Søren Beck Nielsen
Faculty of Humanities, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Interactional integration of talk and note-taking

This paper contributes to the current line of research that examines how participants interactionally engage in simultaneous multiple courses of actions. It looks into how institutional interactants jointly integrate two concurrent engagements: talk and note-taking. It builds upon video recordings of naturally occurring monitoring visits in Denmark, where social supervision representatives interview foster parents and facility leaders and simultaneously take notes on their laptop computers. Data suggest that talk and note-taking concur very commonly, that is, representatives take notes extensively while the other party talks. The paper investigates three factors that advance our knowledge about interactional reasons why this dual engagement can take place so commonly. First, when initiating concurring writing or talk, both parties orient towards simultaneous engagement in the two activities as appropriate. Second, whilst writing, representatives verbally display reciprocity to talk, which prompts speakers to continue. Third, representatives frequently suspend the act of writing in order to briefly face the speakers, which they similarly treat as an encouragement to continue.

Key words: conversation analysis, multiactivity, institutional interaction

Research on multitasking in experimental psychology has long and comprehensive history of examining if individuals can engage in more than one motor and/or cognitive task at the time, and how such dual commitments affect their performance (e.g., Duncan, 1979; Meiran, 1996; Pashler, 1984; Rogers & Monsell, 1995). Some of the recent and very specific, yet fundamental, topics, which this line of research helps elucidate, include: the relationship between age multitasking ability (Wechsler et al. 2018), how well other populations, for example students, multitask (Bowman et al., 2010), or how multitasking performance correlates with predictability (i.e., implicit or explicit knowledge about what to do; Ewolds et al., 2017).

In the last decade, interactional research on *multiactivity* has offered an alternative to this experimental research (see Haddington, 2019; Haddington et al., 2014). This alternative consists of detailed analyses of naturally occurring video recordings of talk-in-interaction in which participants are engaged in two or more concurrent or serial courses of action. While research on multitasking (sometimes referred to as dual-task) typically adopts a "broader, individual and cognitive perspective on the phenomenon," research on multiactivity highlights the "social, interactional and temporal features of situations and conduct in which people organise multiple activities together" (Haddington et al., 2014, p. 5). Thus, multiactivity studies explain concurrent engagements not, for example, as an outcome of individual or cognitive capacities, but rather as the participants' systematic exploitation of interactional resources.

In reality, the two perspectives, cognition and interactional organisation, are two sides of the same coin as, for instance, theorized by scholars who explore *distributed language and cognition* (see e.g., Cowley, 2012; Jensen, 2014, 2018; Trasmundi 2020; Trasmundi & Steffensen, 2016). Without failing to recognize this complex duality, however, students of multiactivity focus almost exclusively on the interactional aspect. This focus not only advances our understanding of social situations, but also offers detailed insights about interactional processes and how actors can manage dual engagements because they methodically attune activities to one another or prioritize among them. For example, drivers may convergently talk about the route or the emerging elements of traffic with passengers while driving (Mondada, 2012). Conversely, actors may attend to a summon by putting a current activity on hold (e.g., Licoppe & Tuncer, 2014). It is, however, often more rewarding to regard dual engagements as distributed along continuums as opposed to either/or choices (Mondada, 2014).

Terminological transparency is crucial – without clear criteria, almost everything individuals do during waking hours could be construed as exhibiting multiple engagements. On the basis of actors' participation in interaction, Lorenza Mondada (2012, p. 226) defined multiactivity as "multiple simultaneous courses of action that can be variously related, have a specific sequential organization, and be coordinated." Two things in particular are worth noting from this definition. First, "courses of action" implies that multiactivity typically refers to *strings* of

coherent actions rather two concurrent or subsequent *singular* actions. Second, Mondada's use of modality emphasizes that courses of action can be related, organized, and coordinated to constitute multiactivity, but need not be. In other words, it depends upon whether or not participants themselves orient towards the courses of action as interrelated. Some multiactivity studies focus upon ways of administering two concurrent verbal interactions, for example, making phone calls during face-to-face interactions (Ticca, 2014). But, by far, most multiactivity studies elucidate how actors administer conversational participation in conjunction with some other embodied activity (that may include the use of material objects, tools, and technological devices), for instance, walking and talking (Mondada, 2017), conversing while doing manual labour (Keevallik, 2018), massaging and conversing (Nishizaka & Sunaga, 2015), eating and talking (Mondada, 2009), drinking coffee and closing down a conversation (Laurier, 2008), and talking while listening to music (Heinemann & Rauniomaa, 2016).

A series of studies have examined actors' dual commitment in verbal and textual courses of action. Some looked closely into situations where interactants read something while conversing (e.g., Beck Nielsen, 2016; Halldorsdottir, 2006; Ruusuvaori, 2001; Svinhufvud & Vehviläinen, 2013). Other studies focused more upon writing as an integral feature of talk (see Mondada & Svinhufvud, 2016). In particular, many studies examined how writing practices, with writers using different media (e.g., handwritten notes on paper, computer typing, voice dictation, etc.), are pivotal to institutional interaction and constitute goal-oriented action, for example, in judicial settings (González Martínez, 2006; Komter, 2006, 2012), educational situations (Hazel & Mortensen, 2014; Svinhufvud, 2016), political scenes (Mondada, 2016), business meetings (Streeck & Kallmeyer, 2001), medical contexts (Beck Nielsen, 2014; Greatbatch 2006), or related to social work (Monteiro, 2016).

The present study contributes to this line of inquiry with an examination of the integration of talk and writing in connection with a particular kind of social work in Denmark: monitoring visits. Monitoring visits are organized by social supervision centers. The main purpose of these centers is to ensure that citizens, in particular foster children and facility residents, are provided good social service in accordance with standards and legal regulations. The centers employ a large number of representatives to supervise and assess the work of foster parents and facilities for adolescents or impaired adults. Monitoring visits are meetings held between social supervision representatives and foster parents or leaders of facilities for adolescents or impaired adults. They take place in foster parents' homes or at the facilities for adolescents or impaired adults. During the meetings, participants cover a wide range of topics that help representatives supervise foster parents and facility leaders and assess their work. Much of this talk is question-answer driven, similar to an interview, that is, representatives inquire about various matters (e.g., regarding initiatives to ensure the well-being of foster children or residents), which foster parents or facility leaders respond

to. Representatives bring laptop computers for the meetings and use them quite extensively during the visits to take notes (see Table 1). Later, they incorporate the notes in a report draft, which they submit to hearing to the foster parents or facility leaders in question. Following this hearing, representatives complete and publish their reports, which entail an important assessment, since the social supervision center has the authority to renew or reject the license of foster parents and facilities alike.

The actual writing is manifested as computer typing. Typically, representatives do not share what they write on their computers. But the fact that they write is observable (i.e., visible and audible) to co-participants (see also Komter, 2006). Thus, the current study's research question was: how are the two courses of actions (i.e., talk and writing) integrated? Previous research on computer typing during institutional face-to-face interaction has offered some accounts. For example, Greatbatch (2006) showed that when general practitioners type prescriptions, patients may observe the typing and await completion before talking. Postponement of talk, then, represents one way of integrating talk-in-interaction and computer typing in institutional interaction. But whereas doctors fill out prescription forms briefly and at quite projectable points in time during consultations, representatives use their computers extensively throughout the lengthy monitoring visits. This difference might call for other kinds of interactional cooperation to administer dual attention, that is, show each other that both courses of action are possible to attend to at the same time. To examine if this is the case, the present study examined three scenarios: (a) how writing sequences are initiated in concurrence with talk-in-interaction, (b) how representatives display listening while they take notes and, thus, possibly encourage continuation of talk; and (c) how representatives display listening between note-taking by very briefly suspending the act of writing in favour of visual engagement with the other participant.

Data and Method

The current study was conducted in collaboration with one social supervision center in Denmark. Five visits, which took place in a rural district, were video recorded by the author with the written consent of all participants. First, the study was agreed upon by the representatives. Second, the representatives informed the foster parents and the facility leaders and asked beforehand for their permission to have the meeting recorded. Third, on the actual day of the meeting, all participants were asked for permission to video record the meeting. Everyone consented. After the meeting, all participants were offered to have the recording deleted, which everyone declined. In one of five monitoring visits, the representative experienced computer problems and therefore opted to take handwritten notes. This recording was discarded from the current study because it proved difficult to determine

when exactly writing sequences were initiated and terminated.

Thus, four recordings were examined. All four representatives were female. Two of the recordings (i.e., Recordings 1 and 3 in Table 1) represented monitoring visits at two different facilities: Recording 1 took place at a residence for vulnerable adolescents; Recording 3 took place at a facility for impaired adults. The two remaining recordings represented monitoring visits in private homes of two different foster parents. In Recording 2, both foster parents were present throughout the monitoring visit; in Recording 4, the foster father joined the foster mother and the representative approximately half an hour into the meeting.

The recordings were conducted using a single stationary camera that provided no access to what the representatives wrote on their computers. This limited the amount of data gathered (which could have allowed for examining the possible correlation between representatives' conversational contributions, bodily actions, and what they currently write). On the other hand, since the representatives clearly chose to place their computers on a table between themselves and their co-participants and never turn their computers to invite foster parents or facility leaders to read along, this research design emically afforded the same kind of access that foster parents and facility leaders are given, and thereby allowed for examining their responsive actions without *a priori* assumptions.

Similar to studies on multiactivity, the current study used the conversation analytic method to examine the participants' jointly coordinated verbal and bodily actions, the ways in which they exploit conversational structures (e.g., turn-taking systematics), and the intersubjective understandings that they convey through their contributions to the interaction (see e.g., Clift, 2016; Sidnell, 2010). Among other things, this required detailed transcripts that captured not only what the participants said and did, but also when and how they did it (see the Appendix for an index of notation symbols, or Jefferson, 2004, for a detailed account). English translations are placed in italics below the original Danish transcriptions. Furthermore, the sound of computer typing is notated as **+++** aligned with concurrent talk (or silence).

Results

Initiating Talk and Typing as Concurrent Courses of Actions

Table 1 provides an overview of the writing activity in the four recordings. It shows how many times representatives engaged in writing sequences defined as lasting simply from the moment they begin to write to the moment they halt, regardless of the length of the pause.

Thus, the representatives spent an average 17 % of the time taking notes on their computers, which regularly concurred with the foster parents' and facility leaders' talk. The following analyses detail how the participants, through their

Table 1. Overall distribution of writing activity.					
	Duration in minutes	Number of writing sequences	Average duration of writing sequence in seconds	Time spent writing in minutes	Percentage of time spent writing
Recording 1	89.10	65	13.4	14.58	16%
Recording 2	119.53	149	8.1	20.23	17%
Recording 3	66.05	184	5.1	16	24%
Recording 4	107.18	41	15.3	10.51	10%
Total	381.86	439	---	61.32	---
Averages	95.5	110	10.5	15.3	17%

actions and orientations, show one another that concurrent talk-in-interaction participation and note-taking are not considered mutually exclusive commitments. This orientation manifests itself clearly in two ways that both relate to the fact that monitoring visits predominately unfold as question-answer driven interactions.

First, instead of awaiting possible completion, the representatives begin to take notes while facility leaders or foster parents answer their questions. Put more technically, the representatives commence writing sequences in coincidence with either the onset or a midturn position of the foster parents' or facility leaders' turns-at-talk. An even stronger orientation towards the feasibility of listening and typing at the same time, and also towards note-taking as an expected event occasioned by the forthcoming answer to a current question in progress, may be observed when the representatives prepare to commence writing while they pose the question, for example, by gazing at the computer screen, placing their hands upon the keyboard, or even pressing keys in preparation. Such cases are stronger orientations because the representatives show the foster parents and facility leaders up front that a possible writing is in progress. In Excerpt 1, a representative (REP) asks a foster mother (FOM) how the foster parents handle the practical and emotionally difficult cooperation with the child's biological parents. It is worth noting that as REP initiates this question, she has both of her hands folded in front of her, that is, she is placed in a firm listening position that indicates no sign of transition of attention towards the computer (cf. Schegloff, 1998). This changes, however, merely a few seconds later in Line 02:

(1). Rec. 2: 23:36-23:44

01. REP: Jeg tænker hvor er I henne (.) i det nu, #
I'm thinking where are you (.) in this now,

#Pic. 1

(.2)

02. REP: i *forældresam*arbejdet,*
in the parent cooperation,
 *+ / + / + / + *

*REP gazes at computer screen; places right hand on keyboard

03. FOM: ø*::hm *altså nu er #vi jo i v- v- øh nu er samværet jo*
Erhm well now we are in v- v- erh now the contact takes place
 +++++
 #Pic. 2
 *REP tucks her hair behind her ear with left hand and places
 it on keyboard
04. *i familie*huset,*
in the family house,
 ++++
 *REP faces FOM; maintains hands on keyboard
 *REP gazes at computer

It is also worth noting that REP uses a WH-question format that is likely to solicit an elaborate answer, which FOP's initial clausal response also orients

towards (see Fox & Thompson, 2010), as does her subsequent lengthy account (not in transcript). In the light of an expectable imminent multi-unit turn-at-talk from FOM, it is interesting to observe that REP adds an incremental prepositional phrase to her question in Line 02 whilst bodily preparing a full-scale writing sequence by gazing at the computer screen, placing her right hand on the keyboard, and pressing a key a couple of times. In other words, verbally and bodily, REP enacts a transition between, on the one hand, a situation in which she engages solely with the foster parents and, on the other hand, a reconfigured situation in which she concurrently listens and writes. In Line 03, REP effects this reconfiguration when she invokes her left hand as well and types consistently. She types although FOP is nowhere near having answered the question exhaustively, thus, demonstrably enacting that it is not a matter of listening first and writing later, but rather of doing both in unison. In Line 04, however, she does briefly suspend the writing to face the foster mother and, thus, bodily displays listening. This practice will be examined in greater detail below.

Second, foster parents and facility leaders also commonly treat unsolicited talk, while representatives are occupied taking notes, as relevant to produce. This is manifested when they, on their own initiative, take the floor in situations where

representatives begin to write in silence. Sequentially, this scenario may occur when a representative begins to write upon the completed answer to an inquiry. In Excerpt 2, a REP interviews the leader of a facility (LEF) about the institutional structure, specifically whom LEF can ask for assistance. LEF explains that there are three assisting offices, which REP here formulates as three different lines. She thereupon turns towards the computer. This turn is accomplished in silence. To enable a detailed examination, each dot in Line 05 below represents the tenth of a second:

(2). Rec. 3: 7:49-8:01

01. REP: Så der er (.4) tre #3 forskellige linjer,=
So there are three different lines,=
02. LEF: =J|a.
=Yes.
03. REP: |opad,
upwards,
04. LEF: Ja.
Yes.
05. I.*....I.....I.....*I.....I..* (=2.2)
 ++++++
 *REP gazes at computer screen; nods; moves both hands
 to keyboard
06. LEF: *.h Og #4 d- de har valgt at lave den (.) kan man sige*
And t- they have opted to make that call it
 ++++++
07. *specialiserer (...)*
**Specialization*
 ++++++

Following LEF's confirmation in Line 04, REP defers from further inquiry to pursue writing instead. This is an orientation towards a different kind of structure than the one in Excerpt 1, that is, where representatives note answers after they have been exhaustively delivered. The orientation is enhanced by the fact that she nods as she gazes at the screen before she actually types. The silent writing, though, turns out to last for merely 0.7 seconds or so, because LEF, in Line 06,

initiates a lengthy explanation. In doing this, LEF treats REP's act of writing as an occasion to relevantly take the floor and convey an explanation that elaborates her prior answer, which possibly provides the representative more details to add to her notes.

This section's examples have illustrated two recurrent ways in which talk and typing are oriented to as concurrent courses of action, thus, treating the dual commitments as interactionally achievable. In particular, the representatives convey that they are capable of writing whilst listening when they overtly prepare to take notes as the foster parents or facility leaders are about to produce answers to inquiries. Conversely, the foster parents and facility leaders convey confidence that the representatives can receive their talk when they, for example, provide unsolicited explanations while the representatives write in silence. To paraphrase Ruusuvuori (2001), typing does not necessarily mean not listening. Nonetheless, the representatives actively display listening. The next section looks at how co-participants respond to one of the ways in which they do this. With this focus, the analysis moves from onsets of concurrent talk and note-taking in the direction of ongoing reconfigurations that maintain the mutual relevance of the dual activities.

Display of Listening while Taking Notes

Representatives quite commonly use resources such as minimal tokens, nods, and facial expressions to assure foster parents and facility leaders that they appreciate their talk whilst taking notes. These resources may be used in conjunction with each other forming gestalts, that is, organized and perceived wholes. This section, however, concentrates mainly on some uses of minimal expressions that express reciprocity and demonstrably affect foster parents' or facility leaders' talk.

Minimal tokens are notoriously flexible in terms of semantics. A token is, to a large extent, ascribed meaning based upon its sequential placement and prosodic features (see Gardner, 2001, p. 22). That said, previous research has established that particular tokens tend to be used for particular purposes, for example, to convey the recipient's cognitive change of state (Heinemann, 2017), encourage continuation (Schegloff, 1982), or acknowledge reception (Gardner, 2001). The following example may serve as an illustration of how minimal tokens are produced to administer expeditious changes, which dual participation in interaction and writing often involves. A REP invokes the token "ja" ("yes") to encourage a LEF to complete her turn at talk. Prior to the excerpt, she has asked LEF if she is personally enrolled in a supervision program, which the social supervision center strongly recommends. LEF is not. However, she explains that a particular co-worker provides her good counselling. Line 01 in Excerpt 3 is the main consequent clause of a conditional sentence that outlines what happens when the leader approaches this co-worker for advice. REP's hands are placed on the computer's keyboard at the onset of Line 01, yet it is not until mid-turn that

REP actually begins to type:

(3). Rec. 3: 47:34-47:44

01. LEF: .h [Så=så ved *jeg at hun vil (.) sige (.7) *>ved du hvad,<*
- Then then I know she'll say you know what,*
- *****
- *REP gazes at computer screen
02. REP: [Men den-
- But it-*
03. REP: *Ja.*#5
- Yes.*
- *****
04. LEF: *Det †det=det bliver vi nødt til at bliver vi nødt til lige *
- This this=this we'll have to we'll have to*
- *****
05. *at lave en aftale om.*=
- make an appointment about.*
- *****

In Line 02, REP initiates a turn at talk in overlap with LEF, but quickly cuts-off and yields the floor to the leader (see Schegloff, 2000). Immediately after the cut-off, REP gazes down at her computer. Seconds later she begins to write. Thus, this writing sequence is implemented as an alternative to a verbal contribution, which REP abandons, exploiting the projected status as a listener instead of a

speaker as an opportunity to begin taking notes. Thus, in this light, REP's "yes" token in Line 03 produced in conjunction with note-taking both displays listening whilst typing and ratifies that LEF has the floor.

Taking an even closer look at the positioning of REP's "yes" in Line 03, we may notice that it follows the initial element in the leader's direct reported speech, that is, the preliminary "you know what" clause, whereupon LEF pauses. In other words, LEF treats REP's display of reciprocity as a precondition to complete

the turn at talk. This observation is in line with previous findings that speakers may express hesitance to complete their talk without the ratification attributed to participants' mutual gaze (see Goodwin, 1979, 1980; Ruusuvuori, 2001). By uttering "yes," REP accommodates. In sum, Excerpt 3 offers a detailed illustration of how minimal tokens may be used to establish joint attention towards the talk even though representatives gaze at their computers to take notes at the same time.

Excerpt 4 shows how a facility leader similarly treats a representative's "mm hm" token, produced while typing, as an encouragement to produce further talk. But whereas a minimal token in Excerpt 3 was solicited in order to receive encouragement to complete a turn at talk, Excerpt 4 shows how a facility leader awaits a display of reciprocity in order to elaborate with a turn at talk that answers more than the initial question. At this point in the meeting, the parties discuss a master study program, which the leader is currently enrolled in. He has, prior to the example, explained that his study is organized in calls. Here, the representative asks for how long these calls last:

(4). Rec. 1: 3:02-3:15

01. REP: Så ø:h .h *og når nu der er ind*kaldt=hvor
So erh and when there are calls how
**REP gazes at computer screen*
02. *lange er indkaldelser?
long are calls?
**REP faces LEF*
03. (.4)
04. REP: °Alt[så-°
You see-
05. LEF: [Det er #6fredag og lør*dag.
It's Friday and Saturday.
**REP places hands on keyboard;*
gazes at computer screen
06. REP: *Det er fredag=↑lørdag okay.*
It's Friday Saturday okay.
 +++++
07. *(3.0)*
 ++++
08. REP: *°Mm ↑hm, °*
 ++++
09. LEF: *Og <så er det #7 indkredset i:∴: øh> (1.8)
And then it is organized in erh
 +++++
**REP faces LEF;*
maintains hands on keyboard
10. tror det er seksten moduler,
think it's sixteen modules,

REP bodily prepares to type as LEF is about to complete his answer (Line 05), and REP begins to type in Line 06 in coincidence with a repetition and acknowledgement of that answer. After a three-second-long period in which REP types in silence, she quietly utters a freestanding "mm hm" whilst still typing. LEF observes REP during this stretch of silent typing. He begins his turn-at-talk in Line 09 in the very slipstream of the minimal token and produces an elaboration that adds additional and unsolicited information about his study

program. This interactional move reflects Stivers and Heritage's (2001) finding that during the history-taking phases of consultations, patients may sometimes expand their answers with more information than the question solicited. But in contrast to Stivers and Heritage's examples, LEF acted as if awaiting REP's signal (i.e., "mm hm") to proceed with an expansion.

As mentioned, one of the main characteristics of minimal tokens is their low degree of semantic content. This feature manifests itself here where it is impossible for the analysts and participants (i.e., LEF) alike to determine what exactly REP's "mm hm" expression orients towards. Is it, for example, produced socially to convey that LEF is welcome to resume his talk? Or is it produced more privately, that is, as a sort of self-talk, possibly to express having completed the notation of LEF's previous answer? Or could it be a combination of the two? A recent multiactivity study from a very different setting involving mucking out a sheep stable suggests that volume, gaze direction, and body posture may determine how co-participants understand minimal comments as either social or self-talk (Keevallik, 2018). But in this case, where REP remains seated, keeps her

03. REP: [Mm.]
04. LEF: *den er #8 kendt. .h Altså- (.2)* vi skal ikke #9 selv
it is well known. ((PRT)) (.2) we don't have
 +++++
 *REP faces LEF;
 maintains hands on keyboard
05. ud og la*ve *vores mission for den er jo *forud#10bestemt.*
to go out and define our mission cause it is agreed upon.
 +++++
 *REP gazes at computer screen. *REP nods

Unlike the use of minimal tokens, which the previous section analyzed, and REP's nod in Line 05 aside, a noteworthy difference is that the display of listening is conveyed not during but between the acts of writing. That is, in Lines 04-05, REP briefly suspends the act of writing to face the facility leader.

REP begins to take notes on her computer as LEF, currently in a mid-turn position, produces what turns out to be a lengthy explanation, that is, a multi-unit turn at talk. Specifically, the actual typing is prepared with a quick glance at the computer screen (see Beck Nielsen, 2019) alongside a subordinate clause

produced by LEF and instantiated in conjunction with the following main clause. LEF maintains gaze on REP throughout this and conveys no verbal or bodily sign of being troubled by the fact that REP directs her gaze at computer screen whilst LEF is in the midst of a turn at talk (in contrast to Ruusuvuori's, 2001, findings). However, in Line 04, LEF reaches a possible completion point and self-selects to continue (cf. Sacks et al., 1974). She does so with a turn-initial "altså" - a particle that is known to justify a departure from progressivity, for example by projecting relevant corrections or expansions (see Heinemann & Steensig, 2018). Here, this turn-initial particle could perhaps project that LEF's forthcoming and somewhat repetitive assertion that the facility's mission is well-established and familiar might be construed as a departure from progressivity in the service of being very accurate. But a closer look shows a more immediate interactional function, still oriented towards a departure from progressivity of sorts.

LEF cuts off "altså" with a glottal stop followed by a brief pause. That is, LEF suspends her explanation. This suspension, in turn, prompts REP to suspend her writing and briefly face LEF. Interactionally, glottal stops are known for their turn-holding functions (e.g., Ogden 2001). In this particular case, LEF indeed holds the turn, exactly until she has ensured the visual attention of REP

(similar to dynamics originally elucidated by Goodwin, 1979, 1980, 1981). This mutual gaze and suspension of writing is short but consequential - as many other studies have revealed that momentary mutual gaze may be (e.g., Rossano, 2012; Streeck, 2014). Its momentariness is enacted by REP maintaining her hands on the keyboard, quite similar to the instability displayed when actors working on computers torque their torso to momentarily engage with other participants (Schegloff, 1998). This momentariness is also confirmed as REP briefly gazes back at the computer screen and begins to write. But at this point, LEF is well into the continuation of what is now a multi-unit turn – made relevant by REP's brief writing suspension in favor of engagement.

This section has demonstrated the seemingly counterintuitive observation that a way to ensure the integration of talk and note-taking is to have the note-taking suspended for a brief period of time in favor of mutual gaze. This a reminder that gaze direction is an accountable matter that interlocutors take as a sign of orientation, which the sociologist Georg Simmel described eloquently: "the eye cannot take unless at the same time it gives" (1924, p. 358).

Concluding Remarks

Rather than treating the dual administration of participation in talk in interaction and note-taking as a question of cognitive capacity, the current study has looked into some ways in which participants engaged in institutional monitoring visits integrate the two courses of action interactionally. The representatives spend an overall average of 17% of the time taking notes on their computers during the meetings. A closer conversation analytic examination of the data revealed that the two courses of action regularly coincide because both parties orient towards them as mutually possible. This stands in contrast to, for instance, David Greatbatch's (2006) finding about general practitioners' use of computers to write prescriptions during consultation. He noted that patients "usually minimize the likelihood that they will disrupt the doctors' computer-based activities by delaying their questions until potential junctures in the doctor's use of the computer" (2006, p. 330). Conversely, Excerpt 2 showed that speakers recurrently make simultaneous talk relevant by taking the floor in situations where representatives begin to write in silence, for example, to elaborate a prior comment or response. Similarly, Excerpt 1 showed that writers convey that it is equally possible and appropriate for them to take notes while they listen to talk when they commence writing sequences in coincidence with either the onset or a midturn position of foster parents' or facility leaders' answers to their inquiries.

However, integration of talk and note-taking is more than a matter of coordinated onsets. It may require continuous reconfiguration. The current study found that some reconfigurations take place while representatives write using minimal tokens, among other verbal and bodily resources. Excerpts 3 and 4

illustrated that representatives convey listening by the means of such minimal tokens and that the speakers are especially prone to treat the representatives' minimal tokens as continuers when produced while the representatives write, as opposed to, for instance, acknowledgement tokens or self-talk. The current study also found that other reconfigurations take place between the act of writing, in the sense that the representatives frequently display attentiveness to the co-participants' talk by briefly suspending the note-taking to face the speakers. Excerpt 5 illustrated the participants' joint orientation towards the use of this embodied way of displaying attention and, thereby, reconfiguring the interaction into a situation where the dual activities talk and note-taking may relevantly concur because the speaker is ensured that the writer still pays attention to the talk.

Appendix: Transcription Symbols

[	<i>The beginning of overlapping speech</i>
]	<i>The end of overlapping speech</i>
(.)	<i>A pause under 0.2 seconds</i>
(0.5)	<i>A pause measured in seconds</i>
=	<i>Uttered with no pause at all</i>
:	<i>Prolonged sound</i>
word	<i>Emphatic</i>
WORD	<i>Increased volume</i>
°word°	<i>Soft spoken</i>
<word>	<i>Slow speech</i>
>word<	<i>Fast speech</i>
.h	<i>In-breath</i>
wo(h)rd	<i>Laughing voice</i>
heh heh	<i>laughter</i>
wor-	<i>A cut-off, i.e. a sudden speech stop</i>
XX	<i>Unintelligible</i>
*	<i>Notation of embodied conduct that coincides with speech</i>
#	<i>Alignment with a screen shot</i>
↑word	<i>Rising intonation</i>
↓word	<i>Falling intonation</i>
turn-unit.	<i>Falling prosody</i>
turn-unit?	<i>Rising prosody</i>
*+ + + *	<i>Computer typing</i>
I.....I	<i>A stretch of silence. Each dot represents the tenth of a second</i>

Acknowledgments

The author is highly grateful for the two anonymous reviewers' constructive criticism as well as for the assistance and support of the editorial team.

Conflict of Interest Disclosure

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Funding

The research was conducted without external funding.

Research Ethics Statement

The research was conducted in accordance with appropriate ethical standards, please see specifics in the Data and Method section.

References

- Beck Nielsen, S. (2014). Medical record keeping as an interactional accomplishment. *Pragmatics and Society*, 5(2), 221–242. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.5.2.03nie>.
- Beck Nielsen, S. (2016). How doctors manage consulting computer records while interacting with patients. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 49(1), 58–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2016.1126451>
- Beck Nielsen, S. (2019). Making a glance an action: Doctors' quick looks at their desktop computer screens. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 142, 62–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.12.021>
- Bowman, L. L., Levine, L. E., Waite, B. M., & Gendron, M. (2010). Can students really multitask? An experimental study of instant messaging while reading. *Computers & Education*, 54(4), 927–931. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2009.09.024>
- Clift, R. (2016). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics.
- Cowley, S. (2012). Mimesis and language: A distributed view. *Interaction Studies*, 13(1), 17–40. <https://doi.org/10.1075/is.13.1.02cow>
- Duncan, J. (1979). Divided attention: The whole is more than the sum of its parts. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 5(2), 216–228. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.5.2.216>
- Ewolds, H., Broeker, L., de Oliveira, R. F., Raab, M., & Künzell, S. (2021). Ways to improve multitasking: Effects of predictability after single- and dual-task training. *Journal of Cognition*, 4(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.5334/joc.142>
- Fox, B. A. & Thompson, S. A. (2010). Responses to wh-questions in English conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43(2), 133–156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351811003751680>
- Gardner, R. (2001). *When listeners talk. Response tokens and listener stance*. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.92>
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Behavior in public places. Notes on the social organization of gatherings*. The Free Press.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual. Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Pantheon Books.
- González Martínez, E. (2006). The interweaving of talk and text in a French criminal pretrial hearing. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 39(3), 229–261. https://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi3903_3
- Goodwin, C. (1979). The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 97–121.). Irvington Publishers.
- Goodwin, C. (1980). Restarts, pauses, and the achievement of mutual gaze at turn-beginning. *Sociological Inquiry*, 50(3-4), 272–302.
- Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. Academic Press.
- Greatbatch, D. (2006). Prescriptions and prescribing: Co-ordinating talk and

- text-based activities. In J. Heritage & D. W. Maynard (Eds.), *Communication in medical care: Interaction between primary care physicians and patients* (pp. 313–339). Cambridge University Press.
- Haddington, P. (2019). Leave-taking as multiactivity: Coordinating conversational closings with driving in cars. *Language & Communication*, 65, 58–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2018.04.003>
- Haddington, P., Keisanen, T., Mondada, L., & Nevile, M. (Eds.). (2014). Multiactivity in social interaction: beyond multitasking. John Benjamins.
- Halldorsdottir, I. (2006). Orientations to law, guidelines, and codes in lawyer–client interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 39(3), 263–301. https://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi3903_4
- Hazel, P. & Mortensen, K. (2014). Embodying the institution – Object manipulation in developing interaction in study counselling meetings. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 65, 10–29. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.11.016>
- Heinemann, T. (2017). Receipting answers that are counter to expectations: The polar question-answer-na sequence in Danish. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 50(3), 249–267. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08351813>
- Heinemann, T., & Steensig, J. (2018). Justifying departures from progressivity: The Danish turn-initial particle 'altså'. In J. Heritage & M. L. Sorjonen (Eds.), In between turn and sequence: Turn-initial particles across languages (pp. 445–476). John Benjamins <https://doi.org/10.1075/slsi.31.15hei.2017.1340705>
- Heinemann, T., & Rauniomaa, M. (2016). Turning down sound to turn to talk: Muting and muffling auditory objects as a resource for displaying involvement. *Gesprächsforschung - Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion*, 17, 1–28. <https://www.gespraechsforschung-online.de/fileadmin/dateien/heft2016/ga-heinemann.pdf>
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis. Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125.02jef>
- Jensen, T. W. (2014). Emotion in languaging: Languaging as affective, adaptive, and flexible behavior in social interaction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5:720. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00720>
- Jensen, T. W. (2018). Humor as interactional affordances: An ecological perspective on humor in social interaction. *Psychology of Language and Communication*, 22, 238–259. <https://doi.org/10.2478/plc-2018-0010>
- Keevallik, L. (2018). Sequence initiation or self-talk? Commenting on the surroundings while mucking out a sheep stable. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 51(3), 313–328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2018.1485233>
- Kiesel, A., Steinhauser, M., Wendt, M., Falkenstein, M., Jost, K., Philipp, A. M., & Koch, I. (2010). Control and interference in task switching—A review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(5), 849–874. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019842>
- Komter, M.L. (2006). From talk to text: The interactional construction of a police record. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 39(3), 201–228.

- https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi3903_2
- Komter, M. L. (2012). The career of a suspect's statement: Talk, text, context. *Discourse Studies*, 14(6), 731–752. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445612457486>
- Laurier, E. (2008). Drinking up endings: Conversational resources of the café. *Language & Communication*, 28(2), 165–181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2008.01.011>
- Licoppe, C. & Tuncer, S. (2014). Attending to a summons and putting other activities 'on hold'. In P. Haddington, T. Keisanen, L. Mondada, & M. Nevile (Eds.), *Multiactivity in social interaction: Beyond multitasking* (pp. 167–190). John Benjamins.
- Meiran, N. (1996). Reconfiguration of processing mode prior to task performance. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 22(6), 1423–1442. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.22.6.1423>
- Mondada, L. (2009). The methodical organization of talking and eating: Assessments in dinner conversations. *Food Quality and Preference*, 20(8), 558–571. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2009.03.006>
- Mondada, L. (2012). Talking and driving. *Multiactivity in the car. Semiotica*, 191(1/4), 223–256. <https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2012-0062>
- Mondada, L. (2014). The temporal orders of multiactivity: Operating and demonstrating in the surgical theatre. In P. Haddington, T. Keisanen, L. Mondada & M. Nevile (Eds.), *Multiactivity in social interaction: Beyond multitasking* (pp. 33–76). John Benjamins.
- Mondada, L. (2016). Going to write. Embodied trajectories of writing of collective proposals in grassroots democracy meetings. *Language and Dialogue*, 6(1), 140–178. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ld.6.1.05mon>
- Mondada, L. (2017). Walking and talking together: Questions/answers and mobile participation in guided visits. *Social Science Information*, 56(2), 220–253. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0539018417694777>
- Mondada, M., & Svinhufvud, K. (2016). Writing-in-interaction. Studying writing as a multimodal phenomenon in social interaction. *Language and Dialogue*, 6(1), 1–53. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ld.6.1.01mon>
- Monteiro, D. (2016). Street-level bureaucracy revisited. Formulating address in social work service encounters. *Language and Dialogue*, 6(1), 54–80. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ld.6.1.02mon>
- Nishizaka, A., & Sunaga, M. (2015). Conversing while massaging: Multidimensional asymmetries of multiple activities in interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 48(2), 200–229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2015.1025506>
- Ogden, R. (2001). Turn transition, creak and glottal stop in Finnish talk-in-interaction. *Journal of the International Phonetics Association*, 31, 139–152. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025100301001116>
- Pashler, H. (1984). Processing stages in overlapping tasks: Evidence for a central

- bottleneck. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 10(3), 358–377. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.10.3.358>
- Rossano, F. (2012). Gaze in conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 308–329). Wiley Blackwell.
- Rogers, R. D. & Monsell, S. (1995). Costs of a predictable switch between simple cognitive tasks. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 124(2), 207–231. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.124.2.207>
- Ruusuvuori, J. (2001). Looking means listening: Coordinating displays of engagement in doctor-patient interaction. *Social Science and Medicine*, 52(7), 1093–1108. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(00\)00227-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(00)00227-6)
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 969–735. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412243>
- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. Wiley Blackwell
- Simmel, G. (1924). Sociology of the senses: Visual interaction. In R. E. Park, & E. W. Burges (Eds.), *Introduction to the science of sociology* (pp. 356–361). University of Chicago Press
- Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk* (pp. 71–93). Georgetown University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1998). Body torque. *Social Research*, 65(3), 535–596.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2000). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language in Society*, 29(1), 1–63.
- Stivers, T. & Heritage, J. (2001). Breaking the sequential mold: Answering 'more than the question' during comprehensive history taking. *Text & Talk*, 21(1-2), 151–185
- Streeck, J. (2014). Mutual gaze and recognition: Revisiting Kendon's 'Gaze direction in two-person conversation'. In M. Seyfeddinipur & M. Gullberg (Eds.), *From gesture in conversation to visible action as utterance: Essays in honor of Adam Kendon* (pp. 35–56). John Benjamins.
- Streeck, J., & Kallmeyer, W. (2001). Interaction by inscription. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(4), 465–490. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(99\)00126-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00126-5)
- Svinhufvud, K. (2016). Nodding and note-taking. Multimodal analysis of writing and nodding in student counseling interaction. *Language and Dialogue*, 6(1), 81–109. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ld.6.1.03svi>
- Svinhufvud, K., & Vehviläinen, S. (2013). Papers, documents, and the opening of an academic supervision encounter. *Text & Talk*, 33(1), 139–166. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2013-0007>
- Ticca, A. C. (2014). Managing multiactivity in a travel agency: Making phone calls while interacting with costumers. In P. Haddington, T. Keisanen, L. Mondada, & M. Neville (Eds.), *Multiactivity in social interaction: Beyond multitasking* (pp. 191–223). John Benjamins.
- Trasmundi, S. B. (2020). *Errors and interaction: A cognitive ethnography of emergency medicine*. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.309>

- Trasmundi, S. B., & Steffensen, S. V. (2016). Meaning emergence in the ecology of dialogical systems. *Psychology of Language and Communication*, 20(2), 154-181. <https://doi.org/10.1515/plc-2016-0009>
- Wechsler, K., Drescher, U., Janouch, C., Haeger, M., Voelcker-Rehage, C. & Bock, O. (2018). Multitasking during simulated car driving: A comparison of young and older persons. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9:910. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00910>