

Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction

Gail Jefferson

Although I'd probably rather transcribe than any do any other part of the work (analyzing, theorizing, lecturing, teaching, etc.), the one thing I'd rather *not* do is talk about transcribing. It's not a topic. You might as well talk about typewriting. Transcribing is just something one does to prepare materials for analysis, theorizing, etc. Do the best you can, but what is there to talk about?

On the other hand, there might be something to talk about if we compare a 1964 transcript by Harvey Sacks,

(1) [Sacks GTS trans:1964]

A. I started work at a buck thirty an hour and he said if I work a month you get a buck thirty five an hour and every month there be a raise-

T. Howd you get the job?

A. I just went down there and asked him for it.

T. Last week you were mentioning something about the fact that you-

A. I got lost in one job, yeah.

T. Got lost in it, and your father-

C. He know your father? Yeah.

[A. Sure he knows my father, but my father's got nothing to do with it.

[C. Ok he gave you the job.

A. No, he's got nothing to do with it. Huh uh, My father's not buying beer anymore

with a transcript that I did in 1985.

(2) [GTS:I:2:3:R:1-5:3-4]

Ken: I started workin etta buck thirty en hour
(0.4)Ken: en'e sid that if I work fer a month: yih getta buck,h ·h thi[rty ↓fi:ve=
(Dan): [((sniff))Ken: ='n hour en (·) ev'ry month he uh () he rai[ses you]°()°Dan: [How'dju]g e t th]e jo:b,
(1.0)Ken: ↑Ijs wen' down there'n ↓a:st eem for it
(1.8)Dan: °Cz° la:st week you were mentioning something about th' fa:ct °thet you
↓u[h°Ken: [I got ul ʊ -got (·) lost in one jub=↓Yea:h.
(0.5)(i t bo:th[ered)]Dan: Got lo:st innit ↓e[r (y'r fa:th[e r)]°()°

Ken: [w h h h h [h h h h]h h

Al: [Dz 'ee] know yer father?
(0.2)Al: ↓Yah.
(0.6)Ken: Sure 'ee knows my father [b't my fa t h e r's g't] nothina] do with it.Al: [() they gave you] th' jo:b,]
(0.7)Ken: No: he's got nothin d'do w'th it. Huh-uh, my fa(h)ather's not buyin beer
innymo:re

Fragment (1) is concise, and readable; fragment (2) is a nightmare.

Or, for example, we could look at a recently produced, succinct and readable transcript from Stanley I. Kutler's *Abuse of Power* (1997:253),¹

(3) [AbPow:253]

((re the "seamy things" Hunt says he did for the White House Plumbers))

DEAN: I don't know the full extent of it,

PRESIDENT NIXON: I don't know about anything else.

→ DEAN: I don't know either, and I [*laughs*] almost hate to learn some of these things.and ask why I feel compelled to produce something like this:²

(4) [Jeff:Canc:40:10-20]

Dean: I ↑don't kno:w thè (·) full extent ↓'v it.↓
(0.7)

Dean: °↓Uh:::eh°
(0.9)

Nixon: °I don'noo° 'bout anything else exc^{hh}e[pt

Dean: → [I don't either in I: °w'd (h)als(h)o

→ hhate tuh learn [some a'] these thi]ngs. ·hh·hh·hh·hh

Nixon: [W e l l] y a : h]

(0.2)

Dean: So ↑That's, hhhh that's that situation.

Why put all that stuff in? Well, as they say, because it's there. Of course there's a whole lot of stuff "there," i.e., in the tapes, and it doesn't all show up in my transcripts; so it's because it's there, plus I think it's interesting. Things like overlap, laughter, and 'pronunciational particulars,' (what others call 'comic book' and/or stereotyped renderings), for example. My transcripts pay a lot of attention to those sorts of features.

What good are they? I suppose that could be argued in principle, but it seems to me that one cannot know what one will find until one finds it, so what I'll do is show some places where attention to such features turned out to be fruitful.

First of all, we can compare bits of fragments (1) and (2), and then do the same with fragments (3) and (4).

Starting off with fragments (1) and (2), I'll focus on the most irritating segment of the latter, and see what might be gotten from it. Recalling three lines from fragment (1):

A: I got lost in one job, yeah.

T: Got lost in it, and your father-

C. He know your father? Yeah.

and the jumble from fragment (2):

Ken: I got ul-got (·) lost in one jub=↓Yea:h.

(0.5)

(i t bo:th[ered])

Dan: Got lo:st innit ↓e[r (y'r fa:th[e r])]°()°

Ken: [w h h h h [h h h h]h h

Al: [Dz 'ee] know yer father?

(0.2)

Al: ↓Yah.

What is so clearly to be made of this bit in fragment (1) is that the therapist mentions patient A's father, and the mention of A's father triggers a question by patient C:

- T: ...and your father-
 C. He know your father?

In fragment (2) the issue is drastically obscured, first of all by the sheer difficulty of reading through all that stuff, now including some sort of whoosh of breath by Ken (A), but mainly by the addition of an alternative hearing for "your father", i.e., "it bothered". Surely that could be resolved by looking at the context: We have the therapist, (Dan/T), mentioning the word "father", which prompts one patient (Al/C) to ask the other (Ken/A) a question about that father, starting up before the therapist finishes whatever he was going to say.

The alternative is rather improbable, i.e., that Dan has said something about Ken's having been "bothered", and it just so happens that at that moment Al decides to cut in with a tangential question about Ken's father. Logic plumps for "father"; so much so that I only kept the alternative in as a matter of principle. I wished that I could unhear it. But I do hear it; it would be irresponsible to leave it out even though it not only messes up the transcript but it's so improbable that I'm embarrassed by it.

But on thinking about it, yes, it's more than likely that the "father" alternative is what's happening with Al, but that *doesn't* tell us what Dan said. In our materials we sometimes can clearly hear one speaker saying something, and find that a coparticipant somehow has heard something else. Once in a while, one or the other mentions the mishearing. For example:

(5) [Frankel:GS:X]

((re a plant Alan is trying to sell to Nell))

Alan: → Still growing. It's got buds 'n everything else on it.

Nell: Oh has i:t?

Alan: → Buds. No[t bugs.]

Nell: → [Oh bu:d]s. I thought you said bugs.

Alan: No. I don't see any bugs. It might have, but I can't see any

It's a phenomenon. And it very likely happens more often than we have access to in our materials, because people don't always, or even routinely, mention the fact that they did a mishearing (sometimes they don't realize it, sometimes they do realize it but it doesn't seem to matter, etc.).

What the "bothered" alternative does is to raise the *possibility* that such a thing has happened here: Dan is saying something about Ken having been

“bothered”, which Al hears as his saying something about Ken’s “father”, which inspires the question he then and there asks (‘then and there’ in fine detail, i.e., starting up after the first syllable of what he hears as the trigger-word, “fa:th[er]”).³

I’ll just mention one other difference between the two fragments. One of them shows an ‘and’ while the other shows an ‘or’ (pronounced “er”).

A. I got lost in one job, yeah.
 T. → Got lost in it, and your father—
 versus
 Ken: I got ul ʊ-got (·) lost in one jub=↓Yeah.
 (0.5) (it bo:thered)
 Dan: → Got lo:st innit ↓e[r (yʹr fa:ther) °() °
 Ken: [w h h h h h h h h h h h

So what, “and” or “or”. Well, “and” is accepting a proffered version of what happened, and augmenting it: ‘You got lost in it and it bothered..?’ / ‘You got lost in it and your father...’. If it’s “or”, then while repeating the proffered version of what happened may acknowledge it as reasonable, the “or” projects an alternative version; *not* that you “got lost in it”, *but* that “...it both[ered ()...]” / *but* that “...your fath[er ()...]”. So, the difference between “and” and “or” is a difference between two polar activities: One transcript shows the therapist accepting, the other shows him rejecting, the patient’s version of what had happened.

Turning to fragments (3) and (4), focusing on the occurrence of laughter. In fragment (3), we are shown some talk in progress, in the course of which Dean “[*laughs*]”:

PRESIDENT NIXON: I don’t know about anything else.

DEAN: I don’t know either, and I [*laughs*] almost hate to learn some of these things.

In fragment (4) we are shown some details of those two utterances:

Nixon: °I don’noo° ’bout anything else exc^{hh}e[pt
 Dean: [I don’t either in I: °w’d
 (h)als(h)o hhate tuh learn some a’ these things.

For one, fragment (4) suggests that Nixon is going on to mention something else he knows about, i.e., we now have the word ‘except’. And we have Dean starting up within that word, at “exce...”, where after, Nixon stops. One thing that might be happening here is that Dean hears, in “exce...”, the word ‘except’

forming up, and starts to talk at that point. This ‘recognitional- response’ is a not-uncommon phenomenon. Here are a couple of cases.⁴

- (6) [Rah:II:11:R]
 Jessie: °two pihleece cah:rs’d° stopped outsi:de.=
 Ada: =eeYe::[s?
 Jessie: → [·h An’ that whether he thow:t that I ed’n
 ac[cidn’t] [ohr someth]ing...
 Ada: → [I:::::][k n e o : w]

In fragment (6) above, just as Jessie starts to say the dreaded word “ac[cident”, Ada starts her comforting “I::: kno:w”. And in fragment (7) below, just as Mr. Bryant is pointing out that with the credit note his firm is offering Miss Sokol, their services won’t “co[st] her anything, she starts up with her acceptance of his offer:

- (7) [SCC:DCD:37:R]
 Bryant: → ...but ·hh if you’ve goh^hta credit neote ih weon’t
 co[st you anything anyw]ay.
 Sokol: → [Wul owright the;n,]
 Sokol: That’s faiuh.

Similarly, with “exce...”, Dean may hear the word ‘except’ forming up. Hearing that, he may hear that Nixon is starting to mention something else, knowledge of which Dean doesn’t want to be burdened with. It may be that Dean moves then and there to stop any possible revelations by cutting in on the alerting word ‘except’, prior to its completion, with an agreement that specifically ignores its projection of further things (i.e., his “I don’t either” targets Nixon’s initial proposal, “I don’t know about anything else”), and then goes on to announce his unwillingness to know any more.

Then there is the laughter. It appears that there is not merely laughter in the utterance with which Dean may be declining to hear what Nixon started to say, but that Nixon, in projecting such talk, himself produces something that might be taken for laughter. That is, fragment (4) shows that he produces the word “except” with some breathiness and an unvocalized mid-vowel: “exc^{hh}ept”. Again, here is a possible case of a recurrent phenomenon: A recipient of someone’s utterance may treat something in that utterance as laughter, and respond with laughter of his own. Here’s a simple case:⁵

(8) [Schenkein:II]

Bill: Dju watch by any chance Miss International Showcase las' night?

Ellen: n:No I didn'[I w'z reading my-

Bill: → [You missed a really great pro(h)[gram.

Ellen: → [O(hh)h i(h)t wa(hh)s?=

Ellen: =ehh heh heh heh!

Here, just after a plosive breath occurs in the course of Bill's utterance, Ellen produces a laughter-loaded response.

In fragment (4), Dean may be doing something similar, but less directly – and less transparently – reciprocal. That is, he does not immediately start to laugh, but first produces a bit of talk. He's not, then, to be heard as slavishly laughing just because the President is laughing. As well, the work he's doing with that bit of talk may be enhanced by his not only ignoring the word "except", but declining to reciprocate the laughter with which the problematic word is being produced.

Furthermore, his delayed laughter, while perhaps taking Nixon's prior laughter as a warrant (i.e., it is all right for him to laugh since the President has just laughed), can, by its delay, be heard for the work it may independently be doing, e.g., as tempering his declination to hear what the President was perhaps about to tell him.⁶

Yet another point can be made. It is possible that the transcriber of fragment (3), by not attending the details of the laughter, but just noting that it occurred, misheard the talk in which that laughter occurs, i.e., fragment (3) shows Dean saying "I [*laughs*] almost...", while fragment (4) shows him saying "I: w'd (h)als(h)o..." (in standard orthography, "I would also").

In an early paper on laughter (Jefferson 1985), I proposed that laughter can make an utterance less (or un-) intelligible, and may possibly be used for that feature. In the case at hand, Dean's laughter, while not being deployed for that purpose, may have made the utterance that I hear as "I would also..." less intelligible, resulting in its being heard by another transcriber as "I almost...".

Here's another sort of thing that can be noticed in a comparison of fragments (3) and (4). In the former, Dean, shown of course in standard orthography, is saying "...I [*laughs*] almost hate to learn some of these things." In the latter, among other pronunciational particulars, he's shown as saying "tuh learn".

In an early paper on this issue (Jefferson 1983), I point out that "the sort of 'comic book' orthography I use (e.g., for 'What are you doing?', 'Wutche doin'?)" is considered objectionable in that it makes the speakers look 'stupid';

it seems to caricature them rather than illuminate features of their talk”, and that “experts on phonetics such as William Labov, propose that someone who, for example, says ‘dat’ instead of ‘that’, is not producing defective English but is speaking correctly in his dialect, and thus should not be transcript-displayed as producing an object which is commonly treated as defective.”

In that paper, as part of my defense of ‘pronunciational particulars’ I show several fragments in which speakers of one or another ‘dialect’ can be found to be varying their pronunciations; for example, a member of the California motorcycle gang, the Hell’s Angels, produces “them” followed by “dere” (‘their’):

(9) [KPFK:G]

Joe: I tell them right t’dere face ...

For example, a Bronx janitor produces several versions of ‘there’ (and ‘they’re’): “theyuh”, “they’re”, “deyuh”, and “dere”, while consistently using “th” for (two different versions of) ‘the’:

(10) [Frankel:USI:117:R]

Vic: We get in they:uh (0.5) en they’re uh (0.2) the tu- (·) u (·) t-two ↓guys uh
deyuh, ’n me ’n James ↑Wal↓kuh’s dere ’n th’ broa:d is in th’ bed.

For example, A Philadelphia-Italian meatcutter uses both “dis” and “this”:

(11) [Goodwin:M:3-4]

Frank: → Fu(h)ck you. Dis g[uy is–

Joe: [Hey wait.

Frank: → I definitely ain’t goi(h)in’ ou(h)t with this chick again.

And, for example, in a fragment of a transcript I made of a tape collected by Labov, we find both Mez, a member of a black teenage street gang, and B.J., a black social worker/ ex-street gang member, producing “d” and “th”; Mez saying “Hey lookih dat”, “Who’s that. Who’s that punk right there.”, (and also producing a vowel-begun version of ‘that’s’, “Ahz Davey More.”), B.J., saying things like “y’all see these pictichiz...”, “y’know who dat is”, and “That’s Davey More”.

(14) [Jeff:Canc:7:27-8:9]

Dean: → ↑Started with (1.0) en instruction to me:: (0.9) from Bob ↓Haldeman.
→ (0.4) tuh see if we couldn't set up ay perfectly le↓git'mate (0.3) campaign
intelligence operation over et the ReElection Committee.

(·)

Nixon: Mmhm,
(0.8)

Dean: → Not being in this business?=I turned dih somebuddy who: ·h had been
in this business: (·) Jack Cau'field who: w'z I don' know if you r'member
Ja:ck er not he w'z...

We can at least note that the 'correct' pronunciation, "to", coincides with a stress on that word, while the two 'incorrect' pronunciations, "tuh" and "dih" occur at points where the word is not being stressed. Also, we can at least account for the occurrence of the 'd'-begun "dih", as conditioned by the preceding, 'd'-ended word, "turned". Who knows what other orderlinesses will emerge as attention is given to such details?

Harvey Sacks often spoke of the possibility of "order at all points", and in one of his lectures (Sacks 1966 [1992:I:238]) tells us that "we're dealing with something real and powerful. And not just grossly powerful, like, it provides for the rate of industrial development, but it provides for little tiny things that God might have overlooked, perhaps." Most of the things Sacks dealt with, while not as gross as the rate of industrial development, were on a larger scale than tracking the variations in a Bronx janitor's pronunciations of 'there', or John Dean's pronunciations of 'to'. But now and then, something in one of our more detailed transcripts would catch his attention, and we'd be treated to "a little something I find enormously amusing", having to do with someone's spelling out their name in a traffic court, producing it as "M-a-u-e-r, (pause) h-a-n.", the point being that "pause distributions are kind of important...in this sense at least: You can do them wrong.", which led to a consideration of the "normative" character of pausings (Sacks 1968 [1992:I:784]). Or, for example, we'd be told of "a fascination" he had with "[t]hings like 'didje' and 'wanche'", and his having "noticed several differences between them", which led to an exploration of the phenomenon of "transformation" in actual talk (Sacks 1969 [1992:II:137–139]). (I have a feeling that Sacks' specifically formulating this sort of material as something he found "enormously amusing", or had "a fascination" with, was dealing with their on-the-face-of-it utter trivialness, even for the sort of mundane stuff he was known to work with. *These* "little tiny things" were perhaps beginning to be just a bit too tiny for comfort.)

But they're "there" in the talk recorded on the tapes, and many of them are captured in the transcripts that use the system explicated in the ensuing glossary of transcript symbols. Some of them have led to the discovery of ranges of orderlinesses; most of them are yet to be explored.

Notes

1. In his introduction, Kutler says "I have edited the conversations with an eye toward eliminating what I believe insignificant, trivial, or repetitious . . . and often have omitted dutiful choruses of agreement by those present unless I believed them particularly important. The dialogue of innumerable uses of 'right', 'yeah', 'okay' often has been dropped . . . The 'uhs' and 'ahs' usually have been eliminated". (p. vii)
2. This and subsequent fragments titled and referred to as "Jeff:CanC" are from a transcript I did in October, 2000 of the March 21, 1973 'Cancer on the Presidency' meeting between Nixon and Dean.
3. Another possibility it raises is that Dan did say "bothered", that Al did hear it as such, and that the sound- similarity of the first syllables of "both[ered]" and "fath[er]" triggered Al's question to Ken about "father".
4. For a discussion, and further cases, of this phenomenon, see Jefferson (1984: esp. 28–29). In its way, fragment (2) is also a case of 'recognitional' onset of talk, if not specifically of recognitional 'response'.
5. A version of fragment (8), and a discussion of this phenomenon can be found in Jefferson (1979:82–83).
6. Transcribing the Watergate materials, I've been struck by the delicacy of some of Dean's interactional work. I didn't notice anything of that nature in this particular fragment until I focused on it for this exercise, having chosen the fragment simply because it gave more detail to the *Abuse of Power* version, "...and I [laughs] almost hate to learn some of these things".

References

- Jefferson, G. (1979). "A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance-declination". In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology* (pp. 79–96). New York: Irvington.
- Jefferson, G. (1983). "Issues in the transcription of naturally-occurring talk: Caricature versus capturing pronunciation particulars". In *Tilburg Papers in Language and Literature*, 34, 1–12. Tilburg: Tilburg University.
- Jefferson, G. (1984). "Notes on some orderlinesses of overlap onset". In V. D'Urso & P. Leonardi (Eds.), *Discourse Analysis and Natural Rhetorics* (pp. 11–38). Padua: Cleup Editore.

- Jefferson, G. (1985). "An exercise in the transcription and analysis of laughter". In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Vol. 3: Discourse and Dialogue* (pp. 24–34). London: Academic.
- Kutler, Stanley I. (1997). *Abuse of Power*. New York: Touchstone.
- Sacks, Harvey (1992). *Lectures on Conversation, Volumes I and II*, G. Jefferson (Ed.). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Glossary of transcript symbols

// *Double obliques* indicate the point at which a current speaker's talk is overlapped by the talk of another. ((No longer in use.¹))

Louise: 'N how t//all are you, Al,
Roger: How tall'r you Al.

[*A left bracket* indicates the point of overlap onset. ((The currently-used alternative to the double obliques. Note also, a change in descriptive language.))

Louise: 'N how tall [are you, Al,
Roger: [How tall 'r you Al.

] *A right bracket* indicates the point at which two overlapping utterances end, if they end simultaneously, or the point at which one of them ends in the course of the other. It also is used to parse out segments of overlapping utterances.

Louise: 'N how t[a l l u h r] you]↓A:],
Roger: [How tall 'r] ↓you] Al,]

= *Equal signs* indicate no break or gap.

A pair of equal signs, one at the end of one line and one at the beginning of a next, indicate no break between the two lines.

Maggie: ...en 'e weighs about a hunnerd 'n thirty five pounds.=
Ronald: =AAUUGH! WHADDA L-LIE!

The pair is also used as a transcript convenience when a single speaker's talk is broken up in the transcript, but is actually through-produced by its speaker.

Pammy: Yeah well okeedoe=
Myra: =[Yeah.
Pammy: [I j's thought I'd ask

1. The asterisk (*) was used by some transcribers to indicate termination of simultaneous speech in conjunction with double obliques (//). (Ed.)

In this case, Pammy's utterance is produced as "Yeah well okeedoe I j's thought I'd ask", with Myra's "Yeah" starting up immediately upon completion of "okeedoe", and simultaneously with "I j's...".

A *single equal sign* indicates no break in an ongoing piece of talk, where one might otherwise expect it, e.g., after a completed sentence.

Ehrlichman: ... so I said I j's' find that hard to ima↓gine.=Now
(0.4) ·p ↑since ↓then I've retained coun↓sel.

(0.0) *Numbers in parentheses* indicate elapsed time by tenths of seconds.

Al: ... j's be a lot'v (shh) lotta work- lotta hassle.
(0.2)

Al: =[Well,

Roger: [Well if yer goin' t' all that trouble,

-- *Double dashes* indicate a short, untimed interval without talk, e.g., a 'beat'.
(no longer in use)

Vic: I'm intuh my thing, intuh my -- attitude
against othuh pih- ·hh

(·) *A dot in parentheses* indicates a brief interval (\pm a tenth of a second) within or between utterances.

Mrs A: 'Ello:?

Guy: 'Ello is Curlyu there?

→ (·)

Mrs A: → Oo jis (·) é-Who:?

Guy: Johnny?h An[sin?]

Mrs A: [Oo j]ist ↑a minnih,

┌ *Numbers in parentheses bracketing several lines of transcript* indicate time
(0.0) elapsed between the end of the utterance or sound in the first bracketed
└ line and the start of the utterance or sound in the last bracketed line.

Mrs A: ┌ Oo jist ↑a minnih,
└ (0.6)

Kid: (1.2) ([])

Mrs A: ┌ [It's fer you dea:r,

— *Underscoring* indicates some form of stress, via pitch and/or amplitude.
A short underscore indicates lighter stress than does a long underscore.

Ehrlichman: Well Dean has: uh:,h totally coop'rated
with the U.S. Attorney.

:: *Colons* indicate prolongation of the immediately prior sound. The longer the colon row, the longer the prolongation.

.,?? *Punctuation markers* are used to indicate ‘the usual’ intonation. (The italicized question-mark [?] substitutes for the question-mark/comma of my non-computer transcripts, and indicates a weaker rise than that indicated by a standard question-mark.²) These symbols usually occur at appropriate syntactical points, but occasionally there are such displays as the following.

Maggie: Oh I’d say he’s about what.=five three enna ha:lf?=aren’t chu Ronald,

Sometimes, at a point where a punctuation marker would be appropriate, there isn’t one. The absence of an ‘utterance-final’ punctuation marker indicates some sort of ‘indeterminate’ contour.

WORD *Upper case* indicates especially loud sounds relative to the surrounding talk.

Kalmbach: I returned it ’n went over the:re (·) tih ↑da:y, (0.5) A::ND uh (0.8) he said the ↑rea:son thet. . .

°word° *Degree signs* bracketing an utterance or utterance-part indicates that the sounds are softer than the surrounding talk.

Leslie: But we were ↑very ↓sorry to hear (·) that uh (·)
°your mother° had (·) died is that ri:ght Phi[↑lip?

Philip: [Yeah.

...

Ava: B’t the point is Jessie don’t fehget no:w. ·h (0.3) eh:m
(·) ’e w’ so: close t’°Mart’n° wa:sn’t ↓ ’e.

* *Asterisk*

In some transcripts, the *asterisk* indicates percussive non-speech sounds, e.g., as in the following fragment, a fist thumping a table.

Vic: BU(h)D I’M NO(h)T I(h)NTUH THA(h)*T! * *

In non-computer transcripts, the *asterisk* indicates ‘creaky voice’. (In computer transcripts, I’ve stopped tracking ‘creaky voice’ and am using the asterisk for another phenomenon.)

Emma: En ar air conditioner went out. comin’ ba:ck
so Go*:d.=

Lottie: =°O[h:: G*o:d.°

Emma: [it-

Emma: Oh:: God ih w’z hot. . .

2. The inverted question-mark (¿) is also used as a substitute for the question-mark/comma by some transcribers. (Ed.)

t*, d* In early computer transcripts, *an asterisk following a consonant* replaces the single sub- or superimposed dot which serves as a ‘hardener’ in my non-computer transcripts.

Kalmbach: I w’jɹst (·) understa:nd thet* uh: you en I are deh-
abs’ooly dihgether on tha:t,

Ehrlichman: No question about it*?=uh hHerb

In this case, while Kalmbach produces “jɹst” and “tha:t,” with the American-standard, soft ‘t’, the ‘t’ in his “thet*” is crisp, dentalized, i.e., ‘hard’.

Similarly, while Ehrlichman produces “about” with the soft ‘t’, the ‘t’ in his “it*” is ‘hard’.

t, d In more recent computer transcripts, *a boldface consonant* replaces the single sub- or superimposed dot which serves as a ‘hardener’ in my non-computer transcripts. The above fragment would now be shown as:

Kalmbach: I w’jɹst (·) understa:nd thet uh: you en I are deh-
abs’ooly dihgether on tha:t,

Ehrlichman: No question about it?=uh hHerb

a, è, ì When a *single dot* is not available, *two dots over a vowel* replace the single sub- or superimposed dot which, as well as a ‘hardener’, serves as a ‘shortener’ in my non-computer transcripts.

Ehrlichman: è-he:: told me::? . . . an:d uh, h ì-he sid . . .

Here, while conceivably the ‘e-’ in “e-he” and the ‘i-’ in “i-he” could be read as long sounds, “ee” and “eye”, the single dot over the ‘e-’ and the double dots over the ‘i-’, confirm that those sounds are short. I don’t show the sounds as “eh” and “ih” because they are more fleeting than those spellings indicate.

The *dots* do an additional job in transcripts where I use non-standard orthography. Many words get a range of oddball spellings, in keeping with the range of pronunciations they are subject to. On occasion such a word appears in its standard spelling. If that word carries the dot(s), it means that while such a spelling could be the result of a lapse of transcriber concentration, in this case the standard spelling does indicate the way the word was pronounced.

Emma: En ar air conditioner went out. comin’ ba:ck

Here, while ‘air conditioner’ is routinely pronounced as ‘air c’nditioner’, it is being given a fully formed vowel, shown as “c’onditioner”.

...

(a) Kalmbach: Ehm: I:’m uh scheduled for ↑two duhmorrow afternoo:n.

·
·

(b) Kalmbach: ...he said the ↑re:sɔ:n θet wɜ: ɹ-fer the ca:ll w'z. . .

In this case, while at point (b) Kalmbach is shown pronouncing the word 'for' as "fer", the dot below the 'o' in "for" at point (a) indicates that it's not that the transcriber had simply written the word in its standard orthography, but that it is there fully pronounced as "for".

- (b) *A parenthesized italicized letter* replaces the parenthesized letter with a sub- or superscribed degree sign which, in my non-computer transcripts, indicates an 'incipient sound'.

Emma: you couldn' ev'n putcher hand ou:ts:I:de the CAR
ih jiz'(b)bu:rn.

...

Ehrlichman: But they- (·) thè(p) the point is. . .

- whord *An italicized 'h' appearing in such a word as 'which' 'where', 'what' 'when', 'whether', etc., indicates that while such words are often produced with the 'h' silent (as if they were the words 'witch', 'wear', 'wen', 'weather', etc.), in this case the 'h' was sounded.*

Ehrlichman: En I said well Joh:n what 'n the world er yih talking
↓about*.

.

.

Ehrlichman: See ↑what they've said duh Dean is. . .

While at one point in a conversation Ehrlichman pronounces the word 'what' with the 'h' sounded, at a later point, the 'what' is produced with no 'h'.

- word *An italicized letter* replaces the sub- or superscribed degree sign which, in my non-computer transcripts, indicates unvoiced production.

Ehrlichman: → He said we:ll?=hmhh è-I came dih you:,hh fr'm
Mitchell,hh en I sai:d*,h uh ↓ : Mitchell needs money?

(Kalmbach): → (°°Right°°)

Ehrlichman: Uh::: could*=uh we::: ca::ll Herb Kalmbach en ask
'im duh raise ↓some.

Kalmbach: → °°Yeah.°°

- <word *A pre-positioned left carat* is a 'left push', indicating a hurried start; in effect, an utterance trying to have started a bit sooner than it actually did. This can be heard, for example, as a compressed onset of the utterance or utterance-part in question. A common locus of this phenomenon is 'self repair'.

- Ruth: Monday nights we play, (0.3) <I mean we go to ceramics,
 ...
- Polly: Y'see it's diff'rent f'me:. <eh f'(·) the othuh boyz,
 word< A *post-positioned left carat* indicates that while a word is fully completed, it seems to stop suddenly.
- Meier: Uh well I fel' like my lef' side of my (·) chest I c'd (·) mah had a k- cramp<
- A *dash* indicates a cut-off.
- Vic: He said- yihknow, I get- I get sick behind it.
- > < *Right/left carats* bracketing an utterance or utterance-part indicate that the bracketed material is speeded up, compared to the surrounding talk.
- < > *Left/right carats* bracketing an utterance or utterance-part indicate that the bracketed material is slowed down, compared to the surrounding talk.
- hhh A *dot-prefixed row of 'h's* indicates an inbreath. Without the dot, the 'h's indicate an outbreath.
- wohhrd A *row of 'h's within a word* indicates breathiness. In some transcripts the 'h's are italicized, in some not.
- Colson: . . . a ghhuy wh(h)o's also totally loyal<
 And in computer transcripts, the 'h's are sometimes also superscribed.
- Colson: Th:e ↑thing thet worries me is the(p)(·) is the p^{hh}ossibility'v. . .
- (h) *Parenthesized 'h'* indicates plosiveness. This can be associated with laughter, crying, breathlessness, etc.
- Jim: Don't sound so (h)amp(h)itious fer Ch(h)rise'ssake
 (h)ih suh ·hh sou' l(h)i' yuh k(h)uh g(h)o tuh sleep
 'n the pho(h)one.
 ...
- Maggie: I j'st ran up th' stai(hh)rs that's wh(h)y I'm
 huffing en puffing.
- £ *The pound-sterling sign* indicates a certain quality of voice which conveys 'suppressed laughter' (various transcripts have other symbols, e.g., the Dutch guilder-sign which no longer exists).
- Ken: ahh ha £I don' know who's payin' fer thi(h)s I
 ↑think ih my fa:-ther.£
- wghord A *'gh' stuck into a word* indicates gutturalness. In some transcripts the 'gh' is italicized, in others, not.
- Mike: Ah don' think 'ee lives onna ↓groun' flo↓ :h.
 (0.3)
- James: The: ghghroun' flo'

In this case, a speaker with phlegm in his throat is saying “the ground floor”, with the word ‘ground’ heavily gutturalized.

- () *Empty parentheses* indicate that the transcriber was unable to get what was said. The length of the parenthesized space reflects the length of the un-gotten talk.

Mike: No.
(0.4)

Mike: (),

In the speaker-designation column, the empty parentheses indicate transcriber’s inability to identify a speaker.

Roger: Paz’m z’m Miller Highlit*e.h
(0.5)

(): hnh Yhehh

- (word) *Parenthesized words and speaker* designations are especially dubious.

(Mike) [(Lee me alone.)]

Carol: [Mike I know yu]h’ love’ m

- (blurf) *Nonsense syllables* are sometimes provided, to give at least an indication of various features of the un-gotten material.

Nixon: Jerry sh’d talk to ↑Witnaw. (0.5) And uh: (·) jis brace eem ’n tell ’im tih (·)(offih sebbatikiss)...

- (Ø) A *nul sign* indicates that there may not be talk occurring; that what is being heard as possibly talk might also be ambient noise.

Nixon: _____ °(Well ah’ll protect chu but* uh)°

(Ø): (0.7) (Okay.)

Nixon: _|_ °(Thet uh)° thet’s that’s why:. (0.9) °I° (0.5) can’t let chu ↓go (0.2) go dow:n.

- (()) *Doubled parentheses* contain transcriber’s descriptions.

Ray : ehh-heh-heh-heh-heh-he:h-eh=

Maggie: =((dainty snort))

...

Vic: ((dumb slob voice)) Well we usetuh do dis