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1- Introduction:

Parentheticals are structures that appear in spoken and written discourse. Their existence is thought to be mainly attributed to disfluency and performance difficulties. However, a close examination of such a phenomenon reveals that they are chosen to serve communicative purposes. Also, though they are peripheral structures, they are relevant to discourse.

2- Objectives of the study:

The present study is an attempt to investigate the relationship between social interaction and forms of language use. The primary focus is on parenthetical structures inserted within talk-in-interaction. The primary objectives of the study are the following:

1) Identify and describe parenthetical structures employed by conversation participants based on semantic and pragmatic factors.
2) Explain the relevance of employed parenthetical constructions to the content and context of the interaction.
3) Investigate how the parenthetical inserts are related to the main line of the conversation; i.e. the effect that the parenthetical has on the sequential organization of the conversation and the shaping of the participation framework.
4) Compare parenthetical structures used in two different languages, namely, English and Arabic.

3- Methodology:

Two approaches are adopted as the theoretical framework of the study, namely, Relevance Theory (henceforth RT) and Conversational Analysis (CA). Following CA, certain procedures prior to and during the analysis are followed:

1) The type of chosen data: Two everyday interactional practices are selected as the data of the study. The selected data are
naturalistic; no setting up of experimental procedures or interviews to observe conversational behavior and features. The data are transcribed.

2) Participants' viewpoint and the role of the analyst: In analyzing the two conversations, the analysis is grounded on the participants' viewpoint during the interaction. Macro-social categories, such as power, race, gender or role status, are avoided. Furthermore, the description and interpretation of data are based on what is directly observable to both the participants and the analyst. In other words, there is no speculation about the participants' intentions, desires, or beliefs. Rather, the interaction is interpreted as a set of actions performed by participants.

Parenthetical constructions are identified according to their interpolation within the host and form. Following RT, the parenthetical along with its host (produced by a certain speaker) are analyzed in terms of how the hearer interprets them. The hearer's interpretation is divided into three sections: explicatures, contextual assumptions, and implicatures. Then, the cognitive effect that is produced within the hearer is formalized.

4- Data:

Two natural conversational interactions are selected. The number of participants in each conversation is two. The first conversation is an informal face-to-face conversation between two participants. It is in colloquial English. The audio as well as the transcript are downloaded from the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English. The corpus is based on a large body of recordings of naturally occurring spoken interaction from all over the United States.

The other conversation is a phone call between two participants using colloquial Egyptian Arabic. Both the audio recording and the transcript are downloaded from TALKBNK CA data (the Arabic portion of CALLHome corpora).
5- Background:
5-1- Parentheticals: overview

"Parentheticals are expressions that are linearly represented in a given string of utterance, but seem structurally independent at the same time" (Dehe & Kavalova, 2007, p.1). In other words, the parenthetical expression "...is inserted in the middle of another structure, and which is unintegrated in the sense that it could be omitted without affecting the rest of that structure or its meaning" (Biber et al., 1999a, p.1067).

A key feature of parentheticals is discontinuity, i.e. grammatical discontinuity and content and action discontinuity. Diverse studies of parentheticals have asserted their syntactic independence from their host (Burton-Robers (1998), Espinal (1991)). In other words, parentheticals are linearly integrated in their host (also known as anchor), but are structurally independent. They do not form a single grammatical construction, nor is the parenthetical an immediate constituent of the anchor. Therefore, parentheticals cannot be moved, questioned, or become the focus of it-cleft construction. Likewise, they don't undergo "the scope of quantifiers or any operators in the host clause" (Dehe & Kavalova, 2007, p.4). What parentheticals actually do is to "momentarily suspend the unfolding of a structure or some wider activity pattern" (Duvallon & Routarinne, 2005, p.48).

The syntactic independence that parentheticals exhibit has been attributed to unplanned discourse. However, it has been argued that this syntactic independence allows parentheticals to digress from their host construction. Flaudernik (1993) maintains that parentheticals provide "a second topic nucleus" (p.166), but they are semantically and pragmatically connected to their host. Similarly, parentheticals are deliberately opted to express stylistic features or "as a communicative or pragmatic strategy" (Brinton, 2010, p.6).
Both the parenthetical and its host "make a collective contribution to the interpretation of the utterance at the level of implicit content" (Blakemore, 2005, p.1179). For Berrendonner (1993), the parenthetical and its host express two separate, yet embedded, discursive programs," each of which has its own relatively independent cognitive objectives and each of which calls for its own independent planning" (Duvallon & Routarinne, 2005, p.48). Thus, it is a general feature of parentheticals "that they express information that is not central to the overall message conveyed by a text or spoken utterance" (Banik & Lee, 2008, p.2668). They allow the reader/listener to distinguish more and less important information contained within spoken/written discourse.

It is noteworthy that parentheticals are distinguished from other interpolated structures that are not related to the discourse plane of the host, or are addressed to a different person. Unlike disjuncts, parentheticals serve as reflection, commentary, or evaluation of the anchor. It is "backgrounded semantically in respect to the anchor, which communicates the important information" (Huddleston & Pullman, 2002, p.896). Nevertheless, the parenthetical can be omitted without affecting the meaning of the host: "were parentheticals edited out, the utterance would remain well-formed" (Brinton, 2010, p.9). Based upon this, parentheticals do not affect the truth-conditionality of the host; "they are not relevant to the conditions that must hold in any possible world for the anchor sentence to be true" (Ibid., p.10).

5-1-1- Interpolation:

Due to their lack of syntactic attachment, parentheticals express positional mobility, i.e. they can be interpolated, or juxtaposed, anywhere in the host "even in places which have typically been considered… syntactically very solidly connected" (Duvallon & Routarinne, 2005, p.53). Instances of possible locations are listed in the following table. Parentheticals are italicized, bold faced, and enclosed between (<>).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible location</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Between a reporting expression and the reported speech</td>
<td>I was just so surprised when you said Joana said &lt; or does it say on the ticket where &gt; that it opens at two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Between the subject NP and the finite verb</td>
<td>An Italian, a French man, and a Russian, &lt; or should I say a person from the CIS &gt; were at the gates of heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Between certain expressions and their infinitive verb phrase</td>
<td>In my view, it's high time &lt; it's in no way connected with this matter &gt; to get our steamer done.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (1): Interpolation of Parentheticals within the Host

Source: Duvallon & Routarinne, 2005, p.53

However, there are certain syntactic points within the host where the parentheticals cannot be juxtaposed. For instance, they "cannot occur between a verb and its complement nor within the pre-modifier of an NP or between a P and its complement" (Brinton, 2010, p.2).

The parenthetical is inserted in a way that halts the main stream of meaning of the host clause (henceforth HC), i.e. the parenthetical is inserted at a place where the main sentence (or clause) is still incomplete. The selection of such places is constitutive for the recognition of the parenthetical within discourse. They are analyzed as initiating a subsidiary action.

5-1-2- Taxonomy of Parentheticals:

There is no agreement in the literature about a limited number or nature of members classified as parentheticals. For example, Espinal (1991) provides a list of parentheticals including sentences, appositive relatives, adjectival phrases, adverbial clauses, adverbial phrases, noun phrases, and prepositional phrases.
Kaltenbock (2005) investigates the types of parentheticals that are employed in spoken discourse. A taxonomy of the different structures that can be grouped under the heading "Parentheticals" is presented. Identification of parenthetical structures assists in studying their communicative functions.

Kaltenbock (2005) focuses on the parenthetical clause (henceforth PC). They are classified on the basis of having a formal link with the host clause (HC). Two types are identified: *syndetic* and *asynthetic*. The former is "introduced by an overt marker, which links the PC to the host clause" (Kaltenbock, 2005, p.34). Such clauses are not syntactically attached to HC. Rather, there is a semantic-pragmatic link between PC and HC. Members of PCs within this group include the following:

1) **Characterizing Constructions**: they are clauses that provide explanation and are marked by overt markers such as 'that is'.

Example: Many clauses are asynthetic, *that is they do not have an overt marker.*

2) **Content clauses (appositive clause)**:

Example: The warning – *that prices should be lowered* – was ignored.

3) **Adverbial-like clauses**: they can appear in a peripheral position. Such clauses "are semantically linked to the host, with the head of the PC (the subordinator) being coindexed with the host clause" (Ibid., p.36).

Example: He is a real bastard – *if you do not mind the expression.*

4) **Non-restrictive relative clause**: according to Mazeland (2007), it is a clause that presents additional (not necessarily needed) information about the head. In the following example, the relative pronoun, 'which', establishes a link between the clause and the antecedent "only on a semantic-pragmatic level" (Kaltenbock, 2005, p.36).

Example: Mary is away on business, *which is convenient.*
The asyndetic type of parenthetical clauses has no overt marker to indicate their relation to HC. This class includes the following forms:

1) **Self-contained clauses**: they are independent main clauses.

Example: Mary – I hate to tell you this – is coming over to visit.

2) **Reduced PCs** (henceforth RPC): such clauses contain a syntactic gap (i.e. they do not have a complement for the verb). Such a gap is filled conceptually by HC. RPCs are of **TWO subtypes**: *Comment Clause* (CC) and *Reporting Clause* (RC).

The following table distinguishes between the two subtypes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtype</th>
<th>Comment clause (CC)</th>
<th>Reporting clause (RC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaning</strong></td>
<td>They provide a commentary on the proposition of HC</td>
<td>They identify the source of information mentioned in HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Used verbs</strong></td>
<td>Verbs of thinking are used, e.g. <em>think, believe, suppose, seem</em></td>
<td>Message-conveying verbs are used, e.g. <em>say, tell</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tense of used verb</strong></td>
<td>Preference of present tense</td>
<td>Preference of past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choice of subject</strong></td>
<td>It is typically first (or second) person</td>
<td>It is typically third person subject as source identificator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Word order</strong></td>
<td>Subject followed by a verb, e.g. <em>I believe</em></td>
<td>Flexibility of word order: Subject followed by a verb, e.g. <em>John says</em> Verb followed by a subject, e.g. <em>says John</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (2): Distinction of Comment Clause and Reporting Clause
The following figure summarizes Kaltenbock's taxonomy:

**Parenthetical clauses**

- **Syndetic**
- **Asyndetic**

**Characterizing Construction**
- Content Clause
- Adverbial-like Clause
- Nonrestrictive relative Clause

**Reduced PC**

- **Self-contained PC**

**Reporting Clause (RPC)**

**Comment Clause (CC)**

**Figure (1): Taxonomy of Spoken Parenthetical Clauses**

Mazeland (2007) identifies similar types of parentheticals in talk in interaction. However, the identified types are both clausal and non-clausal types. The types are identified as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Comparison</th>
<th>Appositive nominal</th>
<th>Non-restrictive relative clause</th>
<th>Characterizing construction</th>
<th>Accounting/Clarifying clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Format</strong></td>
<td>Appositive noun phrase Prepositional phrase One-word unit</td>
<td>Clausal format</td>
<td>Clausal format (that is + predicate)</td>
<td>Clausal format (conjunction + Subject + verb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment of Use</strong></td>
<td>It more often occurs after a noun phrase or a prepositional phrase in a simple clause that is not complete yet</td>
<td>It occurs after preliminary component completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaning &amp; Function</strong></td>
<td>It explicates, exemplifies, specifies, or delimits the range of the category they are attached to</td>
<td>It is an optional, more independent unit that is not required for identificatory purposes</td>
<td>It presents a locally relevant features of a referent currently talked about</td>
<td>It accounts or clarifies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table (3): Types of Parentheticals**

Both types of parentheticals, whether of the clausal format or the non-clausal format, are investigated in the present study.
6- Theoretical Framework:

The study attempts to investigate the relevance of inserted parentheticals within conversational interaction. Two theories are adopted to represent the theoretical framework of the study, namely, relevance theory and conversational analysis.

6-1- Relevance Theory:

Relevance theory (RT) is a pragmatic framework that is devised by Sperber and Wilson as a development of Grice's principle. As its name suggests, the theory presents an analysis of the concept of 'relevance' as a property of mental processes that approximate the ordinary meaning of the term. The basic pursuit of RT is to account for how people distinguish "relevant from irrelevant information, or in some cases, more relevant from less relevant information" (Sperber & Wilson, 1995, p.119). According to Sperber & Wilson, "an assumption is relevant in a context if and only if it has some contextual effects in that context" (Ibid., p.122). The primary distinctive feature of the concept of 'relevance' in RT is that it is identified in the course of comprehension rather than being fixed prior to comprehension (Wilson, 2016, p.4).

Relevance has TWO essential aspects necessary for its comprehension: a cognitive aspect and a communicative aspect. Both aspects will be reviewed in the following sections:

6-1-1- Relevance & cognition:

Cognition is "the process of acquiring, storing, and manipulating information" (Clark, 2013, p.79). Also, it involves representations and computations. A basic aid for cognition to perform its functions properly is RELEVANCE of information. Generally, our cognitive system is in constant search for relevant information, that is, information from which significant effects follow. This is the first principle of relevance which is called "the cognitive principle of relevance". It states that human cognition tends to be geared to the maximization of relevance (Clark, 2013, p.91). In other words, our mind tends to allocate attention and
processing resources to stimuli in the environment that are relevant. Our memories are organized so that they will retrieve relevant background information, and that our inferential systems are set up so as to maximize the cognitive effects we can derive. Relevance plays a fundamental role for interpreting "internal mental representations which can provide an input to cognitive processes" (Wilson, 2016, p.4). Thoughts, memories, or inferences may provide relevant inputs.

A context "comprises mentally represented information of any type – beliefs…, plans, goals, intentions…- and is constructed or selected in the course of the comprehension process from a range of potential contexts available to the individual"(Ibid.). What makes information (processed and represented by cognition) relevant to an individual is that it interacts with some contextual information to achieve 'worthwhile cognitive effect'. Consequently, the more the cognitive effects a stimulus has, the more relevant it is. In other words, "when an individual person derives conclusions on the basis of new or existing assumptions, these are cognitive effects" (Clark, 2013, p.86). The derived cognitive effects can be classified into THREE classes:

1) Contextual implication: they are NEW conclusions that follow from logical connection between existing and new assumptions. It can be shown in the following figure:

![Figure (2): Derivation of Contextual Implications](image_url)
2) Strengthened cognitive effect (fig. 3): "where new information strengthens an existing assumption by providing stronger evidence in support of it" (Clark, 2013, p.86).

3) Contradictory cognitive effect (fig. 4): "where new information contradicts and leads to the elimination of one or more existing assumptions" (Ibid.)

The three inputs outlined above are all regarded relevant as long as they yield cognitive effects (whether new, strengthened, or eliminated effect).

However, the derived cognitive effects are not the only factor that guarantees a degree of relevance to a stimulus. Another factor is 'Effort'. It refers to the expenditure exerted in performing mental processes to process a stimulus: "Other things being equal, the greater the processing effort, the lower the relevance" (Sperber & Wilson, 1995, p. 124). The processing effort involves processing the stimulus as well as accessing contextual assumptions and deriving cognitive effects.
In the light of the role played by cognitive effects and effort, relevance can be defined as follows:

**Relevance:**

*Extent condition 1:* an assumption is relevant in a context to the extent that its contextual effects in this context are large.

*Extent condition 2:* an assumption is relevant in a context to the extent that the effort required to process it in this context is small (Ibid., p. 125).

**6-1-2- Relevance and Communication:**

In RT, relevance is an essential requirement for successful communication. Attention is drawn to what is more relevant at the time. The speaker attracts the addressee's attention through a stimulus which can be an utterance, a sound, or even a gesture. Also, the speaker attempts for an utterance to be relevant enough to be worth the addressee's attention. This is referred to as *'the communicative principle of relevance'* which states the following: *Every utterance communicates a presupposition of its own optimal relevance* (Sperber & Wilson, 1995, p. 158).

Two significant notions are involved in the principle mentioned above, namely, the kind of communication and 'presupposition of optimal relevance'. In RT, the former is known as *'Ostensive Inferential Communication'*. The communicator produces a stimulus which makes it mutually manifest to communicator and audience that the communicator intends, by means of this stimulus, to make manifest or more manifest to the audience a set of assumptions (Ibid., p. 155)

The audience, on the other hand, is entitled to participate by paying attention to the stimulus and making inferences about the intentions of the communicator.
The latter notion, presumption of optimal relevance, states the following:

a) The set of assumptions which the communicator intends to make manifest to the addressee is relevant enough to make it worth the addressee's while to process the ostensive stimulus.

b) The ostensive stimulus is the most relevant one the communicator could have used to communicate the assumptions (Ibid.)

In other words, the communicator necessarily intends for their stimuli to be relevant in some way to their audience and that their audience believes that they do. "When no satisfactory level of relevance is achieved, a more plausible assumption is that the communicator has tried to be optimally relevant, but failed" (Ibid., p. 159)

6-2- Conversation Analysis:

Conversation analysis (henceforth CA) is a field of study that evolved in the mid-sixties within sociology "from the 'cognitive revolution' that swept across the social sciences" (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990, p. 283). Scholars like Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, Erving Goffman, and Harold Garfinkel have contributed to its development and recognition. It investigates social interaction that was developed in the study of ordinary conversation. "Its aim is to uncover the ethno-methods by which members of a society make sense of their activities, thus, making them recognizable, manageable, and reproducible" (Pallotti, 2007, p.37).

The primary focus is on the participants themselves within the interaction and the set of techniques that they use to construct and interpret talk-in-interaction. For CA, language is a tool to be used by participants in the interaction. In other words, "sentences…and utterances…are understood as forms of action situated within specific contexts and designed with specific attention to these contexts" (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990, p.287).
For CA, talk-in-interaction, similar to other forms of social interaction, consists of lines of actions and coordinated practices where every single piece of details matters. The goal is 'to describe 'practices', 'usages', 'devices', whereby social actors interact in ways that are ordered and intelligible to themselves and to external observers' (Pallotti, 2007, p.40). In other words, each conversational action displays an understanding of former conversational actions. Likewise, it projects subsequent conversational actions.

It is noteworthy that every conversational action is affected by and closely related to the context. Actions are context-shaped, i.e. "the framework of action from which it emerges provides primary organization for its production and interpretation" (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990, p.289). Also, actions are context-renewing, i.e. they "constitute the frame of relevance that will shape subsequent actions" (Ibid.).

Understanding the context of the conversational action is essential for its interpretation. One aspect of context is 'participation framework'. Conversational action requires both speaker and hearer. The speaker needs a hearer. The hearer, on the other hand, is "a coparticipant who can decline as well as accept the status offered them" (Ibid., p.292). The speaker's conversational action takes into account the recipient design. That is to say, it determines attributes that should exist in the recipient in order for the conversational action to be effective. For example, "an inquiry proposes the speaker's belief that the addressee possesses information the asker lacks" (Ibid., p.293). Similarly, when a speaker employs a certain reference term, he/she puts into consideration assessment of the knowledge of their addressee.

6-2-1- Conversational Organization :
6-2-1-1- Turns ,Turn Constructional Units & Turn taking:

Talk, the focus of CA, involves elements that should be well organized for it to achieve success. The basic unit of talk is 'the
*turn*. The building block of the turn is *turn constructional unit* (TCU). TCUs can be a single lexical item, a phrase, a clause or full sentences. TCUs form a recognizable action in context. In other words, "a speaker beginning to talk in a turn has the right and obligation to produce one TCU, which may realize one or more actions" (Schegloff, 2007, p.4).

As the speaker approaches the end of a present TCU, a transition of talk to another possible speaker becomes relevant. This is known as ‘*turn-taking*’. It is a procedure by which interlocutors exchange turns in an orderly way throughout the conversational interaction and it guarantees the orderly organization of conversation. "This occurs at precise points in conversation in which one speaker starts talking exactly when the other speaker stops" (Pallotti, 2007, p.44). This point is labeled *transition-relevance place* (TRP) and it is located at the end of TCU.

TCUs perform actions in turn-at-talk. Diverse sorts of actions can get done in/by a TCU. They include the following: asking, answering, offering, requesting, teasing, and so forth. Schegloff (2007) proposes that in determining the type of action conveyed by a particular TCU, "we start from an observation about how some bit of talk was done, and ask: What could someone be doing by talking in this way? What does that bit of talk appear designed to do?" (P.8). A single TCU can perform more than one action.

**6-2-1-2- Adjacency Pair:**

Turns are arranged into sequences. Each sequence of turns presents course(s) of action that gets implemented through talk. The constitutive element of sequence construction is *adjacency pair*. Adjacency pairs are defined as sequences of two communicative actions that are produced by different speakers, adjacent to one another, ordered as a first part and a second part, categorized…so that any given first part requires a particular type of second. Examples include greetings, question-answer,
compliment-thanks, assertion-acknowledgement, invitation-acceptance/rejection, and so forth.

In such pairs, there is 'conditional relevance'. It is a kind of link or relation between the two parts of the pair, i.e. "the production of a certain move recognizable as a first pair part makes a certain continuation relevant, which completes and concludes the sequence" (Pallotti, 2007, p.46).

7- Analysis:
7-1- Conversation 1:

It is a natural face-to-face conversation between two young male friends: 'Fred' and 'Richard' in a private home in Los Angeles. The language of the conversation is English. The excerpt takes around 20 minutes. During the course of interaction, three topics are raised. They are in order: Fred's problem at work, Richard's relation with his ex-girlfriend, and their future plans. Different parenthetical clauses are identified.

Fred tells Richard about his argument with the supervisor in his workplace and the reasons that led to it. Richard is familiar with Fred's work conditions. Fred makes manifest to Richard his desire to narrate what happened at work. Thus, he started the conversation with a 'story preface', i.e. "a turn that is only a single unit, but that offers to tell a longer story" (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990, p.299). The recipient demonstrates willingness to continue listening to the story.

Fred: (H) .. (H) Yeah.
    I tell you man
    That factory's the pits ma[n
Richard: [What's new].

Fred draws Richard's attention by the production of the TCUs (indicated by the two arrows). A stimulus is produced for Richard, the listener, to follow what is to be said by Fred.

Fred narrates to Richard the problem he had at the workplace. It started when he was taking his usual break. However, Fred adds further information: that the break was a little bit longer. Fred
inserts this piece of information in the form of a parenthetical non-restrictive clause, as though it was not an important piece of details.

*Fred:* [and I took] a= break,
   .. that was <VOX just a little bit VOX> too long man,
   You know

*Richard:* [Yeah,
   I can imagine].

The production of that parenthetical captures Richard's attention. Therefore, Richard follows a path of least effort to process Fred's utterance:

**Explicature:** 1) Fred took a break at work  
2) Fred took a longer break than usual

**Contextual assumptions:** 1) Fred works in a factory  
2) Fred has a problem at work  
3) There is a reason for that problem  
4) The factory allows a break  
5) The break has certain duration

**Implicatures:** 1) Extending a usual break can be a cause of problems at workplace  
2) Fred is not a disciplined employee

Based on processing provided information, Richard reaches a strengthened cognitive effect that extending a break is a provocative to the factory administration and that Fred is not a disciplined employee. Richard replies "I can imagine" which indicates that what Fred has just said is expected by Richard based on his knowledge of the work conditions in the factory and his knowledge of Fred himself.

Fred halts the narration of what happened at the factory. He inserts an additional parenthetical of the appositive nominal form. The new parenthetical gives further information about the extended break. He inserts it in a new separate turn and he manages to stimulate Richard's attention.

*Fred:* (H) <@ ha]=lf hou=r brea=k @>
Richard's attention is drawn and, in turn, he processes the utterance:

**Explicature:**
1) The extended break took half an hour
2) Fred extended the usual break into half an hour break

**Contextual assumptions:**
1) The usual duration of a break in the factory is fifteen minutes
2) The usual duration of the break is accepted by the factory administration
3) It is not accepted to extend a usual break in the factory

**Implicatures:**
1) Extension of usual break is the reason for Fred's problem at work

Richard reaches a strengthened cognitive effect that Fred's extension of break is a reason for his problem at work. That is why he interrupts Fred's turn and instantly comments:

\[ \text{Richard: } \ldots (H) \ [2\text{You stretched a fifteen minute break2} \text{ into a [3half hour3} \text{ break}.] \]

The aforementioned two parentheticals are inserted within turns. Their insertion halts the main line of the conversation between Fred and Richard, which is the narration of the problem at the factory. However, the parentheticals are related to the main line as they clarify to Richard the source of the problem. Then, Fred proceeds the narration of what happened:

\[ \text{Fred: } [2@(H)= @@@ @(H) @2] \]

\[ [3\text{to a half hour3}.] \]
\[ (H) \text{And then he comes into the cafeteria}. \]

Fred continues narrating what happened at the factory and tells Richard that he was packing ice cream. However, he holds the narration and inserts a parenthetical of the appositive nominal form within the turn.

\[ \text{Fred: } \ldots \text{I did ice cream.} \]

\[ \ldots \text{ Right,} \]
\[ \text{Balian?} \]
Fred is not sure about the name of the ice cream and he wants Richard to confirm whether this is the right name for it. The stopping of the narration and insertion of parenthetical draws Richard's attention. He initiates processing Fred's utterance:

**Explicature:**
1) Fred packed ice cream
2) Fred is asking whether the name of the ice cream is the right name

**Contextual assumptions:**
1) Fred produces ice cream in the factory.
2) The ice cream has a brand name
3) Balian is the brand name of ice cream

**Implicatures:**
1) Fred wants a confirmation of the piece of information about the ice cream
2) Fred thinks I know the answer to his question

Based on this processing effort, Richard forms a new contextual implication and he decides to provide an answer to Fred. Thus, Richard replies:

**Richard:**  
Unh[unh]

Once Fred gets the response which he regards necessary for the continuation of narration, he proceeds the telling of what happened at the factory:

**Fred:** [(H) And you gotta pack those in cases...]

In the course of the interaction, it becomes evident that both participants, Fred and Richard, are not satisfied with the job they have and they intend to change it as soon as possible. This brings up the mention of Richard's parents and their reaction toward his career move. However, Fred knows that Richard's parents have travelled and they have not been back yet. He is not sure of the time of their return for knowing their reaction is linked to their return. Thus, Fred produces the following turn where he inserts a parenthetical of the comment clause type 'I think' followed by another parenthetical of the reporting clause type 'my dad told me'.

---
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Fred: [Your parents] don't know yet.

Hunh.

Richard: N=0

They'll know when they come back.

Fred: -- I --

And I think my dad told me yesterday, they are coming back the fifteenth? [or sixteenth]?

Fred displays his intention of having an assertion about the information that he had from his father, i.e. the arrival date of Richard's parents.

Richard begins the processing of the turn. He believes that this turn is relevant to the course of the interaction; otherwise Fred would not produce it.

**Explicatures:** 1) Fred does not know the arrival date of my parents.

2) Fred's dad told him the date of my parents' arrival.

3) Fred is not sure they will arrive the fifteenth or sixteenth

**Contextual assumptions:** 1) My parents have travelled and have not come back yet

2) They will come back on a certain date

**Implicatures:** 1) Fred seeks a confirmation of the arrival date of the parents

2) Fred thinks that I know the date

3) Fred is not certain of the date

Richard forms a new cognitive implication, that is, he should answer Fred's question and that he should know the date of his parents' arrival. Thus, Richard produces the second part of the adjacency pair:

Richard: [Yeah.

..def]inite ----

I think s- --
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It's gonna be the fifteenth, Richard and his girlfriend got separated. Fred knows that, but he wants to know the feeling of other family members regarding this decision. He asks Richard about his sisters' feelings. Richard tells Fred that his sisters want him to stay away from his ex-girlfriend. They fear that she will control him if he comes back to her.

Richard: Cause they feel that,
    She's gonna get too strong,
    by me,
    you know uh,
    [kissing her ---,
Fred: [Oh].
Richard: → [or something or or or 2],
Fred: [2Exactly2]
Richard: → [3crawling3] back,
Fred: [3I see3].
Richard: → and begging her,
    % .. you know,
Fred: (H)[=
Richard: [for me to come back or]  
Fred: She gonna get] the upper hand.
Richard: -- Exactly.
In response to Fred's question about his sisters' feelings, Richard justifies his sisters' feelings. Richard's TCU is incomplete: 'She's gonna get too strong, by…' as he inserts four parenthetical nominal appositives (indicated by the arrows). All the appositives are intended to provide more explanation of the humiliation that Richard's sisters think that he will endure to come back to his ex-girlfriend.

Fred processes the subsequent turns:

*Explicatures:* 1) Richard's sisters believe that his ex-girlfriend will control him
2) She will control him because he begs and humiliates himself

Contextual assumptions: 1) Richard is answering my question
2) Richard's sisters do not approve of his coming back to her

Implicatures: 1) The main reason is Richard's acceptance to humiliate himself for her to come back to him
As an indication that Fred got the expressed information, Fred replies saying 'Oh', 'Exactly', and 'I see'.

In the last section of the conversation, diverse parentheticals are identified. Fred is inquiring whether Richard is working for twelve hours. Richard answers him, but he clarifies that it is his own decision. He is not forced to do so. He emphasizes this piece of information through employing a peripheral adverbial clause.

Fred: ... (H) Y- are y- --
Are you working twelve hours?
... You're [gonna be],
Richard: [Yeah].
Fred: You're [2gonna be do2]ing that?
Richard: [2Yeah2].
Fred: .. [3Nine to nine3]?
Richard: [3Definitely3].

Nine to nine

If I want
That's a –
[That's] up to me

Richard introduces the peripheral clause (indicated by the arrow) as a separate TCU. It is not syntactically connected to the host; yet, it is semantically related to it. Richard provides Fred with the answer, but he adds further information that is considered necessary to the conversation.

Fred processes this TCU as follows:

Explicatures: 1) Richard provides an answer to the question
2) It is true that Richard works for twelve hours
3) It is Richard's choice to work for twelve hours

**Contextual assumptions:** 1) Employees can work for long hours  
2) Organizations can force employees to work for long hours  
3) Richard works in a company

**Implicatures:** 1) Richard's company does not force its employees to work for long shifts  
2) Richard can choose to work for long hours

Fred reaches a contradictory cognitive effect. Fred thought that the Richard's company has a certain policy regarding working hours. It turned out that employees are free to choose their working hours. This meaning is obtained through Richard's usage of the parenthetical adverbial clause.

### 7-2- Conversation 2:

The second conversation is between two female friends: Nadia and Enji. It is a phone call conversation in colloquial Egyptian Arabic. The extract lasts for 30 minutes. The main topic of the call is that Nadia invites Enji to attend her wedding which will be held in Moscow. However, there are other subtopics that are raised within the conversation. Several parenthetical clauses are identified. They are scattered throughout the conversation. Instances of identified parentheticals will be discussed below.

Because Nadia stays in USA, Enji asks her whether there will be guests from America to attend the wedding ceremony. Nadia tells her that there will be a lot of people from different places in addition to Khalid, Nadia's cousin. Nadia presents this piece of information in the form of parenthetical nominal appositive.

*Enji:* ايه ده؟ هو في ناس كتير جايينلك من أمريكا من كل حتة؟ [What is this? Will there be a lot of people coming from America, everywhere?]

*Nadia:* وخلد ابن عمتي ممكن يجي ...
[wi ḥālid ?ibn ʿammitī mūmkin yīgī]

[... and Khalid my cousin might come ...]

Enji: َأ

Uuh

Nadia's TCU, indicated by the arrow, has an appositive nominal parenthetical. It is inserted between the subject 'Khalid' and the verb phrase 'might come'. Enji, the recipient, starts out to process Enji's utterance:

**Explicatures:**
1) Nadia has a cousin
2) His name is Khalid
3) Khalid the cousin might come

**Contextual assumptions:**
1) Nadia invites different people to her wedding
2) Nadia invites her relatives to the wedding
3) Relatives attend each other's wedding

**Implicatures:**
1) Out of all the people called Khalid that I (Enji) might know, Nadia refers to her cousin Khalid
2) Nadia thinks I do not know, or do not remember, Khalid, who is her cousin

Nadia's usage of the appositive nominal, which is placed directly after the subject 'Khalid', increases the achieved effect and reduces the required effort. Enji forms a new contextual implication: that Nadia's relative Khalid is attending the wedding. Within the same context of the phone call, Enji wonders whether Nadia has changed her phone number. She expresses her uncertainty through the usage of a parenthetical of the reporting type:

Enji: وانتي غيرتي تليفونك سمعت

[... wi ?intī ġayartī telīfūnek simiʿt...]

(...)And you changed your phone number, I heard from someone...)

Nadia: إياك عندي نمريتي الجديدة

[...?ayiwa ʿandek nemretī ?elgedīda...] (Yes, I have. You have my new number, don't you?)
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Nadia inserts the parenthetical at a peripheral position. This is because Enji introduces the most important information first. This is the information that she wants to convey and ask about. Enji makes manifest to Nadia that she wants to communicate information. Nadia, on the other hand, starts recovering the intended interpretation of Enji’s TCU:

**Explicatures**: 1) Enji knows that I changed my phone number
   2) Enji is not sure that I changed my phone number
   3) Someone told Enji that I had changed my phone number
   4) Enji wants me to confirm or refute what she heard

**Contextual assumptions**: 1) People change phone numbers
   2) I gave people the new number

**Implicatures**: 1) Enji does not have the new phone number
   2) I am not sure whether Enji has my new phone number
   3) We have not phoned each other lately
   4) Enji does not remember who told her that I had changed my phone number, or she thinks it is not important

Nadia forms a cognitive implication that she is not sure whether she gave Enji her new phone number. Therefore, she has to clarify that to Enji. Thus, Nadia produces her reply in answering Enji.

Enji asks Nadia to write a letter telling her all the details of the wedding ceremony if Enji could not manage to attend the wedding in Moscow. Enji justifies her request by inserting a parenthetical clause of the accounting type in the middle of the running TCU.

\[
\text{Enji:} \quad \text{بس إنتي بقى في حالة أي حاجة إبعتيلي جواب} \\
\text{عشان مش حينفع تليفون يعني عن كل الأخبار} \\
 [...bas ?intī baʾa fī ḥālet ?ay ḥāga ?ibʾatilī gawāb ʿšān meš ḥayinfaʾ teлейfūn yaʾnī ʿan kull ?iʾḥbār...]
\]
(But, no matter what, send me a letter → because a phone call won't avail about all the stories)

The parenthetical is inserted between the noun phrase 'the letter' and the reduced adjective clause 'about all the stories'. Had the parenthetical been omitted, the main clause would not have been affected. Enji managed to attract Nadia's attention. Nadia begins to interpret her utterance:

**Explicature:**
1) Enji asks me to send her a letter
2) The reason is that phone calls will not avail
3) The letter is about the wedding details

**Contextual assumptions:**
1) Enji thinks writing a letter is more convenient than talking over the phone
2) Phone calls and letters are effective means of communication
3) Making phone calls and writing letters take time
4) I am busy to write a letter or to have a phone call

**Implicatures:**
1) There will be a lot of details in the wedding ceremony
2) Enji thinks I am too busy to phone her

Thus, Nadia reaches the cognitive implication that she will not be able either to write Enji a letter or to phone her:

*Nadia:* إنجي أننا مابكتبش إنتي مش متخيلة أننا مافتكش أنا مسافرة بعد بكرة

[...Engi ?ana mabaktibš ?intī meš mutaḥayila āh ?ana ma qultelkīš ?ana mesāra ba’d bukra...]

*(Enji, I cannot write... you cannot imagine... Uh I did not tell you I'm going to travel the day after tomorrow).*

Enji expresses to Nadia why she is hesitant about attending the wedding in Moscow. The reason is that Nadia's mother told her that the airport is far away and she has to book a room in a hotel.
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Enji: أصل نسه بتقولي المطار 30 كيلو ولا معرفش: إد إيه والبلد لازم بيبقى هوتل

[...؟لس ليسا بيتقل؟ال İzماارت تالاتين كيلو والا لا شروت فيد هوتيل] (Because she told me that the airport was 30 Km away or I do not know how far and there had to be a hotel).

Nadia's attention is drawn to Enji's ostensive stimulus. She automatically starts processing it:

**Explicatures**: 1) someone (my mother) told Enji that the airport (in Moscow) is far away (30 km away) from the city

2) Also, Enji has to have a hotel reservation

**Contextual assumptions**: 1) the airport being far away from the town is a reason that Enji may not be able to attend the wedding ceremony

2) The need for having a hotel reservation is another reason that Enji may not be able to attend the wedding

3) Enji got in touch with my mother

4) My mother is the source of Enji's information

**Implicatures**: 1) Enji fears to move alone in a foreign country

2) Enji thinks that what my mother told her might be true

3) If Enji found that the reported information is true, she will not attend the wedding

4) Enji needs me to confirm or refute what my mother told her

The connection between the new and existing information yields an eliminated cognitive effect. Nadia reaches the conclusion that Enji may not be able to attend the wedding because of what my mother told her. Nadia needs to assure her that she will not be alone in Moscow as her mother told her. Therefore, Nadia replies saying:

Nadia: لا مالكيش دعوه بحنا حنستضيفك/hotel
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[l’malkāš da’wa bhwteil ?iḥna ḥnistaḍṭīfik] (Do not worry about the hotel. We will entertain you)

8- Discussion & Findings:
Several parentheticals of different types are employed by the participants in both conversations. They are inserted either into an ongoing TCU or in a separate turn. Either way, they affect the hearers' grasping of the utterance or, consequently, how they formulate the subsequent turn.

The identified parentheticals within the two conversations facilitated the attainment of the speaker's desired meaning. They were linked to the meaning of the host clause to a large extent. This contradicts the assumption that parentheticals are a mark of disfluency of discourse. Rather, they play a role in the flow of conversations between participants as they facilitate the production of the subsequent turns. Also, parentheticals do not differ according to the language of the interaction. Employed parenthetical constructions are similar in both English and Arabic.

9- Conclusion:
The present study aims to investigate the relevance of parenthetical constructions within conversational interaction. Relevance Theory (RT) and Conversation Analysis (CA) are adopted as two approaches for investigation. The structures are identified and interpreted in terms of the cognitive effects and the processing effort on the part of the hearer.

Parentheticals are derived from and related to the main line of conversation. They are not disfluent structures. Rather, they are employed to convey a meaning that is relevant to the interlocutors.
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Appendix (1)

Fred & Richard Conversation Transcript

0.000 1.496 FRED: (H) .. (H) Yeah.
1.496 2.132 I tell you man,
2.132 3.496 that factory's the pits ma[n,
3.419 3.971 RICHARD: [What's new].
3.496 6.123 FRED: last night] I got into a hassle with James Boyd.
4.759 7.719 .. (H) I'm in the cafeteria,
7.719 8.043 RICHARD: [Yeah].
7.719 8.623 FRED: [and I took] a= break,
8.623 10.412 .. that was <VOX just a little bit VOX> too long man.
10.412 10.712 You know.
10.712 11.136 RICHARD: [Yeah,
10.793 11.399 FRED: [@@ (H)
11.136 11.938 RICHARD: I can imagine].
11.399 13.076 FRED: (H) <@ ha]=lf hour= break =@>,
13.076 15.412 RICHARD: ... (H) [2You stretched a fifteen minute break2] into a [3half hour3] break.
13.316 15.230 FRED: [2@(H)= @@@ @(H) @2]
15.412 16.188 [3to a half hour3].
16.358 18.400 (H) And then he comes into the cafeteria.
18.400 21.320 (H) And I thought he was coming in to chase everybody away.
21.320 22.343 RICHARD: [He was after you].
23.166 24.055 .. And he calls me.
24.055 25.434 And I'm @walking out the door.
25.434 27.028 Right as he's walking in the o[ther one]?
26.682 27.233 RICHARD: [Unhu]=nh?
27.233 28.139 FRED: ... @(H) @
28.139 28.752 (H) And he goes,
28.752 29.066 <VOX ~Fred,
29.066 29.693 I wanna talk to you,
29.693 30.094 come here VOX».
30.094 31.008 .. (H) @And I go,
31.008 31.658 oh= man,
31.658 32.465 what is this about.
32.465 34.316 .. (H) And on my production card.
34.316 35.323 ... (TSk) (H) Let's see.
35.323 36.724 ... The day before yesterday.
36.724 37.927 ..I did ice cream.
37.927 38.241 .. Right,
38.241 38.819 Balian?
38.819 39.288 RICHARD: [Unh[uh].
39.063 41.080 FRED: [(H)] And you gotta pack those in cases.
41.080 42.055 ... (H)[2= And2],
41.630 42.055 RICHARD: [2Right2].
42.065 42.467 FRED: so like,
42.467 44.468 I didn't put that down on my production c[ard].
44.142 45.517 RICHARD: [How many] cases you packed.
45.517 46.551 FRED: (H) I don't know man.
46.551 47.898 ... I packed two pallets.
47.898 48.604 ... You know,
48.604 50.536 ... I don't know how many .. cases [that is].
50.015 50.468 RICHARD: [Un unh].
50.536 50.737 FRED: but,
50.737 51.839 (H)= you know,
that,
. that shit was heavy man.
And like,
... and like,
... I put down on the card,
you know,
no cases.
Because it was lost time.
You know,
... you know we,
Right.
[we stripped the s]ides and everything,
[Right.
Yeah],
and l[2ike,
[2Y- y- you were teaming up with s2]omebody,
there were no cases2].
[3or working alone3].
[3(H) %=3] (H) packed this or not.
... You know.
... (TSK) (H) he comes and says,
well,
... (H) packed this or not.
... You know.
... On your production card,
all it says,
you know,
is that you did ... three thousand sheets,
but [you did-] --
[Two] loads.
Yeah.
... But you didn't pack it.
(H)= So I go,
yeah,
I go look man,
there they are.
You could see,
there's my name,
... %= ... stamped right on there.
I just didn't put it down.
... <VOX Oh,
well I gotta figure it out VOX>.
(H) And he goes,
<VOX and what are you doing in the cafeteria so late VOX>.
(H) I'm just going,
aw man,
this is the pits man.
This is [at the bottom of the] --
That's the last thing you] wanted to hear.
Yeah really.
This fucking mayate.
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101.153 101.403 You know,
101.403 102.444 getting on my case.
102.444 102.842 RICHARD: Yeah.
102.842 104.871 FRED: ... @@@
104.871 105.477 ... [(H)]
105.164 106.065 RICHARD: [Well that's] nothing new.
106.065 107.129 FRED: <@ It's nothing [2new @>,
106.898 107.951 RICHARD: [2It's always been like that2].
107.129 107.416 FRED: it's --
107.416 109.003 (H) It's p2]ar for the course man.
109.003 109.807 ... Right?
109.807 110.372 .. [H] Right?
110.060 110.365 RICHARD: [Yeah],
110.372 111.041 definitely.
111.041 112.916 ... Ts- why I= can't take that,
112.916 113.930 that type of living anymore,
113.930 114.527 even is this,
114.527 115.095 uh,
115.095 116.478 .. career doesn't work out for me,
116.478 117.832 I'll find something that [will].
117.718 118.226 FRED: [Some]thing else.
118.226 119.729 Well you're gonna do real estate maybe,
119.729 119.973 [right]?
119.729 120.134 RICHARD: [Def]initely,
120.134 120.345 I'm --
120.345 121.482 I got my books and everything,
121.482 122.771 I'll be studying and uh,
122.771 124.187 ... but in a sense,
124.187 124.783 I need uh,
124.783 126.548 ... some type of steady income.
126.548 127.341 FRED: ... (H) But,
127.341 127.925 but uh=,
127.925 128.445 .. you s- --
128.445 129.847 Th- the competition man.
129.847 130.308 I mean,
130.308 131.489 .. (H) is it real tough?
131.489 131.678 Like,
131.678 132.393 .. on the lot?
132.393 132.918 RICHARD: ... Yeah,
132.918 133.260 it is.
133.260 133.711 There's def --
133.711 135.910 And there's guys that've been doing that four or five years,
135.910 136.235 [and],
135.910 136.927 FRED: [And they're] real good at it[2e].
136.835 138.090 RICHARD: [2h2]at are real good at it,
138.090 139.907 an=d they= know how to .. talk to the people,
139.907 140.531 and they know that,
140.531 141.652 .. when somebody's coming in,
141.652 142.629 if they're buying or not.
142.629 143.246 FRED: ... Oh,
143.246 144.204 they could tell right aw[ay].
144.146 145.496 RICHARD: [Y]eah but that all comes with time.
145.496 145.766 You know,
145.766 145.994 [and,
145.766 146.235 FRED: [Yeah].
145.994 147.363 RICHARD: ... and they're] pretty helpful with me,
147.363 147.931 and uh,
147.931 150.580 ... you know it'll all come in time.
150.580 150.805 Right,
150.805 151.513 I figure,
151.513 153.484 the more cars I get out,
153.484 154.841 the more people I talk to,
154.841 156.188 n- the more cars I'm gonna sell.
156.188 157.250 Just all comes with time.
157.250 158.367 Once I get my experience,
158.367 160.392 I'll be up there too in the top four salesman.
160.392 161.253 (H)=[
161.253 161.803 Your parents] don't know yet.
161.803 162.042 Hunh.
162.042 162.526 FRED: [Your parents] don't know yet.
162.526 163.661 Hunh.
163.661 164.841 Huh.
164.841 165.340 RICHARD: No.
165.340 166.545 They'll know when they come back.
166.545 167.250 RICHARD: I think s- --
167.250 168.095 which would be on a Saturday I think.
168.095 169.511 FRED: ... (H) ... And I'll be working till nine o'clock.
169.511 171.256 RICHARD: So they'll,
171.256 173.863 174.199 they'll be pretty=.. happy for me,
173.863 176.188 176.624 more or less,
176.188 177.226 178.975 because uh,
177.226 179.363 179.727 they didn't want me to work in the factory much longer.
179.363 179.905 180.274 FRED: ... Yeah,
179.905 180.274 180.600 I know.
180.274 182.101 182.472 My mom doesn't know what to do to get me out.
182.101 183.328 183.700 ... (H) But,
183.328 184.934 185.340 they didn't take a trip through=,
184.934 185.544 186.269 Brazil,
185.544 186.269 186.279 and Ar[gentina]? RICHARD: [I don't know].
186.279 187.183 187.583 I don't know they- they,
187.183 187.802 188.208 they [<X didn't X>] --
187.802 188.791 189.199 FRED: [They] spent the whole time in= Guayaquil?
188.791 189.643 189.975 RICHARD: ... Yeah I think so.
188.975 189.250 189.680 189.980 190.274 They tol--
189.250 190.727 191.160 My dad told me he was gonna go to uh=,
190.727 191.766 192.152 192.514 Argentina,
191.766 192.996 193.351 and Peru,
192.996 193.646 194.008 and Colombia,
193.646 194.008 194.340 but,
194.008 195.661 195.996 ... he only wrote one letter,
195.661 196.880 197.192 and and they were in uh,
196.880 197.902 198.216 FRED: ... No one's called em,
197.902 199.160 199.472 %y- I mean no one's talked to [them]?
198.975 199.197 200.352 RICHARD: [No].
199.197 199.821 200.977 FRED: [2X2].
199.821 200.977 201.805 202.352 [2He2] sent postcards to everybody,
200.977 201.727 202.605 and a <YWN letter but,
201.727 202.800 203.060 ... (YAWN)[=]
202.800 203.893 204.120 RICHARD: [Yeah].
203.893 205.492 206.203 other than that YWN>,
205.492 206.775 207.775 he hasn't called or told us what's up,
206.775 208.662 209.073 <X and he'll be in here no time X>.
208.662 209.073 FRED: ... Is he staying over at ~Miguel ~Juarez's?
209.073 209.353 RICHARD: ... Yeah,
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209.073 209.535  FRED: ... Yeah?
209.535 210.909  RICHARD: ... And uh=,
210.909 211.956  the other architect.
211.956 213.256  Is his nephew or something.
213.256 213.503  ~Pedro ~Cruz.
213.503 214.436  ... ~Pedro ~Cruz.
214.436 216.193  FRED: ... ~Pedro ~Cruz.
215.959 216.193  RICHARD: [Yeah],
216.193 217.299  he's a architect [2or2],
216.995 218.738  FRED: [I nev2]er met him.
217.860 218.738  ... I know ~Miguel,
219.209 220.240  RICHARD: [That's his,
220.240 221.934  one of] his .. brother's sons or something.
221.934 222.627  FRED: ... Unhunh.
230.278 230.725  ... (H) They weren't all heartbroken about,
230.725 233.099  RICHARD: [Well they have no ide2ea XX2],
232.397 233.127  FRED: [They must have been] --
233.127 235.452  They have no id[2ea XX2],
234.167 235.452  RICHARD: [2When they left2],
235.452 236.723  we were on shaky grounds,
236.723 237.123  but,
237.123 239.471  ... %= you know,
239.471 241.146  they thought it might be able to work out.
241.146 242.101  ... So when they come in,
242.101 243.276  they'll be pretty shocked.
243.276 243.718  FRED: ... Yeah.
243.718 244.026  RICHARD: And,
244.026 244.680  FRED: ... But uh,
244.680 245.476  and hurt.
245.476 245.996  like I say,
245.996 247.784  things .. will work out f- for the best.
247.784 248.802  FRED: What about her folks.
248.802 250.127  ... They're not sorry at all,
250.127 250.387  hu[h].
250.258 250.769  FRED: [N]o= uh,
250.769 251.779  RICHARD: in fact I've seen em,
251.779 251.983  I--
251.983 253.312  I- I went to church with em,
253.312 254.862  for the last three Sundays.
254.862 255.426  FRED: Really?
255.426 256.685  RICHARD: ... [With ~Jeanie].
256.685 256.668  FRED: [Wow=],
256.668 257.696  RICHARD: ... She thought it might,
257.696 257.946  you know.
257.946 259.475  help our relationship as friends,
259.475 259.978  and uh,
259.978 262.241  FRED: ... (H) She still considers you man.
262.241 262.478  Hunh.
262.478 263.196  RICHARD: Exactly.
263.196 263.711  She does,
263.711 264.242 because I mean,
264.242 265.315 we went to church together,
265.315 266.890 for the last three Sundays,
266.890 267.447 FRED: ... [Yeah].
266.972 267.880 RICHARD: [(H)] and then,
267.880 269.242 then we went to the movies after,
269.242 271.383 ... and her= her folks were at church,
271.383 271.556 that we did,
271.556 271.981 you know,
271.981 273.067 %n=
273.067 273.542 her mom,
273.542 275.155 w-
275.155 276.832 she wasn't at church last Sunday,
276.832 278.246 ... we went to the,
278.246 279.028 to their house.
279.028 279.805 % And uh,
279.805 280.598 ... I went over there,
280.598 282.759 and her brother was there,
282.759 283.668 her nephews and nieces,
283.668 285.155 her sister,
285.155 286.922 (... (H) our godson,
286.922 287.585 ... (H) .. And uh=,
287.585 288.171 it was just like,
288.171 290.201 everybody was real ... friendly and every[thing],
290.460 290.900 FRED: [Yeah]=.
290.900 292.254 RICHARD: ... (TSK) I don't know if the parents =re awa=re,
292.254 292.809 that we did,
292.809 293.318 you know,
293.318 293.900 RICHARD: [Break up]?
293.900 294.331 but %it,
294.331 295.460 possibly was for the better,
295.460 295.854 cause they,
295.854 298.388 they didn't feel comfortable with us living together anyhow.
298.388 298.946 FRED: Yeah=,
298.946 299.660 ... right,
299.660 301.652 that's .. not looked on .. too good .. [hunh].
301.299 301.649 RICHARD: [No].
301.652 302.047 So,
302.047 302.728 %w- what they,
302.728 304.108 what they probably .. think is,
304.108 304.325 you know,
304.325 306.515 that we still have a lot of= love for each other,
306.515 307.318 (H)= That,
307.318 308.743 ... n[=oving] out was the best thing.
307.452 308.807 FRED: [But sh-] --
308.743 310.483 RICHARD: until we bo=th are ready .. for marriage,
310.483 312.074 and if she .. s=till loves me,
312.074 313.302 a=nd I still love her=,
313.302 315.577 and,
315.577 315.143 (H) ... we want= get married,
315.143 317.351 there's still the .. chance of us getting back together,
317.351 318.635 and .. getting married this time.
318.635 319.150 RICHARD: ... Yeah.
319.150 320.855 RICHARD: ... (TSK) (H)= So I mean it --
320.855 322.660 %I= think things are working out pretty good.
322.660 324.420 She called me the other day and uh,
324.420 325.513 ... you know,
325.513 326.678 she calls me and talks to me,
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and I call her and ask her how her day was and everything.

... Yeah.

... (H) ... What,

what does uh,

... your ... sisters say,

RICHARD: ... N- they tell me to stay away from her,

don't even call or anything.

FRED: ... Yeah[=]?

RICHARD: [Wait] till she calls you and everything.

But %,

you know,

that's not right.

FRED: ... Yeah.

RICHARD: [I mean],

if she accepts me calling her,

and she doesn't tell me,

<VOX don't call me VOX> or,

FRED: (H)= They're telling you that,

why.

To,

like uh,

 Cause they feel that,

she's gonna get too strong,

by me,

you know uh,

[kissing] her ass,

FRED: [Oh].

RICHARD: [for me to come back or],

FRED: She gonna get] the upper hand.

RICHARD: ... Exactly.

Which,

you know=

... (H) ... [um],

FRED: [Yeah]=.

RICHARD: ... (TSK) I'm not gonna just .. wait for her to call me,

because it's not right,

I have feelings for her,

I wanna know,

you know,

how she's d[oin]g,

RICHARD: [doing].

I'm gonna] communicate with her.

That's all there is to it.

It's not like I w- --

(H) I'm asking her,

you know,

... let me .. move back in or,

you know=,
FRED: (TSK) @Yeah]=?)
386.183 386.941 RICHARD: [The] day before I moved out.
388.114 389.464 FRED: (H)=[2=2]
389.338 392.007 RICHARD: [2Jus2] just to tell her I was sorrry about everything that had happened,
392.007 392.724 and that uh,
392.724 395.505 you know I hope .. we could remain friends,
395.505 397.132 and that .. God brings us back together,
397.132 398.107 if it was meant to be.
398.107 401.151 RICHARD: ... \And she was real happy about this.
401.151 402.484 She said that really meant a lot to me.
402.484 402.866 You know,
402.866 404.392 That you did send me flowers,
404.392 405.154 and uh,
405.154 407.135 FRED: ... And then --
407.135 409.298 Cause she knew it came from my heart,
409.298 410.616 no matter what,
410.616 411.257 she knows deep down inside,
411.257 412.507 .. I'd put her through and everything,
412.507 413.735 FRED: @(@(H)x)= @@@@@
417.379 419.044 RICHARD: [X And X>],
419.348 420.899 But I don't even know what it is in fact.
420.899 422.707 I might ... have to go to therapy or something,
422.707 423.382 to [end out].
423.022 425.103 RICHARD: [2(2hx)= == @@@@]
425.103 425.909 ... [2@(H)2]
425.909 426.272 RICHARD: [2Because there's2] no --
426.272 427.100 There's no way I,
427.100 427.491 I shou[d]
427.491 428.091 FRED: [(H]=
428.091 428.481 RICHARD: .. you know],
428.481 429.275 FRED: ... You should be like this?
429.275 430.065 RICHARD: Exactly.
430.065 430.787 FRED: ... (H][=
430.787 431.176 RICHARD: [I] mean an--
431.176 432.003 FRED: [2People2] say you,
432.003 433.221 RICHARD: y=[ou act out of uh,
433.221 433.912 ... it's okay,
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Sad... or maybe...

...two in the afternoon, to nine in the evening.

[See].

(\( \text{H} \)) ... or if I wanted to come in before two, if I was on the evening shift, I would come in at nine, and work nine to nine.

(\( \text{H} \)) ... If I was on the evening shift, from two to nine, I could come in and work from nine to nine.

FRED: \[Unhuh\].

RICHARD: (\( \text{H} \)) ... So if I wanted to come in before two, if I was on the evening shift, I would come in at nine, and work nine to nine.

FRED: (\( \text{H} \)) So, um, ...

... when you went last week, and you applied right, they hired you.

RICHARD: ... Mhm?

FRED: they, they hired you.

RICHARD: ... Right on the spot.

FRED: ... Right on the spot.

RICHARD: He gave me interview, he talked to me, told me \( w = h y \) I \( w = a n t e d \) to get into sales, and if, if I felt I could sell, (\( \text{H} \)) if I had any experience, and everything...

FRED: \[Unhuh\].

RICHARD: ... So, you've done cars all through my early years, but it was \( 3 \) owned and sold, \( 4 \) party.

FRED: you know about cars.

RICHARD: \( \text{Tsk} \) (\( \text{H} \)) So I have some type of experience selling, dealing with people.

FRED: \( \text{You know about cars.} \)

RICHARD: handling the money, and uh, the only thing it is, %th-%%= to have to ... work on, is doing the paperwork.

RICHARD: ... (\( \text{Tsk} \)) (\( \text{H} \)) So I have some type of experience selling, which is f- ... very simple.

That, you know,
once it comes along with experience, and the more people I work with, the easier it will, it'll be, that's the most important thing and, and selling them the car, talking to somebody in, to buying a car, that doesn't wanna buy. That's there to look.

Fred: Yeah.

Richard: But yet, wouldn't mind owning a new car.

Fred: That's right.

Richard: And you've gotta talk em into it, you gotta sell it to em. You know? You gotta em in your office, and you gotta sell that car to em. You can't let em leave without that sale. Otherwise, they're gonna go elsewhere.

Fred: Right.

Richard: If they believe you, and you can sell em, take it with you, @ you want @ this car, Definitely.

Fred: [You need this car, you gonna make a lot of money].

Richard: Definetely.

Fred: [2H] in order for you to buy this car. I mean if, is the price too much? I could work on the price. Let me go talk to my manager. Maybe I could drop it five six-hundred dollars. Maybe we have a three-hundred rebate that you could use towards the down payment. If you finance fifteen or sixteen thousand dollars.

Fred: [H] So, [Is that it]?

Richard: [Yeah, I've days I watched uh.}
...videotapes dealing with this guy that, that, ...% that sold cars, and made a hundred thou-
---His goal was to make a hundred thousand dollars every year selling cars. (H)= And he accomplished his goal. Every year he sold a hundred thousand dollars,
(H) [and he retired],

(FRED): [Oh my god].

(RICHARD): at thirty-five after,

(H)= and he retired,

(FRED): [Oh I see].

(RICHARD): [2and uh2],

FRED: [2A sys2]tem,

(RICHARD): Exactly.

Books,

seminars,

un,

(FRED): [Yeah].

(RICHARD): [(H) vi]deo tape[2x2].

650.452 651.852 FRED: [2Hund2]red thousand a year.

651.852 653.211 FRED: That guy must've hustle[3d3].

653.006 653.307 RICHARD: [3Ye3]ah,

653.307 653.605 well,

653.605 654.267 it's possible.

654.267 654.742 You figure,

654.742 655.455 you could sell,

655.455 658.678 ... at least twenty cars a month,

658.678 661.258 ... every month for twelve months,

661.258 662.567 you know you're gonna be up there in,

662.567 664.746 f- % seventy eighty thousand dollar bracket,

664.746 666.668 FRED: ... Twenty cars in a month.

666.668 668.000 ...That's almost a car a day.

668.000 668.886 RICHARD: ... Exactly.

668.886 670.850 ... Which [isn't] difficult,

670.199 670.417 FRED: [X] --

670.417 671.503 RICHARD: If you're on the lot,

671.503 674.839 for a damn ... twelve hours %uh=,

674.839 675.463 one car,

675.463 676.188 isn't all that much,

676.188 678.076 if ... you have .. the clients coming in.

678.076 679.206 ... That's the only thing.

679.206 680.278 [If you have] the traffic,

680.278 682.632 FRED: [Yeah].

682.632 682.680 we're on a busy street,

682.680 682.777 Firestone Boulevard.

682.777 683.488 FRED: ... Right.

683.488 684.125 Firestone where,

684.125 685.008 by the six o five?

685.008 686.151 RICHARD: ... R- exactly.

686.151 687.338 Right before the six o five.

687.338 687.848 [Right by --

687.848 687.984 FRED: [Yeah].
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687.848 688.728 RICHARD: Right past Downy,
688.728 690.205 where we used to play basketball at uh,
690.205 690.957 the YMCA.
690.957 691.407 FRED: .. Yeah.
691.407 693.092 .. it a little .. pa- past that going,
693.092 694.396 RICHARD: I'd say= a mile.
694.396 695.381 FRED: [east].
695.381 696.020 uh east, 
696.020 697.170 FRED: .. (H) .. You know,
697.170 698.647 I have been wanting to go visit you.
698.647 700.540 But, 
700.540 703.840 I'm afraid you're gonna sell me a car bro.
703.840 704.815 than you [2already are2].
704.815 704.999 FRED: [2(H) .. 2(22|H)
704.999 706.020 RICHARD: [Yeah well,
706.020 710.658 FRED: [2(H)=] And then I'll be a free agent.
710.658 711.008 RICHARD: ... (Yeah I'm) --
711.008 711.658 FRED: [(H)=] And then I'll be a free agent.
711.658 711.008 RICHARD: [2ln2] fact,
711.246 712.060 I was planning,
712.060 712.060 FRED: at least].
712.060 713.361 if they were gonna play basketball,
713.361 715.893 RICHARD: [Yeah well,
715.893 717.613 FRED: ... You could go for .. couple hou[r,s
717.613 718.069 717.396 718.453 RICHARD: [It's right down the s]treet,
717.396 718.453 FRED: at least].
718.453 718.069 RICHARD: [2ln2] fact,
718.069 718.069 FRED: Take a shower.
718.069 720.284 719.845 720.505 RICHARD: I could bring my .. work clothes,
720.284 720.284 FRED: [2(H) .. 2(22|H)
720.284 722.856 RICHARD: ... [Yeah I'm] --
722.856 723.313 722.856 723.313 RICHARD: ... [Yeah I'm] --
723.313 723.725 FRED: Take a shower.
723.725 724.750 RICHARD: I could bring my .. work clothes,
724.750 725.950 and uh=],
725.950 726.300 FRED: [2(H) .. 2(22|H)
726.300 726.491 RICHARD: ... [Yeah I'm] --
726.491 727.488 FRED: Take a shower.
727.488 728.863 RICHARD: I could bring my .. work clothes,
728.863 729.963 and, 
729.963 729.963 FRED: [2(H) .. 2(22|H)
729.963 731.104 RICHARD: ... [Yeah I'm] --
731.104 731.104 FRED: [2(H) .. 2(22|H)
731.104 731.999 RICHARD: I could bring my .. work clothes,
731.999 732.387 FRED: Take a shower.
732.387 732.837 RICHARD: I could bring my .. work clothes,
732.837 733.625 FRED: Take a shower.
733.625 734.411 RICHARD: I could bring my .. work clothes,
734.411 734.411 FRED: Take a shower.
734.411 735.447 RICHARD: I could bring my .. work clothes,
735.447 737.358 FRED: Take a shower.
737.358 737.577 RICHARD: I could bring my .. work clothes,
737.577 738.848 FRED: Take a shower.
...The last two weeks the [gym was closed].

RICHARD: [And you haven't talked] to ~Gary ~Holt at all?

FRED: (H)= ... I haven't seen him this week.

RICHARD: ... Yeah.

FRED: (H)= ... I haven't seen him this week.

RICHARD: ...Yeah.

FRED: Where, at federal?

RICHARD: .. Yeah.

FRED: You last [2what2].

RICHARD: [2One2] week check,

FRED: and one week vacation check.

RICHARD: (H) So it'll help me,

FRED: [No].

RICHARD: [Now that] I don't have to .. pay rent.

FRED: .. [2Yeah2].

RICHARD: [2I2] might be able to,

FRED: [why not].
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RICHARD: [Could I] call right here while --
FRED: ... Uh=,
RICHARD: ... And you could hear me,
FRED: [<X Yeah= X>].
RICHARD: ... Talking about my car,
because I have to get the car,
I don't what it's gonna cost,
but it had ... problems uh,
... with the fuel injection system.
FRED: ... Unhunh,
... So I have to have that fixed,
in order for me to get,
uh,
right now,
~Jeanie's lending me the Samurai.
FRED: ... Oh she's --
RICHARD: Yeah.
She's being real cool.
And I've had it for three days and uh,
... that was very nice of her.
I appreciated her doing that for me.
Appendix (2)

Arabic Conversation

Nadia & Engi Phone Call Transcript

UTF8@
t-00000785-1/11312

Begin@ara

A Subject, B Subject

Participants:

heritage Options:

Tayyib salAS lAzim nitkallim carabi cala$An humma cayzIn %E il+mukalmaB~ tibqa bi+il+<English Egyptian Arabic> cala$An humma

11270_2640biysaggiliu=a

Eh laGAat kitlr mukalmAt kitlr Haw- HawaEn i+Alam wi HayistadimU

19710_11570Hayciyu=a <English speech recognition> wi HagAt kida OkkE

21180_19330%ah Tayyib

22980_20120fa+HaniDTarr nitkallim carabi {laugh}

24910_22440Tayyib Tayyib mASi mi$s farqaB~

26020_24370<laugh> izsayyk

27740_25940ilHamdulillA kuwayyisaB~ wi inti izzayyik

30850_27670ilHamdulillA inti carfaB~

A:

"Tayyib xalAS lAzim nitkallim carabi cala$An humma cayzIn %E il+mukalmaB~ tibqa bi+il+<English Egyptian Arabic> cala$An humma biysaggiliu=a"

B:

"Eh luGAt kitIr mukalmAt kitIr Haw- HawalEn il+cAlam wi HayistadimU Hayicmilu=a <English speech recognition> wi HagAt kida OkkE"

A:

"fa+HaniDTarr nitkallim {laugh}"

B:

"Tayyib Tayyib mA$i mi$ farqaB~ {laugh}"

A:

"izzayyik"

B:

"ilHamdulillA kuwayyisaB~ wi inti izzayyik"

A:

"ilHamdulillA inti carfaB~ in ana Hatgawwiz=1"

B:

"(( simict )) [static] ana simict &maha kAnit bitiHki li+$&irIn wi $&afIcaB~ wi macraf$ mIn wi humma QalUl"

A:

"ma humma ahum bitiHkilhum %E bi+il+ZabT Tayyib {laugh}"

B:

"la bitqUl carf In &nadyaB~ Haticmil Eh Ha- Hatitgawwiz wAHid rUsi wi cammAAlaB~ baqa ti- titkallim qultilha ma inti carfaB~ min 54200_44890sanaB~ yanici 50920_47300Haticmil Eh away"
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116590_113510ingilliz walla mAsi bass &rusya ana
STayyib bass Hayibqa fi nAs Hayibqa fi nAs kitr hinAk maycirawU
rUsi wi macAhum nAs yicrafU = rUsi Ha fi nAs gayyIn min min
English &New Zealand> 135 wi135 gayyIn min %E &alnanya 135 wi135 gayyIn>
min &asbunya 135 wi135 gayyIn min il&burtuGAI 135 wi135 gayyIn min
131300_116160amrKu wi & 131170_130509Tayyib
yacni kull wi mucZam muc- yacni {cough} fi nAs minimum 135 wi135 gayyIn
$mIn &ebulanda fi ininE talAtAb= yicrafU = rUsi wi ilhayyIn ln fa+mi
142150_131930Hayibqa fi muksiLab= yacni
%E HaAWiUll bass m- nAs muctCakkidaB= yacni %E English I will check
iL= %E English ticket kida wi bitAc wi Hakallim mamtik anq qutilha
152730_142790Hafakkar
154570_151910int carfaB= inm hiyya misafrAb= yOm arbabAb= yuyu
156870_154310ma ana carfaB= {distortion} {{ma ba} b} {distortion}
fa+ yacni laZim tiqarrari qabl ma hiyya misaliU fi malkI$ dacwa mafI$ malkI$ dacwa
159800_155540carfIn
%a al lissa bitqulli il+mAtar talatIn klu walla macaF= Eh min
il+balad wi il+balad laZim yibqa <English Hotel> &SU= %E English
168160_159970Hotel macaF= ana Hadd xAli-
la la malkI$ dacwa macaF= dacwa bi+OEi ifNa Han- Han
175980_167490HanistaDifik bass m- HanistaDifik ba-
bai+ay zayy il+mUIUK yacni HanistaDifik %E calaSan Hayibqa fi nAs
SkitIr il+nAs HatnAm cala cala iL+arD wi HagAt kida bass yacni malkI
185620_176030dacwa bi+OEi
177190_176620( )) wi yOm tisacA$rar Hayibqa il+yOm illi binglb fl il+nAs min il+maTar
Hayibqa 135 wi135+maTar da fl nAs gayyIn iL+SubH fl nAs gayyIn bacd
212730_205850il+Duhr wi fl nAs gayyIn bi+il+OEi
215170_212330ah ((Tabcan miSu ifmawaDki))
fa+Tab iktibi iktibi candak inmu laZim yibqa yOm tisacA$rar law law
219430_212750Hattigizi iL+arD
220660_219760%ah
\]
\]
calaSan niglbik maca fi nafs il+yOm calaSan yOm ciSrIn mAs Hayibqa
225250_219870fi waqt yOm wAhid wi ciSrIn il+fareH
226220_225280%ah ma ana carfaB= wi ahamm HagaB= bi+il+nishAli il+nAs illi gayyiAb= im ifNa nigbhum
229920_226200min il+maTar
230730_230450%ah
\]
\]
241360_237340maF= maU mamtik (( )) calitte talatIn klu wi HagaAt kida
246060_241230maF= cala talatIn klu di aktar HagaB= %E %E bha xuUraB= cala-
-- cala sinqAb= 135 wi135 wa tidx tixi yisaqik fa+calasa n xAku da
255440_244840il+OEi ana bacmuU ayy Hadd 135 i Hangibhum min il+maTar
257290_255270( static) (( )) [static]
{breath} lAkin bacd kida maF= maF= maF= calaSan yOm Hattibu kullkum
262410_255560fi fi mag- mug- fi %E English groups> fi magmuNaAt {laugh}
\%
\%
%ah {laugh} Eh da huwwa nAs kitr gayyInlik min &amrkA min kida
268290_264210Hattiba-
away mS ana Ha- Hakitlik Ha- mS lissa qaylAlik il+nAs illi
271640_267130gayyaB=
274210_271310%ah kull doI cirifiHum min &amrkA walla min ifN
278250_274200A %M fl SiwayaB= min &amrkA wi SiwayaB= min Hijat tanyAb=
wi &tAmir &farag yimkIn ylgI la huwwa HayHAwiU ylgI fi Tarfiq
li+&nAmr wi &xAlid ibn cammiti numkIn ylgI huwwa dliwaqti fi &mA$n
286540_278270iL+arD
281030_280720Tayyib
287450_287120%ah

<A bass law HayIgi HayIgi min &amrkA yacni HayIgi <English weekend
-- (laugh)
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away fa+cala$An kida ana mi$ SayfaB~ im ni HagaB~ kuwyissyaB~ bass
inti mumkin tuqcud di bIna wi inti wi Hayibqa il+nAs kullaha maca bacD yacni ana law Hagi Hagi baRD ha
=
(( ))
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429170_426410hana xalAS itkatAb kitAb calaSAAn tiBqi carfaB~ {laugh} A.*
430820_428820%ah mahu mamtik qaliti mabrUK B.*
432010_430500%ah aIla yihAnik filki A.*
[static] (qalitlii) qaliti ana kalImat ana bacd lamma manhu qAlit B.*
438000_431710qalt aHsan Hadd akallimnAa kAn cld mlAdikh A.*
433160_432630fi il A.*
440710_436600away %ah %ah kAn cld mlAdi %ah da mn A.*
439000_438800( )) B.*
441970_440260wi ini Gayyari tihilOnik smict B.*
444530_44060away candik nnmitri il(g)+giddaB~ m$s kida A.*
447350_444250(%E)) la bass Habqa akallimna axudha minha yacni [static] A.*
448610_446940Tayyib xudha xudha diilwaqti A.*
452180_448960mu$m nuhimn il+mukalmaB~ di bi+bulAS {laugh} A.*
453000_451870away {laugh} %ah B.*
456160_452460[laugh] fa% E sitiB~ wAHid sabacAB~ A.*
457440_456590sattAB~ wAHid sabacAB~ B.*
459830_458090tarnayAB~ sitiB~ arbacB~ A.*
461060_460080tarnayAB~ sitiB~ arbacB~ B.*
464750_461260tamanyAB~ wAHid zru [(drawn out)] arbacB~ A.*
469140_465620English six one eight six four eight one zero four> B.*
470860_474930Okke % di nimirlik il(g)+)giddaB~ ana kunt nawyB~ akallimnAa A.*
474080_446970 A.*
472890_472540away A.*
- la xalAS ma ma matitkalimIS bass %E yacni Hwh baqa tiHgizi ti tiHgizi il+taBkar wi tcmli kulf il+taBtAat [breath] qabli ma 486770_474000mAan tasAfir calaSAAn calaSAAn tiHAqi 487790_485970ma HaballaGha kull HagaB~ ( ( ) ) B.*
calaSAAn away calaSAAn % E in$acallAa lamma ti- %E lamma tlgi wi hyyAa 490490_487290misafraB~ iddha kull il+bayanAt kull il+maclumAt A.*
495870_495210%ah A.*
500730_496060A calaSAAn 137 ili ikBri candid yOm tsaBtAat yulu%y 503310_501130-- huswAa da illi iHna cayZin il+nAa tiS wal Sal fl A.*
504230_501400%ah ma ana- %M B.*
fa+law yacni xalAS law mafi- law matiqdarIS tlgi yOm tsaBtAat 512790_504060il+sama itBarbaqit calA il+arD Okke E Akin da -- A.*
HaysahhI lina HagAt kiAar giddan icCnn zayy ma baqulkil iHna HanwAl sabacAATar bi+Il+El macandASG Ger yOm tamaNArar yOm ciSrni nicmil fl il+taBtAat calAAn yOm tsaBtAat kullu min SabaHyyaAa(t) rabbina li+bil+Il+El HaniBqa rayHIn hayyAa in min 525990_513090ml+maTAr rAyHL Il 137 i
529980_526170wAHid yistAanAa wi il+Al Aan yurUH wi da yurUH wi il+Al yistAanAa la mahu mu$m wi inti mu$m mutaxayyilAa% macandimAS carabiyAat A.*
fa+HAnCgAar carabiyAaB~ yacni il+mawDUC kibAb bass %E fa+calaSAAn <kida Tammini ahlik wi fl sabacAat(t) alAa A*English guide book 544500 529450il+samsu li-il-li+il+tiAgAniB 537190_535970[distortion] {laugh} [distortion] B.*
ma ana HasCal fi HalAb(t) law gawyAaB~ bi+gadd baqa Haqqu maca 548900_543710mantik qacdaB~ m$s acraf minAa kull HagaB~ (breath) ma- ma- mAmi HagAt kiAar giddan maticraftAS calaSAAn tiBqi carfaB~ yacni calaSAAn hyyAa lamma bitUH bitUH ka+sAciHaB~ ma 555770_548400maclumIfHS -- ka+<English tourist> -- bitUH (( )) bitetE5 hunak fa+fi HAgAt kiAar giddan hyyAa --macandAAS fikraB~ canha inti Tabcan uqudu macAaAa wi kull HagaB 565610_555810akIn %E A.*
559330_555810%ah %ah B.*
--yacni wi mawDUC lAkin hyyAa macandAAS fikraB~ can HagAt tanyAa A.*
571580_565990yacni il+HagAt il+E-- %M %M B.*
-- il+siyaHyyAaB~ wi bibiyba il+tacAnu muluxtalit 137 ivi137i+suy- zayy A.*
Part 1: Languages
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End@
## Appendix (3)
### Arabic – English Transliteration Symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English Transliteration Symbol</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English Transliteration Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ا</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ض</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ط</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ت</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>ظ</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ث</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>غ</td>
<td>ē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>خ</td>
<td>ĝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>ق</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خ</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>د</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>د</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ل</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذ</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>م</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ر</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>ن</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>س</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ش</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>و</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ص</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>ي</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>ء</td>
<td>ء</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ا (الف المد)</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>ٍ</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ي (باء المد)</td>
<td>ī</td>
<td>ُ</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>و (و أو المد)</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ة</td>
<td>a, ah, āh, at, āt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix (4)

Conversation Transcription Conventions: The most important symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[     ]</td>
<td>Overlap onset and termination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>Fast, immediate continuation with a new turn or segment (latching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(     )</td>
<td>Unclear word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>Bracketing an utterance indicating speeding up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@</td>
<td>Laughter or laughter-like sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~</td>
<td>Fluctuation over one word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>Glottal stop / creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..</td>
<td>Pause of less than .5 of a second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>Pause of more than .5 of a second</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>