their accessibility. They were also easier to handle: since the participants interacted only via the auditory channel, audio recordings captured for the researcher all that was available to the participants themselves. There was no need to worry about the visual channel.

Meanwhile, however, video recording has become easy. Video material of face-to-face interactions is increasingly available and providing access to the wider range of semiotic resources used by participants. Most recently, in order to obtain best-quality data for both video and acoustic-phonetic analysis, researchers have begun to combine (multi-camera) video recording with separate high-quality audio recordings (see, e.g., Peräkylä and Ruusuvuori 2006; Selting 2010; on the problems resulting from the observer paradox in data collection see Labov 1972). Yet on occasion, restricting data collection to the audio channel may be unavoidable: for instance, some institutions dealing with sensitive personal data may be willing to allow audio but not video recording. Increasing attention is also being paid to various forms of mediated internet communication at the interface between speech and writing (chat, social networking). In principle, thus, the choice of data must be carefully considered and justified with regard to the research question.

ii. How large should our database be in order to yield reliable results?

The smaller the database, the greater the risk of basing one's analysis on coincidental instances, or of paying too much attention to marginal or unusual forms of the phenomenon under consideration. The larger the database, the more clearly frequency patterns will emerge. Nevertheless, students may wish to start with the careful analysis of single cases in order to get a first grip on the phenomenon in question and to develop hypotheses that can then be used in the analysis of a larger database. In general, the size of the corpus will depend on the material available, the research question, and the goals of the investigation.

iii. Do we wish to include data from technically mediated interaction in the new media?

Technically mediated forms of virtual co-present interaction between participants, for example, in internet chatrooms (see, e.g., Neuage 2004; Beißwenger 2007), blur the traditional boundaries between spoken and written communication. What are the consequences of including such data in our investigations? The challenges are significant, in part because the turn-taking system of everyday conversation is distorted by technological constraints. Yet at least one interactional linguistic research study has suggested that the organization of, for example, repair in computer-mediated interaction is not abandoned, but instead simply adapted to meet the specific affordances of the new medium (Schönfeldt and Golato 2003).

4.1.2 Transcription

Transcription is a hotly debated issue. At least four different approaches are currently being pursued:

i. Jeffersonian transcription

Researchers working with data from CA corpora use the system originally developed by Gail Jefferson (see Sacks et al. 1974) and successively revised over the past decades (see, e.g., Atkinson and Heritage 1984; Jefferson 2004a; Schegloff 2007a:265–9; Hepburn and Bolden 2013).[7]

ii. Du Bois transcription

Researchers working with data from the Santa Barbara corpus of spoken American English use the transcription system devised by Du Bois et al. (1993).

iii. Minimal orthographic transcription plus enhanced lines as needed

Walker (2004a:45), for instance, advocates "unadorned orthographic transcriptions" as "relatively simple presentation transcriptions" for the analysis of the sequential organization of talk. These are then "enhanced" for the investigation of the object under analysis – for example, for the study of fine phonetic detail.

iv. GAT transcription

Researchers working in the German research context and/or with German data use the GAT system. GAT is an acronym for **G**esprächs**A**nalytisches **T**ranskriptionssystem (literally: conversation analytic transcription system), a system that takes CA transcription as its basis but is designed to allow for a more precise representation of prosodic and phonetic parameters. The first version of the GAT system (Selting et al. 1998) has recently been revised as GAT2 (Selting et al. 2009) and is now also available in English (Couper-Kuhlen and Barth-Weingarten 2011) and Portuguese (Schröder et al. 2016).

As transcription is an important means of constituting the object of research, and as it necessarily presupposes theory (see Ochs 1979; also Edwards and Lampert 1993; Selting 2001b), students must carefully consider the choice of transcription system for their own work (see also Mondada 2013). Overviews of the transcription systems underlying the data presented here are included in an appendix to this book.[8]

[7] For a critical discussion see Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (1996b:39–45) and Walker (2004a:39–44).

[8] Our policy in citing data from the literature in this book has been to retain the transcription used in the original source but to adapt Jeffersonian "eye dialect" to standard orthography. For an explanation of the glossing abbreviations in the translation of examples see the Leipzig Glossing Rules: https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php. Glossing abbreviations cited in the transcripts are only explained when relevant for the discussion.