o</td>
<td>Ikaw ang gagawa</td>
<td>You do it now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Tsk (. ) unnay-avovo gaan ti gamput-a nan-omos anad</td>
<td>Buti ka pa natapos ka nang maligo</td>
<td>Gosh. Good for you, you already finished taking a bath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I can’t be going to Amdalao, nay</td>
<td>I can’t go to Amdalao, mom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Nakay ta pumalsut ad! Hhhhhhhh[hh!</td>
<td>Pupunta ka nanaman makisayaw</td>
<td>He might feel bad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>[Ha?</td>
<td>Ha?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>(1.8)</td>
<td>(1.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Cha’ann maukisan</td>
<td>Hindi pa yan nabalatan</td>
<td>It’s not yet peeled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Nauto?</td>
<td>Cooked?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Nai, soon</td>
<td>Not yet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Na, pagbiit lang nat</td>
<td>Kaunti lang yan</td>
<td>oh, that won’t take very long.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Icholnat nu yan?</td>
<td>Reheat that first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Ma’ ummoyan papa?</td>
<td>Where did papa go?</td>
<td>Saan pumunta si papa</td>
<td>Umoy mangala taong mamvoan i-akit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>ma’ inon chichi</td>
<td>Ano kaya ang gagawin ko?</td>
<td>Oh no. how will that be</td>
<td>Kumuha siya ng taong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Umm, mm</td>
<td>You’re like…</td>
<td>Nu naid bay-am</td>
<td>Nu naid bay-am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Ay, gingaa’ agay si Yole, ta siyan mangwa</td>
<td>Oh, I’ll call Yole, so she’ll be the one to make</td>
<td>ha’pon imoy won</td>
<td>Hindi na lang ako pupunta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Ay, issa agay imoy [ichi?]</td>
<td>Oh, you won’t go there?</td>
<td>asi agay nu osan mavigat?</td>
<td>Asi agay nu osan mavigat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Isum agan</td>
<td>You will just (go) the next day?</td>
<td>nu kaugud-u ma'm Berkin vigat, inyoon ti inyak man-resign</td>
<td>Kung makausap ko si mam Berkin, uuwi ako para magresign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td><strong>ot asiya' wot mangulin nu simana</strong></td>
<td>Saka na lang ako babalik kapag semana</td>
<td>Then I'll just go back there after Holy Week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td><strong>Oh?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td><strong>Sia pay</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>(2.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td><strong>ot asi awoy agay imoy?</strong></td>
<td>Pupunta ka ba?</td>
<td>Then you'll just go later?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td><strong>Udch?</strong></td>
<td>saan</td>
<td>To?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td><strong>Ud chu chi?</strong></td>
<td>Ud ichi</td>
<td>Doon</td>
<td>To there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td><strong>nu umoyon si Levi paan, inyoon, inya' voan nu...pangulay foggan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>When Levi leaves, I'll go also when.. come what may</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td><strong>ye! ma yachin vakvakota?</strong></td>
<td>Anong pangalan ng matanda</td>
<td>Ye! Who's that old woman?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td><strong>I Chapul</strong></td>
<td>I chapul</td>
<td>Si Chapul</td>
<td>Chapul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td><strong>Hh</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td><strong>Ma' papan cha Billy?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Who's the father of Billy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td><strong>Ha?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ha?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td><strong>Maman cha Billy wennu:: i:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother of Billy or::</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td><strong>Lolancha Mal-lin, Billin, asawan Ganito</strong></td>
<td>Lolancha malvin un, lolan cha marlyn, Billyn</td>
<td>Lola ni malvin, lola ni Millin</td>
<td>Grandmother of Marlyn, Billy, the wife of Ganito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Tag</td>
<td>SAN</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Pigan tawonna?</td>
<td>Asawan Ganito</td>
<td>How old is she?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Hit amod vakvakot</td>
<td>Asawa ni Ganito</td>
<td>Very old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Ot hiyanin voan anan Billy un no-a</td>
<td>Baka yun yung sinabi ni Billy sa akin</td>
<td>She’s the one that Billy is saying what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>O? ot ichta a () un iya gat asim mangchonan it yana omya</td>
<td>Yun ang sinabi kong ikaw sana ang hahawak nito</td>
<td>Oh? that’s what I said that you hold it in the meantime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>umali-a ta iya' si-a iyo' hit apom ana?</td>
<td>Sumama ka para makita mo yung mga pinsan mo</td>
<td>She said you go and I’ll take you to your grandchild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>O?:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Yo apom chi tot</td>
<td>Hindi mo naman siya kaano-an</td>
<td>Why, is she your grand daughter?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>(cough) Linakay!</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oh no!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Nu ancha ina chi</td>
<td>Kapatid nila lola niyo yun</td>
<td>They’re relatives of my moher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>yanu iyagaluan ayu an tot</td>
<td>Hindi naman kayo taga Cagaluan</td>
<td>You’re not from Cagaluan!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Iyagaluan icholan</td>
<td>Taga Cagaluan si Dolan</td>
<td>Jolan is from Cagaluan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Ot imoy nangasawa</td>
<td>Umoy odchan mangasawa</td>
<td>Pumunta siya dito para mag-asawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Ah! (2) hi ud chi no chi Agaluan?</td>
<td>Saan dun sa Cagalan</td>
<td>Ah! (2) Where in Cagalan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>chummagat illing-u chin noa tot iya oyat nan-illing ut yajin chakol</td>
<td>Chumagat illing-u chin noa tan iya oyat nan illing-u yachin chakola</td>
<td>Asan yung hikaw ko para yun yung gamitin ko sa sayaw namin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>ummat illing no? (.8) [awa’ avot isayawno!</td>
<td>Saan yung hikaw mo</td>
<td>Where’s you’re earing? The one for your dancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>finala…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>inalan Inoy chit yachi, ay… inawit, inusal na chit queen na.</td>
<td>Nayan inoy chit yachi, ay inawit, inusal na chit queen na.</td>
<td>Kinuha ni inoy yung hikaw na yun, ginamit sa pageant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>yachi odchan chakol tot ah (. )man anoan it inga.</td>
<td>Yachi odchana chakol tottoh</td>
<td>Yun sana yung gagamitin ko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>tam-agay nu a oyana maala-ak it salidsid tot… vinulod o oyat [oan unjisa</td>
<td>Tam-agay nu…maala-ak it salidsid tot vinulod-u</td>
<td>Akala ko makukuha ako ngayon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ogyat oan onchesa</td>
<td>Para humiram na lang ako</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Ina!</td>
<td>[na!]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>alolo-om ta umoy-a (.) ad-adchaniyan</td>
<td>Ikaw yung lumapit hindi siya</td>
<td>You’re the one who approached, not him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>ot ina' paan inayagan an Ambeth ina.</td>
<td>Mavainak paan hit inayagan-ak Ambeth ina'.</td>
<td>Ambeth called me here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Hhh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Ina’ ina inayagan an Ambeth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Here, Ambeth came to inform me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Valvayam avos nat</td>
<td>Hugasan muna yan</td>
<td>Wash that first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Innakay! Lam pa i man(.)man noa navon yachi?</td>
<td>Madumi yan wag mong gamitin</td>
<td>Oh no! look, she might use that again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Asi’ usalon nan yachin awad uddu: (.4) pichong (1)</td>
<td>Yun yung gamitin mo</td>
<td>I'll use the one at the (.4) back (of the house) (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td>Naliuwak</td>
<td>Nakalimutan ko na</td>
<td>I forgot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>ma' usalan yu vo? (. ) man-ain [ayu?</td>
<td>Anong gagamit mo, yung tapis?</td>
<td>What will you use? (. ) you'll wear the [skirt?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>[man-ain</td>
<td>[skirt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Tugge: (.5) mansalidsid ta (. ) milipo ad HHhhhhhhHH nan ikim (3.5)</td>
<td>Pagbutihin mo naman sa sayaw ninyo</td>
<td>Let's go now (.5) dance so that (. ) you'll break HHhhhhhhHH your feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>magan inon chi chi Surround na paana inya' maasalidsid</td>
<td>Magat chichiyan am an surround paana inyak agay maasalidsid</td>
<td>Paano na yan pupunta na lang ako makisalidsid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>umoy ano ma'isalidsid papa</td>
<td>Makikisayaw daw siya</td>
<td>She said she'll go join the dance, papa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>(unintelligible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Hhhhhh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>it naya mam pay un ma'wa</td>
<td>Here, I'm gonna do it now!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>iyasog oodchan agay ad aniya...</td>
<td>I was supposed to cook it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>nagampot odchan naa no-a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Hh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>no...anna si-a</td>
<td>Ano, ikaw muna</td>
<td>Here, here it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>NV/PS</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>chaan matu'tu</td>
<td>Not yet crushed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>atomaa't amonan man sukut a laeng met</td>
<td>Magpalit ka ng damit mo You’re rushing, you will just dress up anyway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>No?</td>
<td>Ano What?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>ien yaji gan ploblema nan nayan (.).anoa (.5) nilaos</td>
<td>Nilaus Tapos na That’s the problem, that(.), what (.5) finished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>si-amet an</td>
<td>Ikaw kasi It’s (because of) you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>eh pio garud un si-at mangwa...tot nalmam inka vo iyole..</td>
<td>Ikaw na lang yung gagawa, para maganda So I want that you do it to fix it yourself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Ma (.5) it nanay-otan yu hinon nanay-otan cha Roda'n inmoy na iniyoy wancha vagni? (.8)</td>
<td>Nung gumawa kayo ng suman, san ninyo ibinigay Why (.5) did they (make) chal-ot, Rhoda made chal-ot that they brought to Vagni (.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Paman? (.). ay (.). it ti, nayan na (2) SIVIT</td>
<td>Paman? Ay itti nayan na, sivit Bakit, ay yung gagawin mo Magpasivit Why? (.). Oh, the, that (2) SIVIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Sivit a, ah. Sivit JS?</td>
<td>Sivit ba ni Js? Sivit, oh oh. The sivit of JS?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Ma’...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Unintelligible (sound of frying oil)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Ad? (.8)</td>
<td>To?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Ot iyami iyoy Ot iyacin Oo, kami na</td>
<td>Then we brought him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Tamanyu imoy ipasivit? (1) Bakit niyo siya ipasivit</td>
<td>Why did you go to have him sivit?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Ichan na (.tuti na Kasi kami yung lola niya</td>
<td>That (.). his speaking disorder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>NAPPON!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>issam uddu (1) Huwag mong</td>
<td>Don’t...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>(unintelligible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Vinalvalattana! Andami mong inilagay na tubig</td>
<td>She made it soup!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attomanan! Ang dami</td>
<td>It’s too much</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Aw-am agay inoa Lagyan mo na lang ng...</td>
<td>Just put what</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Naya?</td>
<td>This?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Umm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td><em>ot imasivit yu pon?</em></td>
<td>Anong nangyari kay JS? Then you had him sivit?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td><em>ot (1.8) taw-an ah (.) nu ummunay chatta (.4) logoyna ancha (.2) tutina</em></td>
<td>Taw-an ah nu ummunay chatta Hindi ko alam kung bumuti ang kinalalagyan niya Sa kanyang sakit And (1.8) I don't know really (.) if he recovered from his <em>logoy</em> and his <em>tuti</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td><em>Hi (.5) logoy</em></td>
<td>The (.5) logoy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td><em>Logoy ancha nan yachi un chat chaan agay ya noa (.5) chat tutina (2 ) hapun masalimuwat chan uguhona</em></td>
<td>Logoy ancha yachi Chan chaan agay ya Chat tuti na Logoy ang tawag dun Hindi pa tapos “logoy” is when you can’t…the speaking disorder...(can’t) understand his words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td><em>masalivuwat avo hin sachi?</em></td>
<td>Naiintindihan naman yung salita niya He can be understood now?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
SAMPLE INFORMED CONSENT USED DURING THE LANGUAGE DOCUMENTATION PROJECT IN PASIL, KALINGA

PINASIL LANGUAGE DOCUMENTATION PROJECT
INFORMED CONSENT

I am willing to take part in the Pinasil Language Documentation Project, which aims to preserve our native language through recordings. I am being asked to participate in this project because of my ability to speak Pinasil.

I give SIL permission to use and share the recordings from me. I permit these recordings to be used for research, and be accessed by any researcher or anyone interested in the Pinasil. I understand that these recordings cannot be used for commercial reasons and cannot be shared with payment.

- Can SIL publish your name as the source of the recording? Yes / No
- Are there people/group of people that you would rather not have hear or see these recordings? Yes / No
  If yes, who are they? 
- Can SIL publish these recordings or part of these recordings? Yes / No
- Can SIL transcribe and translate the words contained in the recordings and publish them in any medium? Yes / No
- Do you agree that SIL can store these recordings? Yes / No
- Do you agree to these terms voluntarily? Yes / No
- Do you understand that you can change the answers given here at any time you choose, present or future? Yes / No

Date: December 13, 2014
Name: Nona Gente
Signature: [Signature]
Witness 1 name: Paccualia A. Latanjan
Witness 1 Signature: [Signature]
Witness 2 name: Mary E. Panugan
Witness 2 Signature: [Signature]
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