Handbook of Data Analysis

Melissa Hardy and Alan Bryman

26

Conversation Analysis

STEVEN E. CLAYMAN AND
VIRGINIA TEAS GILL

Human interaction lies at the very heart of social life. It is primarily through interaction that children are socialized, culture is transmitted, language is put to use, identities are affirmed, institutions are activated, and social structures of all kinds are reproduced. Moreover, as Schegloff (1987) has observed, talk-in-interaction is the primordial site of human sociality and a fundamental locus of social organization in its own right. It is thus ironic that the study of interaction was long overlooked. This was due in part to an erroneous assumption that interactional conduct is either an epiphenomenon of social structure or inherently disorderly (Sacks, 1984), coupled with the lack of an approach that would expose its organizational principles. Conversation analysis (CA) has begun to rectify this state of affairs. It offers a rigorous methodology of data collection and analysis that is uniquely suited to addressing the problems and exploiting the opportunities posed by human interaction as an object of inquiry.

CA was developed by Harvey Sacks in collaboration with Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. It emerged within sociology in the late 1960s, a time when the discipline was dominated by abstract theorizing about large-scale structural phenomena. However, certain intellectual cross-currents had begun to run counter to the sociological mainstream, devoting new attention to the specifics of social conduct in everyday life, and this would provide a foundation for the eventual development of CA. Erving Goffman (1963, 1964, 1967) began to explore what he would later call 'the interaction order' (Goffman, 1983), the domain of direct interaction between persons. Goffman repeatedly argued that this domain is a type of social institution in its own right, one that intersects with other more familiar societal institutions but is organized by its own distinctive imperatives such as the preservation of 'face'. In a related but distinct development that would come to be known as ethnomethodology, Harold Garfinkel (1967) began to examine the procedures of common-sense reasoning that people use to make sense of their circumstances and to navigate through everyday life. Garfinkel challenged the mainstream view that social conduct is regulated by internalized norms, arguing instead that all norms – including those identified by Goffman – rest upon an unexplicated foundation of practical reasoning through which norms are implemented and action is produced and rendered intelligible in normative terms.

Harvey Sacks was a student of Goffman and an associate of Garfinkel, and his development of CA can be understood as a partial synthesis of these twin concerns with the institution of interaction and the procedures of common-sense reasoning used to produce and recognize interactional conduct (Heritage, 2001). The research enterprise that emerged from this synthesis has generated a substantial and cumulative body of empirical findings. In

a relatively short span of time the field has grown and diversified to encompass a variety of distinguishable variants. Some researchers work with data drawn primarily from ordinary conversation and seek to describe highly general interactional practices and systems of practice such as those governing the organization of turn-taking, the sequencing of action, the repair of misunderstandings, the relationship between vocal and nonvocal behaviors, and so on (Atkinson and Heritage, 1984; Button and Lee, 1987; Psathas, 1990). Others focus on data drawn from institutional settings – doctor–patient interactions, news interviews, trial examinations, etc. – with the aim of exploring how generic practices of talk get mobilized and adapted for the accomplishment of specific institutional tasks (Boden and Zimmerman, 1991; Drew and Heritage, 1992b; and Heritage and Maynard, forthcoming). Gender differences at the level of interaction have also been explored (West and Zimmerman, 1983; Goodwin, 1990). Still others have used CA methods and findings to address practical questions that extend beyond the organization of interaction *per se* – questions such as how speaking practices bear on bureaucratic and professional decision-making (Boyd, 1998; Clayman and Reisner, 1998; Maynard, 1984; Heritage and Stivers, 1999; Heritage et al., 2001; Peräkylä, 1998), affect the conduct and results of survey research (Maynard et al., 2002), shed light on speech disorders (Goodwin, 1995; Heeschen and Schegloff, 1999) and processes of cognition and cognitive development (Goodwin, 1994; Maynard and Schaeffer, 1996; Schegloff, 1991; Wootton, 1997), and illuminate large-scale cultural differences (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1991; Lindström, 1994) and processes of historical change (Clayman and Heritage, 2002).

If the empirical productivity of CA exceeds that of its intellectual forebears, this is mainly due to the methodology that underlies it. While the substance of CA owes much to Goffman and Garfinkel, its methodology bears little resemblance to either the ethnographic methods employed by Goffman or the quasi-experimental demonstrations favored by Garfinkel in his early work. By utilizing naturalistic observation – the direct observation of naturally occurring conduct – CA is broadly congruent with the ethnographic tradition of social science research. However, within CA observation is always directed toward conduct as it has been preserved in audio and video recordings, and this facilitates a highly disciplined mode of analysis marked by standards of evidence and analytic precision that are distinctive.

Indeed, the CA approach is difficult to categorize in terms that usually dominate discussions of social science methodology. On the one hand, the enterprise has a strong qualitative dimension involving the close analysis of single instances of conduct; on the other hand, it has an informally 'quantitative' dimension in that practitioners typically assemble and systematically examine numerous instances of a given phenomenon. It is both an interpretive enterprise seeking to capture the understandings and orientations displayed by the participants themselves, and at the same time it enforces rigorous standards of evidence made possible by the use of recorded data. It is a predominantly data-driven or inductive enterprise, but it is guided by a well-developed conceptual foundation grounded in empirical findings from past research. Given the natural tendency to process novel stimuli in terms of familiar conceptual categories, it is perhaps not surprising that CA has in the past been incorrectly pigeonholed in relation to extant social science methods.

Accordingly, in the spirit of clarification and as a guide to those wishing to work with interactional materials, we offer a brief introduction to the methods of CA.[1]

GENERATING DATA: RECORDING AND TRANSCRIBING

Conversation analysts work almost exclusively with naturally occurring interaction as it has been captured in audio and video recordings and rendered into detailed transcripts. Both the subject matter and its rendering into usable data require some discussion.

Naturally occurring interaction

Naturally occurring interaction is perhaps best understood by contrast to what it is not. It does not include hypothetical or invented examples of interaction, nor role-playing or experimentally induced interactions. There are compelling reasons for excluding these forms of data. Invented or contrived interaction is necessarily conditioned by the

researcher's ungrounded intuitions about how talk normally unfolds. Past research has demonstrated that intuition, no matter how plausible it might seem, simply is not a reliable guide in this area. As Zimmerman (1988: 421) has observed:

> Indeed, if the analysis of conversation is to be anything more than an intuitive, interpretive exercise carried on through artfully posed opinions about what is going on in some segment of talk, or what is possible or plausible in interaction, then intuition and its offspring, interpretation, must be disciplined by reference to the details of actual episodes of conversational interaction. (Zimmerman 1988:421)

Working with actual interaction can yield astonishing discoveries that, in Sacks's (1984: 25) words, 'we could not, by imagination, assert were there'. Any detailed transcript of everyday recorded interaction reveals a richness and complexity that could not be invented or contrived.

What constitutes 'natural' interaction is, however, by no means straightforward. Because of the 'observer's paradox' (Labov, 1972) a researcher can never know whether the interaction is unfolding as it would have were it not being externally observed (ten Have, 1999). In addition, the recording equipment itself may become a topic of conversation for participants, such that the content of the talk becomes 'researcher-produced' (ten Have, 1999: 49).

However, such observer effects are much less significant than they might seem at first glance. Sensitivity to being observed is a highly general and hence 'natural' feature of interaction. As Goodwin (1981: 44) notes, 'within conversation, participants never behave as if they were unobserved; it is clear that they organize their behavior in terms of the observation it will receive from their coparticipants'. Thus, while people may indeed avoid discussing sensitive topics on tape, as a general practice of interaction they may also avoid mentioning such topics before strangers.

Moreover, these effects tend to be limited to the surface content of the interaction; they do not affect the underlying structure of interaction, which is the primary focus of CA research. When the participants refer to the presence of the recording machine, they do so via processes -- ways of taking turns, building actions, and organizing them into sequences -- that are not markedly different from the rest of their talk (ten Have, 1999).

In any case, hyperconsciousness about the recording machine tends to be short-lived. It recedes into the background as the participants become enmeshed in the practical demands of the interaction in which they find themselves.

Under the rubric 'naturally occurring interaction' falls a wide range of interactional events. It encompasses everything from casual encounters between family and friends, to interaction that takes place in institutional and workplace contexts, to interaction that is produced in the course of scientific research itself. Underlying this range of events are various organizations for taking turns – that is, various speech exchange systems (Sacks et al., 1974) – ranging from ordinary conversation (where the length, order, and content of turns are free to vary) to highly formal and constrained speech exchange systems such as debates, interviews, and business meetings.

A note on sampling

Unlike most social science disciplines, CA addresses a largely unexplored domain of phenomena whose components are not yet fully known or understood. Sacks (1984: 21) called this domain 'the methods people use in doing social life', and it has been demonstrated that these methods have a describable order of their own. Until these methods are formally described and analyzed, it is premature to ask how prevalent they are within some larger 'population' of interactions, or how they are distributed in relation to exogenous psychological or social variables. Such questions cannot be answered without formal quantification, and this cannot proceed in a valid way until the complex phenomena of interaction have been identified and thoroughly understood (Schegloff, 1993).

Because the object of CA analysis is to describe the endogenous organization rather than the exogenous distribution of interactional phenomena, the issue of sampling is approached rather differently in CA than in other fields. Conversation analysts typically follow the naturalist's strategy of gathering 'specimens' of particular phenomena from as many settings of interaction as possible for the purposes of systematic analysis and comparison (Heritage, 1988: 131; ten Have, 1999: 51).

As sources of interactional data, not all settings are created equal. Ordinary conversation among acquaintances and family

members appears to represent the richest and most varied source of interactional phenomena, while interactions in bureaucratic, occupational, and other institutional contexts tend to contain a markedly narrower range of practices that may differ from their counterparts in ordinary conversation (Drew and Heritage, 1992a). Underlying these differences is the fact that ordinary conversation appears to be the primordial form of interaction, the original source of interactional practices that get specialized and adapted in task-oriented institutional contexts. It is thus important to bear in mind the social context from which data are drawn. Moreover, although the researcher's substantive interests may favor focused data-gathering from a specialized type of setting, it is generally useful to use ordinary conversation as a comparative frame of reference (Schegloff, 1987).

While the naturalistic approach remains primary within CA, conversation analysts do not necessarily dismiss the possibility of conducting formally quantitative/distributional analyses of interactional phenomena (Zimmerman, 1988; Heritage, 1999). Indeed, once such phenomena have been carefully mapped, this can provide a rigorous empirical basis for distributional studies, replacing vague concepts with well-defined categories that are firmly anchored in interactional reality.

Audio and video recording

The emphasis on talk-in-interaction was originally a practical decision for Harvey Sacks, whose main concern as a sociologist was to formally describe the structure of real social events as they actually occurred (Sacks, 1984). The availability of audio recording technology in the early 1960s made it possible to capture and preserve a particular type of social event, conversational interaction. Given the centrality of interaction in the life of society, Sacks's ostensibly practical decision turned out to be a fortuitous one.

Technological advances over the years have made it possible to make video as well as audio recordings, and thus to record nonvocal behaviors that unfold in conjunction with the stream of speech. However, recordings still offer the same basic service as they did for Sacks in the 1960s – recordings provide access to social interaction at a level of detail that approaches what is available to the interactional participants themselves. This encompasses not only what was said but also how it was said, including vocal behaviors such as silences, audible breathing, and laughter, and (in the case of video recordings) nonvocal behaviors such as gaze direction, gestural displays, and body positioning. Since recordings can be replayed, segments of interaction can be examined repeatedly, slowed down for frame-by-frame scrutiny, and re-examined as new information becomes available.

The importance of recordings in CA can be likened to that of slow-motion 'instant replay' during televised sporting events (Atkinson, 1984). While spectators in the stands may have only a vague grasp of the fleeting events within a particular play, television viewers can – by virtue of the instant replay – achieve a more detailed and precise understanding of the specific sequence of behaviors that led to the play's outcome. Similar benefits accrue to the academic study of interaction when it has been preserved in recorded form.[2]

Recordings also provide reliable evidence. Recordings provide a more accurate record of interactional events than do other data-gathering methods such as writing fieldnotes, and thus serve as more convincing evidence upon which to base findings about detailed interactional patterns. On-site observations, fieldnotes, and interviews suit the purposes of and questions posed within ethnographic and other studies, but the purposes of and questions posed within CA investigations cannot be addressed without tape-recorded evidence (see Heritage, 1984b: 236). Moreover, there is a strong tradition within CA of including such evidence – as rendered in transcript excerpts and video 'frame grabs' – in published work. This practice exposes the researcher's processes of inference and interpretation to public scrutiny, enabling readers to independently assess the validity of analytic claims by reference to key data excerpts on which they are based.

Many researchers will face the choice of whether to use audio or video recording technology. In general, video is preferable to audio when recording face-to-face interactions. This is because nonvocal activities such as facial expressions, gaze direction, and gestural displays serve – along with vocal activities – as communicative and interpretive resources for participants in interaction. Only video recordings give researchers access to both vocal and nonvocal resources. For telephone encounters, by contrast, only the speech stream is available to the participants, hence audiotaping will often suffice. However, if the participants are engaged in additional

embodied work that the researcher would like to explore, video recordings are again necessary. For example, while survey interviewers and emergency call takers are talking on the phone, they may be simultaneously engaged in reading a computer screen, entering information via a keyboard, and at times communicating with nearby co-workers. All of this can have a significant impact on the ongoing telephone talk, which might not be apparent without a video record of the full range of embodied conduct (Maynard and Schaeffer, 2000; Whalen, 1995).

Transcribing data

Once the interaction of interest has been recorded, the rationale for transcribing it is straightforward. Transcripts make features of the recording more transparent and accessible, enabling one to 'see' the vocal and nonvocal activities that unfold on the tape. A good transcript helps the analyst get a purchase on the organization of the interaction, including its fleeting and momentary features. A transcript is not a substitute for the recording, but rather is an essential analytical tool to be used along with the recording. Moreover, as noted previously, transcripts also serve as a resource in CA publications and presentations, allowing others to independently assess analytic claims by reference to excerpts from the data themselves.

Gail Jefferson originated the transcription system commonly used within CA (Jefferson, 1974). It was designed as a compromise between two objectives: to preserve the details of talk as it is actually produced, while at the same time remaining simple enough to yield transcripts that are accessible to a general audience. Thus, a full phonological system was avoided in favor of one that uses standard orthography supplemented with additional symbols to capture articulatory elements such as overlapping speech, silences, various forms of stress, and so on. At first exposure the system can seem unfamiliar, but skill in applying it increases rapidly with practice. Over the years, other investigators have built upon Jefferson's system, most notably Goodwin (1981) who developed symbols to represent nonvocal activities, such as gaze and gesture, on a transcript. A brief outline of the transcription system appears in the Appendix to this chapter; for a more thorough guide, see Atkinson and Heritage (1984: ix–xvi).

The transcription process is itself part of the analytical process. For this reason, it is generally recommended that researchers do at least some of their own transcribing rather than delegating the entire task to research assistants. Transcribing a large corpus of data does represent a major time commitment, however, so many researchers follow a two-step process in which assistants make initial 'rough' transcripts of a data corpus, which the researcher then refines in whole or in part.

Ten Have's (1999: 75–98) discussion of the actual process of transcribing is comprehensive and his advice is exceptionally practical. Here, we will briefly note some the main issues involved.

Audio transcribing has traditionally been done with the aid of a transcribing machine, essentially a stenographer's audio tape playback machine with a foot pedal for starting, stopping, and rewinding the tape. If the data are on videotape, nonvocal details can be added by viewing the video after the audio transcription is complete. More recently, technological advances have made it possible to digitize audio and video tapes and to store the data files on CD, DVD, or hard drive. A computer can now serve as a 'transcribing machine'; computer software programs let the researcher work with a split screen and transcribe in a word-processing program while watching the video on the same screen. Some programs can also automatically time silences, although at the time of writing we know of no voice recognition software that can transcribe real-time multiparty conversation. Still, the future of data is undoubtedly digital. It is much easier to access individual segments on a digitized recording than on an analog tape, and digitization also eliminates the problem of wear and tear on analog tapes and the resulting deterioration of data. However, analog equipment remains adequate to the task, provided transcription is done from copies of the original tapes rather than the originals themselves.

The level of detail in a CA transcript often strikes non-CA researchers as superfluous and unnecessary. However, if the objective is to understand the resources through which interactants build mutually intelligible courses of action, then anything that is available to the interactants is potentially relevant as an interactional resource. For instance, Jefferson (1985) demonstrates the importance of seemingly trivial behavioral details surrounding the articulation of laughter (see also Glenn, 2003). In excerpt 1, Louise laughs during the utterance, 'playing with his organ' (at the arrow, line 7). This transcript has been simplified in various ways, most relevantly by

(1) [Jefferson, 1985: 28, simplified transcript]

```
 1    Ken:     And he came home and decided he was gonna play with
 2             his orchids from then on in.
 3    Roger:   With his what?
 4    Louise:  heh heh heh heh
 5    Ken:     With his orchids. [He has an orchid-
 6    Roger:                     [Oh heh hehheh
 7  → Louise   Playing with his organ yeah I thought the same thing!
 8             ((spoken through laughter))
 9    Ken:     Because he's got a great big [glass house-
10  → Roger:                                [I can see him playing with
11  →          his organ ((laughing))
```

summarizing the laughter (line 8) rather than transcribing it beat by beat.

Such simplification obscures the way laughter is employed as an interactional resource. In the more detailed excerpt 2, the laughter is fully transcribed. With the added detail, it becomes apparent that Louise precisely places her laughter within the utterance, 'PLAYN(h)W(h)IZ O(h)R'N' (line 8), stopping abruptly when she moves on to the next utterance ('ya:h I thought the same'). Roger subsequently laughs in a strikingly similar way within essentially the same phrase (second arrow, line 14). Deployed in this way, laughter displays recognition of an alternate 'obscene' hearing of the phrase 'playing with his orchids', even as it partially but not totally obscures its articulation.

Accordingly, researchers should strive to preserve as much detail as possible. However, because transcribing is extremely labor-intensive and time-consuming, the practicalities of the research process mandate transcripts that fall short of perfection. The amount of time invested in a transcript will inevitably vary with the interests of the researcher and the level of detail deemed necessary for the research task at hand. One practical strategy is to transcribe in varying amounts of detail, reserving the highest level of detail for segments that will receive the most analytic attention.

The placement of silences is another illuminating detail, one that also highlights the connection between transcription and analysis. When transcribing a silence, the transcriptionist must decide whether to place the silence within a line of talk, or have it be free-standing on its own line. This decision is predicated on an analysis of whom, if anyone, the silence 'belongs' to, and hence whether turn transition is relevant at that point (Psathas and Anderson, 1990: 89). To illustrate, in excerpt 3 all of the silences are placed within B's lines of talk, and are thus treated as hesitations within an ongoing turn. However, two of the silences (0.7 and 1.5) actually occur at the end of a possibly complete unit of talk. It would be more analytically helpful to give these silences their own lines (see below), thus acknowledging them as places where the floor is open and other parties could come in

(2) [Jefferson, 1985: 29, detailed transcript]

```
 1    Ken:     An'e came hom'n decided'e wz gonna play with his o:rchids.
 2             from then on i:n.
 3    Roger:   With iz what?
 4    Louise:  mh hih hih [huh
 5    Ken:                [With iz orchids. =
 6    Ken:     =Ee[z got an orch [id-
 7    Roger:      [Oh:.           [ hehh [ h a h .he:h ]  .heh
 8  → Louise:                            [heh huh .hh ] PLAYN(h)W(h)IZ O(h)R'N
 9             ya:h I[thought the [same
10    Roger:         [uh::         [.hunhh. hh.hh
11    Ken:                         [Cz eez gotta great big [gla:ss  house]
12    Roger:                                               [I c'n s(h)e e ]=
13    Ken:     =[(          )
14  → Roger:    [im pl(h)ay with iz o(h)r(h)g.(h)n.uh
```

(3) [Psathas and Anderson, 1990: 89]

1 B: ... all of which were *no:rmal.* (0.7) So:: I was *pegged,* (0.5) as a
2   person with (.) more than a back problem. (1.5) Or at least that's
3   what I ...

if they choose. Transcript 4 makes it much easier to see that others were declining the opportunity to respond at a place where they had the option to do so.

A final note on the transcription of silences. Conversation analysts are divided about whether silences should be timed with the aid of a mechanical device such as a stop-watch or computer, or whether they should be gauged by simply counting beats (*'one* one thousand, *two* one thousand ...'). The latter method may be less reliable, but is arguably more sensitive to local variations in the tempo of interaction. Whichever method is chosen, it should be used systematically throughout a corpus (see ten Have, 1999: 85; Psathas and Anderson, 1990: 87).

ANALYZING DATA

Getting started

Once data have been gathered and prepared, how should analysis begin? A geographic analogy is useful here. The domain of inter-action may be likened to an uncharted terri-tory whose topography remains only partially understood. Conversation analysts seek to map this territory with the aid of recordings and transcripts, which make specimens of its contours available to repeated scrutiny. At this point the analogy breaks down, for con-versation analysts then go on to analyze how the participants jointly produce and repro-duce the topography of interaction as they deal with one another in real time. Analysis is thus a type of mapping exercise, albeit one that maps not only interactional patterns but also the underlying methods and procedures

through which participants produce them and render them intelligible.

This type of analysis requires holding in abeyance premature questions about *why* a social activity is organized in a particular way, focusing instead on *what* is being done and *how* it is accomplished. That is, the analyst should put aside theoretical considerations about the possible intersections between the interaction and other aspects of the social world (e.g., social structural variables such as status, race, and gender, as well as psycholo-gical variables such as motivations, emotions, and personality traits) in order to understand the endogenous organization of the inter-action. This means being willing to accept that order is neither wholly external to inter-action nor automatically present despite what the participants do. It entails being attentive to the ways the participants them-selves produce the orderly features of the interaction and display their understanding and appreciation of those features to one another – and by implication for professional analysts as well. As Schegloff and Sacks (1973: 290) observe:

We have proceeded under the assumption (an assumption borne out by our research) that insofar as the materials we worked with exhibited order-liness, they did so not only for us ... but for the co-participants who had produced them. If the materials ... were orderly, they were so because they had been methodically produced by members of the society for one another, and it was a feature of the conversations that we treated as data that they were produced so as to ... allow the participants to display to each other their analysis, appreciation and use of that orderliness.

Interactional activities can be investigated at several different levels. Conversations have

(4) [Psathas and Anderson, 1990: 89]

1 B: ... all of which were *no:rmal.*
2 → (0.7)
3 B: So:: I was *pegged,* (0.5) as a person with (.) more than a back problem.
4 → (1.5)
5 B: Or at least that's what I ...

nested layers of activity, any one of which may be analyzed in terms of the underlying procedures through which it is accomplished (Drew and Heritage, 1992a: 29–45). At the most macroscopic level are overarching activity frameworks that organize lengthy stretches of interaction, such as 'getting acquainted' or 'talking about personal problems' or 'seeing a doctor for medical help' or 'cross-examining a witness'. One step below this are discrete sequences of action, which may be analyzed for their relatively generic sequential properties (e.g., paired actions, story-telling sequences) or for type-specific characteristics (e.g., as question– answer sequences, invitation sequences, news delivery sequences). Next come the singular actions that comprise sequences, actions normally accomplished through a single turn at talk such as questions, requests, news announcements, or ways of responding to these various actions. Finally, at the most microscopic level are the specific lexical choices, intonation contours, nonvocal behaviors, and other turn components that are mobilized within turns at talk.

As should be apparent from the preceding list, virtually everything that happens in interaction is fair game for analysis. While there is a natural tendency to dismiss the seemingly small and all too familiar details of interactional conduct as varying randomly or as insignificant 'manners of speaking', conversation analysts proceed from the assumption that all elements of interaction are orderly and meaningful (Sacks, 1984), analyzable in terms of the underlying methods participants use to produce and understand them. This attitude opens up a wealth of possibilities for analysis, but it can be daunting for the novice. Where to begin? While there is no simple recipe for getting started or for locating phenomena for analysis, drawing on Schegloff (1996: 172), we suggest two pathways into the data.

Begin with a 'noticing' One pathway begins with relatively unmotivated observation. The analyst simply notices something about the way a speaker says or does something at a given point within interaction, something that strikes the analyst as in some way interesting. Of course, purely unmotivated observation is an unattainable ideal. Experienced conversation analysts approach data with a well-developed empirically-based conceptual/theoretical foundation that affects what analysts are inclined to notice in the data and what strikes them as 'interesting'. Nevertheless, it is possible to approach data without a specific agenda in mind at the outset, and thus remain open to previously unexplored practices of interaction. Having noticed a given practice, the analyst can then proceed to analyze it in terms of what it might be 'doing' – the action(s) that it accomplishes, and how it figures within and contributes to an ongoing course of interaction.

For example, Sacks (1992: 256–7) observed that when children speak to adults, they commonly begin by asking a question such as 'You know what, Daddy?' Anyone who has been around children for any length of time will be familiar with this recurrent feature of children's talk. What is going on with this practice? One clue can be gleaned from the response it elicits. Adults typically respond to the 'You know what' question with another question – 'What?' This type of response not only invites the child to speak again and say what motivated the original question, but in so doing it simultaneously aligns the adult as one who is prepared to listen to the ensuing talk. Thus, the original 'You know what' query sets in motion a chain of events that gives the child a ratified speaking 'slot' and an attentive recipient. The fact that children use this practice disproportionately displays their orientation to having somewhat diminished rights to talk, for the practice

(5) [Heritage, 1998]

```
1      Act:   ....hhhh and some of thuh- (0.3) some of my students
2             translated Eliot into Chine::se. I think thuh very
3             first.
4             (0.2)
5      Har:   Did you learn to speak (.) Chine [:se.
6  → Act:                                      [.hh Oh yes.
7             (0.7)
8      Act:   .hhhh You ca::n't live in thuh country without speaking
9             thuh lang[uage it's impossible .hhhhh=
10     Har:            [Not no: cour:se
```

can be understood as a methodical solution to the problem of how to get the floor in conversation despite such diminished rights.

A similar course of reasoning underlies Heritage's (1998) analysis of a particular way of designing answers to questions. Heritage initially observed that some answers to questions are prefaced with 'Oh', as in excerpt 5 example (line 6, arrowed), taken from a radio interview with Sir Harold Acton, a noted British aesthete.

This practice, far from being random or insignificant, turns out to have a systematic interactional import. By prefacing an answer with 'Oh', the answerer implies that the prior question 'came from left field' and is thus of questionable relevance. In this particular case, the prior discussion concerned Acton's experience teaching modern poetry at Beijing University, and it is in the context of that discussion that he is asked (at line 5) if he learned to speak Chinese. He plainly finds this question to be obvious or self-evident – he expresses that view explicitly at lines 8–9, but he also conveys it implicitly in his initial response to the question (line 6) via the 'Oh'-prefaced affirmative answer.

With this pathway into the data, an initial noticing is 'pursued by asking what – if anything – such a practice of talking has as its outcome' (Schegloff, 1996: 172). Of course, not every observed practice will turn out to have a systematic import. Nonetheless, many core findings of CA have their origins in noticings of previously unnoticed and unexplored practices of interaction.

Begin with a vernacular action Another pathway is to focus on a particular type of action that is already known as part of the vernacular culture – asking questions, giving advice, delivering news announcements, etc. Here the challenge for the analyst is to transcend what competent members of the culture intuitively know about the action in question. This can be accomplished by exploring the ways a given action can be designed and implemented and the ramifications of such alternatives, identifying the sequential environments in which the action occurs, and exploring how it is consequential for subsequent talk.

For example, using the delivery of bad news as a starting point, Maynard (1992, 1996, 1997, 2003) has examined a wide range of practices that bearers of bad news use to manage this difficult interpersonal task. Such practices serve to minimize recipient resistance and thus maximize the likelihood that recipients will be adequately prepared to register and accept the news. In a similar vein, various studies have

explicated familiar aspects of doctor–patient interaction with surprising results. Halkowski (forthcoming) has examined how patients initially present their symptoms to doctors. As it turns out, patients employ a range of practices that serve to display their competence as observers of their own bodies. Gill (1998) and Gill and Maynard (forthcoming), focusing on diagnostic explanations in doctor–patient encounters, have explored how patients offer explanations for their own illnesses. As it turns out, they do so normally with marked caution and in ways that reflect their orientation to the structure of the medical interview, where getting information about symptoms normally precedes diagnosis (see also Gill et al., 2001). In each case, a familiar type of action – delivering bad news, describing symptoms, offering medical explanations – is explicated in terms of previously unexamined design features and sequential properties.

Grounding an analysis

Once a possible phenomenon has been located, how should analysis proceed? In the broad tradition of interpretive sociology that extends back through Alfred Schutz and Max Weber, and *emic* analysis in social anthropology, CA seeks analyses that are grounded in the understandings and orientations of the participants themselves. From a CA perspective these understandings cannot be adequately assessed either by interviewing the participants after the fact or by asking informants about the import of the practice in question. The problem with such retrospective accounts is not only that they may be misguided – they are also conditioned by the immediate interactional context in which they are produced, and are couched in vernacular terms that are generally inadequate to the technical demands of social scientific inquiry. In the domain of interaction, the understandings that matter are those that are incarnate in the interaction being examined – understandings that participants act on within interaction and thus render consequential for its subsequent development (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973).

The response as an analytic resource For tapping into such understandings, one crucial resource centers on how recipients respond to the practice in question. Consider that interactions ordinarily unfold as a series of turns or 'moves', each one of which is to some extent sensitive to and conditioned by the move that preceded it (even as it shapes

(6) [Whalen and Zimmerman, 1987: 174]

```
1       Dispatcher:  Midcity Emergency
2       Caller:      Um yeah (.) somebody jus' vandalized my car,
3   →   Dispatcher:  What's your address.
4       Caller:      Sixteen seventy Redland Road.
```

and constrains what comes next). Given the general responsiveness of contributions to interaction, each contribution will normally display that speaker's understanding of what came before (Sacks et al., 1974). Interactants themselves rely on such retrospective displays of understanding to ascertain whether and how they were understood, and this 'architecture of intersubjectivity' (Heritage, 1984b: 254) can also be a resource for conversation analysts.

To illustrate, consider the utterance 'Somebody just vandalized my car'. As Whalen and Zimmerman (1987) have observed, while the lexical meaning of this utterance is transparent and unambiguous, the type of action that it implements – what it is 'doing' from the standpoint of the interactants themselves – is less obvious and cannot be determined by considering the utterance in isolation. It could in principle be a straightforward *announcement of news*, with no agenda other than that of conveying information to an uninformed recipient. If this were the case, one would expect it to generate an initial response along the lines of 'Oh' or 'Oh really' or 'My goodness' – that is, a response that attends to it as new and perhaps surprising information (Jefferson, 1981; Heritage, 1984b). Alternatively, the news announcement could be subsidiary to the task of *requesting help* or assistance of some sort, in which case one would expect a response that either accepts or rejects the request, or at least proceeds in that direction. In reality, the utterance was produced by a caller to an emergency service, and it was responded to as shown in excerpt 6. Notice that the dispatcher's response – a query about the caller's address (arrowed) – is a purely instrumental query, a necessary prerequisite for sending assistance that clearly treats the prior utterance as a request for help rather than a mere news announcement. The dispatcher's impetus to hear this as a request is undoubtedly conditioned by the local institutional environment. In this context, while not everything a caller says will be understood as a request for help, descriptions of trouble are

routinely heard and treated this way (Whalen and Zimmerman, 1987). But the crucial point is that such understandings are displayed publicly in the subsequent response and are thus available as an analytic resource.

Responses can also be informative in more subtle ways. Beyond revealing participant understandings of the basic type of action embodied in a prior utterance, they can also shed light on more detailed aspects of the action, such as its level of intensity or its valence. For instance, an announcement of news may be regarded not only as an announcement generically but as embodying either good or bad news, and this too is displayed through subsequent talk (Maynard, 1997). Thus, the birth announcement in excerpt 7 is receipted (arrowed) not just as news ('Oh') but specifically as good news via the inclusion of a favorable assessment ('how lovely').

In other cases, the proper valence of a given news announcement may be unclear to the recipient, resulting in a more cautious mode of receipt. Contrast the birth announcement sequence in excerpt 7 with a similar announcement in excerpt 8. This time the announcement (line 1) generates an initial response ('Oh my goodness' at arrow 1) that registers it as surprising, but specifically avoids evaluating the news in an explicit way. This non-evaluative response is intelligible under the circumstances – the announcement is being issued by the expecting mother (Andi) whose husband (Bob) had previously had a vasectomy, raising the spectre of an unplanned pregnancy. Moreover, the recipient of the news (Betty) is clearly aware of this fact, as evidenced by her subsequent query about a reversal (line 3). Only when subsequent talk reveals that the husband's vasectomy had indeed been reversed and that the pregnancy was fully planned does Betty receipt it unequivocally as good news ('Oh I'm so happy' at arrow 2).

At a still more subtle level, responses can even shed light on the meaning and import of a momentary silence in interaction

(7) [Maynard, 1997: 111]

```
1       Carrie:  I: thought you'd like to know I've got a little gran'daughter
2   →   Leslie:  thlk Oh: how lovely.
```

(8) [Maynard, 1997: 116, simplified]

```
1       Andi:  hhhh! Bob and I are going to have a baby.
2  1→  Betty: Oh my goodness hhow- (1.0)
3              did you have a reversal- he have a reversal?
4       Andi:  Yea:h.
              .
              .
              .
5       Andi:  It was [very successful,] [very quickly] hh::h. hhh
6  2→  Betty:         [OH I'M  SO  ] [HAPPY.    ]
```

(Davidson, 1984; Pomerantz, 1984). In excerpt 9, C invites B (and a third party) to stay with him at the beach (line 1). This invitation launches a particular type of sequence, one that establishes the relevance of a response that either accepts or declines the invitation. However, what initially follows is silence (line 2). A silence in this sequential context would ordinarily be understood as 'belonging' to the recipient of the invitation (Sacks et al., 1974), and it could in principle result from a number of causes. B may have a basic problem hearing or understanding the invitation, or B may have heard/understood but is intending to reject it and is presenting herself as hesitant in order to do so. The problem, in short, could be either the intelligibility or the acceptability of the invitation. C's response to the silence (arrowed, line 3) clearly treats it as indicating the latter type of problem. Instead of repeating or rewording the invitation – which would be the usual way of handling a problem of intelligibility (Schegloff et al., 1977) – C offers an argument for accepting the invitation. This move presupposes the intelligibility of the invitation and seems designed to overcome what C infers is resistance on B's part. Moreover, the substance of C's argument displays his analysis of B's reason for resisting (concern about insufficient room and the inconvenience that this might entail), a reason that he counters in an effort to nudge her toward an acceptance.

At varying levels of detail, then, successive contributions to interaction can shed light on the meaning and import for the participants of the events to which they are responsive. Of course, it is entirely possible for a respondent to misunderstand what a speaker originally intended, but such errors are typically revealed through repair efforts undertaken in subsequent turns at talk (Schegloff, 1992). More often, subsequent talk by the speaker implicitly confirms the respondent's understanding (see example 9, line 6, above). In any event, the sequential organization of interaction provides a running index of how the participants understand and orient to one another's conduct.

Deployment as an analytic resource The response to a practice is an extremely useful resource, but it is not always a sufficient basis on which to build an analysis. Subsequent talk does not always reveal a wholly transparent understanding of prior talk, and it may at times be designedly opaque (as in example 8, arrow 1, above). Moreover, subsequent talk is most useful for analyzing utterances that initiate sequences (e.g., news announcements, requests, invitations) and thus generate responses that are closely geared to their particulars of the talk in question; subsequent talk is less useful for analyzing talk that is itself primarily responsive and hence generates less attentive sequelae.

Fortunately, other analytic resources are available that center not on the *recipient* but on the *producer* of the talk in question. Examining in detail how speakers recurrently deploy a given practice – in particular sequential environments, in particular positions inside the speaker's own turn, and in conjunction with other practices – can provide important clues as to the meaning and import of that practice for those who use it.

(9) [Davidson, 1984: 105, simplified]

```
1   C:   Well you can both sta:y.
2        (0.4)
3  →C:   [Got plenty a' roo:m, hh[hh
4   B:   [Oh I-              [Oh(h)o(h)o,
5        (.)
6   B:   Please don't tempt me,
```

(10) [Jefferson, 1984: 205]

```
1        M:  and she's been very thrifty.
2   → B:  Mm hm,
3        M:  .hhhhh So: (.) I said it- it a:dds up to one thing
4             money somepla:ce
5   → B:  Mm hm,
6        M:  .hhhh=
7   → B:  Mm [hm,
8        M:      [But ish (.) she tn- transacts all her business in
9             Lo:s Angeles you know and people like this are so secretive
10            it's a(m) really it's almost a mental state
11  → B:  Yeah .hh Well .hh uh:m (0.9) y- there's something wrong too
12            if she doesn't pay her bills....
```

To illustrate, consider the various bits of talk that are used to receipt prior talk – items such as 'mm hm', 'yeah', 'oh', and 'okay'. These were long assumed to comprise an undifferentiated set of 'acknowledgement tokens' or 'backchannel' displays of understanding. However, it has been demonstrated – largely on the basis of the highly selective manner in which these tokens are deployed – that each performs a somewhat distinct interactional function (Beach, 1993; Heritage, 1984a; Jefferson, 1984). The contrast between 'mm hm' and 'yeah' provides a useful case in point (Jefferson, 1984). In excerpt 10, notice how B deploys these receipt tokens (arrowed) in the course of M's extended telling. Although B uses both forms of receipt, she deploys them in discriminably different ways. One point of difference is the prior sequential environment; the 'mm hm' tokens appear in the midst of M's extended telling as it unfolds, while the 'yeah' token appears at what is constructed as the completion of the telling. Correspondingly,

there are differences in what B does next – each 'mm hm' token stands alone within B's turn at talk, while the 'yeah' token is followed by further talk as B assumes the role of speaker and produces a more substantial response to M's telling. It turns out that some speakers do not discriminate in their use of these tokens, but those that do discriminate systematically in precisely this way. Accordingly, these tokens embody different stances toward the talk to which they are responding; 'mm hm' displays a stance of 'passive recipiency' while 'yeah' displays 'incipient speakership'. This conclusion is based on the systematic manner in which they are deployed in interaction.

The distinct functions of these tokens are perhaps most apparent when the tokens are used in sequentially incongruous ways. Thus, in excerpt 11, when speaker G finishes an extended telling and clearly marks it as finished via an explicit assertion to that effect ('So that's the story' in line 10), B receipts the story with 'Mm hm' (arrowed).

(11) [Jefferson, 1984: 209]

```
1        G:  I'd li:ke to have the mirrors. But if she wants them? (.)
2             .hh why that's: I-th-tha:t's fi::ne.
3        B:  Mm hm,
4        G:  If she's going to use them you kno:w.
5        B:  Mm [hm,
6        G:      [.hhhhhh I'm not going to uh,hh maybe queer the dea:l
7             just by wanting this that and the othe[r (you know),
8        B:                                            [NO:.
9             (0.2)
10       G:  .hhhh s:So: uhm,h (.) tha:t's the story.
11  → B:  Mm hm,
12            (0.2)
13  G:  An:d uh (0.6) uhm,hhh (1.0) .hhhh u-Then I have a ma:n
14            coming Tue:sday...
```

If this is a display of passive recipiency, it is strikingly misfitted to such an obvious story completion, which might be expected to generate a more substantial response. And yet, it seems to have been produced and understood as embodying just such a passive stance – subsequent to this token, B falls silent and offers no further talk (line 12), whereas G searches for and eventually finds something further to say (lines 13–14). Here then, an interactant exploits the passivity of 'mm hm' as a resource for resisting the impending speakership role by prompting the prior speaker to continue.

The preceding discussion does not by any means exhaust the analytic resources that are available to the researcher, but it does illustrate at least some of the resources that may be exploited in the service of developing an analysis that is properly grounded in the displayed understandings and orientations of the participants themselves. These resources include both how speakers deploy the practice in question, and how it is subsequently dealt with by other participants. Given such resources, the analyst need not speculate about the endogenous meaning and import of a given practice, because such understandings are continually being displayed by the participants as they use and respond to the practice in question. Exploiting these resources as thoroughly as possible is a hallmark of the CA approach.

Working through collections

The primary objective of CA is to elucidate generic mechanisms that recurrently organize interaction. Although analysis often begins by examining a single fragment of interaction, this is normally the first step in a deeper analysis that transcends that particular fragment and sheds light on practices and organizations of practice that appear within and are consequential for numerous interactions. As Sacks (1984: 26–7) has observed:

> Thus it is not any particular conversation, as an object, that we are primarily interested in. Our aim is to get into a position to transform ... our view of 'what happened', from a matter of a particular interaction done by particular people, to a matter of interactions as products of a machinery. We are trying to find the machinery. In order to do so we have to get access to its products.

Such organizations of practice can be observed in operation within single specimens of talk, but a full understanding of how they work usually requires the systematic analysis of numerous examples that instantiate the phenomenon in question. This is the informally quantitative aspect of CA alluded to earlier. In a variety of ways, working with collections can flesh out and enrich an analysis initially arrived at through a single case. It enables the researcher to begin to specify the scope of the phenomenon being examined, and in particular the conditions under which it does or does not hold. Collections also enable one to specify the strength and normativity of the practice – whether it is merely an empirical regularity evident only to the analyst, or a social convention that the participants themselves recognize and orient to, or a normative practice that the participants enforce on one another such that non-compliance is sanctionable.

When building a collection of candidate instances of a given phenomenon (e.g., news announcements, receipt tokens, follow-up questions in news interviews, symptom descriptions in doctor–patient interactions), it is useful to begin the search by casting a wide net. One should include not only what appear to be clear instances of the phenomenon in question, but also less clear boundary cases in which the phenomenon is present in a partial or imperfect form, as well as negative or 'deviant' cases where the phenomenon simply did not occur as expected. When a phenomenon has not yet been analytically specified, such cases are necessary to clarify the phenomenon's boundaries and to illuminate some of its more elusive properties.

Once a collection is assembled, analysis proceeds on a case-by-case basis with the ultimate objective of developing an account of the phenomenon that will be comprehensive, encompassing all relevant instances in the collection. In this respect, the methodology of CA is formally similar to what has elsewhere been termed 'analytic induction', a qualitative method that can be traced to Znaniecki (1934) and which seeks to produce a relationship of perfect correspondence between an empirical phenomenon and the analytic apparatus postulated to explain its various manifestations within a corpus of data (Katz, 1983). Beyond this the similarity ends, for analytic induction has traditionally been concerned with the formulation of causal laws, while CA seeks to explicate the endogenous principles that interactants use to organize their conduct.

Central to this process is the analysis of deviant cases – that is, cases that run contrary to the researcher's developing sense of how

(12) [Schegloff, 1968: 1079]

```
1   ((ring))
2   ((receiver is lifted, and there is a one-second silence))
3   Caller:     Hello.
4   Answerer:   American Red Cross.
5   Caller:     Hello, this is police headquarters....
```

the phenomenon is organized. Rather than dismissing such cases or chalking them up to random error, such cases should be aggressively sought and incorporated into the analysis. Almost invariably, confronting such cases is an analytically fruitful endeavor.

Some deviant cases are shown, upon analysis, to result from interactants' orientation to the same considerations that produce the 'regular' cases. These cases are, in effect, 'exceptions that prove the rule', providing powerful evidence for the original analytic formulation. We have already seen an illustration of this in the discussion of excerpt 11 above, in which an 'mm hm' token was placed in an unusual sequential environment, but was nevertheless shown to function much like other such tokens as a display of passive recipiency. For another illustration, consider the phenomenon known as an adjacency pair – a pair of actions (e.g., question–answer, request– response, greeting–greeting) whose sequential co-occurrence is explained by the property of conditional relevance, which stipulates that the production of a first action makes a corresponding response both relevant and expectable (Schegloff, 1968, 1972; Schegloff and Sacks, 1973). How, then, do we account for instances where the relevant response was not immediately produced? In many cases it can be shown that even though the response item was not produced then and there, the interactants nonetheless acted in accordance with the assumption that it should properly be forthcoming. For instance, the recipient may provide an account to explain and justify the nonproduction of a relevant response; alternatively, if no account is forthcoming, the initiator of the sequence may, after a pause, attempt to elicit the relevant item and thereby complete the unfinished sequence (see excerpt 9, line 3, above). In any case, through such actions the parties display an orientation to the very same principles that are postulated to underpin the production of 'normal' adjacency pair sequences (Heritage, 1984b: 248–53). This line of reasoning not only confirms the initial analysis regarding conditional relevance; it also enriches it by showing how the same principles can generate a nonstandard course of action.

In other instances, deviant cases can prompt the researcher to revise the initial analysis in favor of a more general formulation, one that can encompass both the regular cases and the anomalous departure. Perhaps the clearest statement of this process can be found in Schegloff's (1968) analysis of telephone call openings. In a corpus of 500 telephone calls, Schegloff found that a straightforward rule – 'answerer speaks first' – adequately described all but one of the call openings (excerpt 12). In that one unusual case, the caller speaks first (line 3): Rather than ignoring this instance or explaining it away in an *ad hoc* fashion, Schegloff returned to the drawing board and developed a more general analytic apparatus that could account for all 500 cases. This apparatus involved what would later be termed adjacency pairs, and the recognition that the ringing of the telephone launches a special kind of adjacency pair sequence – a summons–answer sequence – and thus establishes the relevance of an appropriate response to the summons. Against this backdrop, the rule that 'answerer speaks first' actually reflects the more general principle that once a summons (here a ringing phone) has been issued, an appropriate response is due. The deviant case can also be explained in light of the summons and its sequential implications. In that case the ring (line 1 above) was followed by silence (line 2), during which the relevant response was heard by the caller to be absent. This in turn prompted the caller to speak first as a way of reissuing the summons to solicit a response and thereby 'repair' the unfinished sequence. In this way, deviant cases can encourage the development of a more general and analytically powerful account that can encompass both the regular cases and the atypical variant.

Finally, some deviant cases may, upon analysis, turn out to fall beyond the parameters of the core phenomenon being investigated, and are thus not genuinely 'deviant' at all. Here the impetus is to clarify as precisely as possible what distinguishes the apparent departure from the other cases, and thus constitutes it as an alternate interactional phenomenon. For instance, consider how personal troubles are discussed in conversation

(Jefferson, 1988; Jefferson and Lee, 1981). When speakers disclose their troubles, recipients commonly respond with affiliative displays of understanding. However, in contrast to this typical pattern, recipients may instead offer advice and thereby transform the situation from a 'troubles-telling' to a 'service encounter', implicating different discourse identities and situated activities. This line of analysis, unlike the previous two, does not result in a single analytic formulation which can account for both the 'regular' and 'deviant' cases. Rather, it recognizes differences between alternate courses of action, and in so doing it clarifies the boundaries of the core phenomenon.

However deviant cases are handled, it is almost always productive to consider such cases carefully in pursuit of a comprehensive analysis of the available data. Whether they provide compelling evidence for the original analysis, or prompt the development of a more powerful analysis, or clarify the scope of the phenomenon being investigated, such cases ensure that the result will be firmly anchored to interactional reality.

RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

Because CA is addressed to a domain of phenomena that did not previously have a disciplinary home within the social sciences, its significance has not always been recognized by those in other social science sectors. The sustained focus on the endogenous organization of talk-in-interaction has nonetheless proven to be both productive and illuminating, enabling researchers to begin to map what is an exceedingly complex domain of social phenomena. Much has been learned about the basic objects that comprise this domain and the principles in terms of which they are organized.

Progress on this front has made it possible for researchers to begin applying CA methods and findings to address questions that extend beyond the organization of interaction *per se*, questions involving how this domain intersects with and can thus illuminate other aspects of the social world. As we noted at the beginning of this chapter, some researchers have examined the impact of interactional practices on bureaucratic and professional decision-making (e.g., in medicine, journalism, and social science research). Others have done comparative analyses of interactional practices to illuminate large-scale processes of cultural variation and historical change. Still others have explored how interaction can illuminate processes of cognition and cognitive development. Some of this work involves formal quantification, correlating interactional practices with other variables of interest. The utility of CA in this context is that the growing body of past interactional research identifies previously unknown practices, establishes and validates the meaning and import of those practices, and thus provides a solid foundation for quantitative and distributional studies.

As progress is made in these various 'applied' areas, it is important to keep in mind that such work would not be possible without the 'pure' research on which it is based. The domain of talk-in-interaction remains a rich and compelling topic in its own right, one in which agency is exercised, intersubjectivity is achieved, and various contexts of the social world are brought to life. Notwithstanding what has already been accomplished, much remains to be discovered about how human interaction actually works.

APPENDIX

Transcript notational conventions

The transcription conventions developed by Gail Jefferson (1974) are designed to capture the details of talk and interaction as it naturally occurs. This is a brief guide to the symbols – for a more detailed exposition, see Atkinson and Heritage (1984, pp. ix–xvi).

A: That's <u>my view.</u>   <u>Underlined items</u> were markedly stessed.
A: That's my:: view.   <u>Colon(s)</u> indicate the prior sound was prolonged.
A: That's MY view.   <u>Capital letters</u> indicate increased volume.
A: That's my- my view.   <u>A hyphen</u> denotes a glottal stop or 'cut-off' of sound.

A: hhh That's my view.	<u>Strings of 'hhh'</u> mark audible outbreath. The longer the string, the longer the outbreath.
A: .hhh That's my view.	<u>Strings of '.hhh'</u> mark audible inbreath. (Note the preceding period.) Again the longer the string, the longer the inbreath.
A: That's (.) my view. (1.3)	<u>Numbers in parentheses</u> denote elapsed silence in seconds. A period denotes a
B: But should it be.	micropause of less than 0.2 seconds.
A: That's my view .=	<u>Equals signs</u> indicate that one sound followed the other with no
B: = But should it be.	intervening silence.
A: Tha[t's my view]	<u>Brackets</u> mark the onset and termination of simultaneous speech.
B: [But should it] be.	
A: That's my view,	<u>Punctuation marks</u> denote intonation rather than grammar at turn
B: But should it be.	constructional unit boundaries. Periods indicate fallingintonation,
A: I think so?	question marks indicate rising intonation, and commas indicate 'continuing' or slightly rising intonation.
A: That's my ( )	<u>Open parentheses</u> indicate transcriber's uncertainty as to what was said.
B: But (should it) be.	<u>Words in parentheses</u> represent a best guess as to what was said.

NOTES

1 For a much more elaborate discussion of CA methods, see ten Have (1999).

2 This is not to imply that recordings can capture every interactional feature that was available to the participants. A recording is always a version of reality, and will reflect such choices as how cameras are positioned and how much of the interaction is recorded. Although for simplicity's sake we will refer to recordings as 'the data', it is with the understanding that any recording is unavoidably a rendering of the data, the actual events that were recorded (see Psathas and Anderson, 1990).

REFERENCES

Atkinson, Max (1984) *Our Masters' Voices: The Language and Body Language of Politics*. London: Methuen.

Atkinson, Maxwell and Heritage, John (eds) (1984) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beach, Wayne A. (1993) 'Transitional regularities for casual "okay" usages', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19: 325–52.

Boden, Deirdre and Zimmerman, Don H. (eds) (1991) *Talk and Social Structure*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Boyd, Elizabeth (1998) 'Bureaucratic authority in the "company of equals": Initiating discussion during medical peer review', *American Sociological Review*, 63: 200–24.

Button, Graham and Lee, J.R.E. (eds) (1987) *Talk and Social Organisation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Clayman, Steven E. and Heritage, John (2002) 'Questioning presidents: Journalistic deference and adversarialness in the press conferences of U.S. President's Eisenhower and Reagan', *Journal of Communication*, 52: 749–75.

Clayman, Steven E. and Reisner, Anne (1998) 'Gatekeeping in action: Editorial conferences and assessments of newsworthiness', *American Sociological Review*, 63: 178–99.

Davidson, Judy (1984) 'Subsequent versions of invitations, offers, requests, and proposals dealing with potential or actual rejection', in J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds), *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 102–28.

Drew, Paul and Heritage, John (1992a) 'Analyzing talk at work: An introduction', in Paul Drew and John Heritage (eds), *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3–65.

Drew, Paul and Heritage, John (eds) (1992b) *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Garfinkel, Harold (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gill, Virginia Teas (1998) 'Doing attributions in medical interaction: Patients' explanations for illness and doctors' responses', *Social Psychology Quarterly* 61: 342–60.

Gill, Virginia Teas and Maynard, Douglas W. (forthcoming) 'Patients' explanations for health problems and physicians' responsiveness in the medical interview', in J. Heritage and D.W. Maynard (eds), *Practicing Medicine: Structure and Process in Primary Care Encounters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gill, Virginia Teas, Halkowski, Timothy and Roberts, Felkia (2001) 'Accomplishing a request without

making one: A single case analysis of a primary care visit', *Text*, 21(1/2): 55–81.

Glenn, Philip J. (2003) *Laughter in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goffman, Erving (1963) *Behavior in Public Places*. New York: Free Press.

Goffman, Erving (1964) 'The neglected situation', *American Anthropologist* 66(6 Pt. II): 133–6.

Goffman, Erving (1967) *Interaction Ritual: Essays in Face to Face Behavior*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Goffman, Erving (1983) 'The interaction order', *American Sociological Review*, 48: 1–17.

Goodwin, Charles (1981) *Conversational Organization: Interaction between Speakers and Hearers*. New York: Academic Press.

Goodwin, Charles (1994) 'Professional vision', *American Anthropologist* 96(3): 606–33.

Goodwin, Charles (1995) 'Co-constructing meaning in conversations with an aphasic man', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 28(3): 233–60.

Goodwin, Marjorie (1990) *He-Said-She-Said: Talk as Social Organization among Black Children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Halkowski, Timothy (forthcoming) 'Realizing the illness: Patients' reports of symptom discovery in primary care visits', in J. Heritage and D.W. Maynard (eds), *Practicing Medicine: Structure and Process in Primary Care Encounters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heeschen, Claus and Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1999) 'Agrammatism, adaptation theory, and conversation analysis: On the role of the so-called telegraphic style in talk-in-interaction', *Aphasiology*, 13: 365–405.

Heritage, John (1984a) 'A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement', in J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds), *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 299–345.

Heritage, John (1984b) *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heritage, John (1988) 'Explanations as accounts: A conversation analytic perspective', in C. Antaki (ed.), *Analyzing Everyday Explanation: A Casebook of Methods*. London: Sage, pp. 127–44.

Heritage, John (1998) 'Oh-prefaced responses to inquiry', *Language in Society*, 27(3): 291–334.

Heritage, John (1999) 'CA at century's end: Practices of talk-in-interaction, their distributions and their outcomes', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 32(1–2): 69–76.

Heritage, John (2001) 'Goffman, Garfinkel, and conversation analysis', in M. Wetherell, S.J. Taylor and S.J. Yates (eds), *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*. London: Sage.

Heritage, John and Maynard, Douglas W. (eds) (forthcoming) *Practicing Medicine: Structure and Process in Primary Care Encounters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, John and Stivers, Tanya (1999) 'Online commentary in acute medical visits: A method of shaping patient expectations', *Social Science and Medicine*, 49(11): 1501–17.

Heritage, John, Boyd, Elizabeth and Kleinman, Lawrence (2001) 'Subverting criteria: The role of precedent in decisions to finance surgery', *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 23(5): 701–28.

Houtkoop-Steenstra, Hanneke (1991) 'Opening sequences in Dutch telephone conversations', in D. Boden and D.H. Zimmerman (eds), *Talk and Social Structure*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 232–50.

Jefferson, Gail (1974) 'Error correction as an interactional resource', *Language in Society*, 2: 181–199.

Jefferson, Gail (1981) 'Caveat speaker: A preliminary exploration of shift implicative recipiency in the articulation of topic'. End of grant report to the Social Science Research Council, Great Britain.

Jefferson, Gail (1984) 'Notes on a systematic deployment of the acknowledgement tokens "Yeah" and "Mm hm"', *Papers in Linguistics*, 17: 197–216.

Jefferson, Gail (1985) 'An exercise in the transcription and analysis of laughter', in T.A. van Dijk (ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis Volume 3*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 25–34.

Jefferson, Gail (1988) 'On the sequential organization of troubles-talk in ordinary conversation', *Social Problems*, 35(4): 418–41.

Jefferson, Gail and J.R.E. Lee (1981) 'The rejection of advice: Managing the problematic convergence of a "Troubles-telling" and a "Service Encounter"', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 5: 399–422.

Katz, Jack (1983) 'A theory of qualitative methodology: The social system of analytic fieldwork', in R.M. Emerson (ed.), *Contemporary Field Research*. Boston: Little, Brown, pp. 127–148.

Labov, William (1972) *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lindström, Anna (1994) 'Identification and recognition in Swedish telephone conversation openings', *Language in Society*, 23(2): 231–52.

Maynard, Douglas W. (1984) *Inside Plea Bargaining: The Language of Negotiation*. New York: Plenum.

Maynard, Douglas W. (2003) *Bad News. Good News: Conversational Order in Everyday Talk and Clinical Settings*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Maynard, Douglas W. (1992) 'On clinicians co-implicating recipients' perspectives in the delivery of diagnostic news', in P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds), *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 331–58.

Maynard, Douglas W. (1996) 'On "realization" in everyday life: The forecasting of bad news as a social relation', *American Sociological Review*, 61(1): 109–31.

Maynard, Douglas W. (1997) 'The news delivery sequence: Bad news and good news in conversational interaction', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 30(2): 93–130.

Maynard, Douglas W. and Schaeffer, Nora Cate (1996) 'From paradigm to prototype and back again: Interactive aspects of "cognitive processing" in standardized survey interviews', in N. Schwarz and S. Sudman (eds), *Answering Questions: Methodology for Determining Cognitive and Communicating Processes in Survey Research*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass. pp. 65–88.

Maynard Douglas W. and Schaeffer, Nora Cate (2000) 'Toward a sociology of social scientific knowledge: Survey research and ethnomethodology's asymmetric alternates', *Social Studies of Science*, 30: 265–312.

Maynard, Douglas W., Houtkoop-Steenstra, Hanneke, Schaeffer, Nora Cate and van der Zouwen, Johannes (eds) (2002) *Standardization and Tacit Knowledge: Interaction and Practice in the Survey Interview*. New York: Wiley Interscience.

Peräkylä, Anssi (1998) 'Authority and accountability: The delivery of diagnosis in primary health care', *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 61: 301–20.

Pomerantz, Anita (1984) 'Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes', in J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 57–101.

Psathas, George (ed.) (1990) *Interaction Competence*. Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Psathas, George and Anderson, Timothy (1990) 'The "practices" of transcription in conversation analysis', *Semiotica*, 78: 75–99.

Sacks, Harvey (1984) 'Notes on methodology', in J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds), *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 21–7.

Sacks, Harvey (1992) *Lectures on Conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, Harvey, Schegloff, Emanuel A. and Jefferson, Gail (1974) 'A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation', *Language*, 50: 696–735.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1968) 'Sequencing in conversational openings', *American Anthropologist*, 70: 1075–95.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1972) 'Notes on a conversational practice: Formulating place', in D. Sudnow (ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction*. New York: Free Press, pp. 75–119.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1987) 'Between macro and micro: Contexts and other connections', in J.C. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Münch and N.J. Smelser (eds), *The Micro-Macro Link*. Berkeley: University of California Press. pp. 207–234.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1991) 'Conversation analysis and socially shared cognition', in Lauren B. Resnick, John M. Levine and S.D. Teasley (eds), *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, pp. 150–71.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1992) 'Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided for place for the defence of intersubjectivity in conversation', *American Journal of Sociology*, 95(5): 1295–345.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1993) 'Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26: 99–128.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1996) 'Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action', *American Journal of Sociology*, 102(1): 161–216.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. and Sacks, Harvey (1973) 'Opening up closings', *Semiotica*, 8: 289–327.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., Jefferson, Gail and Sacks, Harvey (1977) 'The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation', *Language*, 53: 361–82.

ten Have, Paul (1999) *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide*. London: Sage.

West, Candace and Zimmerman, Don H. (1983) 'Small insults: A study of interruptions in cross-sex conversations with unacquainted persons', in B. Thorne, C. Kramarae and N. Henley (eds), *Language, Gender and Society*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, pp. 102–17.

Whalen, Jack (1995) 'A technology of order production: Computer-aided dispatch in public safety communications', in P. ten Have and G. Psathas (eds), *Situated Order: Studies in the Social Organization of Talk and Embodied Activities*. Washington, DC: University Press of America, pp. 187–230.

Whalen, Marilyn and Zimmerman, Don H. (1987) 'Sequential and institutional contexts in calls for help', *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50: 172–85.

Wootton, Anthony J. (1997) *Interaction and the Development of Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zimmerman, Don H. (1988) 'On conversation: The conversation analytic perspective', *Communication Yearbook*, 11: 406–32.

Znaniecki, Florian (1934) *The Method of Sociology*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart.