

JYX



This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.

Author(s): Olbertz-Siitonen, Margarethe

Title: Discourse Analysis

Year: 2019

Version: Accepted version (Final draft)

Copyright: © 2019 Taylor & Francis

Rights: In Copyright

Rights url: <http://rightsstatements.org/page/InC/1.0/?language=en>

Please cite the original version:

Olbertz-Siitonen, M. (2019). Discourse Analysis. In S. M. Croucher, & D. Cronn-Mills (Eds.), *Understanding Communication Research Methods : A Theoretical and Practical Approach* (2nd ed., pp. 191-204). Routledge.

or texts from a discourse analytic perspective means to determine what is achieved through their production.

This chapter discusses why discourse is a worthwhile object of research in communication studies. You will learn what discourse analysis represents and what different discourse analytic approaches have in common. This chapter provides you with information on aspects of data collection and data processing that are crucial for conducting consistent and reliable discourse analytic work. The chapter will guide your first analytical steps by introducing important principles and some basic practical advice on analyzing discourse. As you may have noticed, this section of the book takes up a bit more space. Discourse analysis is a broad field of enquiry and involves a number of points to consider for your research project.

FIGURE 14.1

Chapter Outline

- Discourse Analysis Defined
 - Types of Data
 - How to Transcribe
 - How to Conduct a Discourse Analysis
 - Key Steps & Questions to Consider
 - Activities
 - Discussion Questions
 - Key Terms
 - Undergraduate Student Paper
-

Why study Discourse?

Let's explore some good reasons to study discourse. Analyzing discourse has the advantage of working with first-order data, which means you will observe and discover authentic practices and real-life concerns. Talk and texts can provide you with insight into the ways people construct and account for social reality and the nature of social action. In other words, by studying discourse we uncover what people actually do by means of certain lexical choices, rhetorical formats, a particular line of argument, and so on. In the case of spoken discourse also *how* something is said can be important. For example, you might find seemingly random or irrelevant details—such as hesitations, pauses or volume of speech—meaningful resources in social conduct.

What you discover when studying discourse can have all sorts of practical, political, and societal implications. This is because discourse is a locus of social interaction. What happens in society largely happens through discourse. Findings on discursive practices can increase public awareness of how gender inequalities, power, or culture and cultural differences are our doing and as social constructs inextricably tied to discourse. Piller (2012) argued, “we do not have culture but [...] we construct culture discursively” (p. 5). Observations on the discursive construction of culture might encourage treating people as individuals whose activities are situated rather than determined by group membership. On a smaller scale, insights into conversational structures can help facilitate effective communication in institutional settings. Understanding how a single word is enough to change the course and outcome of talk is relevant for personnel in service encounters, such as interactions between doctor and patient, or clerk and

customer (see Stokoe, 2014). In fact, the Conversation Analytic Role-play Method (CARM), which is a communication skills training program developed by Stokoe (2014), builds on research within a larger framework of discourse studies.

Discourse runs through all aspects of human life. Analyzing discourse or “what people do” (Potter, 2016, p. 190) can tackle a number of different communication research problems. Whether your research questions are open-ended (e.g., how discourse is organized and what is achieved through that organization) or directed at a specific social fact (e.g., how group membership is constructed), employing discourse analysis will enable you to shed light on core characteristics of the issue at hand. Let’s take a closer look at basic premises and principles of discourse analysis (DA). Over the next sections, you will find answers to the following questions: What is discourse analysis? What kinds of data are needed? How do I transcribe data? How do I conduct a discourse analytic study?

What is Discourse Analysis?

DA really is an umbrella term describing a field of study. DA is not a single method but includes a number of different approaches. These approaches can be distinguished by research interests, underlying theoretical or philosophical considerations, the kind of data utilized, and analytical procedures. In general terms and—as we will see further below—in a more traditional sense **DA** stands for the study of texts and talk, focusing on language use and on language as a means of social action (see Antaki, 2008; Potter, 2016; Potter & Hepburn, 2008; Rapley, 2007; Silverman, 2011).

FIGURE 14.2

A comprehensive definition of DA

In their anthology *Discourse Analytic Research: Repertoires and Readings of Texts in Action*, Burman and Parker (2017) bring together a selection of various discourse studies. Burman and Parker consider what the collected contributions have in common, thereby providing a comprehensive and far-reaching definition of discourse analysis.

According to Burman and Parker (2017), the studies share “a concern with the ways language produces and constrains meaning, where meaning does not, or does not only, reside within individuals’ heads, and where social conditions give rise to the forms of talk available. In its various forms, discourse analysis offers a social account of subjectivity by attending to the linguistic resources by which the sociopolitical realm is produced and reproduced.” (p. 3)

Burman and Parker (2017) continue by underlining how “all involve an attention to the ways in which language (as with other representational systems) does more than reflect what it represents, with the corresponding implication that meanings are multiple and shifting, rather than unitary and fixed.” (p. 3)

DA is characterized by its commitment to **social constructionism** (Potter & Hepburn, 2008; Silverman, 2011). What we say and write is not approached as objective accounts of social facts, but as constructions which accomplish “versions of the world, of society, events and inner psychological worlds” (Potter, 2016, p. 190). Within this broad framework, various theoretical perspectives guide research on discourse and you can choose among a number of methods.

Below you find an overview of the most common approaches, their scopes, and typical data compiled by Antaki (2008). While Antaki stressed the table is not conclusive, it still provides a sufficient picture of possible research approaches in DA.

FIGURE 14.3

What actions are to be revealed	Candidate theory/method	Typical data
Personal meaning-making	Narrative Analysis, Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis	Interviews, diaries, autobiographies, stories
Imposing and managing frames of meaning and identities	Interactional Sociolinguistics, Ethnography of speaking	Audio and video recordings, ethnographic observations
Accomplishing interactional life in real time	Conversation Analysis	Audio and video recordings
Displaying and deploying psychological states; describing the world and promoting interests	Discursive Psychology	Audio and video recordings, texts
Constituting and representing culture and society	[Generic] Discourse Analysis	Texts, interviews
Constituting and regulating the social and the political world; the operation of power	Critical Discourse Analysis	Official and unofficial texts, speeches, media accounts and representations, interviews

Table 1: Discourse analytic methods and data according to researchers' interests (Antaki, 2008, p. 432)

Antaki's (2008) table shows how approaches range from **micro-** to **macro-level** phenomena.

While **conversation analysis** is concerned with the stepwise organization of talk and the accomplishment of mutual understanding, studies in **critical discourse analysis** take a political stance and examine discourse contributing to the construction and reproduction of power. Of course, the multitude and diversity of approaches somewhat blur the scale of DA. However, according to Antaki (2008, p. 432) any discourse analytic work is characterized by four key

features: 1) a focus on natural talk or texts, 2) an appreciation of words as embedded in their co-text and wider context, 3) a sensitivity towards the non-literal meaning of words, and 4) special attention to the social actions achieved through language use. The four points outline the frame of DA and provide valuable benchmarks for your own analysis.

In recent years, DA has seen a shift towards **multimodality** (Jones, 2012). Across approaches, scholars have started to focus on language use as only one out of many equally relevant resources (or **modes**) of communication. Beside language, modes include gestures, gaze, body orientation, or the design and layout of documents. “*Multimodality*” from this perspective is approached holistically with no mode treated by the analyst as more important than the other.

In sum, work conducted within the framework of DA typically follows a qualitative, inductive and data-driven line of inquiry. Common aims of discourse studies are to uncover the underlying patterns and structures of **meaning-making** in spoken and written discourse and to trace the ways social reality is produced, negotiated, and reinforced in everyday discursive practices (see Keller, 2013).

What Kinds of Data are Needed?

What kind of discursive material you should collect is informed by your research interests and by the approach you have chosen. For example, if you like to study how immigrants reflect on their experiences living abroad and organize these experiences into individual storylines, your approach likely will be **narrative analysis** (Antaki, 2008). Your study will use data containing personal accounts of immigration, such as open-ended interviews, blog entries, articles, journal

entries, or even autobiographies. On the other hand, a research project can develop in reverse order with data informing your research interests and approach. This is the case when you are allowed access to an existing set of data or you simply come across an interesting phenomenon you would like to study.

As mentioned above, one unifying feature of most DA approaches is their concern with natural texts and talk. In other words, the study relies on **naturally occurring data**. If you are uncertain, whether the data can be considered natural, a memorable rule is Potter's (2002) "dead social scientist's test" (p. 541): data are naturally occurring when the recorded situation would have taken place despite the researcher's existence. The Potter rule clearly excludes social experiments conducted in controlled laboratory settings and surveys, and questions the applicability of interviews or focus groups. Such modes of data collection yield **biased** material since influenced and shaped by the researcher's informed decisions.

However, qualitative interviews and focus groups are often justified by approaching them as social constructs themselves, for example "interviews *as* discourse data" (Nikander, 2012, p. 397; emphasis added). This means the data are seen within the context of their production: what participants tell and how they tell it is tied to the circumstances of being interviewed. Participants' answers should not be taken as factual information. Second, researchers may place emphasis on the role of the interviewer in their analysis (see, e.g., Nikander, 2012). Focus groups and interviews as discourse data include the option of studying interviews and focus groups entirely in their own right. For example, exploring the activities involved in the mutual organization of research interviews can help unveil underlying expectations about participating

in these kinds of data collection. Similar to the service encounters mentioned above (Stokoe, 2014), such analysis has the potential to further demonstrate how one word can change the outcome of an interview.

FIGURE 14.4

For example, Puchta and Potter (1999) in a discursive psychological study on question formats in market research focus groups organized in Germany discovered that moderators use extended or elaborate questions to ensure interviewees' participation and "guide the responses made by participants" (p. 332). Such findings demonstrate how moderators or interviewers are crucially involved in the production of answers.

An ongoing debate is whether data containing mundane conversations or institutional talk can ever be completely free of researcher's interference. The recording of natural interactions involves setting up and operating a video camera, microphones or audio-recorders, and keeping field notes (Silverman, 2011). **Labov's Observer's Paradox** (1972) identifies the problem: "the aim of linguistic research in the community must be to find out how people talk when they are not being systematically observed; yet we can only obtain this data by systematic observation" (p. 209).

On the other hand, many forms of written language are produced and archived irrespective of academic interests, satisfying the requirement of authenticity particularly well. Even certain audio/visual recordings may be considered truly natural including TV interviews, moderated talk shows, vlogs, and so on. The recordings were produced for larger audiences and are an essential

part of their construction. Social media brings with it the added advantage of allowing unobtrusive collection of data. For example, the camera is an essential element of video-mediated talk. Automated chat logs are another source of genuine discursive data made available by everyday technology.

FIGURE 14.5

Considering research ethics

As with any kind of study involving humans, you have to follow the principles of ethical conduct in research, such as getting **informed consent** from your research participants. However, keeping participants' integrity in mind is particularly important with naturally occurring data. Authentic data gives you access to people's real-life concerns and may contain sensitive information that should not be traceable to any particular person. Protecting your participants' identity is important.

How to Transcribe

The process of data collection often includes preparing and organizing the material for later analysis. In the case of spoken discourse, you are required to **transcribe** your data (transferring recorded interaction word by word into written form). We recommend you start rough drafts of **transcripts** during the process of gathering research material allowing you to get acquainted with the details of the recordings, which may help build research questions and focus any additional data collection.

Transcripts are important to DA for four reasons. First, transcripts are a way to deal with the transient characteristics of talk, which would otherwise be difficult to trace or inaccessible. Fixed in written form, spoken discourse becomes available for thorough and recurrent examination. Second, transcripts have the practical advantage of allowing quick access to keywords with the help of a search function. Third, the process of transcribing compels repeated review of the data providing insight and forming an initial picture of participants' practices. Transcriptions are considered the first step of analysis or a "major 'noticing device'" (ten Have, 2007, p. 95; see also Kowal & O'Connell, 2014). Finally, any kind of DA study needs to be open to scrutiny based on the "'validity through transparency and access' principle" (Nikander, 2008, p. 227) of qualitative research. You are expected to make the analysis available to your readers and to demonstrate what exactly your observations and reflections are based on. By including in your research report transcripts of analyzed extracts, you establish reference points and ensure others can follow your analytical argument.

When you transcribe you can follow specific **transcription conventions** (rules developed to mark temporal and prosodic features of talk including pauses, intonation contours, stress and volume). The conventions you choose depend on your approach. Kowal and O'Connell (2014, pp. 74-75) provide an overview of four notation systems commonly utilized in DA. Transcripts usually consist of three columns including line numbers, the current speaker or speakers (using masked initials or pseudonyms), and a written version of their talk. The rough scheme below in Figure 14.6 gives you an idea of the prevailing form of transcripts:

FIGURE 14.6

Line Number	Speaker(s)	Communication
1	name1	talk
2		talk
3		talk
4	name2	talk
5	name1	talk
6	name3	talk
7		talk
8	name2	talk

We highly recommend numbering each line of the transcript, even if the turn of one participant stretches over several lines. Line numbering ensures the discourse in your analysis can be traced back to the transcript with little difficulty. Second, use a monospaced font—such as Courier New—to produce a clean and aligned transcript. A monospaced font allows you to precisely mark, for example, overlapping talk (see example (2) lines 02–03) in Figure 14.7.

FIGURE 14.7

Two examples of transcripts

(1)

(from Wells, 2011, p. 443)

1. I: Um-hum.
2. R: Yeah. I do.. my daughter was about ten then. And
3. That's where I got something like a little gap
4. Because I think I end up leaving her then for a year or two.
5. But...and because I know when I would
6. Come to my mother's just to leave her, it would
7. Almost be just antagonizing, you know, all the
8. Screaming and pulling on me and, you know,
9. Because she wanted me...she wanted to be with me.
10. I: Um-hum.
11. R: She wanted to stay with me. She wondered 'Why
12. you going and I'm not going?'
13. I: Um-hum.
14. R: And, ah, and it got to really be [] real strenuous on me and
15. my daughter

(2)

```

Ava and Bee (from Sidnell, 2010, pp. 52–53)
01 Ava: I'm so:: ti:yid. I j's played ba:ske'ball t'day since the
02     firs' time since I wz a freshm'n in hi:ghsch[ool.]
03 Bee:                                     [Ba::]sk(h)et=
04     b(h)a(h)ll? (h) [(°Whe(h)re.)
05 Ava:                                     [Yeah fuh like an hour enna ha:[lf.]
06 Bee:                                     [.hh] Where
07     didju play ba:sk[etbaw. ]
08 Ann:                                     [(The) gy]:m.
09 Bee: In the gy:m? [(hh)

```

As can be seen in the two examples, transcripts of talk differ remarkably in their level of detail. How thorough you need to be is informed by your research interests. The first case stems from a study exploring a mother's accounts of maternal identity who had temporarily lost the custody of her children (Wells, 2011). Focusing only on the wording of her narrative is sufficient for the study. The second transcript, on the other hand, has a conversation analytic background and relies on the precise notation of stretches and overlaps. The detailed transcript allows for a fine-grained analysis of the organization of talk, such as the mutual accomplishment of **turn-taking** (see Sidnell, 2010). A multimodal approach to interaction further calls for transcripts that take account of all relevant modalities. Multimodal transcripts include notations of verbal activities and prosodic features, gestures, gaze, and bodily orientations, and their exact timing and progression (see Mondada, 2007). Often such transcripts are enriched with schematic pictures or—depending on participants' permissions—photographs. However, even the most detailed transcript constitutes a work in progress and may be adjusted later on. As you proceed with your analysis you might hear things differently, or maybe your focus changes and requires you to add more details.

FIGURE 14.8

Translating data

If you are analyzing discourse produced in a foreign language, you might be required to enclose translations into your research report. In the case of written discourse, placing a translation directly beneath the original is often sufficient. When representing translated talk, on the other hand, you have several options: (1) you can provide a translation below the original transcript, (2) include the translation line by line into the transcript or (3) choose a parallel format where original and translation are side-by-side (see Nikander, 2008, pp. 227–229).

How to Conduct a Discourse Analytic Study

While transcripts are essential, analysis of spoken discourse always includes the original recordings. When transcribing, you have to make certain choices since details might be difficult to mark down or vocal features can be heard differently, and so on. A transcript is a selective **interpretation**. This is why discourse analysts usually rely on a combination of recording *and* transcripts.

Analyzing discourse is more of a back-and-forth procedure than a linear process. Indeed, no clear-cut, step-by-step guidelines exist for conducting any kind of DA study, but you are expected to make your own methodological choices in accordance with your data, research interests, and theoretical grounds. DA work has been compared, in fact, to a skill requiring experience, a certain mentality, and creativity (Antaki, 2008; Keller, 2013; Potter, 2004, 2016; Rapley, 2007). Of course, as we will see below, discourse studies are not free of methodological commitments and you have to be clear about your decisions and remember to justify them well. However, approaching your data with as little provision as possible can facilitate the discovery

of phenomena a rule-governed analysis might overlook. To get a better picture of conducting a DA, Rapley (2007) recommends reading other people's work. Academic journals in the field, such as *Discourse Studies*, *Text & Talk*, and *Discourse & Society*, are useful for studying others' methodological approaches. Your department may organize regular data sessions where you can improve your skills by analyzing data together with experts.

FIGURE 14.9

"There are no hard-and-fast answers or solutions to any of the debates and dilemmas you will face when undertaking work on conversations and texts. It often depends on what you read, how you read it, and what just makes sense to you in the context of your own work. Above all, I would suggest going and reading examples of as many people's empirical work as you have time for, to get a sense about the practical decisions they made and the practical solutions they employed." (Rapley, 2007, p. 109)

As DA generally aims at discovering patterns and recurrent structures of meaning-making, one way to begin tackling your data is by identifying themes and by organizing them into a collection of different categories. This kind of **coding** is done through careful examination and re-examination of your material (for more on coding practices see Keller, 2013; Rapley, 2007): once you come across something interesting, mark it down and label it using a descriptive phrase or a keyword. See, if you can find similar instances in the data, and refine your initial tag or classification with what the occurrences have in common. You might be required to add sub-categories or expand existing codes in order to catch nuances and distinguish certain formats from others. During this process you may come across a number of interesting phenomena.

However, we advise limiting your focus and keeping track of how single categories and sub-categories relate to each other and the main theme of your study. While coding can help you create and manage an archive, coding is not always necessary nor a sufficient step. As Potter (2004) puts it: “Part of DA may involve coding a set of materials, but this is an analytic preliminary used to make the quantity of materials more manageable rather than a procedure that performs the analysis itself” (p. 216).

Analyzing, then, means to explore and explain what is going on in your data. While coding involves finding and categorizing interesting passages, analysis is more about figuring out what exactly makes these passages interesting. Remember that in the process of conducting a discourse analytic study you cannot necessarily follow a straight path. Data collection, transcribing, coding and analysis often overlap.

Whatever your approach—conversation analysis, narrative analysis, critical discourse analysis, discursive psychology—try to keep the four key features of DA in mind (see Antaki, 2008). While DA provides no fixed instructions on how to analyze your data, the key features reveal underlying principles and can assist you in navigating your analysis. First, avoid repeating or paraphrasing what participants say, but rather try to make sense of people’s activities and provide a profound and clear account of what you think they are doing. This is based on the assumption what people say or write constitutes versions of reality which cannot be approached as simple facts or truths. You should always demonstrate how you arrived at a certain understanding. According to Rapley (2007), “your job is to convince others that your claims, your interpretations, are both credible and plausible, that you are not just making this up from

thin air or this is just your vague hunch, but that your argument is based on the materials from your archive” (pp. 128–129). This goes hand in hand with an appreciation and discussion of previous work on the subject. DA’s views on social reality have further analytical consequences. For example, from a discourse analytic perspective status, gender, or cultural membership are only achieved through discourse. Rather than referring to such attributes as an explanation for certain behavior or using them as a starting point for your research, the idea is to explore how, for what purposes, and under which circumstances they are brought up in discourse. Finally, treat single contributions in relation to their placement by considering what preceded a certain expression or a word and what it leads to next.

Summary

This chapter provided you with some basic insights into the broad area of discourse analysis. As is often the case with such introductions, this text constitutes more of a starting point – but one that hopefully inspires you to learn more about this field and maybe even a certain approach in particular. In general terms, DA allows us to recognize the ways people (together) create meaning and social facts. Although analyzing discourse is a skill requiring learning by doing, the chapter should help guide you in the process.

Key Terms

Bias	Coding	Conversation Analysis
Critical Discourse Analysis	Discourse Analysis (DA)	Interpretation
Labov’s Observer’s Paradox	Macro-Level	Meaning-Making
Micro-Level	Modes	Multimodality

Narrative Analysis	Naturally Occurring Data	Social Constructionism
Transcribe	Transcription Conventions	Transcripts
Turn-Taking		

Key Steps & Questions to Consider

1. DA describes a field of study, encompassing a number of different approaches.
2. Conducting a discourse analytic study often includes recurrent and overlapping steps.
3. Usually discourse analytic work means studying naturally occurring data.
4. In the case of spoken discourse, data collection involves the recording of suitable situations, which means setting up cameras and audio recorders beforehand.
5. Recording and using naturally occurring data entail specific demands with regard to research ethics.
6. Recorded data should be roughly transcribed to allow for a better overview. The notation of single passages that become relevant for analysis can be refined later on using an established transcription system.
7. The data may be organized by categorizing interesting phenomena. However, while coding sometimes includes analytical elements, analysis does not stop there.
8. Analyzing means exploring and explaining what is going on in the data.
9. Analysis generally aims at discovering patterns and structures of meaning-making. The main focus is on how people constitute social facts through discursive practices.
10. A multimodal approach to discourse does not favor language over other modes of communication.

11. The research report should clearly demonstrate how presented findings have evolved and follow the “‘validity through transparency and access’ principle” (Nikander, 2008, p. 227).

Activities

1. Find online a TV interview. Transcribe a short passage of talk (approximately one page). Prepare a rough transcript. Then go into details by marking pauses, overlaps, stresses, and so on. For an example see Puchta and Potter (1999, especially p. 333).
2. Practice coding. Using the TV interview you found online, label interesting instances and organize them into categories and sub-categories. Focus on the different ways the interviewer addresses the interviewee.
3. Pick one instance from your TV interview for closer inspection. What is happening? How can this be explained? Try to trace and reconstruct what the interviewer is doing by addressing their interview partner in a certain way.

Discussion Questions

1. What kinds of discourse do you come across on a daily basis? What makes them interesting for closer inspection? How could they be approached analytically?
2. Under which circumstances could discursive data that stem from experiments in laboratory settings be considered naturally occurring? What questions could be directed at such materials from a DA perspective?
3. If you are working in groups or pairs, agree on a talk for activity 1 and decide which part of that talk should be transcribed. Everyone transcribes the passage on their own and then

compare your notations. In which ways do they match? What differences do you find?

What implications have these similarities and differences for possible analysis?

References

- Antaki, C. (2008). Discourse analysis and conversation analysis. In P. Alasuutari, L. Bickman, & J. Brannan (Eds.). *The Sage handbook of social research methods*. (pp. 431-446). London: Sage.
- Burman, E. & Parker, I. (2017). Introduction – discourse analysis: The turn to the text. In E. Burman & I. Partker (Eds.). *Discourse analytic research: Repertoires and readings of texts in action*. (pp. 1-13). Abington, UK: Routledge.
- ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis*. London: Sage.
- Jones, R. H. (2012). Multimodal discourse analysis. In C. Chapelle (Ed.). *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0813/pdf>.
- Keller, R. (2013). *Doing discourse research: An introduction for social scientists*. London: Sage.
- Kowal, S. & O'Connell, D. (2014). Transcription as a crucial step of data analysis. In U. Flick (Ed.). *The Sage handbook of qualitative data analysis* (pp. 64-78). London: Sage.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Mondada, L. (2007). Multimodal resources for turn-taking: pointing and the emergence of possible next speakers. *Discourse Studies*, 9, 194-225.
- Nikander, P. (2008). Working with transcripts and translated data. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 5, 225–231.

- Nikander, P. (2012). Interviews as discourse data. In J. F. Gubrium (Ed.) *The Sage handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft* (pp. 397-413). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Piller, I. (2012). Intercultural communication: An overview. In C.B. Paulston, S.F. Kiesling, & E.S. Rangel (Eds.). *The handbook of intercultural discourse and communication*. (pp. 3-18). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Potter, J. (1997). Discourse analysis as a way of analysing naturally occurring talk. In D. Silverman (Ed.). *Qualitative research. theory, method and practice*. (pp. 144-160). London: Sage.
- Potter, J. (2002). Two kinds of natural. *Discourse Studies*, 4, 539-542.
- Potter, J. (2004). Discourse analysis as a way of analysing naturally occurring talk. In D. Silverman (Ed.). *Qualitative research. theory, method and practice*. (pp. 200-221). London: Sage.
- Potter, J. (2016). Discursive psychology and the study of naturally occurring talk. In D. Silverman (Ed.). *Qualitative research*, 4th Edition. (pp. 189-206). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2008). Discursive constructionism. In J. A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.). *Handbook of constructionist research*. (pp. 275-293). New York: Guilford Press.
- Puchta, C. & Potter, J. (1999). Asking elaborate questions: focus groups and the management of spontaneity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3, 314-335.
- Rapley, T. (2007). *Doing conversation, discourse and document analysis*. London: Sage.
- Sacks, H. (1984) Notes on methodology. In M. Atkinson, & J. Heritage (Eds.). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. (pp. 21-27). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Schenkein, J. (1978). Explanation of transcript notation. In J. Schenkein (Ed.). *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction*. (pp. xi-xvi). New York: Academic Press.
- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Silverman, D. (2006). *Interpreting qualitative data*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Silverman, D. (2011). *Interpreting qualitative data*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Silverman, D. (2013). *Doing qualitative research*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Stokoe, E. (2014). The conversation analytic role-play method (CARM): A method for training communication skills as an alternative to simulated role-play. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 47, 255–265.
- Wells, K. (2011). A narrative analysis of one mother’s story of child custody loss and regain. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33, 439–447.

Undergraduate Student Paper

The gradual production of a humorous event in a Finnish talk show

(translated from Finnish)

Saara Vilokkinen

- 1 Host *kenen idea oli laittaa laura räty (0.5) ministeriksi.*
 whose idea was it to select laura räty (0.5) as secretary.
- 2 Guest *.hh aika harvat asiat on niinku kenenkään yksittäisten*
 .hh quite few things are the ideas of
- 3 *ihm[isten ideoita]*
 a [single person alone]
- 4 Host *[mut se oli sun idea,]*
 [but it was your idea,]
- 5 (0.5)

6 Guest *mut mä olin siinä mukana*
but I was involved in this

7 *kun sitä [kehiteltiin (sitä)]*
when this [was developed (this)]

8 Host *[se oli sun idea;]*
[it was your idea;]

9 (.)

10 Guest *.h mä olin*
.h I was

11 *mu:[kana siinä kun sitä kehiteltiin sitä ideaa?]*
in[vo:lved in this when this was developed this idea?]

12 Host *[.h ((naurattaa)) <SE] oli*
[.h ((laughs)) <IT] was

13 *[SUN IDEA>*
[YOUR IDEA>

14 Guest *[mä olin MUKANA SIINÄ?*
[I was INVOLVED IN THIS?

15 (.)

16 Host *mä satun tietään et se oli sun idea,*
I happen to know that it was your idea,

17 *((naurattaa)) oliko?*
((laughs)) was it?

Commented [A1]: Saara has prepared a very detailed transcript, which depicts all the features relevant for her conversation analysis. The transcript shows, for example, overlaps, stresses, intonation and pauses as well as in-breaths.

(for transcription conventions see Sidnell, 2010)

This passage is taken from a Finnish talk show (“Hjallis”) that was broadcasted on MTV3, a Finnish TV-channel, on the 10th of October 2014. The guest of this show was Taru Tujunen, the former party secretary of a large Finnish party. I chose this data, because I remembered seeing the show on television and noticing that the talk was intense and possibly interesting to analyze from a conversation analytic perspective. Of course I attempted to watch the conversation again without presuming too much beforehand. However, this 15 second-long stretch of talk which takes place two minutes after the beginning drew my attention and I decided to focus my analysis on this particular passage. In principle, the extract could have also been longer for the analysis of

this case, but I believe that within these 15 seconds one can already identify a certain phenomenon using conversation analysis.

Commented [A2]: It is sometimes important to include (preceding) talk if it becomes relevant in the course of a certain passage. However, in this case Saara's choice to keep the extract at 15 seconds is justified - no more insight is needed to analyze this segment (and to be able to follow as a reader without difficulty).

In the beginning of the passage Hjallis, the host, asks his guest whose idea it was to select Laura Rätty as secretary. Hjallis poses his question quite calmly with falling intonation, but as can be seen in the transcript he makes a clear pause of half a second after mentioning the name of Laura Rätty (line 1). Also his guest, Tujunen, begins to speak with a rather calm and continuing intonation, responding that *“.hh quite few things are the ideas of a single person alone”* (lines 2–3), until Hjallis cuts in at the end of her reply. Hjallis clearly takes on the role of the interviewer by dramatizing and by answering in overlap in his guest's stead: *“but it was your idea,”* (line 4). After a very short pause, Tujunen answers emphatically: *“I was involved in this when this was developed (this)”* (lines 6–7), clearly stressing the word ‘involved’, but again Hjallis cuts in, using more emphasis himself: *“it was your idea!”* (line 8). Until this point Hjallis has been physically oriented towards his guest, and he reinforced his interruptions through intensive eye contact with Tujunen.

After a micro pause, Tujunen repeats her answer with yet more weight: *“.h I was involved in this when this was developed this idea?”* (lines 10–11). Again Hjallis interferes towards the end of her sentence, now almost shouting with very strong emphasis: *“<IT was YOUR IDEA>”* (lines 12–13). At the same time Hjallis shakes his finger at her thereby still intensifying his exclamation. Partly in overlap with this, now Tujunen herself shouts back: *“I was INVOLVED IN THIS?”* (line 14) and in turn shakes her finger at Hjallis. At lines 16–17 Hjallis continues a little

quieter, but still with clear accentuation: “*I happen to know that it was your idea, ((laughs)) was it?*”.

Commented [A3]: Saara reproduces the course of this talk with great care, and she pays attention to nonverbal activities. It is easy to follow how the passage slowly builds up.

From my point of view, this conversation is quite a typical example of talk shows that strive to entertain, such as “Hjallis”. Hjallis takes a rather authoritative interviewer role by interrupting his interviewee – in this case Tujunen – with his assumptions, which he readily presents as truths. However, he nevertheless ends this passage by saying “*I happen to know that it was your idea, ((laughs)) was it?*”. In the beginning he does not hesitate to make claims of truth while his interviewee is still speaking, and he even says that he knows the story. Yet, in the end, by asking “was it?” (line 17), he still indicates that his assumptions are not necessarily reliable. I think that this is a clear device for dramatizing and making the talk more exciting and thus more entertaining for the audience, by grilling the interviewee, so to speak. This might even be exactly “Hjallis” trademark in general.

Tujunen starts out answering Hallis’ question calmly and professionally, with level intonation, but she clearly reacts to his accentuated interruptions by intensifying her own intonation and stressing words she wants to highlight. Tujunen also accelerates her speech rate and increases the volume of her talk in reaction to Hjallis’ progressively emphasized and louder interruptions. However, it is noteworthy that between these gradually pronounced turns there is also continuous laughter, and as they produce those turns both parties are smiling at each other increasingly. The debate in this situation is clearly not conducted in a hostile spirit, but takes a rather humorous turn. Clearly, the parties react to one another’s turns by precisely responding themselves still a bit louder and with still some more emphasis after the other has done the same, as well as by

increasing their laughter and smiles. It is also notable how Hjallis reinforces his most prominent turn by shaking his finger and how immediately after this Tujunen does the same in her own turn. The parties therefore clearly build on each other's activities in this conversation, together producing this humorous passage.

References

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation Analysis. An Introduction*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Commented [A4]: In her conclusions Saara reflects on her observations. She makes some important points here: For example, her analysis of this passage demonstrates how the participants interactively achieve humor and how both speakers orient to the presence of an audience (i.e. using resources of entertaining).