

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

**TOPIC-INVOKED PARTICIPATION FRAMEWORKS
IN “TALK”- DISCUSSION PROGRAMS**

A Pro Gradu Thesis

by

Heidi Koskela

Department of English

2001

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

1. INTRODUCTION	5
<i>1.1 Focus</i>	5
<i>1.2 Motivations</i>	6
<i>1.3 The structure of this study</i>	6
2. METHOD AND PREVIOUS RESEARCH	8
<i>2.1 Conversation analysis as a method</i>	8
<i>2.2 CA and institutional interaction</i>	10
<i>2.3 Participation frameworks</i>	12
<i>2.4 Topic invoked participation frameworks</i>	16
3. DATA AND TRANSCRIPTION	20
<i>3.1 Overview of the data</i>	20
<i>3.2 Transcription</i>	22
4. TOPICAL MOVEMENT AND PARTICIPATION	24
<i>4.1 Boundaried topical movement</i>	26
<i>4.1.1 Gradual shaping of the question initiating topic</i>	33
<i>4.1.2 The participants' alignment to talk in progress</i>	36
<i>4.2 Stepwise topical movement</i>	38
<i>4.3 Content shift in the topic</i>	40
5. SELECTING NEXT SPEAKER	44
<i>5.1 Speaker-selection in institutional settings</i>	45
<i>5.2 Speaker-selection in topic-initiation sequences</i>	46
<i>5.2.1 Gaze and speaker-selection</i>	48
<i>5.2.2 Achieving fluent speaker-transition</i>	50
<i>5.3 Selecting "second" speaker</i>	51

5.4 <i>Problems in speaker-selection</i>	54
6. TEAMS IN CONVERSATION	61
6.1 <i>Extra-interactional collectivities made relevant in interaction</i>	63
6.1.1 <i>Orienting to shared knowledge</i>	66
6.1.2 <i>Negotiating the relevance of an extra-interactional collectivity</i>	70
6.2 <i>Interactional teams</i>	71
6.2.1 <i>Teams and situated identities</i>	72
6.2.2 <i>Teams and transportable identities</i>	75
6.2.3 <i>Team alignment in the construction of agreement</i>	79
7. CONCLUSION	84
REFERENCES	88
APPENDIX 1	95

HUMANISTINEN TIEDEKUNTA
ENGLANNIN KIELEN LAITOS

Heidi Koskela
TOPIC-INVOKED PARTICIPATION FRAMEWORKS
IN "TALK"- DISCUSSION PROGRAMS

Pro Gradu-tutkielma
Englantilainen filologia
Helmikuu 2001

94 sivua + 1 liite

Tutkielman tarkoituksena on tarkastella puheenaiheen herättämiä muutoksia osallistumiskehikoissa televisiokeskustelussa. Osallistumiskehikot koostuvat keskustelijoiden toiminnasta suhteessa puheeseen ja toisiinsa ja ne ovat keskustelijoiden yhdessä muokkaamia. Perinteisten puhujan ja kuulijan roolien lisäksi osallistumiskehikko sisältää kaikki keskustelijat ja heidän toimintansa esim. tietävinä vastaanottajina, tietämättöminä vastaanottajina, sivustakuulijoina ym. Tutkimusaineisto koostuu kahdesta keskusteluohjelmasta, joissa kaksi juontajaa ja 4-5 vierasta keskustelevat useista eri aiheista. Ohjelmat ovat suomalaisia, mutta osa keskustelijoista on ulkomaalaisia ja keskustelu tapahtuu englanniksi. Aineisto on litteroitu video- ja ääninauhalta.

Lähestymistapana tutkielmassa on keskusteluanalyysi. Keskusteluanalyysi pyrkii kuvaamaan vuorovaikutuksen järjestyneisyyttä. Teoriaa ei keskusteluanalyysissä aseteta ulkoapäin, vaan kyseessä on induktiivinen lähestymistapa, jossa tarkastellaan keskustelijoiden itsensä käyttämiä keinoja ja käytänteitä. Tutkielmassa etsitään vastauksia seuraaviin kysymyksiin: 1) kuinka puheenaihe herättää muutoksia osallistumiskehikossa, 2) minkälaisia nämä muutokset ovat ja 3) mitä vaikutuksia näillä muutoksilla on seuraavalle toiminnalle. Tutkielmassa keskitytään puheenaiheen herättämiin muutoksiin osallistumiskehikossa kolmessa erilaisessa ympäristössä: ensinnä ympäristöissä, joissa liikutaan puheenaiheesta toiseen, toiseksi suhteessa seuraavan puhujan valintaan ja kolmanneksi suhteessa osallistumiseen tiimeinä.

Aineistossa uusi puheenaihe aloitetaan usein kysymyksillä. Kysymyksillä myös vaikutetaan seuraavan puhujan valintaan ja projisoidaan erityyppisiä diskurssi-identiteettejä osallistujille. Juontajien käyttämänä kysymykset palvelevat usein myös heidän institutionaalista tehtäväänsä ohjelman luotsaajina ja tiedon välittäjinä katsojille. Puheenaiheiden valinnalla tehdään paikoitellen relevantiksi tietty aspekti osallistujien identiteetistä tai osallistujien jäsenyys eri ryhmissä, ja nämä tekijät ja niihin orientoituminen muokkaavat osallistumiskehikkoa. Jäsenyys eri ryhmissä ja identiteetin aspektien topikalisointi vaikuttaa usein myös tiimiytymiseen. Osallistujien tiedon määrä ja laatu suhteessa puheenaiheeseen vaikuttavat osallistumiskehikon muotoutumiseen. Erilaisilla diskurssi-identiteeteillä, joista osallistumiskehikko muodostuu, voidaan vaikuttaa myös laajempien sosiaalisten identiteettien muodostumiseen, esimerkiksi eksperttiyden sosiaaliseen rakentumiseen.

Asiasanat: participation frameworks. topic-invoked participation frameworks.
conversation analysis. institutional interaction.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Focus

In this thesis I will examine topic invoked participation frameworks in two television multiparty discussion programs. The objective of my study is to 1) find out how topic invokes changes in the participation arrangement, 2) what kind of changes there are in the participation framework and 3) what consequences these changes have for subsequent action. I am going to concentrate on those aspects of participation that seemed relevant and consequential in these data. The data examined in this study consist of two TV discussion programs that were recorded on video- and audio tape and then transcribed. The discussions involved two journalists and 4-5 invited guests from different cultural, linguistic, ethnic, and national backgrounds. The programs are recorded from Finnish TV, and the language used in the programs is English, a foreign language to most of the co-participants. The format of these programs is a discussion program, where hosts and guests talk about different topics. The topics were pre-selected, and the guests were invited according to their relevance for the themes and goals of the program.

Participation frameworks provide a possibility for the interactants to participate in various different ways in an interactive event. Participation frameworks are dynamic; in other words the participants can have multiple roles and positions in relation to talk and to other participants that change as the conversation goes on. Topic of talk is one factor that invokes changes in the participation framework. How that happens is the focus of this study. I will analyze the data with the methodology used in conversation analysis (CA). I will attempt to describe the mechanisms that participants use in conversation and I will describe the actions as they emerge from data, not using pre-set categories.

1.2 Motivations

Interaction is a crucial part of everyday life and increasingly important in the media. There are many functions that interaction in the media has. Its function can be to report news, to educate, to entertain, to serve political goals etc. This means that there is a need to describe and explain interaction and to find out more about the dynamics of interaction in different settings. There is relatively little previous research about topic invoked participation frameworks in broadcast settings, or even in institutional settings in general. I feel that it is important to study participation frameworks in different settings. First, to increase knowledge about participation frameworks in general and second, to increase knowledge about participation in institutional (in this case broadcast) settings.

I started this study with looking at the data and making some observations that I found interesting about the participants' position in relation to ongoing talk and to each other as the conversation proceeded. Looking more closely at these instances, the topic of talk seemed to be a factor influencing the changes in the participation framework. These data were particularly suitable for analysis because many different topics were talked about by several different people. I started to examine the data more closely and tried to find out ways how the topic of talk invokes changes in the participation framework. I started the analysis by examining the details of interaction in places where topical movement occurs. Then I moved on to investigate aspects of speaker-selection. In these data participation as teams seemed to affect the participation framework on many occasions, hence my third focus of attention.

1.3 The structure of this study

I will first discuss my choice of method and also briefly review earlier research on participation frameworks and topic-invoked participation frameworks. In the third

chapter I will discuss the data and transcription. The analysis of the data starts in chapter four where I will examine topical movement and participation. I found topical movement a good starting point in this study because it provides possibilities for the participants to arrange themselves in new ways that are appropriate for that particular topic and activities. In chapter five I will analyze speaker-selection, how topic influences speaker-selection and the consequences of speaker-selection on participation frameworks. I will pay attention to how the roles of speaker and listener are distributed and negotiated among the participants and how other roles and discourse identities that accompany these roles together form a participation framework. Chapter six deals with the relevance of collectivities and participation as teams. I will examine how participating as a team shapes the participation framework and also how certain participation frameworks favor participation as a team. Finally I will discuss my findings in chapter seven, the conclusion.

2. METHOD AND PREVIOUS RESEARCH

2.1 *Conversation analysis as a method*

Conversation analysis was developed by Harvey Sacks (together with Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson) in the 1960s, inspired by Harold Garfinkel's ethnomethodological research. Ethnomethodology was originally used in sociology, but it has spread to many other fields of study. It is a way of studying everyday life - the way "ordinary people" manage and make sense of their everyday life. While the interest of ethnomethodology is a wide variety of phenomena concerning everyday life and practical reasoning, conversation analysis (hereafter CA) focuses on "the comparatively restricted domain of talk-in-interaction and its various constituent activity systems (e.g., turn-taking, sequencing, repair, gaze direction, institutional specializations, and the like)" (Clayman and Maynard 1995:2).

CA is the analysis of the *structure* of interaction. It is based on the idea that conversation with all its details is a very highly structurally organized activity and "the investigation of sequential phenomena has become an objective in its own right" (Clayman and Maynard 1995:14). CA attempts to describe the mechanisms that participants use in conversation to make it orderly and intelligible. Besides the linguistic features of interaction, laughter, pauses, repair etc. are all resources that can be used by interactants in conversation, and so it is crucial not to treat any of these aspects of interaction as trivial.

The method of CA is inductive; pre-set categories are not used, but actions are described as they emerge from data. The relevance of context (e.g. formal or informal, conversation between friends or distant acquaintances etc.) is not assumed beforehand. Instead, these contextual features are only of interest to CA if the participants themselves orient to the features of context in their actions (see, e.g., Levinson 1983:295).

Context in a more specific meaning, however, is important in CA. A central notion of CA is that conversation is seen as *context-shaped* and *context-renewing*. 'Context' here is referring specifically to the sequential context of the conversation itself.¹ As Goodwin and Heritage (1990:288) have noted: "each conversational action is treated as both displaying an understanding of prior and projection of subsequent conversational actions". This being the case, analysis must include not only a single action but also the sequence in which the action occurs (Goodwin and Heritage 1990:289). The importance of sequential context in CA is an essential feature of the method. "Interactants can relate utterances to one another in terms of the actions they perform; hence, by *positioning* their talk in relation to some antecedent utterance, or in relation to some larger interactional trajectory, interactants can accomplish identifiable activities." (Clayman and Maynard 1995:12).

Conversation analysts see conversation as a phenomenon that is jointly constructed by the participants, and so the importance of co-operation and intersubjectivity are stressed in CA studies. Another central notion is that utterances can have many functions. The meaning of an utterance is seen as a combination of the utterance, the recipient's interpretation of the utterance and the context. Ultimately it is the recipient's interpretation of the utterance that "makes the meaning" - the speaker's intentions are not analyzed. Hakulinen (1996:14) points out that an action or an utterance should always be analyzed as a part of ongoing action.

The following interrelated forms of organization are central in CA in describing the structure of conversation: turn-taking organization, sequential organization (see, e.g. Silverman 1998:103-109), repair organization (see, e.g. Silverman 1998:122), and preference organization (see, e.g. Silverman 1998:123). Hakulinen (1997:16) describes the relations between turn-taking, sequential, and repair organizations in the following way: "turn-taking organization shapes conversation into sequences

1

Drew and Heritage (1992:19) define 'context' in CA as "inherently locally produced and transformable at any moment."

that the participants orient to; the possibility of repair is built within the turn-taking organization.” Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974:723) state that repair, in turn-taking or in any other trouble in conversation, is done by using the turn-taking system. Preference organization deals with the fact that first turns can be built so that a particular type of second turn is expected, or ‘preferred’. Preferred second turns and dispreferred second turns take on a different form, which shows that the producers of the second turn understand the preference (Sacks 1992:LC2:144). These organizations operate with certain principles, but what is extremely important, is that the principles are not determining action, but rather they function as resources that people use when making sense of action. The principles are not some abstract set of rules, but always used and applied *by people within social settings*.

CA uses only naturally occurring conversations as data. Originally the focus was on everyday conversations, but the interest has since moved to include different institutional conversations (classroom interaction, news interviews, courtroom interaction, doctor-patient interaction etc.) as well. Using everyday conversations as a starting point, systematic variations from the conversational procedures may be analyzed in institutional interaction.² Also by contrasting institutional interaction with ordinary conversations it can be determined what is distinctive about interactions in institutional settings (Goodwin and Heritage 1990:289).

2.2 CA and institutional interaction

There are different institutional settings in which the setting itself is somehow consequential for the interaction. For example in formal institutional interactions, such as courtroom interaction and in news interviews there are strong constraints

2

Everyday conversation is considered to be the primordial kind of talk and other kinds of talk are seen as derived from it. (see, e.g., Heritage 1984, 1995; Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974; Schegloff 1992)

in turn taking and consequently the participants have a reduced set of conversational options in their use (Drew & Heritage 1992:26-27). However, it is important to remember that the setting itself does not make the interaction institutional. Only when participants in their actions show orientation to the institutional tasks or functions we can talk about institutional interaction (Drew & Heritage 1992:22).

In broadcast interaction participation is often linked with speaker identities. The types of turns that are available for participants depend on the identities they have in conversation. Interviewers or hosts typically ask questions and interviewees or guests produce responses to questions (Drew and Heritage 1992, Heritage and Roth 1995). In these data it can be seen that there is asymmetry between the hosts and the guests in the control of action, more precisely differentiated rights to certain actions, such as asking questions and initiating topics and asymmetrical control over what topics are talked about and at what length. This asymmetry is linked with the situated identities that the participants have in this particular institutional setting.

One aspect of institutionality in these data is that the institutional agendas and goals have been established prior to the interactive event and the representatives of the institution, that is the journalists, or the hosts have the right and the obligation to act according to these agendas and to pursue the pre-set goals. Moreover, there is a silent, "overhearing" audience (see, e.g. Scannell 1991) that can at some points shape the interaction.

Often present in institutional interactions is the systematic asymmetry of knowledge. It is present in conversations where one party holds a role of an expert, such as the doctor in medical interaction. News interviews (see, for example, Clayman 1987; Heritage and Greatbatch 1991) often have some sort of experts as interviewees and this yields to asymmetry in knowledge. However, the program type that I have examined differs in many ways from television news interviews,

it is less formal and is designed to resemble everyday conversation. In these programs differential states of knowledge (Drew and Heritage 1992:47-53) change constantly, like in everyday conversation.

2.3 Participation frameworks

A participant's role, or position in relation to ongoing talk and to other participants, changes constantly in conversation. Recipients constantly interpret the current speaker's talk and how the current speaker orients him/herself towards the talk and the ongoing activities. Similarly, recipients pay attention to what kind of position the current speaker projects to other participants with the talk. Recipients have various options for dealing with the talk in progress and they can, together with the current speaker, define their own position in the participation framework that is forming at a particular moment. Thus, both speakers and hearers collaboratively form the participation framework. This means that although some events might be performed by single individuals they still are social in their essence. (see Goodwin 1981:5) Central to the concept of participation framework is that participation is seen as multi-party activity - one person alone can only propose a participation framework. This is expressed by Goodwin (1981:6): "the identity assumed by one party is ratified, not by his own actions, but by the action of another who assumes a complementary identity toward him."

The notion of participation framework was originally developed by Erving Goffman, who started to break down the notions of speaker and hearer in conversation. Goffman used the term participation framework to describe the recipients' orientation to talk. He divided the participants that had formerly been named "hearers" into the categories of ratified recipients and unrated recipients. The category of ratified recipients includes addressed recipient and unaddressed recipient and the category of unrated recipients includes over-hearers or bystanders and eavesdroppers (Levinson 1988:169, Goffman 1981).

Goffman also divided the role of "speaker" into three separate production roles. First, the role of animator a "sounding box", the one who actually speaks the words, second, the role of author, who is the one originating the thoughts, and third, the role of principal, whose viewpoint and whose values are being expressed (Levinson 1988:169, Goffman 1981). A good example of these three roles is a newscaster who in a news broadcast reads a text that a reporter has written and that is referring to a politician's opinions. In that case the newscaster would be the animator, the reporter would be the author, and the politician would be the principal. (Seppänen 1997:158) Goffman did not include these speaker roles in the participation framework, but called the different speaker positions *production formats*. He studied the different production formats, and their change, "changes of footing", in lecturing, and other monologues, so the focus was on individual speaker and his actions. How these changes of footing operated in actual interaction was not studied (Clayman 1992:167).

The term participation framework has later on been developed to describe the positions of both speakers and hearers. It has been studied by conversation analysts such as Charles Goodwin and Marjorie Harness Goodwin. I will use the term in the way that it is used by the Goodwins, describing the participants' (both speakers' and hearers') orientation to talk and their position in conversation. While Goffman focused on the description and analysis of typologies of participant categories, work by conversation analysts has approached participation as a "temporally unfolding, interactively sustained embodied course of activity" (Goodwin 1996:375). Therefore it is not relevant to try to identify all possible participant categories, but focus on the analysis of the interaction itself. The focus in my study is the interaction, how participation is an interactively achieved phenomenon. I will attempt to describe the ways in which participants jointly create and re-create different participation frameworks in interaction through talk and embodied action.

Besides the roles of current speaker and recipient that are perhaps the most obvious roles that change between participants in conversation, there are different discourse identities that form the participation framework. There are questioners, answerers, story tellers, story recipients, inviters, invitees etc. When participants initiate action and in doing so assume a certain discourse identity, they similarly project reciprocal identities for other participant(s) (Zimmerman 1998:90). Zimmerman (1998:92) argues that discourse identities orient participants to what type of activity is taking place in interaction and their roles within the activity.

Discourse identities are often used in defining the concept of participation framework: "The participation framework consists of two or more participants with different, varying discourse identities" (Seppänen 1997:156). The discourse identities are shaped, for example, by what kind of access to information participants at a particular moment have, whether they are knowing recipients or unknowing recipients, whether their access to knowledge is based on their own experiences or common cultural knowledge etc. (see, e.g. Seppänen 1997:161, Goodwin & Goodwin 1990b). Furthermore, discourse identities, themselves being intrinsic to the interactive event, can be used to mark a participant as a representative of a social identity (Halonen 1996:174). For example, spouses can orient to the fact that they have shared an experience that the other participants have not shared with them and thus, by employing certain discourse identities (such as co-tellers of a story), make relevant this type of social identity in conversation. Antaki & Widdicombe (1998:11) have stated: "[These] discourse identities are the materials out of which larger, more recognizably 'social' or 'institutional' identities are built."

Besides discourse identities there are also situated identities such as hosts and guests in a TV program, or interviewer and interviewee in an interview, or, to take an example outside institutional context, the host and the guest at a dinner party. These situated identities can alter the participation framework in that they offer participants a possibility to orient to those situation-dependent identities. Situated

identities remain constant throughout the interactive event, while discourse identities shift from utterance to utterance (see Zimmerman 1998:94). It is important to keep in mind that a situated identity is not something that automatically directs the activities of the participants but it can be said to be relevant in interaction only when participants themselves orient to these situated identities.

In short then, what participation frameworks do is that they provide a possibility for the participants to participate in various different ways. As noted by Marjorie Harness Goodwin: "Participation frameworks allow participants to construct and reconstruct their social organization on an ongoing basis." (1990:33). Goodwin & Goodwin (1990a:86) also point out that speakers can attempt to strategically change the social organization by using the kind of talk that changes the way participants are aligned to each other.

Naturally there are also occasions where the participation framework is not well formed and there is some kind of trouble in interaction. However, when a participation arrangement is somehow inappropriate, participants usually notice this and they can actively remedy the situation. For example, if a hearer is not displaying orientation to a speaker, the speaker can take active steps, such as aborting the current utterance and beginning a new utterance, to secure a hearer (see Goodwin 1996:374) and thus changing the participation framework so that it becomes appropriate for the action at hand.

The participation framework is dynamic - it can change several times even within one utterance (see, e.g. Goodwin 1979). This makes it something that the participants (and analysts as well) have to constantly pay attention to. Besides the fact that it is constantly changing, the participation framework is also created through various different ways. It is created through talk, through other vocal phenomena, such as laughter, breathing, coughing etc., through the participants' bodies, gaze, facial expressions, gestures etc. (see Kangasharju 1998:30). These

facts make the study of participation frameworks challenging, and at the same time interesting.

In sum, a participation framework is a complex phenomenon. It is something that changes constantly and manifests itself in a variety of ways. Next I will turn to a specific kind of participation frameworks that are my focus in this study, namely topic invoked participation frameworks.

2.4 Topic invoked participation frameworks

Topic has proved to be a complex matter of study, something that is difficult to define in theoretical terms, or to capture by systematic analysis (Atkinson & Heritage 1984:165). In conversation analysis topic has been studied, for example, by Button and Casey (1984), Jefferson (1984), Ochs and Schieffelin (1983), Schegloff and Sacks (1973). Different aspects of topic have been studied, for example, how topic is initiated (see, e.g. Button and Casey 1984) and how talk progresses from one topic to another (e.g. Jefferson 1984).

Topic of talk is one aspect of interaction that has an impact on how people participate in a given interactive event and so topic can also be analysed from the point of view of participation in interaction. Topic-invoked participation frameworks have been studied by Charles Goodwin and Marjorie Harness Goodwin. They describe how topic influences the participation framework in the following way:

"Topic provides parties to a conversation with resources for rapidly changing how they are aligned to each other, and the activities that are relevant at the moment. Crucial to the organization of such a participation framework is the way in which it is invoked by topic and thus can change as the topic of the moment changes." (Goodwin & Goodwin 1990a:112)

With the following example I wish to clarify the notion of topic-invoked participation frameworks. An extensive analysis has been carried out on this

example by Goodwin & Goodwin (1990a) and I will use this example to point out some basic observations of how topic invokes changes in the participation framework. In this example a group of boys are making preparations for a sling-shot fight. Huey and his younger brother Michael are the leaders of two groups, and they are choosing players for their teams.

(1) (Goodwin & Goodwin 1990a)

1. Michael: Allright who's on your **side** Huey.
2. Chopper: Pick- pick four **people**.
3. Huey: It's quarter after four and I'm not
4. ready to **go** yet.
5. Bruce: Me neither.
6. Huey: I'm not going till four thirty.
7. Michael: Well get in there and get them papers
8. off that couch [before-
9. Huey: [I did already.
10. Chopper: get your four **guys**,
11. Michael: You get **three** guys.
12. Huey: [I only get three guys?
13. Chopper: [I mean three guys.
14. Michael: That's right.

In line 1 Michael treats Huey as a team leader, asking who Huey is going to choose to his side. He makes demands on Huey, regarding the preparations for the fight, and one of the other boys, Chopper, joins Michael in making demands on Huey (line 2). How Huey responds to this is that he refuses the demand to start choosing his team immediately (lines 3-4, 6) and claims that he is not ready for that yet.

Similar demand-refusal pattern occurs again in lines 7-9. However, what makes this sequence different from the previous one is that there is a content shift in topic in line 7. While the topic of talk up to this point has been the sling-shot fight, it is now household chores. This activity includes Michael and Huey, but it does not include Chopper (or any of the other boys). Michael is now talking to Huey as a brother, not as a participant in a sling-shot fight. Still, the activity type remains the same; Michael continues to make demands on Huey, but the topic of talk restricts the participation of the other boys. From lines 1 to 6 the participants have situated identities that are relevant for the activity at hand (team-leaders, team-members) but in lines 7 through 9 the topic of talk is such that those identities are no longer

relevant. When the topic shifts back to the sling-shot fight, the participation framework changes again so that the situated identities of team-members and team-leaders become relevant again. This example shows how within one activity type the topic of talk can be used to alter the participation framework.

Talk about a particular subject can divide participants into different subsets, some of whom might have more access to the subject matter than others (see Goodwin 1986:284a). For example, in the present study talk about a certain culture divides the participants so that the member of that culture has primary access to the topic while other participants have varying, but nonetheless lesser, degrees of access to that particular topic. Thus a topic can have an effect on how expertise and competence are distributed and negotiated in conversation. This asymmetry in knowledge has an influence on the type of participation that individuals choose to engage in and it consequently affects the participation framework.

In the following extract I will show, with the help of a simple example, how topic divides the participants so that one participant has primary access to the topic and the other participants have little or no knowledge about the topic and how this invokes changes in the participation framework.

(2) [T2 995]

- 995 JP =and we can not uh show (our) legs or anything we have to be covered
 996 all over (.) body: (.) with dre:ss like this
 997 (0.4)
 998 SS yes=
 999 JP =and here if we are going to some Indian families uh we cannot (.) really
 1000 wear this western clothes we have to be °hh Indian dress we-
 1001 SS what about the China women: (.) these da[ys]
 1002 MS [we]ll,
 1003 MS women I think they have equal (.) right as men do. °hh but (.)
 1004 uh s- (.) it's- it's the sa::me but where I find that
 1005 °hh it's not always true (.) because (.) my (.) classmates
 1006 they are going to (.) be graduate from universities and they are going
 1007 to find- look for jobs °hh and (.) it's (.) it's so difficult for them

One of the hosts (SS) has asked a guest, JP, who is Indian, about what it is like to live in India as a woman. JP is the one who has primary access to the topic, she is

the knowledgeable participant and also the discourse role of a speaker is projected to her. The other participants are cast as recipients. In line 1001 the host interrupts JP and asks MS a question (acting according to the agenda that she has as a host in a TV program), and shifts the content of the topic from women in India to women in China. That alters the participation framework so that MS is now the knowledgeable participant, the one with primary access to the topic, and the rest of the participants are recipients. So, by shifting the content of the topic, the discourse identities of JP and MS are reversed.

The objective of my study is to find out how topic invokes changes in the participation framework, what kind of changes there are, and what consequences these changes have for subsequent action.

3. DATA AND TRANSCRIPTION

3.1 Overview of the data

The data that are used in this study come from Finnish television discussion programs that were a part of a series of educational programs on language and culture. The broad themes of the programs were cultural diversity and multiculturalism. Each program had some aspects of these broad themes as their special theme. The topics that were discussed in the programs were pre-established and selected on the basis of their value or relevance to the themes of the programs. The guests, who were both native and non-native speakers of English, were invited to the programs as representatives of institutions that were suitable for the goals of the program, such as cultural identities, ethnic groups, linguistic background etc. The discussions were led by two hosts. One of the hosts was a Finnish woman, and the other one a German man now living in Finland. The discussions were conducted in English and broadcast to a Finnish audience³.

In the first program the theme of the program was national and cultural identity and cross-cultural marriages. During the program the participants talk about typical characteristics of their nationalities, having two cultures in one family, adjusting to another culture, cultural misunderstandings etc. Two bicultural couples were invited as guests to this program, a British woman and her husband, who is Finnish, and a French woman and her Finnish husband. The guests were invited because of their relevance as representatives of nationality, and representatives of another collectivity, "a married couple". These aspects of their identities were recurrently topicalized on the course of the program.

In the second program the theme was ethnic diversity, experiences of racism, and cultural differences. In this program the participants talk about topics such as

3

About 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis, see Firth (1996). About foreign language interaction and conversation analysis, see Wagner (1996).

distinguishing nationalities by the looks of people, what causes racism, the experiences that the guests have had in Finland as foreigners, aspects of their own cultures etc. There were five guests in this program. Three of the guests were female coming from China, Jamaica and India. Two guests were male, one from Turkey and the other from Zimbabwe. Membership in different ethnic collectivities was used as a criterion in selecting guests to this program. Both of the programs that I used in this study were approximately 40 minutes long and were transcribed as a whole.

The nature of these programs can be characterised as “quasi-conversational” (Drew & Heritage 1992:28). While they do have certain characteristics of institutional interaction, they are also designed so that they resemble everyday conversation. The representatives of the institutions at times engage in activities that are typical of broadcast talk (e.g. asking questions from the guests), but at times they also perform activities that are characteristic of everyday conversation such as offer their personal opinions and tell stories. In this sense these programs differ from more formal broadcast formats, such as interviews where the interviewers withhold their personal opinions and display neutrality to topics (Heritage and Greatbatch 1991, Clayman 1988, 1992).

Multiparty TV discussion programs have been previously studied by Nuolijärvi and Tiittula (1995, 1997, 2000), and comparing the data that they have used with these data, the variety in form within one program type can be seen. Even though a program can be labeled as a discussion program, it can take on many forms, from a quite formal, host-led type of discussion to an informal, everyday-like conversation.

3.2 Transcription

The transcription system that I use in this study is adapted from the system developed by Gail Jefferson (Sacks et al. 1974:731-733, Atkinson & Heritage 1984:ix-x). This is the most commonly used transcription system in CA studies, with variations in how detailed the transcription is. If one's main interest is some aspect of prosody, it is obvious that intonation patterns must be carefully coded, while in some other type of studies some other aspects, e.g. overlap or pauses, might be more important and consequently they are transcribed in more detail. The transcription conventions that I have used are enclosed (Appendix 1).

I have attempted to transcribe the material as accurately and as objectively as possible, but still the transcription remains only a reflection of what really took place in the conversation. This is why I always use the video- and audio tapes when analyzing the data and consider the transcripts to be a tool to be used together with the tapes. By making the transcripts I was forced to focus my attention to the details of interaction (see ten Have 1999) and the transcripts also serve the function of giving the reader a possibility to check the analysis (ibid.).

Transcription is always a difficult task, especially so when transcribing multiparty conversations. This material, even though there were several participants in the programs, was manageable because being recorded from television, the quality of the sound was good. I also had the video tapes as a back-up if I needed to check who was talking. This was especially problematic in the cases where there was overlapping talk produced by several participants.

The videotapes were essential because I also pay attention to the nonverbal features of conversation in the analysis. Because of camera angles, however, the examination of nonverbal actions is quite limited. I can see only those features that the director of the program has chosen to be shown to the audience. For example, there are only a few instances where all of the participants are in the picture

together, and on many occasions the recipient(s) and their possible gestures, gaze etc. cannot be seen from the video. Bearing this limitation in mind I have still tried to include features of nonverbal communication in the analysis wherever possible.

Next I will move on to the analysis of the data, starting with examining the way topics are initiated and how changes in participation framework occur already at the stage of topic-initiation.

4. TOPICAL MOVEMENT AND PARTICIPATION

In this section I will examine topical movement and participation. I will investigate how topics are initiated in these data, and how topics are shifted, and what consequences this topical movement has for the participation arrangements and how it shapes the participation framework of the moment. Topic-invoked participation frameworks change as the topic of talk changes and so the forming of topic-invoked participation frameworks is often visible in topic initiations where a relevant participation framework is proposed. The participation frameworks are then further negotiated and re-created in places where there is movement from one topic to another, or a shift in topics. In the closing of the topic the participation framework is usually relaxed.⁴

In these data a variety of different topics are talked about. The choice of topics reflects the goals and agendas of the program and the hosts as the representatives of the institution carry the primary responsibility of the choice of topics. A general observation about topic initiation is that there are asymmetrical participation rights concerning topic initiation between the hosts and the guests. This is evident in that most of the topic-initiation is done by the hosts. It is the hosts' institutional task to introduce different topics and different points of view on a given topic for the television viewers (see, e.g. Heritage & Greatbatch 1991). Regularly they initiate new topics and invite participation from the guests by asking questions. This is a typical way of managing broadcast interaction (Heritage and Roth 1995). By asking questions the hosts can restrict the participation arrangement, i.e. they can direct the question to a certain participant, or to a certain subset of participants. The use of questions can also restrict the content of following talk in a way the questioners see appropriate.

4

Some systematic ways with which topic can be closed have been found (see, e.g., Maynard 1980, Button 1990). On summary assessments implicating the closure of a topic see Drew and Holt 1998:502-503, see also Jefferson 1984:211.

Guests usually talk about the topics that the hosts have initiated, they seldom initiate completely new topics or topics that do not flow from previous conversation. However, there are some occasions on which the guests initiate new topics as well and they are not sanctioned for that atypical action. This reflects the informal character of the program and is one aspect that makes this program different from more formal program types. In formal program types departure from the norm is often followed by overt sanctions (Drew and Heritage 1992:27). The informality of this particular program type can be seen in the way the participants at times orient to the rules of everyday conversation and at times to the rules of institutional interaction. Although the roles of questioner and answerer in these data are asymmetrically distributed with the hosts being predominantly in the role of questioner and the guests in the role of answerer, the roles do shift on occasion during the conversation. While in everyday conversation the roles of questioner and answerer shift during the conversation, in a more formal TV program formats, such as news interviews, these roles are pre-established and stable throughout the interactive event (see, e.g. Heritage 1985).

While guests do not initiate new topical lines very often, they do initiate content shift in topic. Because there are members of different collectivities in the conversation, it is easy to use their membership in those collectivities as a resource in shifting the content of topic and in doing so to introduce different points of view on one topic to the television viewers. A usual way of shifting the content of the topic is to invite experiences from a different perspective (i.e., different nationality, different culture, different linguistic background). In these data guests shift content in topic by asking other participants questions about the same topic, but from a different perspective. By doing this they 1) alter the participation arrangement of the moment, 2) position themselves in a different way in relation to ongoing talk, and 3) propose alternative participation frameworks.

Concerning topic-transition, Sacks (1992) has made a distinction between stepwise topical movement and boundaried topical movement. In stepwise topical movement one topic flows into another and in boundaried topical movement the closure of one topic is followed by the initiation of another topic (Atkinson and Heritage 1984:165). In everyday conversations stepwise topical movement is used regularly, topics are usually developed from previous topics and clear boundaries between topics are rare.

It's a general feature for topical organization in conversation that the best way to move from topic to topic is not by a topic close followed by a topic beginning, but by what we call a *stepwise* move. Such a move involves connecting what we've just been talking about to what we're now talking about, although they are different.

(Sacks 1992:LC2:566)

In these data movement from one topic to another is done both in stepwise and in boundaried manner. Next, I will examine the practices with which boundaried topical movement is achieved and how the practices that are used affect the participation framework.

4.1 Boundaried topical movement

It is the hosts' institutional task to elicit reports from the guests on different topics for the benefit of the television audience. The hosts often initiate new topics by asking questions from the guests and thus making it relevant for the guests to give their opinions or experiences about that topic. In the following example one of the hosts initiates a new topic that is not connected to the previous topic of talk by asking a question.

(3) [T1 1101]

1101 CG (.) but uh (.) so in that respect (xx you were saying u:h)

1102 (.) and u:h (.) I feel you can be happy in Finla(h)[nd(h)]

→ 1103 SS [by] the way

1104 SS have there been any hh funny incidences, any funny situations hhh

In line 1103 SS starts a new topic that does not flow from the previous topic, resulting to boundaried topical movement. SS marks this abrupt transition from one topic to another with the words "by the way" that precede the question that initiates new topic. When speakers move from one topic to another abruptly they often use markers that alert the recipients to the fact that a sudden change of topics, and similarly a change in the participation framework, is about to take place. These remarks are called *markers of discontinuous discourse* by Ochs and Schieffelin (1983:77). Markers of discontinuous discourse can take the form of explicit announcement of the change in topics, e.g., "I'm sorry to change the subject" (ibid). Ochs and Schieffelin (ibid.) have also found that markers of discontinuous discourse are often used together with attention-getting devices, such as "listen!", "look!", and "wait!".

In the following examples it can be seen how hosts use markers of discontinuous discourse to mark the abrupt changes from one topic to another. In example (4) an announcement of a pending item is used as a marker of discontinuous discourse, in examples (5) and (6) the abrupt change in topics is marked with referring back to an earlier topic.

In example (4) the host marks the change in topics by saying "I was just to ah(h)-going to ask [...]" She explicitly announces that some new matter has been pending (see Jefferson 1984:217).

- (4) [T1 923]
 923 PR =I've not learned that yet
 924 F ye[ah]
 925 AR [(>but we're] very affectionate.<)=
 → 926 SS =right. I was just to ah(h)- going to ask how quickly or (.) how slowly (.)
 927 SS does the cultural (.) integration work. I mean for people
 928 who live abroad.

With her question starting in line 926 SS proposes a change in the participation framework so that a subset of participants ("people who live abroad") become the addressees of the question and thus relevant next speakers.

In example (5) the abrupt change in topics is marked with SS's referring back to an earlier topic "but if we mm (.) go back to this (.) nationality heheh business"

(5) [T1 493]

493 SS =anyway the language is a very important thing (.) to all of us
 → 494 in one way or the other. °hh but if we mm (.) go back to this (.)
 495 nationality heheh business and (0.4) try to (.) **define** what we **are**
 496 for instance you, Caroline you are French (.) and if you (.)
 497 rule out everything else, **what** is it, that is French in you,
 498 what remains that you could really (.) <call (.) F:rench> [...]

Here the participation framework moves from a more general level (lines 493-495) to a more specific level (lines 496-498) when SS guides the talk so that the topic moves from including all participants to include only one of them. In lines 493-494 SS summarizes the previous topic and in so doing brings it to a close and similarly relaxes the participation framework. When she starts the new topic her talk is at first directed to all participants ("...try to define what we are..") and then moves to select CG as the primary addressee.

A similar referring back to an earlier topic can be seen in example (6) when RS says: "oh- we were t- or **you** were talking about women [...]" This does not refer to the immediately previous topic, but a topic that has been talked about earlier in the conversation. Ochs and Schieffelin (1983:71) call the introducing of a topic that has been talked about earlier in conversation, at some point prior to the immediately preceding utterance *re-introducing topics*.

(6) [T2 1082]

1082 RS =now you see we [know] pretty much
 1083 F [(yeah)]
 1084 RS about each others c(h)u:(h)l[(ture)
 1085 M [yeah
 1086 RS [hah hah][hah huh huh] °hhh
 1087 F [yeah]
 1088 MS [o::h]
 1089 RS [and] very important things=
 1090 F [mm]
 1091 MS =yeah=
 → 1092 RS =oh- we were t- or **you** were talking about women! †

1093 (.) in different cultures and I would like to ask you as- as uh uh (.)
 1094 **foreign women**

In this example RS's change of topic restricts the following participation framework so that only a restricted group of participants ("foreign women") become addressees of the question and relevant next speakers.

In examples (4), (5), and (6) the institutionality of the data can be seen. The hosts initiate bounded topical movement and on these occasions the hosts, because of their institutional role, can abruptly change the earlier topic to a new topic and in doing so invoke changes in the participation framework. The hosts have the institutional right to choose the topics that are talked about and at what length they are talked about. It is also their responsibility to attempt to build a fluent conversation for the television viewers. The situated identity of a host in a TV program gives the hosts a more advantaged position to determine firstly, when to start a new topic and secondly, what that new topic is going to be.

It can be said that the pre-set agenda of the program has an influence on why on some occasions the hosts make sudden, sometimes even abrupt transitions from one topic to another. In the planning stage of the program certain topics are planned to be covered, and the hosts act according to their institutional roles in bringing up those topics, sometimes resulting in bounded topic-transition. Usually markers of discontinuous discourse are used, but not on every occasion. In the next example, RS starts a completely new topic in line 1591 and does not alert the other participants in any way that such a sudden change in topics is about to take place. He also begins his utterance at a place where the current utterance has not reached its completion but is in fact projecting a continuation with "and-". Again, the institutionality, especially the pre-set agenda and the hosts' responsibilities as representatives of the institution, can be seen in the host's choice of actions.

(7) [T2 1583]

1583 SS I th[ink it's
 1584 M [mm

representative of that nationality has primary access to knowledge and he becomes a participant who uses this knowledge to tell something new to the other participants.

As was seen above, in these data questions are regularly used in initiating topic. Other possible ways of initiating topic have been studied by Button (1987) and Button & Casey (1984, 1985, 1989). One way of initiating topic is the use of topic initial elicitors (Button and Casey 1984:167). They consist of three parts; first, an inquiry about the possibility of presenting a report of some newsworthy event (e.g., “what’s new?”), second, a positive response to the first part and a production of a newsworthy-event-report (e.g., “well, I saw Mike today”) and third, a topicalizer (e.g., “oh really”). By using topic initial elicitors an open, though bounded, domain from which possible topic initials can be selected and offered is provided (Button and Casey 1984:170).

Topic initial elicitors are not used in these data, perhaps because in this way the hosts could not so well see to it that the topics that have been planned to be covered would emerge. Topic initial elicitors occur regularly following closing components of talk, following opening components of talk, and following topic-bounding turns (Button and Casey 1984:170). Other ways of generating topic in conversation are news announcements and itemized news inquiries (Button and Casey 1989).⁵

5

In news announcements participants initiate topic by partially describing an event in which they, or some third parties (who are known to the recipient) have been involved. The recipient orients to the incompleteness of the description and the news announcer then engages in elaboration. In itemized news inquiries (Button and Casey 1989) a participant nominates a possible new topic by inquiring about an event that is somehow related to a coparticipant. Then the coparticipant produces an incomplete response and the inquirer promotes elaboration with continuation object such as “mm-h” or “yes”.

4.1.1 *The gradual shaping of the question initiating the topic*

Since questions are so regularly used in these data when initiating topic, I will pay closer attention to how the act of questioning is done. I will use the following example as a case to illustrate some aspects of questioning. I will take a look at how a questioning action is accomplished across multiple turn constructional units (about the production of questioning actions in news interviews see Heritage & Roth 1995). With this I will try to point out how the act of questioning is not done by one person alone, but how it is an interactive achievement. The participation framework that is invoked by the topic that is being initiated starts to form already at this point, when the question initiating the topic is gradually emerging. I will also investigate the participants' alignment to the question as it progresses under chapter 4.1.2.

- (10a) [T2 1005]
- 1005 MP °hh [what] about uh (.) okay if a baby is born in China uh
 1006 MS [so]
 1007 MP **I'm told** I don't know if it's true! †=
 → 1008 MS =yeah=
 1009 MP =uh that if: you have uh (.) you're allowed to have one child in China †=
 → 1010 MS =ye[ah] [yeah
 1011 MP [is] it so °h[h and

The participation framework that is forming when MP begins her question in line 1008 marks MS as the recipient of the question. MS acknowledges MP's talk (note that again a guest is in the role of the questioner) and shows that she is actively listening and waiting for what MP is going to say next, she is waiting to see where MP's utterance is going. Through the placement of her "yeah" and the intonation she uses it becomes clear that the "yeah" in line 1008 has a continuative function (see Goodwin 1986b). In line 1010 the function of MS's "yeah"s is different. This difference can be seen by looking at the sequential placement of the "yeah"s and by examining the nonverbal features of the conversation.

(10b) [T2 1007]

- 1007 MP I'm told I don't know if it's true! †=
 1008 MS =yeah=
 → 1009 MP =uh that if: you have uh(.)you're allowed to have one child in China †=
 o--MP questioning frown--o
 o---MP one finger up-----
- 1010 MS =y e [a h] [yeah
 o--MSnod-o
 1011 MP [is] it so °h[h and
 -----o

MP's utterance in line 1007 ("you're allowed to have one child in China †") is a question. Firstly it is marked to be a question by rising intonation, in other words it is a declarative question (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 814) and secondly, MP makes it a question with her facial expression ('metacommunicative comment', Streeck & Knapp 1992). What is interesting here is that this metacommunicative comment allows the participants to orient to MP's utterance as a question even *before* the marker of a declarative question, rising intonation, occurs at the end of the utterance. MS produces a second-pair part to MP's question by answering "yeah" (line 1010) and nodding simultaneously. Her answer confirms the facts that have been stated in MP's utterance in line 1009 and MP can continue her question. Hence "you're allowed to have one child in China" initiates an insertion sequence that is used to clarify something before continuing.

(10c) [T2 1009]

- 1009 MP =uh that if: you have uh (.) you're allowed to have one child in China †=
 1010 MS =ye[ah] [yeah
 1011 MP [is] it so °h[h and
 1012 MP if you have a **girl**, usually (.) they would (.)

By asking "is it so" (line 1011) MP treats MS as an expert, as someone who has primary access to the information about which the speaker herself only has second-hand knowledge. Although MP is still going to continue her turn, she invites MS again to participate in the construction of the turn. After "is it so" there is a possible completion point but MP does not terminate her turn. She continues talking and she secures the turn to herself by an audible inbreath immediately after "is it so". This makes it evident that her question in line 1009 served as background

information and as a context for something else that is following (see Heritage and Roth 1995:39).

The fact that people are only allowed to have one child in China becomes relevant in line 1012 when MP finally comes to the point she has been preparing. She has already in line 1009 started to ask this question “if: you have uh (.)”, but then added an insertion sequence and after that she resumes the question in line 1012. The actual question “is this a **myth**↑” that was gradually shaped through lines 1005-1017 actually emerges in line 1017.

(10d) [T2 1012]

1012 MP if you have a **girl**, usually (.) they would (.)
 1013 MP kill the ba[by↑] [°hhh] [(.) drown or send the][baby] away
 1014 MS [*huh][huh huh*][huh huh huh°hh (.)][well]
 1015 RS [o::h yeah.]
 1016 MS =n::[ever]
 1017 MP [is th]is a **myth**↑

MP’s primary addressee of her utterance is MS and she first uses the pronoun “you”. “You” here is not necessarily a “personal you”, but more likely it is a “generic you” (Lerner 1996: 282) referring to a category of persons, here “the Chinese”. What is interesting in this extract is that MP changes the pronoun referring to the Chinese (line 1012) to “they”. By doing this she orients to the possibility that the use of “you”, even if it is generic, could be misunderstood. By using “they” MP is not talking about something that MS might do, but instead talks about something that some other people (“the Chinese”) might do. As Lerner (1996:283) points out: the use of “they” usually excludes possible addressed recipients. The change of pronouns here disaffiliates MS for a while from the Chinese in general.

Besides the change of pronouns there are other aspects of talk that hint that the topic of talk is now somehow problematic. The change of pronouns from “you” to “they” is marked in the conversation by a small pause before “they”. MP also pauses before the word “kill”. Moreover, when she produces the word “kill” she

does not look at MS. The pauses here seem to indicate that a problematic item is following.

It can be seen in this example that the parties recognize that the act of questioning is in progress even though an utterance that is syntactically formed as a question does not emerge until in line 1017 (see Heritage and Roth 1995:38). The parties collaboratively participate in the questioning action; one party produces the question across multiple turn constructional units and the other parties do not intersect talk in the question delivery structure (Heritage and Roth 1995:41). In this example it can be seen how the activity of questioning invokes a specific participation framework and how participants orient to the action at hand, but also how the topic of talk influences the way the participation framework is forming.

4.1.2 The participants' alignment to talk in progress

The participants show their alignment to ongoing talk in various different ways. This in turn can affect the way the talk progresses. I will use the question that has already been discussed in the previous subchapter to illustrate how participants align to talk in progress. In line 1015 RS shows that he is a knowing recipient. As soon as the new information in MP's utterance has come up ("they would (.) kill the baby↑") RS through intonation and stress shows the other participants that he knows something about the subject.

(11a) [T2 1013]
 1013 MP kill the ba[by↑] [°hhh] [(.) drown or send the][baby] away
 1014 MS [*huh][huh huh*] [huh huh huh°hh (.)] [well]
 → 1015 RS [o::h yeah.]

MS is the primary addressee of MP's talk and from the beginning of MP's turn it is evident that MS is expected to answer MP's question. The topic that is being talked about is an extremely serious, and problematic topic, but here it is handled

lightly, even jokingly. MP uses her facial expressions and gestures in aligning to the talk. She first produces a small smile (line 1008) and then a wide smile together with a headshake (line 1009). With the smile and headshake in line 1009 MS can display a stance towards MP's utterance already when the utterance is in progress.

- (11b) [T2 1007]
- 1007 MP **I'm told** I don't know if it's true! † =
- 1008 MS =yeah=
 o--x--o x = MS, small smile
- 1009 MP =uh that if: you have uh (.) you're allowed to have one child in China † =
 o-----x-----o
 x = MS, wide smile + headshake
- 1010 MS =ye[ah] [yeah
 1011 MP [is] it so °h[h and

When MP has said “they would (.) kill the baby † ” MS starts laughing quietly. Note that MP is not laughing when she starts to produce the utterance, and she does not join MS's laughter (line 1013). Thus the producer of the utterance and the primary recipient of the utterance offer competing frameworks for the other participants to interpret and to align to the ongoing talk (see Goodwin 1986a).

- (11c) [T2 1012]
- 1012 MP if you have a **girl**, usually (.) they would (.)
- 1013 MP kill the ba[by †] [°hhh [(.) drown or send the][baby] away
- 1014 MS [*huh][huh huh*][huh huh huh °hh (.)][well]
- o-----MS shakes head slowly-----o

By laughing MS treats the utterance as laughable. She aligns to it as something not so serious as the content of the utterance sounds like, but more like as a funny rumour. Her headshake together with the laugh here could be seen as a projection (Schegloff, 1984:267) of her answer “n::ever” in line 1016. In this way the fact that she disagrees with MP's utterance becomes available for the other participants already when MP is still talking. This also proposes a way that the other participants should treat the utterance.

4.2 Stepwise topical movement

While in bounded topical movement speakers in most cases mark that they are about to change the topic, in stepwise topical movement this is not the case. In stepwise topical movement the change from one topic to another is gradual and without specific markers and consequently it is difficult to identify topical boundaries (Drew and Holt 1998:509). In the following example one of the guests, MP, initiates a new topical line of talk by asking a question from another guest, MS. The previous topic of conversation has been the situation of women in China. In line 1005 MP uses this preceding topic and moves to a relevant other topic. MP links together two unconnected topics by using material (China) that is related to both topics (see Jefferson 1984:204).

- (12) [T2 995]
- 995 SS what about the China women: (.) these da[ys]
 996 MS [we]ll,
 997 MS women I think they have equal (.) right as men do. °hh but (.)
 998 uh s- (.) it's the sa::me but where I find that
 999 °hh it's not always true (.) because (.) my (.) classmates
 1000 they are going to (.) be graduate from universities and they are going
 1001 to (.) find- look for jobs °hh and (.) it's (.) so difficult for them
 1002 (.) in anywhere in a factory in- a- anywhere, but that's not good *job*
 1003 M m[m-h]
 1004 F [a:ha,]
 → 1005 MP °hh [what] about uh (.) okay if a baby is born in China uh
 1006 MS [so]
 1007 MP **I'm told** I don't know if it's true! †=
 1008 MS =yeah=

MP's utterance changes the participation framework so that while MS remains "the expert", the one who has first-hand access to the subject matter at hand, the role of the questioner changes now to MP, instead of SS. MP thus takes on the discursive role of questioner. When MP asks this question, she marks her own status as a non-expert, but at the same time as someone who is not completely unknowing, but in fact does know something about the subject. She does this by clarifying the nature of her knowledge ("I'm told" in line 1007). This distances herself from the facts she is stating, marks her as someone who is, in Goffman's (1981) terms the animator

of the information. Note that she first starts (line 1005) in a way that does not explicate her own relationship with the talk and then inserts the utterance in line 1007 to distance herself from the facts. She continues to explicitly elaborate her stance by adding “I don’t know if it’s true” and in this way further distances herself from the facts that she states in the utterance and questions their accuracy.

What is interesting in this example, is that MP takes on a very active role in actions that are in these programs more typically done by hosts, such as questioning and initiating topic. The institutional character of talk in television can usually be seen exactly in this respect; the hosts and guests have different discursive rights and obligations. It can be said that the conversation is shaped more by the goals that the hosts have, than by the possible goals that the guests have (see Drew and Heritage 1992: 49-50, Nuolijärvi and Tiittula 1997:7-9).

In the following example there is stepwise topical movement in line 849 where AR connects what has been talked about with what she is now talking about by using the word “another” to link the two topics together.

- (13) [T1 842]
- 842 PR we have two different °hh **basic** (0.5) ways and basic opinions
 843 and we have two different kinds- kinds of Christmases and °hh
 844 SS mm↑
 845 PR two different kinds of this and that. (.) [and]
 846 SS [so the]se are the good sides=
 847 PR ye[ah I think (that is) (x)-
 848 SS [of internatio[nal marriage
 → 849 AR [oh and another
 850 AR good side is that I would (.) I could **not** have dreamed of
 851 having my children anywhere else but Finland
 852 SS mm-hh=
 853 AR =I mean (.) on **that** side (.) for **me**. (.) the- the **doctors** and the midwives
 and the the maternity hospitals and the childcare it’s ab:solutely fantastic.

The participation framework changes with stepwise topical movement so that AR becomes the speaker and tells something that is based on her own experiences. The topic makes her contribution relevant because of her first-hand knowledge about the topic, her marriage with PR. PR’s role changes from speaker to recipient and

SS remains the primary recipient of talk and she displays her role as a recipient with “mm-h” in line 852.

The placing of AR’s talk in lines 849 shows how participants constantly pay attention to ongoing action and position themselves in ways that are appropriate and relevant. In line 846-848 SS has produced a summary formulation of previous talk, which is a typical way of bringing a topic to a close. AR claims speakership by placing her utterance in overlap with SS’s utterance and proposes stepwise topical movement instead of topic closure.

In the following example a similar linking device in moving stepwise from one topic to another is used. SS’s question in line 572 restricts the following talk so that it should contain similar aspects than the previous talk (something typically Finnish) and also something different from previous talk (something else). The participation framework remains the same; SS is the questioner, eliciting information from JS and the other participants are unknowing recipients.

(14) [T1 567]

- 567 JS yes I mean she- she finds it natural and I find it very natural (.)
 568 that they should (.) take care of something e(h)lse heh
 569 SS yeah
 570 JS I’m here just [watching] the clothes
 571 SS [mm-h]
 → 572 SS hh so what else is (.) typically Finnish in you Jari
 573 JS uh (.) also I found (.) that I’m a perfect (.) product of this
 574 Finnish queueing culture.

4.3. *Content shift in the topic*

A very usual way of changing the participation framework of the moment in these data is to shift the content of the topic. Content shift in topic is even more subtle movement in topics than stepwise topical movement. While in stepwise topical movement there is gradual transformation from one topic to another and only some aspect of the topic remains the same, in content shift there are many aspects of the

topic that remain the same. Often the perspective on the topic changes (e.g., queueing in Finland vs. queueing in England, something practical in China vs. something practical in Turkey). That is what can be seen in this example as well; the content of the topic shifts gradually and there are no clear boundaries where one could say that a completely new topic begins. The topic of talk has been queueing, more specifically how Finnish people queue, and JS, who is Finnish, has been telling how he behaves in a queue. RS shifts the content of the topic from how the Finns queue to how the English queue.

(15) [T1 598]

598 JS but< eh heh (.) it's- it's quite funny

599 I can **feel** that [(.) th]at it's something (me) which is (.) controlling (.)

600 AR [mm]

601 JS my (.) behaviour in- in the queue.

→ 602 RS aren't the English famous for queueing

603 AR oh yes [we queue but] I mean we also **jump** the queue.

604 RS [very patiently]

RS's utterance in line 602 not only shifts the content of the topic, but also changes the participation framework so that now JS is no longer the speaker, but he becomes a recipient. The content shift in the topic makes AR the principal addressee of RS's question. She is now expected to take on the participation role of a speaker and answer RS's question. A sort of an expert role is given to AR - she is the one of the participants who is English and so has primary access to the information. In other words the information she has is based on her own experiences.

When RS asks the question he aligns himself to the question in a way that makes it clear that he is, at least to some extent, knowledgeable about the topic and he is now seeking for a confirmation for his prior knowledge. This can be seen in the way he formulates the question in the form of negative yes/no question "aren't the English..." (see Quirk et al., 1985:807-810). Here the function of the question is not so much to elicit new information but to make a statement that makes the recipient's (AR) confirmation or denial relevant in the next turn (see Heritage and Roth 1995:10).

to the other participants that she is not sure about the accuracy of her knowledge. The nonverbal aspects of MS's talk support the alignment that is displayed verbally. When MS says "or something like that" she shakes her head.

(16b) [T2 654]

654 MS or, °hh to- you know (.) to co- contact others or somethi[ng like that
o-----headshake-----o

The headshake is placed exactly on the place where MS displays her alignment to the talk she is producing. The headshake can be seen as a 'metacommunicative comment' (Streeck & Knapp 1992) further qualifying the utterance's meaning.

In these data the topic influences the way the participation framework shapes often by creating differential states of knowledge between the participants. The participants come from different cultures and they represent different nationalities. In both programs different nationalities, different cultures and different races are a central theme. When the topic of talk is some aspect of a certain nationality or a certain culture, the person from that culture has the discourse identity of the knowing participant, an "expert", and the question that initiates the topic is directed to the representative of that culture. Meanwhile the other participants have lesser degrees of knowledge about the topic and the role of unknowing recipients is projected to them. What happens then of course varies from occasion to occasion, the person who is addressed may or may not want to talk about the topic and can choose an action that projects the role of speaker to somebody else in the conversation.

In this chapter I have analyzed how topics are initiated and how topic initiation shapes the participation framework. I have already in this section payed some attention to how topic-initiation is used not only to select the topic of talk, but also to select next speaker. In the following section I will examine more closely speaker-selection.

5. SELECTING NEXT SPEAKER

In this chapter I will investigate some aspects of speaker-selection. First, by discussing the special characteristics of speaker-selection in institutional settings. Second, by investigating speaker-selection in topic-initiation sequences. In chapter 2 I have already discussed aspects of topic-initiation and their significance to the participation framework. Now I will examine more closely how speaker-selection is done in topic-initiation sequences and how it affects the participation framework of the moment. Thirdly, I will address the question of “second” speakers, “second” referring to a fact that stories in conversation are sometimes followed by “second stories” that are similar to the first story (see, e.g. Sacks 1992:LC2:249-260). I am going to examine how the selection of “second” speakers is done. Fourthly, I will draw attention to some problems in speaker-selection and discuss how these problems may arise and how they may be solved.

Speaker-selection, a basic component of the system of turn-taking, is a central part of the participation framework. The participants constantly pay attention to what kind of position the current speaker projects to other participants with talk. Acting upon these projections the participants can then define their position in the participation framework. Who takes on the role of next speaker is worked out collaboratively by the participants. The current speaker’s talk has elements in it which allow the other participants to interpret when speaker-change can take place. It can also have elements that select the next speaker. While one person is selected to be next speaker, the other participants are cast in the roles of recipients with varying access to knowledge in the topic of the moment.

There are various different ways with which speaker-selection can be done. It can be done with explicit verbal address forms, with more implicit verbal forms, or with non-verbal clues, such as gaze. The current speaker can select next speaker, or if the current speaker does not select next speaker the participants can also self-select to be next speakers. Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974:704) have

described the following rule set for speaker-selection:

1. a) if the 'current speaker selects next' technique is used, the party who is selected has the right and the obligation to take next turn, others do not have such rights or obligations
 - b) if 'current speaker selects next' technique is not used, self-selection for next speakership may (but need not) be instituted. First starter acquires rights to a turn
 - c) if 'current speaker selects next' technique is not used, current speaker may (but need not) continue unless another participant self-selects
- 2) if neither 1a nor 1b has operated, and current speaker has continued (1c), then the rule set a-c reapplies at the next transition relevance place.

5.1 Speaker-selection in institutional settings

The previous rule-set describes speaker-selection in everyday conversations. Speaker-selection in institutional settings has some properties that are not present in everyday conversations. Perhaps the most prevalent of these properties is the pre-allocation of turns (Drew 1979:61). Pre-allocation of turns is present in 'formal' institutional interactions, such as courtroom interaction, classroom interaction and in news interviews. Heritage and Greatbatch (1991:98) have studied the pre-allocation of turns in news interviews and found out that they follow the pattern of interviewer's question followed by interviewee's answer, regardless of how many participants there are in the situation. They have also pointed out that what makes a 'discussion' program different from an interview is that in discussion programs the question-answer-question-answer procedure is not adhered to.

In these data the practices of turn-taking and speaker-selection often resemble those in everyday conversation, but there are also occasions in which the institutionality of this interactive event is oriented to by the participants. There are asymmetries in the distribution of different types of activities between situated, or institutional, identities (see Drew and Heritage 1992:27); the hosts ask questions and elicit

reports from the guests and the guests provide these reports. The hosts initiate new topics by asking questions from the guests and in so doing often also select next speaker. So it can be said that in topic-initiation sequences the speaker-selection has the institution's mark in it. In the beginning and in the end of the programs there is pre-allocation of turns. It is the hosts' right and obligation to welcome television viewers in the beginning of the program and open the discussion. It is also the hosts' right and obligation to end the discussion. In these positions the turns are pre-allocated.

In these data access to knowledge is often a central aspect of speaker-selection. As new topics are often initiated by asking questions, the discourse role of an answerer is projected to the next speaker. In questioner-answerer roles the distribution of knowledge is asymmetrical. By asking a question the questioner marks herself as a less knowledgeable party, assumes that the answerer has information that the questioner (and the other participants) do not have and positions herself as recipient of new information. These discourse identities of knowing and unknowing participants can then in turn invoke larger social identities. However, there are also occasions on which the hosts in these data also ask questions that they already know the answers to. This shows the scripted, partly rehearsed nature of some of the questions. Nuolijärvi and Tiittula (1997:8) have raised a question of how much the institution constructs the quantity and quality of the guests' expertise and participation, and how much the journalists as representatives of the institution build the role of their guests beforehand, when planning the program, and also during the interactive event itself.

5.2 Speaker-selection in topic initiation sequences

A very usual way of initiating topic in these data is that the hosts ask questions from the guests. The questions that the hosts ask not only initiate topic but also select the next speaker. Often the topic itself is such that it automatically selects

some participant as next speaker. In these data the topic, together with the participants' membership in some collectivity (e.g., linguistic, national, or ethnic collectivity), and the access to knowledge gained through this membership are regularly used as a resource in selecting next speaker. For example, if the topic of talk is Chinese traditions, this is used as a resource to select as next speaker a participant who has first-hand knowledge about the topic, in this case a Chinese woman (see example 10). The questions can be specifically directed to some participant as is the case in the following example where 'current speaker selects next' technique is used.

(19) [T1 1008]

1008 RS oh- we have been talking about uh how it feels for (a) Finns
 1009 to be married to a foreigner a lot now (and) I would-
 → 1010 I would like to ask you when you're back in Fran- in France.
 1011 °hh what do your friends and your relatives think about the fact that
 1012 you're married to a Finn. [>I mean what-<] uh how do [they feel] about=
 1013 CG [uh-] [we-]
 1014 CG =you mean uh married to Jari or (h)m(h)arried t(h)o a Finn.

This type of questioning, where the question is directed to only one of the participants, puts the other participants on the background. It projects the roles of ratified, but non-focal, participants to them. The topic of talk often is used as a resource to determine the next speaker, but sometimes the topic is such that it is relevant to several participants and they then have to work out who is going to be the next speaker.

In the following example the speaker designs her talk so that the guests, as representatives of different cultures, all seem to be possible next speakers. In line 649 SS refers to the guests as "you" ("...something practical (.) **about** your cultures"). Here "you" refers to several participants - however, the guests are not treated as a collectivity where any member of the collectivity could answer the question on behalf of the other collectivity. Instead, the guests have to respond to this as representatives of their own cultures, since they are all members of a different culture.

(20) [T2 647]

- 647 SS =maybe it will be better if we **knew** °hh [something practical
 648 F [(xx) yeah
 → 649 SS (.) **about** your cultures. °I don't know°=
 650 MS =well there's nothing special in China, I think °hh but (.)

Here the topic clearly influences the way the participation framework is going to shape; whoever takes the next turn is supposed to be some sort of an expert on the subject and is expected to tell something that is new (or at least partially new) information to the other participants. Moreover, only the guests are expected to tell something about their cultures, not the hosts. SS's use of the pronoun "we" restricts RS's next actions so that his identity as a co-host in the program is made relevant and according to this identity he, together with SS, is the recipient of the following talk. Although from linguistic cues alone it seems that self-selection is called for here, it is not the case. When examining the non-verbal elements of talk it becomes clear that 'current speaker selects next' technique is used also in this example. I will examine this example in more detail in the following subchapter.

5.2.1 Gaze in speaker-selection

How is the selection of next speaker done? By simply looking at the transcript it seems that this utterance (lines 647-649) is directed to all the guests, and that any one of them could self-select to be the next speaker. Also, if the participants were not paying attention to the non-verbal elements in SS's talk, it would probably seem to them as well that any one of them could self-select to be next speaker. But when examining the video tape it can be seen that SS in fact directs this utterance specifically to MS and she does this by gazing at MS. (for a detailed analysis about gaze and address, see Goodwin 1981, 1984). SS does not gaze at MS during the whole utterance, but instead fixes her gaze at MS at "something." It is from this point onward that MS is the primary addressee of SS's utterance.

(21) [T2 647]

647 SS =maybe it will be better if we **knew** °hh [something practical

o-----

648 F [(xx) yeah

649 SS (.) **about** your cultures. °I don't know°=

---SS looks at MS-----

650 MS well there's nothing special in China, I think °hh but (.)

651 MS yeah generally nothing °hh >but I heard< that in Turkey, °hh

o-----MS looks at ES-----

652 MS it's not (.) it's not polite to use your (.) left hand to ha[nd thin]gs to others

-----o o-----MS looks at ES-----

653 MP [yeah]

654 MS or, °hh to- you know (.) to co- contact others or something like that

In lines 647 and 649 SS projects the role of speaker to MS. MS is given the role of a representative of a foreign culture and she is now expected to tell the other participants something about her culture. MS accepts the turn that is given to her but does not seem to want to accomplish the task that is given to her in SS's previous turn. In other words, she accepts the role of next speaker but does not want to take on the role of a teller of new information. Instead, she now directs the participants' attention to another participant, ES. This is done by shifting the topic so that ES becomes the knowledgeable party ("...in Turkey...") and similarly directing gaze at ES and thus addressing him directly.

In the following example two of the participants are addressed as a collectivity. The speaker uses non-verbal elements of talk to show which one of the members of the collectivity she selects as the next speaker. Sometimes subsets of participants are selected to be next speakers and they then have to negotiate among themselves who is going to speak for the subset. Again, the topic of talk is often such that it makes relevant some type of subset of participants as next speakers. For example, when talking about the languages that a bicultural married couple uses at home, the unit of a married couple is made relevant.

(22) [T1 1103]

1103 SS by the way
 1104 SS have there been any hh funny incidences, any funny situations hhh
 1105 uh because you are a (.) uh: bicultural couple.
 -----SS looks at AR-----
 1106 [have there been any (linguistic)-]
 1107 AR [maybe with the langu]age.

SS addresses AR and PR and treats them as a team ⁶ ("because you are a (.) uh: bicultural couple."). Here the significance of gaze defining the addressee is clearly seen. The words "bicultural couple" could also refer to JS and CG, but SS is gazing at AR and thus specifies the addressees of the utterance (about gaze and address see Goodwin 1981). SS chooses AR as next speaker by looking at her but she is chosen to be next speaker not just as herself, but on behalf of a team she belongs to. In this example it can be seen how topic influences the way the participation framework shapes; the topic invites the type of participation where the two participants' extra-interactional relationship becomes relevant in conversation. In section (6.1.) I will examine this relevance in more detail.

5.2.2 *Achieving fluent speaker-transition*

In multiparty conversations speaker-transition is more complex than in dyadic conversations because several possible next speakers compete for speakership. In the following example it can be seen how the host skillfully manages the talk and guides it according to pre-set agendas. SS starts her utterance immediately after the previous utterance by CG. In fact there is a small overlap (lines 1102-103). She is clearly paying attention to clues that signal that CG's utterance is reaching its completion. These clues include the syntactic properties of the utterance and the intonation. Syntactically the utterance is complete and the falling intonation signals that the end of the utterance is approaching. Non-verbal clues are also very important when participants work out the boundaries of a turn. Unfortunately here the camera angle does not show CG when she is completing the utterance.

⁶

Teams in conversation are dealt with in chapter 6

However, SS has noticed a transition relevance place, or more precisely, she has anticipated it and now she can secure the next turn to herself. A very usual place for overlap to occur is at the completion of previous turn, and as is the case in this example as well, small overlap yields to fluent speaker transition (see, e.g. Jefferson 1983).

(23) [T1 1101]

1101 CG (.) but uh (.) so in that respect (xx you were saying u:h)

1102 (.) and u:h (.) I feel you can be happy in Finla(h)[nd(h)]

→ 1103 SS [by] the way

1104 SS have there been any hh funny incidences, any funny situations hhh

Minimizing gap between turns becomes even more important when participants are not in dyadic conversation, but in multiparty conversation. One feature of multiparty conversation is that if "current speaker selects next speaker" technique hasn't been used, e.g., by specifying the next speaker by gaze or by address, whoever wants to take the next turn must do this as early as possible because there are other participants who could also be willing to take the next turn (Londen 1997:58). In this example (line 1102) "current speaker selects next speaker" technique hasn't been used, so self-selection is permitted at this point. SS has to start her turn quickly, otherwise any of the other participants could self-select to be the next speaker or current speaker (CG) could continue.

5.3 *Selecting "second" speakers*

In these programs the guests are invited to talk about their experiences and their opinions. When participants tell stories it is common that these stories are followed by other stories. Characteristic of second stories is that they are a response to the first story. In these responses the tellers of the second stories not only claim but also prove their understanding of the first story (Sacks 1992 LC2:6-8, 252; Arminen 1998:179). The second story is about the same topic as the first story, it has a similar set of characters, the teller's attitude towards the story is similar to the first

story teller's attitude, the morality of the second story is similar to the one in the first story (Sacks 1992b:3-8, 249-260, 266).

In the following example one story is followed by two stories that are responses to the first story. The numbers 1, 2, and 3 in the transcript show where each of the three stories begin. My aim here is to examine how speakers of the subsequent stories are selected and how topic of talk influences the speaker-selection. The first story is told by AR who talks about raising their children bilingual. The characters in the story are AR, her husband, PR (who is also present at the telling), and their children. The point that she makes in the story is that both parents have spoken their native languages to the children, and that it is not always easy to do so. The participation framework that AR's story invokes is such that she herself is a principal character as well as the teller, PR is a knowing recipient and a character in the story and other participants are unknowing recipients.

(24) [T1 387]

- 1) 387 AR =and not only that, with having children, I mean (.) I made one (.)
 388 rule °hh when we had children that they **h:ave** to be (.) bilingual they
 389 **h:ave** to be [°hh no mat]ter how (.) hard it was to do this and it is hard
 390 SS [yes]
 391 AR to do it properly °hh I mean I spoke absolutely English the **whole** time.
 392 and Pertsu spoke **Finnish**=

((21 lines omitted))

- 413 CG [>I mean<] if already you learn to speak uh [°hh] so well two languages
 414 SS [mm] [yes]
 415 CG I mean it's very good
 416 AR especially English and **Finnish**, I mean you can learn **anything**
 417 [after that]
 418 CG [what about] French [((laughs))
 419 PP [((laughter))
 420 AR [yes heh heh heh •exactly. •
 421 SS and for instance u::h when you Caroline you'll have children (.) later on,
 2) 422 I just got one myself and °hhh as a mother I couldn't really (.) **think** of
 423 speaking (.) any other language than my (.) [native] language=
 424 AR [mm]
 425 CG =mm=
 426 SS =to this child because I would- I would feel l(h)ike a **bad mother**, °hh
 427 if I would and °hh that's really uh that the language goes to the emotional
 428 level. I feel that I cannot communicate with my child in other language
 429 than my own of course she's very young but still °hhh well I could **joke** around
 430 and speak (.) some other languages to her but I just couldn't- I **have** to

431 speak Finnish it's spontaneous=
 432 AR =but you'd be surprised how many foreigners live here, °hh who do not **speak**
 433 their (.) mother tongue to their children. [they speak]
 434 SS [I can't understand that=
 435 AR =the: Finnish language
 3) 436 RS I [have a son about this bi:g, and I have to] be
 437 PP [(xx)]
 438 AR [(x)have **many** (x)]
 439 RS extre[mely] careful
 440 SS [yeah]
 441 RS to speak German [to him.] because I speak Finnish with my wife
 442 AR [yes]
 443 RS [at home,] and I have to be extremely careful=
 444 AR [mm, exactly.]
 445 F =mm=

In line 422 SS starts to tell a second story. She self-selects to be next speaker in line 421 and justifies her speakership by explicating her expertise in the topic with “I just got one myself” and “as a mother” in line 422. The characters in the story are SS and her child. SS is the principal character and the teller of the story while other participants are unknowing recipients. In her story SS shows the other participants that she agrees on the importance of speaking one's own native language to children and so in her story there is a similar morality as there is in the first story.

In line 436 RS tells another second story, in response to the first story. He self-selects to be next speaker, and uses a similar justification for his speakership as SS did in the previous story. He starts his turn by explicating his expertise in the topic (“I have a son about this big”). Again the set of characters is similar to the first story, RS himself, his wife (mentioned briefly) and their child. RS is the teller and the principal character and other participants are unknowing recipients.

The participation framework in the beginning of RS's talk (lines 436-438) is different from the rest of his talk, for in lines 437-438 RS's recipients are not attending to his talk. However, this seems not to be problematic, perhaps because the unattentiveness to RS's talk takes place at the background section of his story (“I have a son about this big [...]”). The unattending recipients direct their attention to RS soon after the story begins (“I have to be [...]”, in line 436). For example, AR, who is one of the participants unattending to RS's talk directs her attention to

RS and shows this with her display of reciprocity (“yes” in line 442). Unfortunately the camera angle is such that it does not show RS, so we do not know if he does something, for example gesturing, to secure the other participants’ attention.

In his second story RS concentrates on a slightly different aspect of the first story than SS did in her second story. While SS focused on the morality of the first story (speaking one’s native language to children), RS focuses on the difficulty of raising a bilingual child, the other aspects of the story still remaining similar to the first story. However, both SS’s and RS’s stories support the first story.

In this story-telling sequence the topic has a clear influence on who self-selects to be next speaker, and on the participation framework in general. In lines 422 & 436 next speakers provide “justifications” of telling the story. As it is the parents that tell their experiences, relevant next speakers are those who have children. Thus, only some of the participants self-select to be next speakers while other participants remain recipients of the stories. JS & CG, not having children, are recipients who can only provide general comments on the topic, not tell their own experiences.

5.4 Problems in speaker-selection

Unproblematic speaker-selection is something that the participants in conversation achieve together. They need to pay attention to where speaker-change can take place and who that next speaker is going to be. Sometimes there are problems in speaker-selection and so in the following example I will take a look at an occasion where the placement of speaker-change causes problems. It can be seen how participants themselves orient to the rules of turn-taking in conversation and how they actively work to solve the problem.

(25a) [T1 603]

603 AR oh yes [we queue but] I mean we also **jump** the queue.

604 RS [very patiently]

605 PR [they have- they [have a temperament.

606 PP [(xx)
 607 AR [I mean I mean
 608 AR if I if I want something and somebody's messing (xx) in front of me I say
 609 excuse me, I'm in a hurry, serve me, and I want to go.
 610 hh and I'll go in front of that person.
 611 PR it's beautiful [to be-]
 612 AR [you know] and: uh (.) sorry=
 613 PR =(yeah) sorry
 614 PP ((laught(er)))
 615 AR [carry on]
 616 PR [(go on)] (baby)=
 617 AR =ca- n[o no,] carry on.
 618 ? [ehheh hh]
 619 PR no no.
 620 PR eh heh[heh heh]
 621 AR [allright] well for example, like Caroline was saying that (.)
 622 if I: go to a shop and I buy some VEGETABLES for example=

PR and AR have different views on whether there is a transition relevance place after AR's "I'll go in front of that person." in line 610. PR treats this as such and starts talking. This is a place that could well be interpreted as a transition relevance place, after all the utterance in line 610 is syntactically complete and there is noticeably falling intonation at the end of the utterance. However, AR sees this as violating the rules of turn-taking and more specifically as violating her rights to complete a turn and she explicitly expresses this.

(25b) [T1 608]

608 AR if I if I want something and somebody's messing (xx) in front of me I say
 609 excuse me, I'm in a hurry, serve me, and I want to go.
 610 hh and I'll go in front of that person.
 → 611 PR it's beautiful [to be-]
 → 612 AR [you know] and: (.) sorry=
o---x---o x = AR turns to look at PR,
AR's right hand stops in the air

Before analyzing the breakdown that takes place in line 612 it could be asked why AR doesn't react similarly to PR's previous addition to the middle of AR's turn in line 605. It becomes obvious that AR orients to the function of PR's speech and responds to it accordingly. Some type of talk is seen more acceptable than other and not interpreted as violating the rules of turn-taking. PR's utterance in line 605 is a comment on AR's talk and he is not clearly going to continue with further talk. A

clue for this is the falling intonation at the end of his comment.

(25c) [T1 603]

- 603 AR oh yes [we queue but] I mean we also **jump** the queue.
 604 RS [very patiently]
 → 605 PR [they have- they [have a temperament.
 606 PP [(xx)
 607 AR [I mean I mean
 608 AR if I if I want something and somebody's messing (xx) in front of me I say
 609 excuse me, I'm in a hurry, serve me, and I want to **go**.

PR's utterance in line 605 is interpreted by AR in a different way than the one in line 611. AR processes the latter to be not just a mere comment on her talk, but a beginning of a longer turn. After AR has processed PR's utterance and realized it is a possible competition for her turn, she expresses her objection to the violation.

(25d) [T1 611]

- 611 PR it's beautiful [to be-]
 612 AR [you know] and: (.) **sorry**=
 o---x---o x = AR turns to look at PR,
 AR's right hand stops in the air

PR, when he realizes AR is still going to continue her turn, is not going to compete for it. He gives up the turn already in line 611 by stopping abruptly in mid-utterance. ("It's beautiful to be-"). He also gives up more explicitly after AR's "sorry". Here PR acknowledges his "error" and immediately answers "(yeah) sorry". He also signals with his gestures that he is not going to compete for the turn, but that AR could now continue her turn. He looks up, away from the other participants and he makes a movement that "gives the turn" to AR with his hand.

(25e) [T1 609]

- 609 PR it's beautiful [to be-]
 610 AR [you know] and: (.) **sorry**=
 611 PR =(yeah) sorry
 o-----x-----o x = PR makes small movement towards AR with left hand
 o---x--- x = PR looks up

At this point AR could continue her turn, but she does not do so. Instead, she makes the interruption an issue to be dealt with using both her talk and her gestures. She tells PR to “carry on”, turns her face away from PR (with “hurt” expression) and engages herself with another activity, drinking, or more specifically preparations for drinking. She lifts a glass to her lips but does not take a sip.

(25f) [T1 609]
 609 PR it's beautiful [to be-]
 610 AR [you know] and: (.) **sorry**=
 611 PR =(yeah) sorry
 o-----
 612 PP ((laught[er]))

 613 AR [carry on]
 614 PR [(go on)] (baby)=
 ----PR looks up----o
 615 AR =ca- n[o no,] carry on.
 616 ? [(laughs)]
 o-----x-----o x = AR turns face away from PR
 617 PR no no
 o--x--o x = AR lifts a glass to her lips

When AR agrees to resume her story, she disengages herself from the other activity, drinking and displays engagement toward the other participants again.⁷ She explicitly agrees to continue as a speaker by saying "allright", and her "well" signals that she is now returning to the topic.

(25g) [T1 617]
 617 PR no no
 o--x--o x = AR lifts a glass to her lips
 618 PR ((la[ughs]))
 619 AR [allright] well for example, like Caroline was saying that (.)
 o-----x-----o x = AR lowers glass back down
 620 if I go to a shop and I buy some VEGETABLES for example=

Lines 612-621 are thus negotiation of the next speaker. The activity changes momentarily from storytelling to speakership-negotiation and similarly the participation framework momentarily changes so that the other participants are at

7

about the organization of engagement see Goodwin 1981.

that point not primarily recipients of talk but more in the role of ratified overhearers.

Usually if there is a violation of turn-taking rules in conversation it is not explicitly addressed, but rather the interactants use devices such as repair and pauses to indicate that there is something problematic in the conversation. Here the fact that AR and PR are a married couple, and have a very close extra-interactional relationship, could influence the way they explicitly address the problematic point in the conversation. This could also explain the other participants' reaction (laughter in line 614). By laughing they orient to the confrontation between AR and PR as something that is not so serious, but something that is laughable.

Another example of an occasion where there is negotiation about who gets the next turn can be found earlier in the same conversation. This example is between participants who do not have an extra-interactional relationship and it differs in an interesting way from the one discussed above.

(26) [T1 451]

451 PR [you get kind] of-

452 CG [>but what about<]

453 PR sor[ry.

454 CG [(go ahead)

455 PR you get kind of lazy. (.) you know hh I I found myself (.) when (.) kids

456 grew up (.) I started speaking this half-English half-Finnish

Here PR and CG start talking simultaneously. Both of them recognize that this is against the rules of conversational organization and stop. They both show orientation to the rules by apologizing for their violation, overlapping speech. Politely, both are also willing to let the other person take the next turn. There is no need for further negotiation so in line 455 PR continues. This negotiation of the next speaker is very "clean" and simple compared with the negotiation between AR and PR. Unfortunately the camera angle here is such that PR and CG are not in the picture so their nonverbal communication cannot be seen.

In the next example that was already discussed from the point of view of speaker-selection in topic-initiation sequences the speaker-selection is not entirely unproblematic either. In line 649 there is a transition relevance place (see Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974) after “**about** your cultures”. This is a syntactically complete utterance and SS’s falling intonation also signals the completion of the turn. SS has secured her gaze to MS and thus selected her as next speaker (current speaker selects next-rule, see Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974), but MS does not start her turn immediately at this point. SS then adds another turn-constructional unit to her turn:

- (27) [T2 647]
- 647 SS =maybe it will be better if we **knew** °hh [something practical
 648 F [(xx) yeah
 → 649 SS (.) **about** your cultures. °I don’t know°=
 650 MS =well there’s nothing special in China, I think °hh but (.)
 651 MS yeah generally nothing °hh >but I heard< that in Turkey, °hh

By adding “°I don’t know°” SS is acting by the principles of turn-taking (“no gap, no overlap”) and in so doing minimizes the gap between the two turns. SS is now looking at MS and so is able to see any possible clues that MS is displaying signalling that she is not ready to start the next turn. SS minimizes the gap successfully because when MS does start her turn there is no gap between the two turns.

In this chapter I have discussed some aspects of speaker-selection and how it affects the participation framework. I have shown how in topic-initiation sequences hosts direct questions specifically to some participants and in so doing select next speaker. I have also paid attention to how topic influences this type of speaker-selection. These topic-initiation sequences are instances where topic-invoked participation frameworks are proposed. I have discussed speaker-selection and second stories and shown how topic of talk has an influence on who are going to be second-story tellers. This in turn influences the whole participation framework that is forming. Finally, I have paid attention to problems in speaker-selection,

how participants orient to the rules of turn-taking and speaker-selection and how problems in speaker-selection are solved by the participants. Already in this chapter we have seen how collectivities are at times oriented to as relevant units of participation by the participants in conversation. In the next chapter I will turn to look at collectivities more closely.

6. TEAMS IN CONVERSATION

One of the special characteristics of multiparty conversations is that participants can organize themselves into sub-groups. In this way the units of participation can be broadened from individual participants to multi-person units. Schegloff (1995:33) has pointed out that there can be fewer parties than there are persons in conversation. I will refer to these occasion-specific sub-groups as teams. What I mean by a team is expressed in a following definition of a team by Kangasharju (1996:292): "A team is characterized by the fact that the participants explicitly act as an association making this association visible to the other participants." There are various ways with which participants can act as an association. Besides linguistic means participants can also use non-verbal cues such as gaze, gestures and movement as ways of making a team available to other participants (see, e.g. Kangasharju 1996, Lerner 1993).

A central aspect of a team is that it is created *in* interaction. Participants in conversation can have extra-interactional relationships (e.g. a married couple), but these relationships do not automatically mean that they are relevant in conversation. They become relevant at a point where participants orient to these teams and in so doing establish the relevance of the team. Participants can also have occasion-specific identities (Lerner 1993:235) that can be used to form a team. An example of this in my data are the identities of hosts and guests in the TV program. But again, it is only at a point where the hosts or guests make this association visible and orient to it in interaction when it becomes relevant in conversation. The duration of a team can vary a great deal. It can last for the length of one word, or even less, or it can continue for long sequences. As I have already mentioned earlier, the participation framework is dynamic, it is constantly changing.

The participation framework offers options for the participants to form teams in interaction, while on the other hand acting as a team affects the participation framework (Kangasharju 1996:306). For example, if two or more

persons have shared knowledge and one of them starts telling a story, the other knowing participant(s) can participate in the telling, in other words participate as a team. Or, if two participants are addressed as a team and thus their participation as a team is made relevant, they can choose to participate as a team and this in turn affects the participation framework of the moment.

Lerner (1993:220-222) has identified four ways of establishing the relevance of a team (Lerner uses the term *association* here; some researchers have used terms such as *coalition*, *ensemble*, or *alliance*. However, in this thesis I will use the term *team*.) Firstly, participants can be addressed as a team by other participants. A second way of associating participants as a team is that participants can speak as a representative of a team. Thirdly, a participant can confer with a co-participant *as* members of a team (e.g. suggesting an action the members of the team should take together as a team). Fourthly, a team can be referred to by other participants who are not members of that team.

It is usual that extra-interactional relationships are used as a source in making a team relevant in conversation (Lerner 1993:235). There are also some conversational environments that favor the formation of teams. Such environments are, for example, story-telling and explainings. When teaming up occurs in these environments it can result in co-telling and co-explaining (Kangasharju 1996:292, see also Lerner 1993). This type of talk is a form of conjoined participation that Francis (1986) and Lerner (1993) have called *team talk*, referring to phenomena where members of a team continue, complete or repair each other's turns, or take a turn on behalf of another member of a team. This type of participation can have different consequences in the conversation and the formation of a team alters the participation framework of the moment.

As the participants have the opportunity to act as members of collectivities, they have one additional way of positioning themselves in relation to ongoing talk and activities. Different activities call upon the relevance of different types of teams.

The activity of story-telling may invoke the relevance of a team of knowledgeable participants as co-tellers. The activity of agreement calls upon the relevance of a team who align together as a team and support a certain position. However, it is important to note that the topic can change even though the activity remains the same. Topic is often a resource that is used in teaming up. The topic can make participants experts, or non-experts, and topic is also an essential factor in agreement and aligning as a team in agreements (or disagreements, for that matter). In these data the topic of talk also often invokes the relevance of certain aspects of identity such as nationality, gender, ethnicity etc. that can then be used as a resource in teaming up.

6.1 Extra-interactional collectivities made relevant in interaction

As I have mentioned before, extra-interactional collectivities are not relevant in conversation *until* they are made relevant by the participants by orienting to these collectivities as somehow relevant. Usual ways of making an extra-interactional collectivity relevant in these data are talking about shared events and orienting to shared knowledge. The topic of talk often calls upon the relevance of an extra-interactional collectivity. This can be seen in the following example. In the program where the next example is taken from there are two married couples as guests. The spouses have a close extra-interactional relationship that at times becomes relevant in conversation. A usual way in which the team is made relevant in this program is to explicitly refer to the members of a particular team as a team. Right at the beginning of the program, when the hosts introduce the guests, they refer to the guests as teams (lines 46 and 52).

(28) [T143]

- 43 RS we're about to investigate this question, a little, and we have u:h invited
 44 some guests↑ to the studio here tonight, two married couples two bilingual
 45 bicultural couples
 → 46 SS °hh we have a British-Finnish couple↑ °hh Angela and: Pertsa Reponen (.)
 47 welcome to the program.
 48 AR °thank you.°

49 PR hello (.) dear Finns.=
 50 SS =ah hahhah hah °hh so[, um
 51 RS [and we have a-
 → 52 RS we have a **French**-Finnish couple as well! ↑
 53 (.) welcome Caroline! [(.) and] Jari
 54 CG [bonsoir]
 55 JS thank you.=

The married couples are referred to as a team and they are also addressed as a team when the hosts welcome them to the show. In this way the hosts make the two teams relevant for the interaction at that moment and for the television viewers as well.

In the following example one of the hosts, SS, has made an extra-interactional team, AR and PR, who are a married couple, relevant in the conversation by explicitly referring to the team in her utterance in line 1105 ("because you are a (.) uh: bicultural couple").

(29a) [T1 1104]

1104 SS have there been any hh funny incidences, any funny situations hhh
 → 1105 uh because you are a (.) uh: bicultural couple.

According to Lerner (1993:220) one way of making a team relevant in conversation is that a team can be referred to by a participant who is not a member of a team. In this example the topic of talk that SS proposes (funny incidents that can happen to a bicultural *couple*) favors participation as a team. The topic of talk has an influence on the type of participation; if the topic was, say, funny incidences that can happen to a foreigner in Finland, it would probably not invoke participation as a team, but more likely participation as an individual, or alternatively it could invoke the relevance of participation of a team that is based on this aspect of the guests' identities.

In line 1107 AR responds to SS's question that is addressed both to AR and PR and starts to talk on behalf of the team. The question that she responds to is designed in a way that either one of the two members of the team could be the next speaker.

The team has shared knowledge and either one of them can tell the story on behalf of the other. Lerner (1987:153) has found out that story-tellings are a common place where teaming up occurs. AR starts to tell a story, and PR continues the story (line 1111). This type of co-telling of a story where another member of the team continues the story is one form of *team talk* (see Francis 1986, Lerner 1993).

- (29b) [T1 1104]
- 1104 SS have there been any hh funny incidences, any funny situations hhh
 1105 uh because you are a (.) uh: bicultural couple.
 1106 [have there been any (linguistic)-]
 → 1107 AR [maybe with the langu]age.
 1108 AR when [you st]arted to
 1109 SS [yeah]
 1110 AR lear(h)n th(h)e la(h)ngu[age hhh]
 → 1111 PR [and Angie has-]
 1112 AR yeah Pertsu you have to [tell this
 1113 PR [yeah
 1114 AR (x) I can't tell this=

AR's laughingly produced utterance in line 1110 shows the other participants that something funny is on the way and so the other participants can orient to the story in an appropriate way already at this point. Of course the participants have had the opportunity to orient to the character of the story already earlier, at a point where SS asks if there have been any “funny incidences” (line 1104). In line 1111 PR joins AR and starts to tell a story about his wife, AR. In the next line AR prompts him to be the one to tell the story.

- (29c) [T1 1110]
- 1110 AR lear(h)n th(h)e la(h)ngu[age hhh]
 1111 PR [and Angie has-]
 → 1112 AR yeah Pertsu you have to [tell this
 1113 PR [yeah

Lerner (1992) has studied assisted storytelling, where participants jointly participate in the delivery of a story for other participants. In this example AR participates in story initiation as a second knowing participant, a *story consociate* (Lerner 1992:248). Acting as a story consociate, she prompts PR to tell the story. By doing this she shows other participants that the knowledge about the story events is

shared between her and PR. This also casts other participants as recipients of the story (more about story prompts see Lerner 1992:251).

PR tells the story, but AR very actively participates in the telling by showing her alignment to the story (laughter). When she is not laughing, she is smiling as she listens to the story. These are clues to the other participants what is the appropriate way to react to the story.

(29d) [T1 1120]
 1120 PR [ei.][one day she] was telling
 1121 ? [(coughs)]
 1122 PR the neighbour's [lady that] (.) when they came [(.) back
 → 1123 AR [hehhohhoh] [heh
 1124 PR from holidays that (.)

6.1.1 Orienting to shared knowledge

Often in conversation there are situations where two or more participants have shared knowledge about something that the others do not know about. This is the case especially in conversations where some, but not all, conversationalists know each other beforehand. In these data there are two married couples and there are many occasions where there is shared knowledge between the spouses. This can be seen in line 1111 when PR starts saying "and Angie has-". Their shared knowledge explains how from these words alone AR can know what PR is about to say ("yeah Pertsu you have to tell this.."). This also shows to the other participants that AR and PR have shared knowledge.

AR has access to the information; after all it is her actions that are being described. That is why she can react to the story in an anticipatory way. Lerner (1992:259) points out that because of shared knowledge story consociates can produce anticipatory laughter (line 1123) even before a recognizable laugh source in the story. For example on line 1122 there is nothing laughable about PR's utterance so far ("one day she was telling the neighbour's lady"). The other participants,

however, at this point can expect that AR has told something funny to the neighbour's lady.

(30) [T1 1120]

1120 PR [ei.][one day she] was telling
 1121 ? [((coughs))]
 1122 PR the neighbour's [lady that] (.) when they came [(.) back
 → 1123 AR [hehhohhoh] [heh
 1124 PR from holidays that (.)

The participation framework that is invoked by the story here includes two knowing participants, who both take part in the telling and four unknowing recipients to whom the story is addressed.⁸ As I have already mentioned before, story-telling is an environment that favors the formation of teams and invokes specific participation frameworks (Goodwin 1996:374). In this case it is not only the topic but also the activity of story-telling that invokes the couple as a unit of participation.

Usually in conversation there is a preference for self-correction over other-correction. However, story-telling is an environment where other-correction does occur. In a situation where there are two or more people who share knowledge about the matter being talked about, the knowing participants can monitor the correctness of the story (Goodwin 1981:156, Lerner 1992:260). In the following two examples the extra-interactional collectivities (enduring social units, in this case couples) are consequential for the organization of the activity of story-telling in that the co-members of the collectivity who have shared knowledge about the topic of talk monitor the correctness of the talk.

(31) [T1 1065]

1065 JS I (.) basically ate (.) fish fingers [(.) six (.) six days a: (.) a week and
 1066 PP [((laughter))
 1067 JS [(.) I didn't] pay any (.) any attention to my clothes.
 → 1068 CG [°you still do.°]
 1069 RS y[ou had] your shirt hanging out of your trousers (or)=

⁸ about principal character who is present at the telling of a story see Goodwin 1984:237-241.

1070 JS [and-]
 1071 JS =u::h, I [don't remember actually.
 1072 RS [*huh huh*, huh huh °hh

In line 1068 CG comments on the uncorrectness of JR's use of past tense in line 1065. The grammatical form is not the main point in the correction, but rather the implications of that grammatical form. Thus CG's comment is not only about the use of past tense, but more about the meaning of JS's utterance. CG's other-correction in line 1068 is a form of commentary that is subordinate to the story. This type of talk is called *byplay* (Goffman 1981, Goodwin 1997). It is intended as a side comment, not an interruption to the story. In this example the subordinate nature of the comment can be seen in that it is spoken in lower volume (high circles in the transcript). The comment is addressed *to* JS, but meant *for* the other participants. The story is being told for the other participants and the comment that CG makes on one fact of the story is also meant for the other participants. *Byplay* can affect the development of the story, but here it does not, the story-teller and the other participants let CG's comment slide by unacknowledged.

In the following example a similar type of other-correction, a side-comment that corrects one fact of the previous speaker's talk affects the development of the talk. The other-correction in line 1239 affects the development of the action so that in line 1240 AR makes a response to the correction.

(32a) [T1 1235]
 1235 CG you have to take it out, then [you] feel better someh[ow
 1236 JS [mm] [mm]
 1237 AR especially if you don't throw plates. [[[lau][ghs))]
 1238 F [[[lau][ghs))]
 → 1239 PR [you do some]times.
 1240 AR ye- we:ll (.) one or two.

The married couple's orientation to their shared knowledge can be seen in line 1239 where PR corrects AR's talk and AR accepts this correction (line 1240). PR uses other-correction as a means of making the couple's shared knowledge visible (see Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks 1977).

Often people who have shared knowledge participate collaboratively. By collaborative participation they demonstrate their shared knowledge, and often also their belonging to the same collectivity. In the next example AR continues CG's utterance (line 1237). CG's utterance is syntactically complete as such, it does not require a completion. So AR's completion is not necessary, but more like an addition to the previous utterance. It can be said that they jointly produce a multi-unit utterance. With her completion AR shows that she considers herself to be a co-member of the same collectivity with CG, "impulsive foreign women". Also with this addition she introduces a humorous mode to the topic which can be seen in the laughter by AR and some other female participant that follows AR's talk in line 1237.

(32b) [T1 1235]

1235 CG you have to take it out, then [you] feel better someh[ow
 1236 JS [mm] [mm]
 → 1237 AR especially if you don't throw plates. [((lau)[ghs))]
 1238 F [((lau)[ghs))]
 1239 PR [you do some]times.
 1240 AR ye- we:ll (.) one or two.

In the following example an enduring social unit, a married couple, becomes relevant in interaction. AR joins PR in completing the utterance. She has knowledge about the topic, after all she is the other party of "we" that PR is talking about. They both produce similar completions to the utterance, the content is the same, but different words are used. It is evident that AR, on the basis of the shared knowledge that she has with PR, can anticipate what PR was attempting to say.

(33) [T1 817]

817 PR and- but the- when we are by ourselves then we have this (0.6)
 → 818 AR [big international war.
 → 819 PR [comp- competition
 820 PR [you know] [ye]s.
 821 RS [but there is si]des]

6.1.2 Negotiating the relevance of an extra-interactional team

The following example shows how team membership is always negotiated in interaction and how a person can participate as a member of the team while at same time other persons can resist participation as a team and make relevant another type of participation. One of the topics of conversation in this program is language, and communicating in a foreign language. The next example is taken from a place where there has already been a long discussion by all participants about what it is like to speak in a foreign language. I have included the original question that one of the hosts, SS, has asked the guests (lines 170 and 171) in order to show how the question design may influence the participation arrangements that form in the answers, but omitted the stretch of conversation in between the question and the sequence I have taken as my next example.

(34) [T1 170]

170 SS so, how do you feel about this °hh I mean- ahahh the party in you
 ----SS gazes towards JS & CG---oo-----shifts gaze to AR & PR----
 171 SS who (.) speaks in the foreign language mainly.

This question is designed so that it is asked from one member of both of the teams (“the party in you...”). This being the case, it would be sufficient if only one of them answered the question (cf. Lerner 1993:229). This is, in fact, how PR starts to produce his answer (line 310). He answers as a representative of a team.

(35a) [T1 309]

309 PP [(xxx), ((laughter))]
 310 PR [I- I I don't- I don't] think that it makes any difference anymore
 311 between us, Angie and me=
 312 AR =mm=

At first AR seems to agree with PR (line 312), but then, in line 316, she separates herself from the team.

(35b) [T1 312]

312 AR =mm=

- 313 PR =but in the beginning, I think I- I- I felt the same way (.) (like)- as
 314 you said. (0.4) but nowadays I don't (.) see any difference I mean uh-
 315 (0.4) doesn't matter
 → 316 AR well I- I feel it, when I start s- trying to speak Finnish, °hh uh

AR moves from team participation to individual participation. She stresses the pronoun I, which contrasts with PR's team participation in line 311 (“...any difference anymore between us...”) However, PR still continues his talk as a member of a team, and he also treats AR as a member of a team when he talks about their use of language as a couple (“but we don't (.) speak Finnish”, l. 318). In the next line AR further stresses the fact that she is now talking about her language use not as a member of a collectivity, but as an individual and emphasizes the word “outside”.

(35c) [T1 316]

- 316 AR well I- I feel it, when I start s- trying to speak Finnish, °hh uh
 317 [(so I)- uh::] [no, but wh]en
 → 318 PR [but we don't] (.)spe[ak Finnish.]
 → 319 AR I [have to speak Finnish outside]
 320 ? [°hh heheh° °hh]
 321 AR [or I have] to speak to some people I know, in Finnish and I have to
 322 PR [oh yeah]
 323 AR start expressing myself °hh I can f- I don't why, but I get a little miserable

As can be seen in this example, one participant can propose participation as a team, but another participant can resist this proposition and participate as an individual instead of a member of a team.

Next I will investigate collectivities that do not exist before the interactive event but are created in interaction, interactional teams.

6.2 Interactional teams

Teams that are not based on extra-interactional relationships but are established in interaction are called interactional teams (Kangasharju 1996:292). A central feature of interactional teams is that they do not exist until they are created by the

participants in conversation (Kangasharju 1996:317). Interactional teams can be created, for example, based on the situated identities of the interactants, or they can be created in an interactional environments such as explainings and story-tellings. The topic of talk is also one factor that can influence the formation of interactional teams. For example, the topic of talk may be such that some of the participants may support it and others do not. This can lead to agreeing or disagreeing as a team, in other words team alignment (for team alignment in business negotiations, see Kangasharju 1996, 1998).

6.2.1 Teams and situated identities

Teams can also be formed on a basis of the participants' situated identities. The activities that are associated with situated identities such as hosts asking questions, and guests providing answers and reports often invoke participation as a team. At times the different situated identities are also topicalized, and thus made relevant. In these data there are two types of situated identities that the participants have. They are the identities of host and guest in a TV discussion program. Because of the institutionality of this data, the situated identities can also be called institutional identities. Besides orienting to these identities as individuals, participants can also form teams according to their situated identities.

In the following example one of the hosts makes relevant the two teams, hosts and guests in conversation. This is done with the use of pronouns - a usual practice for making institutional identities relevant in these data.

(36) [T2 647]

647 SS =maybe it will be better if we **knew** °hh [something practical
 648 F [xx] yeah
 649 SS (.) **about** your cultures. °I don't know°=

In line 647 SS refers to herself as a member of "we". This "we" could also mean Europeans, referring to what she has said earlier, when first initiating the topic ("I

just uh I was about to ask uh °hh are there things that we here in Europe don't know about you") and thus "we" also includes the other host, RS, who is German. This type of collectivity also includes the Finnish audience. The hosts share similar situated identities, namely that of hosts in a TV program, and so belong together to another kind of association. Whichever association SS is referring to, it includes herself and the other host, RS and leaves the guests outside the association. In this extract the role of the hosts as mediators between the guests and the audience can be seen.

According to Kangasharju (1996) a team is relevant in conversation if the participants act as a team. Kangasharju (1996:317) points out that a team does not exist until it is "jointly created by the participants." In this example it seems that the team is one-sidedly created by SS and that the other member of the team, RS, does not seem to be acting as a team. However, jointly creating a team does not mean that there has to be explicit verbal commitment to the team. RS does not need to say anything to show that he sees himself as a member of the team, since a "conversationalist can tacitly accept a categorization by not responding to it." (Kangasharju, 1996:304). Here another member of a team acts on behalf of a team. Being hosts in a TV program SS and RS have a common task of guiding talk and asking questions. Their use of discourse identities such as questioner and information elicitor invoke the institutional identities of hosts and guests (see Greatbatch and Dingwall 1998:122).

In the following example it can be seen how television viewers are taken into account and how they are treated as one type of team. This extract is taken from the beginning of the program. In line 6 SS welcomes viewers to the show and thus treats them as ratified overhearers, to use Goffman's terms. In line 7 she refers to the guests as "they" who have come to talk to "you" - the television viewers, and to talk to "us", the hosts. The audience is a "third party" that is present at the interaction. According to Nuolijärvi and Tiittula (1995:13) institutional conversation differs from everyday conversation in exactly that aspect; there is

always a silent third party that is present at the interaction.

(37) [T2 6]

- 6 SS hello dear viewers. °hh I'd like you to know that today we have
 → 7 most fascinating guests. °hh they have come here to talk to you↑
 → 8 to talk to us↑ (.) °hh a:nd (you) are going to: (.) find out that they **really**
 9 represent the most **d**ifferent parts of this world °hh so.
 10 welcome to the program↑ viewers↑ and guests.

Again in line 10 the viewers and guests are addressed as teams and explicitly separated from each other.

A similar example of making the teams of hosts, guests and television viewers relevant in conversation can be found at the end of the program. The beginning and the end of the program seem to be environments where the audience is most often oriented to. SS separates the teams of hosts and viewers (lines 1758 and 1759) and addresses the question to the guests (“I would like you to teach us (.) and our audience”).

(38a) [T2 1756]

- 1756 SS [and] so I think it's about time to: say good-bye to our (.)
 1757 RS [mm]
 → 1758 SS Finnish audience but uh °hh before **this**, I would like **you** to teach **us** (.)
 → 1759 and our audience↑ how to say good-bye

Although SS talks about herself and the other host, RS, as a team (“I would like you to teach us.”), RS does not here act according to his situated identity, as a host, although SS with her question and especially with the pronoun “us” in line 1758 makes participation as a host relevant for RS. Instead, he makes relevant another aspect of his identity, being a foreigner in Finland.

(38b) [T2 1756]

- 1756 SS [and] so I think it's about time to: say good-bye to our (.)
 1757 RS [mm]
 1758 SS Finnish audience but uh °hh before **this**, I would like **you** to teach **us** (.)
 1759 and our audience↑ how to say good-bye
 1760 (0.4)
 → 1761 RS aufwiedersehen.
 1762 MS (xx) ((in Chinese))
 1763 MP good-bye hh=

1764 MS =[xx)
 1765 M [(xx)
 1766 SS [((laughs))
 1767 JP namaskaar

This example shows how even though participants have certain situated identities in conversation, the participants still can choose not to orient to these identities as relevant at that particular moment.

6.2.2 Teams & Transportable identities

Transportable identities are identities that individuals have across different situations (Zimmerman 1998:91). They are present in a given situation, but they may or may not be relevant in that situation. Transportable identities are usually visible (e.g., gender, ethnicity, age), which means that usually the participants are aware of these aspects of each others' identity. But it needs to be remembered that even though a participant may be *aware* of the fact that a co-interactant is a young person or a female they do not necessarily orient to those identities as being relevant. According to Zimmerman (1998:91) it is important to distinguish between the registering of visible indicators of identity and *oriented-to* identity.

When teams are formed on the basis of transportable identities the topic of talk plays a crucial part. A certain aspect of the participants' identity is topicalized which yields to different participation statuses among the participants (experts, non-experts, members of that particular collectivity, non-members etc.). In the following example one of the hosts, RS, makes relevant certain transportable identities.

(39a) [T2 1088]

1088 RS =oh- we were t- or **you** were talking about women! †
 1089 (.) in different cultures and I would like to ask you as- as uh uh (.)
 1090 **foreign** women
 1091 F °yeah°
 1092 RS in: (.) white (.) Europe
 1093 F mm†

1094 RS (x)- and as uh uh uh women who **look** (.) different
 1095 MP mmyeah=
 1096 RS =°hh do you have any s:pecial u:h experiences or problems °hh as women,
 1097 I mean (.) u:h ((clears throat)) (.) for example in a community like Finland
 1098 where there's not many black people around anyway! †

A combination of transportable identities is used as a basis for categorization in this example. It is not just gender that is relevant here (the female host, SS is thus excluded), nor just ethnicity (the guest males are excluded from the category). Instead, what becomes relevant is a category that combines gender and ethnicity, a category of “foreign women”. The combination of these two transportable identities hasn't been relevant so far, but it is now made relevant in interaction. The immediate consequences for subsequent action are that members of that category are the addressees of the question, they are supposed to answer the question, and thus the role of next speakers is projected to them.

Whoever it is/they are who utter the continuers in lines 1091 and 1093 see themselves as belonging to the category “foreign women”, as does MP in line 1095. They are the addressees of the question and by uttering the continuers they show that they are acting as hearers. RS is producing an extended turn and with the continuers the recipients display an understanding that a multi-unit utterance is in progress but not yet complete (see Goodwin 1986b:207).

(39b) [T2 1088]

1088 RS =oh- we were t- or **you** were talking about women! †
 1089 (.) in different cultures and I would like to ask you as- as uh uh (.)
 1090 **foreign** women
 → 1091 F °yeah°
 1092 RS in: (.) white (.) Europe
 → 1093 F mm†
 1094 RS (x)- and as uh uh uh women who **look** (.) different
 → 1095 MP mmyeah=

Further categorization that is done directly, with labels such as “black” or “Chinese”, differentiates the members of the category “foreign women” from each other. It is interesting to see how after RS's labeling (“black women” in line 1100, “Chinese women” in line 1102, and “Indian women” in line 1105) the people he has

6.2.3 Team alignment in the construction of agreement

In multiparty conversation there are situations where two or more participants can join together to support a certain position (Kangasharju 1996:293). When participants align together as a team, they are not simply agreeing with each other, but using the opportunity to act as members of a team and consequently making the team relevant in conversation. Essential in team alignment is that the participants who agree with each other show this alignment primarily to the other participants, not to each other (Kangasharju 1996:294). This alignment can be done in overt ways such as explicit agreement, or more subtle ways such as reformulations or repetitions.

In the following example AR and CG align together as a team. AR has been telling what her husband is like and CG joins her in line 1187. The topic of talk here invokes participation as a team.

(42a) [T1 1177]

1177 AR who was [absent mm
 1178 PR [b-behind his paper and
 1179 PP [heh heh
 1180 RS m↓m=
 1181 AR =[mm]
 1182 PR [and-]=
 1183 RS =[m↓m]
 1184 ? [(x)]
 1185 PR =okay.=
 1186 F =mm=
 1187 CG [it's the] same I think with me I mean uh, I'm quite uh
 1188 AR [I-]
 1189 CG impulsive you [know a:] bit like Angela and uh I had the same
 1190 AR [yes.]
 1191 CG problem with Jari.°hh[he would] go away, and I couldn't even TALK=
 1192 JS [(uh)-]
 1193 AR =[no NO REAC::T::ION.]
 1194 JS [no but it's it's it's ye]ah
 1195 JS but it's a tactics also because [you-
 1196 CG [(oh)
 1197 JS you start to know what is u:h (.) what is getting (.)
 1198 what is making the other person (.) as angry as possible

In line 1187 CG explicitly states that she has similar opinions with AR. She is not simply agreeing with AR but making the team between herself and AR visible in interaction. One way of distinguishing team alignment from ordinary agreement is, according to Kangasharju (1996:294), that a display of agreement is often not directed to the person who the speaker is agreeing with but to the other participants. This can be seen in line 1189 where CG talks about AR in third person, directing her talk primarily to the other participants.

(42b) [T1 1187]

1187 CG [it's the] same I think with me I mean uh, I'm quite uh
 1188 AR [I-]
 → 1189 CG **impulsive** you [know a:] bit like Angela and uh I had
 1190 AR [yes.]

In line 1191 CG again uses the word “same” to align with AR’s previous talk. (“I had the same problem with Jari.”) In line 1191 CG produces the end of her utterances with raised volume. AR joins her, also with raised volume. In this way they build up the climax of the story collectively.

(42c) [T1 1187]

1187 CG [it's the] same I think with me I mean uh, I'm quite uh
 1188 AR [I-]
 1189 CG **impulsive** you [know a:] bit like Angela and uh I had the same
 1190 AR [yes.]
 → 1191 CG problem with **Jari**.°hh [he would] go **away**, and I couldn't even TALK=
 1192 JS [(uh)-]
 → 1193 AR =[no NO REAC::T::ION.]
 1194 JS [no but it's it's it's ye]ah
 1195 JS but it's a tactics also because [you-
 1196 CG [(oh)
 1197 JS you start to know what is u:h (.) what is getting (.)
 1198 what is making the other person (.) as angry as possible

CG’s talk receives two different kinds of responses. First, there is AR’s utterance in line 1993, in which AR reformulates the content of CG’s utterance (“he would go **away**, and I couldn’t even TALK” reformulated into “no NO REAC::T::ION.”) According to Kangasharju (1996:313) reformulation is one sign of team alignment. Second, there is a contrastive response, JS’s disagreement in line 1994.

Another example of team alignment, again between AR and CG can be seen in the following extract. Also in this example the topic of talk influences the participation arrangement so that participation as a team becomes relevant. The talk preceding this extract has been about the experiences of foreigners in Finland. CG is a foreigner who lives in Finland and she is here talking about her experiences in Finnish shops. The topic invites the participation of AR, who also is a foreigner living in Finland.

Similar aligning devices as in the previous example are used here. First, AR agrees with CG in line 533. After that CG makes the team between the two visible by not just speaking for herself but making AR's contribution to the topic relevant and inviting AR's opinion. Again, she does not address her utterance directly at AR, but uses the third person ("I don't know about Angela.."). With this utterance CG makes AR's opinion relevant and recruits AR as a supporter. The utterance also casts the other participants as the recipients of this utterance. CG and AR are not simply agreeing with each other but aligning as a team and making this alignment visible to the other participants.

(43a) [T1 532]

- 532 CG as long as we are paying or asking for service: then (.) we get it back.
 533 AR yes=
 → 534 CG =and I have the feeling, I don't know about An[gela] but uh that
 535 F [mm]
 536 AR you don't get it [back]
 537 CG [it-] it's very **hard** in Finland.
 538 AR mm.

There are several possible ways with which to show agreement in conversation. The repetition of prior speaker's words or expressions, or the reformulation of them, is one way of showing agreement. Goodwin (1981:115) has found out that repeating another participant's words indicates agreement with that previous speaker. In line 536 AR uses the same words ("you don't get it back") that CG has used in line 532. In this example we can see both explicit verbal agreement ("yes" in line 533) and agreement with the repetition of words (line 536).

(43b) [T1 532]

- 532 CG as long as we are paying or asking for service: then (.) we get it back.
 533 AR yes=
 534 CG =and I have the feeling, I don't know about An[gela] but uh that
 535 F [mm]
 → 536 AR you don't get it [back]
 537 CG [it-] it's very **hard** in Finland.
 538 AR mm.

CG's "but" projects a certain kind of continuation. AR has analyzed CG's talk and in line 536 AR produces the kind of completion that is appropriate to CG's utterance. Anticipatory completions are also indications of a team (Kangasharju 1996:312).

In the previous example the repetition of prior speaker's words was used by another participant to show alignment with the previous speaker. In the following example the content of a part of the previous speaker's utterance is reformulated by another participant in a way that displays agreement with the previous speaker.

(44) [T1 185]

- 185 AR I get angry.[because] I can't (.) find that word (.) that would cover- a whole
 186 SS [mm-h]
 187 AR °hh sentence or (.) you know I have to put little ones (0.5)[instead] of using
 188 SS [yes]
 189 AR just one. >and< I can never find that one word
 → 190 CG (and) and I agree with (you) Angela, uh because you feel a bit slower
 191 F yes
 192 CG =like, if I start to speak Finnish, >well I: can speak a little< uh,
 193 for some reason I am no s:: French anymore, or there's something in **me**:
 → 194 that it's a bit slower, somehow
 195 SS [mm
 196 CG [at least (it's) the way I feel
 → 197 AR [you feel a bit stup(h)i(h)d
 198 AR hih [hii hihhiih huhhuhuh °hh]
 199 RS [anyway, as a foreigner]
 200 RS (.) who does not speak Finnish fluently you often feel
 201 RS kind of handicapped because you just

Again, the topic of talk invites collaborative participation. AR and CG are both foreigners who live in Finland and the topic of talk makes relevant this aspect of their identity. They choose to tell their experiences not only as individuals, but as a momentary interactional team.

In these data participation as a team is one, at times quite central, aspect of the participation framework. Teams that are based on membership in some extra-interactional collectivities are sometimes explicitly referred to and thus made relevant in interaction. Also, when participants have an extra-interactional relationship, their shared knowledge can often be seen in interaction and it can result in teaming-up, for example in story-telling the participants who have shared knowledge about the topic can jointly tell the story, or they can monitor the correctness of talk. Situated, or institutional, identities can also be used in team-formation. This happens in these data especially at the beginning and at the end of the programs, where the topic of talk is the program itself and thus the institutional roles of hosts and guests is in the foreground. The topic of talk has an influence on team-formation also when teams are based on transportable identities, i.e. some aspects of the participants' identities. Often the topic invites collaborative participation from a participant who belongs to a same collectivity with the current speaker. The topic of talk can also invoke team alignment where two or more participants support a certain position together.

7. CONCLUSION

In the present study I have studied topic-invoked participation frameworks and found that topic influences the participation structure of the moment in many different ways. I have concentrated on examining topic-invoked participation frameworks in relation to topical movement, speaker-selection, and participation as a team. The focus of my attention has been the active interactional work done by the participants and I have described some central practices through which topic-invoked participation frameworks are formed.

In chapter 4, I examined topical movement and participation. In these data new topics are usually initiated by asking questions. By asking questions the hosts have the opportunity to restrict both the participation type and the participation arrangement of the guests and also the opportunity to restrict the content of the following talk. The use of questions often serves institutional agendas, for it is a practice with which to introduce different topics for the television viewers. The institutionality in these data can also be seen in the asymmetry between the hosts and the guests in the participation rights concerning topic initiation, for most of the topic-initiation is done by the hosts.

Boundaried topical movement, where there are clear boundaries between topics, is quite usual in these data. This, too, reflects the institutional character of the data. When boundaried topical movement takes place there are often several changes in the participation framework. At topic closings the current participation framework is relaxed, giving room for new topic-initiation. When a new topic is initiated a new set of speakers, recipients, knowing and unknowing participants etc. can be established. In stepwise topical movement there is a more subtle change in topics and similarly the changes in the participation framework can also be more subtle.

In content shift many aspects of the topic remain the same, usually there is only a shift in perspective. When this is the case the participation framework changes

often slightly, many of its aspects remaining the same. Membership in different collectivities is regularly used as a resource in shifting the topic. On these occasions the issue of constructing expertise arises. The role of the teller usually goes to the participant who has first-hand knowledge about the topic, and the rest of the participants adopt the role of recipients. When topic-shifting is done by the hosts it can function as an institutional strategy to introduce different points of view on one topic to the television audience.

When investigating speaker-selection in chapter 5, I found that often in these data the topic of talk is such that it is used in selecting the next speaker. One example of this is topicalising some aspect of a participant's identity. Occasionally, when topic does not explicitly help determine the next speaker, it may still restrict the selection so that only some subgroup of the participants, depending on their access to knowledge about the topic matter, are relevant next speakers. The topic can also leave the selection of next speaker open so that any of the participants can self-select to be next speakers. Nonverbal elements of talk, e.g. gaze, are regularly used when topic of talk is such that it does not help determine next speaker. In this section I also paid attention to how participants orient to the rules of turn-taking and speaker-selection and how problems in speaker-selection are solved by the participants. When stories are followed by second stories expertise in topic matter is used as a resource to self-select as second speaker. This expertise can be stated explicitly, as a justification for speakership. Access to knowledge is often a central aspect of speaker-selection and the formation of the participation framework.

Chapter 6 dealt with participation as a team. The findings showed how extra-interactional collectivities are sometimes used as a resource for teaming-up. Especially displaying shared knowledge plays an important part in team-formation. Story-telling is an environment where shared knowledge is often used as a resource to participate collectively. This can be seen in instances where there is co-telling of a story or in instances where a participant monitors the correctness of a co-participant's story. The findings also supported the fact that even when there is an

extra-interactional relationship between some of the participants the participants can still choose to participate as individuals instead of participating as a team. In other words, the participation framework provides multiple options for the interactants to choose how to participate.

Situated identities in these data were used as a resource of teaming-up mostly at the beginning and at the end of the programs, when the program itself is topicalized. Topic also influences teaming-up on occasions where some aspect of participants' identities is topicalized. For instance participants who belong to same category, e.g. "women" can use the topicalization of this transportable identity as a resource to participate as a team. On the other hand, this type of topicalization also provides an environment where teams that are based on other transportable identities, such as "men", or "couples" can emerge. Topic of talk can invoke team-alignment in instances where some opposite categories, such as "foreigners"/"Finns", "husbands"/"wives" etc. are made relevant in talk.

One of the central practices through which topic-invoked participation frameworks are formed in these data are the use of questions in initiating topic, shifting the topic, determining next speaker, and proposing a participation framework. The findings show that the use of questions also serves the institutional goals of the program and so questions are one way with which hosts manage the interactive event. The findings about the role of questions add knowledge to previous work in topic-invoked participation frameworks and also provide an area for further detailed studies, both in institutional and in everyday interaction.

Another practice that is regularly employed is using membership in a collectivity and access to knowledge to alter the participation arrangements of the moment. One practice through which this is done in these data is the topicalization of certain aspect(s) of the participants' identities. This creation of differential states of knowledge is used to make relevant certain discourse identities that then in turn can invoke larger social identities and can, for example, be used in the social

construction of expertise.

The findings show that topic creates differential states of knowledge between the participants and this in turn influences participation. Expertise can be socially constructed by first choosing a particular topic and then participating in actions that are invoked by that topic. The participant who has first-hand knowledge about that topic becomes the expert and the other, less-knowledgeable participant(s) are cast on the role of non-experts through the distribution of the roles of speaker/listener, or teller/recipient, questioner/answerer, knowing recipient, unknowing recipient, and so on.

A problem that I encountered when conducting the present study was the relatively small number of previous studies on participation frameworks. In many previous studies participation frameworks have been touched upon only lightly, the main focus being somewhere else. There are also studies that have concentrated on some very specific aspect of participation framework. On one hand, this kept my eyes open and provided greater freedom in approaching the subject but, on the other hand, it meant that when dealing with such a wide subject area it was sometimes difficult to focus. In participation frameworks there are a wide variety of interrelated aspects that influence participation and have to be considered when studying them. This of course requires at least some knowledge about many different things and can sometimes prove to be very challenging. In the future, more in-depth information about specific aspects of participation frameworks is needed. For example, questions such as how expertise is socially constructed, or the relevance of membership in different collectivities in interaction, could be approached in more detail by studying participation frameworks.

REFERENCES

- Antaki, C. and S. Widdicombe. 1998. *Identities in Talk*. London: SAGE.
- Arminen, I. 1998. *Therapeutic Interaction. A Study of Mutual Help in the Meetings of Alcoholics Anonymous*. Helsinki: The Finnish Foundation for Alcohol Studies.
- Atkinson, J.M. and J. Heritage. 1984. *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Button, G. 1987. Moving out of closings. In: Button, G., J.R.E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation*, 101-151. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Button, G. and N. Casey 1985. Topic nomination and pursuit, *Human Studies* 9: 3-55
- Button, G. and N. Casey. 1984. Generating the topic: the use of topic initial elicitors. In Atkinson, J.M. and J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, 167-90. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Button, G. and N. Casey. 1989. Topic initiation: business-at-hand. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 22: 61-92
- Clayman, S.E. 1988. Displaying neutrality in television news interviews, *Social Problems* 35: 474-92
- Clayman, S.E. 1992. Footing in the achievement of neutrality: The case of news interview discourse. In P. Drew and J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work. Interaction in institutional settings*, 163-198. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clayman, S.E. 1993. Booming: The anatomy of a disaffiliative response. *American Sociological Review*, 58:110-130
- Clayman, S.E. & D. W. Maynard. 1995. Ethnomethodology and conversation analysis. In P. ten Have, G. Psathas (Eds.), *Situated order: Studies in the social organization of talk and embodied activities*, 1-30. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.
- Drew, P. 1979. Examination: A Comparison of the Turn-taking Organisations for

- Conversation and Examination. In J.M Atkinson and P. Drew, *Order in Court. The Organisation of Verbal Interaction in Judicial Settings*, 34-81. London: MacMillan.
- Drew, P. 1991. Asymmetries of knowledge in conversational interactions. In I. Markova and K. Foppa (Eds.), *Asymmetries in dialogue*. Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Drew, P. and J. Heritage. (Eds.) 1992. *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, P. and E. Holt. 1998. Figures of speech: idiomatic expressions and the management of topic transition in conversation, *Language in Society* 27: 495-522
- Firth, A. 1996. The Discursive Accomplishment of "normality": On Conversation Analysis and "Lingua Franca" English, *Journal of Pragmatics* 26: 237-59
- Francis, D. W. 1986. Some structures of negotiation talk. *Language in Society*, 15: 53-80
- Goffman, E. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodwin, C. 1979. The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: studies in ethnomethodology*, 97-121. New York: Irvington.
- Goodwin, C. 1981. *Conversational Organization: Interaction between Speakers and Hearers*. New York: Academic Press.
- Goodwin, C. 1984. Notes on story structure and the organization of participation. In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action*, 225-246. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, C. 1986a. Audience diversity, participation and interpretation. *Text* 6(3): 283-316
- Goodwin, C. 1986b. Between and within: alternative and sequential treatments of continuers and assessments. *Human Studies* 9: 205-18
- Goodwin, C. 1996. Transparent vision. In: Ochs, E., E.A. Schegloff, S.A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and Grammar*, 370-404. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

- Goodwin, C. and M.H. Goodwin. 1987. Concurrent Operations on Talk: Notes on the Interactive Organization of Assessments. *IprA Papers in Pragmatics* 1, No.1: 1-52
- Goodwin, C. and M.H. Goodwin. 1990a. Interstitial argument. In A.D. Grimshaw (Ed.), *Conflict talk*, 85-117. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, C. and M.H. Goodwin. 1990b. Context, activity and participation. In P. Auer and A. di Luzio (Eds.), *The Contextualization of Language*, 77-99. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Goodwin, C. and J. Heritage. 1990. Conversation Analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 283-307
- Goodwin, M.H. 1990. *He-said-she-said: talk as social organization among black children*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana U.P.
- Goodwin, M.H. 1997. Byplay: Negotiating Evaluation in Storytelling. In G.R. Guy, C. Feagin, D. Schriffin and J. Baugh (Eds.), *Towards a Social Science of Language: Papers in Honor of William Labov 2: Social Interaction and Discourse Structures*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Greatbatch, D. and Dingwall. 1998. Talk and Identity in Divorce Mediation. In C. Antaki and S. Widdicombe *Identities in Talk*, 121-132. London: SAGE.
- Hakulinen, A. 1996. Johdanto: Keskustelunalyysin profiilista ja tilasta [Introduction: On the profile and status of conversation analysis]. In A. Hakulinen (ed.), *Suomalaisen keskustelun keinoja II* [Characteristics of Finnish conversation II].(Kieli 10), 9-22. Department of Finnish, University of Helsinki.
- Hakulinen, A. 1997. Vuorottelujäsennys [Turn taking organization]. In L.Tainio (ed.), *Keskustelunalyysin perusteet* [The basics of conversation analysis], 32-55. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Halonen, M. 1996. Yhteisyyden ja tunnistettavuuden osoittaminen perhekeskustelussa [Showing sharedness and identifiability in a family conversation]. In: A. Hakulinen (ed.), *Suomalaisen keskustelun keinoja II* [Characteristics of Finnish conversation II]. (Kieli 10), 173-205.

Department of Finnish, University of Helsinki.

- Have, P. ten. 1999. *Doing conversation analysis: a practical guide*. London: SAGE.
- Heritage, J. 1984. *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Heritage, J. 1985. Analyzing news interviews: aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience. In T.A. van Dijk, ed. *Handbook of discourse analysis*. London: Academic Press. Vol. 3, 95-117
- Heritage, J. 1995. Conversation analysis: methodological aspects. In U.M. Quasthoff, ed., *Aspects of oral communication*, 391-418. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Heritage, J. and D. Greatbatch. 1991. On the institutional character of institutional talk: the case of news interviews. In D. Boden and D.H. Zimmermann (Eds.), *Talk and social structure. Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*, 93-137. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Heritage, J. and D. Greatbatch. 1991. On the institutional character of institutional talk: the case of news interviews. In D. Boden & D.H. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure: studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*, 93-137. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Heritage, J. and A. Roth. 1995. Grammar and institution: Questions and questioning in the broadcast news interview. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 28(1): 1-60
- Jefferson, G. 1983. On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. *Studium Linguistik*, 14: 58-68
- Jefferson, G. 1984. On stepwise transition from talk about a trouble to inappropriately nextpositioned matters. In: Atkinson, J.M., J. Heritage, eds. *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, 191-222. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kangasharju, H. 1996. Aligning as a team in multiparty conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26: 291-319
- Kangasharju, H. 1998. *Alignment in disagreement: Building alliances in multiperson interaction*. Dissertation, Manuscript version. Dept of

- Finnish Language. University of Helsinki.
- Lerner, G. H. 1987. *Collaborative Turn Sequences: Sentence Construction and Social Action*. An Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of California, Irvine.
- Lerner, G. H. 1991. On the syntax of sentences-in-progress. *Language in Society*, 20: 441-458
- Lerner, G. H. 1992. Assisted Storytelling: Deploying Shared Knowledge as a Practical Matter. *Qualitative Sociology*, 15(3): 247-271
- Lerner, G.H. 1993. Collectivities in action: Establishing the relevance of conjoined participation in conversation. *Text*, 13(2): 213-245
- Lerner, G.H. 1996. On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: 'second person' reference in multi-party conversation. *Pragmatics*, 6(3): 281-294
- Levinson, S. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, S. 1988. Putting linguistics on a proper footing: explorations in Goffman's concepts of participation. in P. Drew and A. Wootton (Eds.) *Erving Goffman: Exploring the Interaction Order*, 161-227. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Londen, A-M. 1997. Kahdenkeskinen keskustelu Londen, Anne-Marie, 1997b: Kahden- ja monenkeskinen keskustelu [On multi-party conversation]. In L. Tainio (ed.), *Keskustelunanalyysin perusteet*, 56-74. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Nuolijärvi, P. and L. Tiittula. 1995. *Vuorovaikutus televisiokeskustelussa. Projektin taustaa ja lähtökohtia* [Interaction in a tv-discussion]. Tutkimusraportti 8/1995. Helsinki: Yleisradio, Yleisötutkimus.
- Nuolijärvi, P. and L. Tiittula. 1997. *Televisiokeskustelun agenda* [The agenda of tv-discussion] Tutkimukset 1/1997. Helsinki: Yleisradio, Yleisötutkimus.
- Nuolijärvi, P. and L. Tiittula. 2000. *Televisiokeskustelun näyttämöllä. Televisioinstitutionaalisuus suomalaisessa ja saksalaisessa keskustelukulttuurissa* [TV-discussion as a performance. Television institutionality in Finnish and German discourse cultures]. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

- Ochs, E. and B. Schieffelin. 1983. Topic as a Discourse Notion. In E. Ochs and B. Schieffelin (Eds.) *Acquiring Conversational Competence*, Academic Press.
- Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J. Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Raevaara, L. 1997. Vierusparit. Esimerkkinä kysymys ja vastaus [Adjacency pairs. Questions and answers as an example]. In L. Tainio (Ed.), *Keskustelunanalyysin perusteet* [The basics of conversation analysis], 75-92. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Sacks, H. 1992a, 1992b. *Lectures On conversation*. Edited by G. Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., E.A. Schegloff, and G. Jefferson. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50: 696-735
- Scannell, P. 1991. *Broadcast Talk*. London: SAGE.
- Schegloff, E.A. 1984. On some gestures relation to talk. In Atkinson, J.M., J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, 266-96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E.A. 1991. Reflections on Talk and social structure. In D. Boden and D. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*, 44-70. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Schegloff, E.A. 1992. On talk and its institutional occasion. In P. Drew and J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work. Interaction in institutional settings*, 101-134. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E.A. 1995. Parties and joint talk: Two ways in which numbers are significant for talk-in-interaction. In P. ten Have and G. Psathas (Eds.), *Situated Order. Studies in the Social Organization of Talk and Embodied Activities*, 31-42. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.
- Schegloff, E.A. and H. Sacks. 1973. Opening up closings, *Semiotica* 8: 289-327
- Schegloff, E.A., G. Jefferson, and H. Sacks. 1977. The preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation. *Language* 53,

361-382

- Seppänen, E-L. 1997. Osallistumiskehikko [Participation Framework]. In L. Tainio (ed.), *Keskustelunalyysin perusteet* [The basics of conversation analysis], 156-176. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Silverman, D. 1998. *Harvey Sacks: Social Science and Conversation Analysis*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Streeck, J. and M. L. Knapp. 1992. The interaction of visual and verbal features in human communication. In Poyatos, F. *Advances in Nonverbal Communication*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Wagner, J. 1996. Conversation analysis of foreign language data. Special Issue of *Journal of Pragmatics*
- Zimmermann, D. 1998. Identity, Context and Interaction. In C. Antaki and S. Widdicombe *Identities in Talk*, 87-106. London: SAGE.

Appendix 1

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

te[xt1]	
[text]2	overlapping utterances
text1=	
=text2	latching utterances
(0.7)	a pause, timed in tenths of a second
(.)	a pause shorter than 0.4 seconds
(x)	unintelligible item, probably one word only
(xx)	unintelligible items, approximately of phrase length
(xxx)	unintelligible items, beyond phrase length
(text)	uncertain transcription
((coughs))	transcriber's comments
CAPITALS	loud speech
° high circles°	quiet speech
bold font	emphasis, via pitch and/or amplitude
>fast<	fast speech
<slow>	slow speech
:	prolongation of the preceding sound, the numbers of colons indicating the length of the prolongation
°hh	inbreath, the number of h's indicating the length of the inbreath
hh	outbreath, the number of h's indicating the length of the outbreath
↑	rising intonation
.	falling intonation
,	continuing intonation
cutoff s-	cutoff word
@text@	altered tone of voice, usually when quoting someone
te(h)xt	breathiness, e.g. in laughter