"Demonstrating function" (0.266) use was less common. "Constructing" actions (0.128) and "measuring" actions (0.085) were rarely used.

8. Talk-type "Question" shows a moderate use of "Locating/indicating" actions (0.456), "Examining" actions (0.333) and "Gesturing" actions (0.276). The other action-types are accompanied by low "action values," indicating very low usage in this talk-type.

The action patterns observed in the data of Table 6.7 prompt the following comments:

1. The results show that the work of "Design proposal" attracts the highest usage of two particular action-types, "Locating/indicating" and "Constructing."
2. "Locating/indicating" actions are important to all the talk-types; they have a wide spectrum of application and a very high usage in the talk-types that could be considered to offer explicit information.
3. "Measuring" has a narrow spectrum of use. The high use of "Measuring" action in talk-type "Dimension/location" was expected, but its lack of use in other talk-types is perplexing. It would reasonably be expected that "Measuring" would feature strongly in "Design proposal" because measuring provides specific detail about size and location. The zero use of "Measuring" in "Information-client" is a reasonable expectation because the physiotherapy and occupational therapy assessment when physical features of the client were examined was excluded from the videotape acts and vignettes analyzed.
4. "Design proposal" and "Dimension/location" talk have high association with action-type groupings, "Constructing" and "Locating/indicating," and "Measuring" and "Locating/indicating," respectively. In both talk-types the pair of action-types with a very high use contrast with the below-average involvement of the remaining action-types. The high "action value" indicates that these action-types appear to have a specific association with these talk-types. For example, "Constructing" actions are clearly associated with "Design proposals," "Measuring" actions are clearly associated with "Dimension/ location," and "Locating/indicating" actions are important for both talk-types. The other action-types do not appear to be as important in communicating "Design proposal" information and "Dimension/ location" information. The dichotomy is not repeated in the other talk-types.
5. The high "action value" for "Locating/indicating" associated with "Explanation" talk and high "action value" for "Demonstrating function" associated with "Information-client" talk suggests that information communicated in these talk-types is reliant on certain types of actions. These talk-types show near-average "action value" for most of the other action-types, hence they are different from the case above for "Design proposal" and "Dimension/location" talk.
6. "Gesturing" has less specificity than the other action-types and enjoys almost universal application across talk-types. Its near-average "action value" in six of seven talk-types suggests that "Gesturing" plays an important role, although at this stage of analysis the role is elusive. It may be used as a social modifier to attract and maintain attention.

The "value" of action to talk

The importance of action to a corresponding piece of talk was determined by considering the understandability of participants' talk with and without observing their actions. In multiple-action events, the influence of all actions on understanding was considered. Each action was not individually considered. Four outcomes of listening were considered:

7. If the talk on the videotape (audio with no images) made no sense and, on replaying the tape, observing the action accompanying the talk enhanced the understanding of the talk, then the action was rated as "gives meaning" to talk.
8. If the talk on the videotape made sense as English expression, but the meaning of the talk was unable to be established without seeing the action, then the action was rated as "identifying the talk." For example, the action could clarify what part of a wheelchair was being talked about or the location of an object.
9. If the talk alone made complete sense and that sense was unchanged after seeing the action, the action was rated as "embellishing the talk."
10. If the action appeared to be unrelated to the talk, it was given a rating "unrelated."

The "Role of action" in the talk of the analyzed videotapes is presented in Table 6.8. The results indicate that in 79% of the events, seeing the action was necessary to understand what was said (in 44% of events the actions "give meaning" to talk and in a further 35% of events seeing action is needed to "identify the talk"). Action embellished an event in 13% of cases. In 8% of events the action appeared to be unrelated to that talk in the event.

Considering Tables 6.7 and 6.8, events coded "Design proposal," "Dimension/location," "Explanation," "Information-client," and "Question" contain large amounts of action accompanying the talk and also manifest a high percentage of occasions where the action is critical to the talk in either giving meaning or identifying something in the talk. These outcomes indicate the extensive use of action with talk by the participants to enhance their communicating. The outcomes also indicate the need for participants to see each other's actions in order to gain the full value of each person's talk.

Table 6.8. Role of action in relation to talk

Talk-type		"Role of action"			
	No. of events	Gives meaning	Identifies talk	Embellishes	Unrelated
Design proposal	138	80 (58%)	36 (26%)	16 (12%)	6 (4%)
Dimension/location	45	24 (53%)	9 (20%)	9 (20%)	3 (7%)
Explanation	73	33 (45%)	20 (27%)	11 (15%)	9 (12%)
Information-client	27	14 (54%)	11 (38%)	2 (8%)	0
Information-physical	56	19 (33%)	22 (40%)	9 (16%)	6 (11%)
Comment	95	30 (32%)	39 (40%)	14 (15%)	12 (13%)
Question	87	27 (31%)	45 (52%)	9 (10%)	6 (7%)
Total	521	227 (44%)	182 (35%)	70 (13%)	42 (8%)