

Feminism & Psychology

<http://fap.sagepub.com/>

Feminist Conversation Analysis : Research by Students at the University of York, UK

Celia Kitzinger

Feminism & Psychology 2007 17: 133

DOI: 10.1177/0959353507076542

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://fap.sagepub.com/content/17/2/133>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Feminism & Psychology* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://fap.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://fap.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://fap.sagepub.com/content/17/2/133.refs.html>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Apr 18, 2007

[What is This?](#)

Feminist Conversation Analysis: Research by Students at the University of York, UK

Edited by Celia KITZINGER

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION: THE PROMISE OF CONVERSATION ANALYSIS FOR FEMINIST RESEARCH

Conversation analysis (CA) is a theoretically and methodologically distinctive approach to the study of social life, developed in the late 1960s and early 1970s by Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson (e.g. Sacks, 1974; Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff, 1968, 1972, 1979; Schegloff et al., 1977). It treats talk and other conduct in interaction as a site for social action and analyses it to identify members' methods for producing social life.

Gender and sexuality researchers are increasingly turning to CA as a method for understanding the routine reproduction of sexism, heterosexism and other forms of power, and of resistance, at the mundane level of everyday life. (For introductions to CA as a feminist methodology see Kitzinger 2000, 2006; Wilkinson and Kitzinger, 2007.) The University of York (UK) is one of the foremost centres for conversation analysis internationally, and since my own appointment there (in 2000), a growing number of PhD students have worked with me on topics related to gender and sexuality. It is their work – and their experiences of doing that work – that is highlighted here.

The contributions to this special feature – all authored or co-authored¹ by current or recently graduated students from York – display the use of CA to research issues of concern to feminists: the role of the researcher in the research and her responsibility to the people she is researching (Estefania Guimaraes); emotional labour in beauty salons (Merran Toerien); the impact of marriage and civil partnership legislation on talk about lesbian and gay relationships (Victoria

Land); the effect of Alzheimer's disease on mother/daughter interaction (Danielle Jones); problem presentation and advice-giving about home birth (Rebecca Shaw); and how gender does – and doesn't – become relevant in interaction (Rose Rickford; Clare Stockill).

CA is sometimes treated by feminist (and other 'radical' or 'critical') researchers as having too narrow and restrictive a scope for politically engaged research (e.g. Billig, 1999; Wetherell, 1998). According to one critic, CA 'limits admissible context so severely that only the most blatant aspects of gendered discursive practice, such as the overt topicalizing of gender in conversation, are likely candidates for Schegloffian analysis' (Bucholtz, 2003: 52). Ignoring completely recent work using CA to study heteronormativity (e.g. Kitzinger, 2000, 2005a, 2005b; Land and Kitzinger, 2005), another critic dismisses the whole approach as irredeemably mired in heteronormative assumptions (Hegarty, 2007). CA is criticized for what its opponents believe to be its exclusive focus on language at the expense of non-verbal forms of communication (Hammersley, 2003), or 'the rigid assumption that sociality can be represented by textuality' (Hegarty, 2007: 52).² It is dismissed as jargon-ridden and impenetrable, and (despite its claims to fidelity to participants' own orientations) as divorced from speakers' own understandings of what is going on in interactions. Feminist linguist Robin Lakoff (2003: 168–9) asks acerbically: 'who is aware that a TRP . . . is approaching as they speak?' and 'who realizes that they are producing a dispreferred second or a presequence?'³ Finally, CA – say the critics – is no *fun*! It is a method that is 'devoid of pleasure' (Hegarty, 2007: 55).

When I discuss these kinds of criticisms with feminist (and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered (LGBT)) students at York, they are incredulous. On two points the students whose work is represented here are unanimous. First, they are using CA because they believe that it gives them the opportunity to understand the world – and, through understanding, to change it for the better. Rose Rickford, an undergraduate student at York, puts it like this:

For me the most important thing about CA is that it's inherently political. It politicizes the everyday. It completely overturns the notion that politics belongs in a separate space – that it's something you do when you vote, or go on a demonstration, or write a letter of protest. I believe that by changing the everyday we can change the world. For me, CA is fundamental in that. Micro-interactions are not tiny insignificant little things that happen underneath the big umbrella of macro-structures. The macro-structure is – in part – something we create through our moment-by-moment micro-interactions. And we could do them differently!⁴

Second, for all of them, CA is *fun*: 'intense and demanding but also a lot of fun' (Guimaraes), 'empowering' (Toerien, 2004: 295), 'engrossing' (Shaw, 2006: 336), 'stimulating' (Jones), 'enjoyable' (Land) and 'exhilarating' (Rickford). According to Clare Stockill, currently working on her PhD at York on young women's talk-in-interaction:

There's a lot of time and homework that goes into learning how to do conversation analysis. But one thing that took me by surprise is how much fun the technical aspect is. I don't know why people think it's dry or boring! I've never come out of a data session without thinking 'that was amazing!'. I just love it! It's about people and their practices, and what happens between people in relationships.

In this introduction to the articles in the special feature, I want less to introduce the articles themselves than to introduce their authors, and to let them speak in their own words about what it is that has drawn them to CA as an intellectual and political endeavour. CA is not widely taught in British universities, which means that most researchers still learn about it long after becoming competent in other methodological approaches. For myself, having been trained as an undergraduate (on an experimental psychology degree) exclusively in positivist-empiricist quantitative methodologies (mostly relating to brains and rats), my own choice of method for my doctoral research on lesbian identities was Q-methodology (see Kitzinger, 1987 for an account of why I used it and Kitzinger, 1999 for an account of why I decided not to use it subsequently), and I then moved on to discourse analysis (DA) (Wilkinson and Kitzinger, 1995) and first encountered CA through the work of discursive psychologists (notably Edwards, 1995, 1997; Potter, 1996) who were increasingly drawing upon it in developing their own work (see Kitzinger, 2004 for an autobiographical account of my own intellectual trajectory towards CA). By contrast with my own mid-career encounter with CA (which led me to spend a sabbatical year retraining as a conversation analyst under the expert tuition of Emanuel Schegloff, John Heritage and Steve Clayman at UCLA), three of the contributors to this special feature, Victoria Land, Rose Rickford and Danielle Jones, first learnt CA as undergraduate students at the University of York.

Teaching of CA in the University of York's Sociology Department varies from year to year, but always includes an introductory undergraduate module, which is also taken by graduate students across various departments (including Psychology and Linguistics). It also attracts, every year, a group of visiting overseas scholars and also people from other UK institutions who make day trips to York in order to participate. This course introduces some of the key discoveries of CA: the organization of turn-taking, sequence organization, repair, word selection and the overall structural organization of talk. In the five years during which the student contributors to this special feature took it, lectures were given by Paul Drew, Celia Kitzinger and Geoffrey Raymond⁵ – and Victoria Land and Merran Toerien also, towards the end of their time at York, taught small seminar groups associated with the course. Other undergraduate CA teaching in Sociology during this period included (at advanced undergraduate level): 'Communication in Medical Interaction' (Paul Drew); 'Language and Social Institutions' (Paul Drew); 'Conversation Analysis, Discourse Analysis and Critical Social Psychology' (Robin Wooffitt), plus CA components of the 'Anomalous Human Experiences' course (Robin Wooffitt), and of our 'Individual and Society'

and 'Methodology' courses taken by all first-year students and taught by varying combinations of full-time teachers and doctoral students. Graduate-level courses during this same time period have included: 'Analysing Video Data' (Anthony Wootton), data analysis seminars (Paul Drew) and a series of five graduate units on Turn-Taking, Sequence Organisation, Repair, Story Telling, and Person Reference (Celia Kitzinger).⁶

Some of the more junior contributors to this special feature were inspired not just by the full-time teachers at York, but also by some of the other contributing students. It was Victoria Land's exemplary teaching in introductory 'Individual in Society' seminars, in which she conveyed to undergraduates her own enthusiasm about her ongoing PhD research on lesbian talk-in-interaction, that contributed to Rose Rickford's emerging sense, as a first-year undergraduate student, that CA was something she wanted to study. She says:

I first really got into the idea of using CA to look at the construction of identity in my very first term at York, taking 'Individual and Society'. Then when I took the 'Methodology' module in my second term I got interested in issues of ontology and epistemology in research methods. I'm not sure that complete objectivity about the world we're researching is ever possible – but CA comes closest of any method I've studied to enabling us to look at the world *through the eyes of our participants*, instead of imposing our own vision of the world on them. The practical exercise we were given in the third term 'Methodology' course, studying how people do greetings, really sealed it for me. I knew I wanted to know more about CA – and I've taken every available CA course ever since. It was an amazing opportunity being allowed to take the graduate CA courses as well – and although I was quite intimidated at first being in classes with graduate students and post-doctoral scholars, I soon realized that I was just one of a group of people interested in finding out some things about the world, and that was really exciting!

Rose is now a third-year undergraduate working on her final honours dissertation analysing calls to a helpline for women with symphysis pubis dysfunction. She has access to this data through her part-time work as research assistant to Celia Kitzinger:

It's amazing to be working with data that people have recorded because they have actively come along to us and said 'please will you use your knowledge and skills to help us develop our service'. Most of the analysis and writing that you do as an undergraduate consists of exercises that are only meaningful in the context of passing courses and getting a degree. But in working on the Pelvic Partnership calls it's clear that I have expertise as a conversation analyst that makes me valuable in helping with something that's actually important in the real world. The charity that runs the helpline will use our analyses to improve their practice and I'm excited to be able to offer that kind of help.

The contribution in this special feature (Kitzinger and Rickford) uses a single episode from one of the Pelvic Partnership calls to explore how gender is constructed in talk. This article began life as a piece of assessed coursework (answering the set question, 'How is gender constructed in talk?') for her undergraduate

course 'Gender and Society', to which she brought her skills as a conversation analyst. Gender is, clearly, not the main focus of the research on these calls that will (like the research carried out by Rebecca Shaw on calls to the Home Birth helpline) primarily be directed to the ways in which the interactions help callers, and could do so more effectively.

For Danielle Jones, it was the undergraduate course 'Communication in Medical Care', taught by Paul Drew, that first inspired her – especially after completing a course project on how doctors deliver diagnoses.

It was because I so much enjoyed Paul's course, which I took in my second year, that I decided to take the Conversation Analysis course in my third year, which was a much more technical introduction to the basic mechanisms of ordinary conversation. Within a few weeks of starting that course, CA became a passion. I found myself listening to people's conversations in a new way in my everyday life. Then in one class Celia [Kitzinger] briefly mentioned CA research on people with communication disorders and mental health problems, and I knew right away what I wanted to do for my final year project. I've known a lot of families which include people with Alzheimer's and I worked in a residential home which included Alzheimer's patients for nearly a year. I wanted to work on ordinary conversations with people with Alzheimer's in the hope that Alzheimer's could become less frightening to people. So that's what I did – with Celia as my supervisor, and I loved it, and decided to apply to do a PhD. I realized, when I brought CA to the conversations, how much I could learn from that kind of analysis, and how useful it could be to families dealing with Alzheimer's.

The article in this special issue (Kitzinger and Jones) is a first attempt to say something useful about communication with an Alzheimer's patient and Danielle is very pleased that the patient's daughter has reported finding our analysis helpful and supportive.

Victoria Land, an undergraduate at the University of York in 1999–2002, first encountered CA on an undergraduate course I co-taught with Paul Drew and Geoffrey Raymond. For her it was 'a theoretical and methodological revelation'. She also took my courses 'Contested Sexualities' and 'Gender and Society', 'which cultivated existing passions and opened up new ways of thinking', so decided to do her PhD research (2002–6) combining the study of sexuality and CA. One important feature of CA is that it specifically studies naturally occurring talk (everyday conversations, or interactions in organizations), not experiments, interviews or focus groups. The initial impetus for Victoria's research was her own experiences of heterosexism: she wanted to collect and analyse instances in which she or other lesbians were (for example) addressed as 'Mrs Land', asked whether they had boyfriends, or in which their heterosexuality was simply presumed. She said:

On a personal level, as a feminist and a lesbian, I recognized that CA has a rich potential to provide a compelling analysis of the relevance of sexuality in everyday life. It's a powerful research tool for analysing and illuminating that everyday experience.

Victoria Land's PhD thesis, 'Doing Politically Engaged Conversation Analysis with Talk by Lesbians and Gay Men: Categories, Person Reference and Heteronormativity in Action' (2006), explores the social construction of sexuality in everyday conversations. It shows how sexism and heterosexism, gender and sexuality are manifested in mundane interaction and contributes especially to our knowledge about 'coming out' as lesbian. The contribution included here (Land and Kitzinger), which deals with explicit contestations around same-sex marriage, represents a very small part of the thesis overall (see Land and Kitzinger, 2005, 2007, 2007 in press, for more of its findings). Victoria is now employed as a researcher in the Digital World Research Centre at the University of Surrey, bringing her CA skills to a cross-media communications project.

The practical uses of CA in helping to improve real-world interactions is what first excited Rebecca Shaw. She was a researcher in the Centre for Health Economics at the University of York when 'by chance, I came across an article in the journal *Health Expectations* by Paul Drew, John Chatwin and Sarah Collins (2001), which proposed conversation analysis as a method for studying interaction in health settings' (Shaw, 2006: 336). Rebecca had worked as a volunteer counsellor for Rape Crisis and (like Rose Rickford, currently working on calls to the Pelvic Partnership helpline) she saw the possibility of using CA research on recorded helpline interactions as a way of understanding what happens during those conversations and how to help women more effectively:

The applied literature on telephone counselling emphasizes the importance of making callers feel comfortable in the first few moments of the call. When I was working on helplines, and especially when I was involved in training, I found myself at a loss for examples of what this would actually sound like. [. . .] [In my PhD research] I've had the opportunity to apply conversation analysis to help-line calls and begin to answer those earlier questions about what 'making the caller feel comfortable' would actually sound like. (Shaw, 2006: 336-7)

As it turned out, Rebecca was not able to get ethical clearance to collect Rape Crisis calls and worked instead on a collection of calls to the Home Birth Helpline (becoming 'a convert to the idea of home birth' [Shaw, 2006: 336] in the process!). Through CA she was able to explore how the feminist commitments of the Home Birth Helpline call-taker translated into actual practice, and thereby to advance her own feminist commitments to women's right to choose. Summarizing the achievement of her PhD research, she says:

Through this analysis of *actual* conversations in which women are actively trying to resist the medicalization of their pregnancy and birth and in which the call-taker is seeking to 'empower' callers, I have illustrated the way in which issues of concern to feminists (i.e. the right to give birth in the place of your choosing) can be furthered and promoted in helpline interaction. (Shaw, 2006: 344)

The article included in this special feature (Shaw and Kitzinger) focuses on the way in which callers to the Home Birth Helpline present their problems and the

call-taker's initial response to them (see also Shaw and Kitzinger, 2005, 2007 in press). Rebecca is continuing to work as a researcher on health-related issues, using a range of different methodologies.

It is no accident that three of the seven students whose work is included here are focussing on health-related issues (Rickford on symphysis pubis dysfunction; Jones on Alzheimer's disease; Shaw on home birth). The health field is one of the longest-established and fastest-growing areas of applied conversation analytic research⁷ (e.g. Drew et al., 2001; Gill, 1998; Heath, 1986, 1992; Heritage and Maynard, 2006; Heritage and Sefi, 1992; Heritage and Stivers, 1999; Maynard, 1992; Peräklyä, 1998; Robinson, 2001; Stivers, 2002a, 2002b). Another of the contributors to this special feature, Merran Toerien – whose PhD (Toerien, 2004) was a feminist study of women's hair-removal practices – is now also working in the field of health. She says:

Since completing my PhD I have gone on to use CA in a very different applied context: health services research. What this has taught me is that CA is good not only for social *critique* (a form of deconstruction, if you like). It is also an effective tool for working within our key social institutions (like the National Health Service), to develop training that may play a constructive role in improving human interaction towards a particular goal (e.g. within counselling sessions or clinic appointments). For me, however I might use it, what remains most inspiring is CA's insistence on studying social life in action and always with a fine-grained sensitivity to the real people involved.

For Merran Toerien (as for many others, myself included) it was in part disappointment with traditional psychology, and a turn to social constructionist and discursive approaches, that led her eventually to CA. She transferred to the University of York part-way through her PhD research⁸ having had a brief glimpse of what CA could offer, and eager to find out more. Far more than theoretical arguments about what CA can and cannot do, it is the experience of actually applying it to data that convinces many people of its value:

Celia was not yet my primary supervisor, but had kindly agreed to a data session with me. She pointed out the difference between a gap (silence between two turn constructional units and therefore – usually – a transition relevant place) and a pause (silence within a speaker's turn constructional unit). She explained how this difference was consequential for the sense the participants themselves made of the given moment of interaction. Put on paper like this it all sounds rather trivial. But it was a revelation to me in so many ways: I suddenly started seeing that interaction had an order to it that went way beyond the links forged by topics; I felt I had the beginnings of a powerful toolkit for making sense of my data from the point of view of the people who had generated it in the first place. And I felt that I was discovering things that I could point to in my data and justify on the grounds of meticulous past research and the evidence of how the participants themselves treated each other's turns at talk. Having felt at sea in data sessions before, I began to feel increasingly confident to venture my own analytic insights.

When she transferred to York, Merran, showing astonishing commitment and

dedication for someone already two years into PhD research using other methodologies, set herself the challenge of ‘learning a technically and theoretically challenging approach from scratch’ (Toerien, 2004: 287):

At the University of York I was rigorously schooled in the ‘basic science’ of CA, which meant that I developed a detailed understanding of how interaction actually works in practice for real people in real time. This meshed very closely with what had inspired me to study psychology as an undergraduate (but which seemed disappointingly absent from much of my course): a fascination with the nuances of human interaction and mutual meaning making. Second, because of Celia’s commitment to a feminist politics, I was also introduced to the exciting potential of using CA to understand how social norms (which I wanted to critique as a feminist) may be sustained ‘from the bottom up,’ through our everyday interaction and often in the course of doing something else entirely (e.g. Celia’s work on the reproduction of heterosexism in calls to out of hours doctors’ surgeries [Kitzinger, 2005a]). This meshed closely with what *had* excited me about my undergraduate psychology course: a class on social constructionism. What I was being offered through CA was a way to see social construction in action – to be able to *point* to the reproduction of things like racism, sexism, ageism, heterosexism in all its subtlety and show it to be happening. I see this as an important foundation for any feminist campaign for change.

Merran’s PhD thesis (2004) uses a multi-method approach to exploring the production, maintenance, practices and sociocultural meanings of the UK norm for women’s body hair removal. The article included in this special feature (Toerien and Kitzinger) represents one small part of it.

Like Merran Toerien, both Estefania Guimaraes and Clare Stockill also came to CA via their interests in social constructionism, DA and discursive psychology. Clare Stockill was taking a module entitled ‘Discourse Analysis’ as part of her MA in Psychology at the Open University:

I was disenchanted with the scientific pretensions of mainstream psychology and had already begun an intellectual journey towards social constructionism but was dissatisfied with the lack of empirical basis for many of the claims made, especially about gender and sexuality. If these things are constructed in social processes then we should be able to *show* them being constructed.

The first thing she read that (as she puts it) ‘turned her on’ to the possibilities of CA was Robin Wooffitt’s (2001) chapter using CA to research psychic practitioners, in the set text for the ‘Discourse Analysis’ unit of her degree, ‘Discourse as Data’:

Psychology has so long ignored real language and real interaction between people – because it’s messy. But Wooffitt’s chapter showed how systematic it actually is. There was a pattern to how the psychics showed, through their talk, that they were in contact with the spirit. Next I read Kitzinger and Frith (1999) on ‘saying no’ and I was just blown away. It made me realize that the systematicity of talk-in-interaction could be a resource for doing feminist analysis. Then, after reading Kitzinger’s (2000) ‘Doing Feminist Conversation Analysis’, that was it! I applied to do a PhD with Celia on gender and conversation.

In her first year of PhD research, Clare has so far taken the undergraduate and graduate classes in CA at York, and attended the Advanced Summer Institute in Conversation Analysis at UCLA ('one of the best experiences of my life'),⁹ and collected some of her data: conversations between teenagers. The article included in this special feature (Stockill and Kitzinger) is her first attempt at analysing this data and is derived from a piece of coursework she completed for the 'Person Reference' unit of the graduate course.

Estefania Guimaraes also first read about CA as part of her MA in Psychology, which included components on discourse analysis and discursive psychology. As her interest in DA/CA developed, she began to think about a PhD on women's reports of abuse, and this connected for her with the work I had done with an earlier PhD student on women refusing unwanted sex (see Kitzinger and Frith, 1999; Kitzinger, 2000):

It was Celia's work on feminist CA – such as an article entitled 'Just Say No?' that connected campaigns targeting young women to say 'no' to unwanted sex with actual conversational practices for doing refusals (which are much more subtle than this) – that attracted me to CA. This connection between how things are really done in actual life and political issues seemed to work in such a powerful manner that it got me hooked.

In the initial rush of enthusiasm for CA, often based on something they have read, students often underestimate how much work is involved in learning the basic skills of CA – a process during which much of their substantive interests in gender, sexuality, violence, birth, mental health issues and so on has basically to be put to one side. Learning to use the specialist 'tool kit' of CA is – like learning statistics – something that might be treated as standing apart from students' substantive interests but providing them with the necessary skills to research them. Most find, however, that the basic practices of interaction become intrinsically interesting to them in their own right, quite separately from the broader political concerns that led them to CA in the first place. There is 'an intellectual buzz of discovery' (Toerien, 2004: 295) from working on data with CA tools and finding oneself in a position not simply to use them to study gender or sexuality, but also to develop the tools themselves by contributing to 'basic' CA understandings about the structures of talk-in-interaction. So, Victoria Land has reflected on the way in which, over the course of her PhD, she reached a position in which 'being a conversation analyst with an interest in politically engaged research involves more than taking the resources contributed by others to investigate oppression, resistance, hassles and so on. Rather it also involves contributing to the cumulative conversation analytic project' (Land, 2006: 66–7). (See Land and Kitzinger, 2005 for a contribution to CA knowledge about embedded correction and Land and Kitzinger, 2007 in press, for a contribution to CA knowledge on person reference.) For Estefania Guimaraes, likewise:

Based on my own research practice I can say that CA research is labour-intensive, time consuming and demanding but, though it can be frustrating at

times, it can also be stimulating and rewarding when you make sense of interactional practices in a new way – and there is so much to discover in the realm of conversation, you always end up intrigued by something and wanting to know more and more!

The work-in-progress that is Estefania's PhD thesis will certainly contribute to understanding the issues involved in women's reports of violence to the police. But, in trying to apply CA tools developed on English language data, she has also become intrigued by some of the systematic differences in practice apparent in Brazilian Portuguese, and by issues of translation – both of which will be part of the final work. Guimaraes's article included in this special feature is an early reflection on her own practice, as a researcher, during the data collection phase of her work.

In sum, for these students at least, CA has offered a methodology for feminist research that is ethical, rigorous, and offers powerful technical resources for understanding human interaction – including interactions that perpetuate inequality, power and discrimination. The contributions in this special feature offer illustrations of feminist CA in action.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to all the contributors to this special feature, not just for your work on these pieces, but also for sharing with me the excitement of CA in our data sessions together. I have enjoyed my collaborative work with all of you! Thank you also to Sue Wilkinson for helpful comments on an earlier version of this introduction.

NOTES

1. Authorship of the pieces in this special feature reflects the extent of my own contribution as supervisor in the resulting product. Only Estefania Guimaraes' is single-authored, in large part because hers is an experiential as well as a conversation analytic piece. The two publications with students who (at the time of writing) were undergraduates necessarily involved me in more extensive drafting of the articles, and reworking of the students' initial analyses, and this is reflected in the order of authorship. The graduate (and post-doctoral) student work is first-authored by the students reflecting the fact that this is, in much larger proportion, their own independent work.
2. The claim that CA is preoccupied with language at the expense of bodily behaviours is in part a reflection of the fact that CA developed at a historical period (1960s/70s) when the tape-recorder was available (for capturing talk) but filming people (thereby capturing bodily behaviours) was a much more cumbersome business – though Goodwin's work was pioneering in this respect (see Goodwin, 1980, 1984, 1987, 2000; also Heath, 1984). Nonetheless, conversation analysts *have* worked on co-present data and have studied bodily behaviour, gesture, gaze, and deportment – and the analysis of video data is an integral part of CA teaching in all of the internationally renowned CA

centres (including at York, University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) and University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB)). Most of the students contributing to this special feature worked on telephone conversations in which participants did not have access to each other's bodily behaviour and so they have analysed the talk alone. Two of the contributors, however, *are* analysing co-present interactions – between women and police officers in a women's police station (Estefania Guimaraes) and between a beauty therapist and her client in a beauty salon (Merran Toerien). Unfortunately, neither was granted permission to video the interactions, hence their focus here on the talk alone. (However, see Toerien and Kitzinger, 2007 in press for analysis of the hand movements of a beauty therapist during a depilation session in which permission *was* granted for video-taping.) It is widely recognized that contemporary best practice includes – where participants have visual access to each other – analysis of bodily behaviour as well as talk. (See the Appendix for a transcription key that captures the details of talk that have been discovered to be relevant for social participants: it is this method of transcription that is used by the contributors to the special feature. See Goodwin, 1987, 2000 for examples of transcription that also captures bodily behaviours.) Reflecting on her experience of taking Anthony Wootton's University of York graduate course 'Analyzing Video Data', Victoria Land says:

I was astounded at the degree of visual detail that we attend to as social participants; tiny gestures, fleeting glances, and slight bodily movements added a whole new level of communication. This degree of detail was matched only by the granularity of the analysis and I soon appreciated the time and effort required to achieve a thorough analysis. It certainly underscored the importance of having access to visual data when analysing co-present interaction.

3. Although these are clearly intended as rhetorical questions, it is worth pointing out that the answer is: everyone (though of course not in those terms). Lakoff's (deliberately obfusatory?) initialization 'TRP' stands for 'transition relevant place'. It means the end of a unit of talk where transition to another speaker is normally relevant (e.g. at the end of a sentence, or what might be a complete sentence even if – in fact – in turns out not to be; see Sacks et al., 1974). One of the findings about lesbian coming out reported in Kitzinger (2000) was that speakers who have just said they are lesbians are *acutely* aware of when they are coming to a place where another speaker might legitimately talk and they show this awareness by trying to block any possibility of an incoming speaker starting up at just these places in the talk (pp. 185–7) – thereby protecting the recipient from having to make a response to their lesbianism and themselves from having to deal with potentially crass responses to it. Of course, none of them uses the term 'TRP' (indeed, I rarely use it myself), but all of them show through how they behave that they understand exactly what it means, and it is *their understanding* that has led conversation analysts to identify the phenomenon in the first place. In the same paper, I also show young women's understandings of 'dispreferred seconds' – a term that simply refers to actions like declining an invitation, rejecting an offer, refusing a request and so on (see Schegloff, 2007). What young women say about this is what conversation analysts have found to be the actual practice of talk-in-interaction: that is, people don't usually (unless they are being deliberately rude) 'just say no'. (See also Kitzinger and Frith, 1999 for a fuller report of this work.) In sum, there is clear evidence that speakers know and *show that they know* the practices of turn-taking and sequence organization for which terms such as 'TRP', 'dispreferred second' and 'pre-

- sequence' are technical descriptions. They live their lives, conduct their interaction and design their talk to embody that interactional knowledge – just as, for example, we live our lives in ways that embody our taken-for-granted physical knowledge about the operation of gravity, without most of us having – or needing to have – a technical understanding of $g = GM/r^2$.
4. Otherwise unattributed quotations are taken from informal interviews about the experience of learning CA and carrying out CA research – some by phone, some by email – with the contributors to this special feature.
 5. Geoffrey Raymond is now at UCSB.
 6. CA and CA-relevant courses are also taught in the Linguistics Department at the University of York.
 7. Other key 'applied' areas include helplines and emergency calls (e.g. Baker et al., 2005; Zimmerman, 1992), court proceedings (e.g. Atkinson, 1992; Atkinson and Drew, 1979; Drew, 1992), and news interviews (e.g. Clayman, 1992, Clayman and Heritage, 2002).
 8. Her supervisor, Sue Wilkinson, took up a two-year Visiting Professorship at Simon Fraser University in Canada.
 9. The Advanced Summer Institute for Conversation Analysis has run for the last six years at either UCLA or UCSB and offers a small group of participants an intensive experience of working on CA with leaders in the field (usually Emanuel Schegloff, John Heritage and Gene Lerner). Other short courses are regularly offered in the Nordic countries, and sometimes elsewhere (by Paul Drew, Gene Lerner and Gail Jefferson in various combinations) and at the University of York (by Paul Drew and Celia Kitzinger). Information about upcoming courses is regularly posted on Paul ten Have's Ethno/CA website: <http://www2.fmg.uva.nl/emca/resource.htm>.

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, J.M. (1992) 'Displaying Neutrality: Formal Aspects of Informal Court Proceedings', in P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds) *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*, pp. 199–210. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Atkinson, J.M. and Drew, P. (1979) *Order in Court: The Organisation of Verbal Interaction in Judicial Settings*. London: Macmillan.
- Baker, C.D., Emmison, M. and Firth, A. (eds.) (2005) *Calling for Help: Language and Social Interaction in Telephone Helplines*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Billig, M. (1999) 'Whose Terms? Whose Ordinarity? Rhetoric and Ideology in Conversation Analysis', *Discourse and Society* 10: 543–82.
- Bucholtz, M. (2003) 'Theories of Discourse as Theories of Gender', in J. Holmes and M. Meyerhoff (eds) *The Handbook of Language and Gender*, pp. 43–68. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 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*, pp. 163–98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clayman, S.E. and Heritage, J. (2002) *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on Air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, P. (1992) 'Contested Evidence in Courtroom Cross-examination: The Case of a Trial for Rape', in P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds) *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*, pp. 470–520. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Drew, P., Chatwin, J. and Collins, S. (2001) 'Conversation Analysis: A Method for Research into Interactions between Patients and Health-care Professionals', *Health Expectations* 4: 58–70.
- Edwards, D. (1995) 'Sacks and Psychology: An Essay Review of Harvey Sacks', *Lectures on Conversation, Theory and Psychology* 5(4): 579–96.
- Edwards, D. (1997) *Discourse and Cognition*. London: Sage.
- Gill, V.T. (1998) 'Doing Attributions in Medical Interactions: Patients' Explanations for Illness and Doctors' Responses', *Social Psychology Quarterly* 61(4): 342–60.
- Goodwin, C. (1980) 'Restarts, Pauses, and the Achievement of a State of Mutual Gaze at Turn-beginning', *Sociological Inquiry* 50(3/4): 272–302.
- Goodwin, C. (1984) 'Notes on Story Structure and the Organization of Participation', in J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of Social Action*, pp. 225–46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, C. (1987) 'Unilateral Departure', in G. Button and J.R. Lee (eds) *Talk and Social Organization: Multilingual Matters*, pp. 206–16. Avon: Clevedon.
- Goodwin, C. (2000) 'Action and Embodiment within Situated Human Interaction', *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 1489–1522.
- Hammersley, M. (2003) 'Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: Methods or Paradigms?', *Discourse and Society* 14: 751–81.
- Heath, C. (1984) 'Talk and Reciprocity: Sequential Organization in Speech and Body Movement', in J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of Social Action*, pp. 247–63. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heath, C. (1986) *Body Movement and Speech in Medical Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heath, C. (1992) 'The Delivery and Reception of Diagnosis in the General-practice Consultation', in P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds) *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*, pp. 235–67. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hegarty, P. (2007) 'What Comes after Discourse Analysis for LGBTQ Psychology?', in V. Clarke and E. Peel (eds) *Out in Psychology: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Queer Perspectives*, pp. 41–57. London: Wiley.
- Heritage, J. and Maynard, D.W. (2006) (eds) *Communication in Medical Care: Interaction between Primary Care Physicians and Patients*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. and Sefi, S. (1992) 'Dilemmas of Advice: Aspects of the Delivery and Reception of Advice in Interactions between Health Visitors and First-time Mothers', in P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds) *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*, pp. 359–417. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. and Stivers, T. (1999) 'Online Commentary in Acute Medical Visits: A Method of Shaping Patient Expectations', *Social Science and Medicine* 49(11): 1501–17.
- Kitzinger, C. (1987) *The Social Construction of Lesbianism*. London: Sage.
- Kitzinger, C. (1999) 'Researching Subjectivity and Diversity: Q Methodology in Feminist Psychology', *Psychology of Women Quarterly* (special issue on 'Innovative Methods', ed. E. Kimmel and M. Crawford) 23(2): 267–76.
- Kitzinger, C. (2000) 'Doing Feminist Conversation Analysis', *Feminism & Psychology* 10: 163–93.
- Kitzinger, C. (2004) 'Feminist Approaches', in C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. Gubrium and D. Silverman (eds) *Qualitative Research Practice*, pp. 125–40. London: Sage.

- Kitzinger, C. (2005a) 'Heteronormativity in Action: Reproducing the Heterosexual Nuclear Family in After-hours Medical Calls', *Social Problems* 52(4): 477–98.
- Kitzinger, C. (2005b) 'Speaking as a Heterosexual: (How) Does Sexuality Matter for Talk-in-interaction?', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38(3): 221–65.
- Kitzinger, C. (2006) 'Talking Sex and Gender', in Paul Drew, Geoffrey Raymond and Darin Weinberg (eds) *Talk in Interaction in Social Research Methods*, pp. 155–70. London: Sage.
- Kitzinger, C. and Frith, H. (1999) 'Just Say No? Using Conversation Analysis to Understand How Young Women Talk about Refusing Sex', *Discourse & Society* 10(3): 293–316.
- Lakoff, R. (2003) 'Language, Gender and Politics: Putting "Women" and "Power" in the Same Sentence', in J. Holmes and M. Meyerhoff (eds) *The Handbook of Language and Gender*, pp. 161–78. Oxford: Blackwells.
- Land, V. (2006) 'Doing Politically Engaged Conversation Analysis with Talk by Lesbians and Gay Men: Categories, Person Reference and Heteronormativity in Action', PhD thesis, Department of Sociology, University of York.
- Land, V. and Kitzinger, C. (2005) 'Speaking as a Lesbian: Correcting the Heterosexist Presumption', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38(4): 317–416.
- Land, V. and Kitzinger, C. (2007) 'Closet Talk: The Contemporary Relevance of the Closet in LGBT Interaction', in V. Clarke and E. Peel (eds) *Out in Psychology: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Queer Perspectives*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Land, V. and Kitzinger C. (2007, in press) 'Some Uses of Third Person Reference Forms in Speaker Self-reference', *Discourse Studies* 9(4).
- Maynard, D.W. (1992) 'On Clinicians Co-implicating Recipients' Perspective in the Delivery of Diagnostic News', in P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds) *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*, pp. 331–58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peräkylä, A. (1998) 'Authority and Accountability: The Delivery of Diagnosis in Primary Health Care', *Social Psychology Quarterly* 61(4): 301–20.
- Potter, J. (1996) *Representing Reality*. London: Sage.
- Robinson, J.D. (2001) 'Closing Medical Encounters: Two Physician Practices and their Implications for the Expression of Patients' Unstated Concerns', *Social Science and Medicine* 53(5): 639–56.
- Sacks, H. (1974) 'An Analysis of the Course of a Joke's Telling in Conversation', in R. Bauman and J. Sherzer (eds) *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*, pp. 54–87. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. and Jefferson, G. (1974) 'A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-taking for Conversation', *Language* 50(4): 696–735.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1968) 'Sequencing in Conversational Openings', *American Anthropologist* 70(6): 1075–95.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1972) 'Notes on a Conversational Practice: Formulating Place', in D. Sudnow (ed.) *Studies in Social Interaction*, pp. 75–119. New York: Free Press.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1979) 'The Relevance of Repair for Syntax-for-conversation', in T. Givon (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics 12: Discourse and Syntax*, pp. 261–88. New York: Academic Press.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2007) *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis, Vol 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E.A., Jefferson, G. and Sacks, H. (1977) 'The Preference for Self-correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation', *Language* 53: 361–82.

- Shaw, R. (2006) "'It's Your Body, Your Baby, Your Birth': A Study of Helpline Talk-in-interaction on the Home Birth Helpline', PhD thesis, Department of Sociology, University of York.
- Shaw, R. and Kitzinger, C. (2005) 'Calls to a Home Birth Helpline: Empowerment in Childbirth', *Social Science and Medicine* 61(11): 2374–83.
- Shaw, R. and Kitzinger, C. (2007, in press) 'Memory in Interaction: An Analysis of Repeat Calls to a Home Birth Helpline', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 40(1): 117–44.
- Stivers, T. (2002a) 'Participating in Decisions about Treatment: Overt Parent Pressure for Antibiotic Medication in Pediatric Encounters', *Social Science and Medicine* 54: 1111–30.
- Stivers, T. (2002b) 'Presenting the Problem in Pediatric Encounters: "Symptoms Only" versus "Candidate Diagnoses"', *Health Communication* 14(3): 299–338.
- Toerien, M. (2004) 'Hair Removal and the Construction of Gender: A Multi-method Approach', PhD thesis, Department of Sociology, University of York.
- Toerien, M. and Kitzinger, C. (2007, in press) 'Emotional Labour in Action: Navigating Multiple Involvements in the Beauty Salon', *Sociology* 41(4).
- Wetherell, M. (1998) 'Positioning and Interpretive Repertoires: Conversation Analysis and Post-structuralism in Dialogue', *Discourse and Society* 9: 387–412.
- Wilkinson, S. and Kitzinger, C. (eds) (1995) *Feminism and Discourse: Psychological Perspectives*. London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wilkinson, S. and Kitzinger, C. (2007) 'Conversation Analysis, Gender and Sexuality', in A. Wetherall, B. Watson and C. Gallois (eds) *Language, Discourse and Social Psychology*, pp. 206–30. Houndmills: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Woffitt, R. (2001) 'Researching Psychic Practitioners: Conversation Analysis', in M. Wetherell, S. Taylor and S.J. Yates (eds), *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*, pp. 49–92. London: Sage in conjunction with the Open University.
- Zimmerman, D.H. (1992) 'The Interactional Organization of Calls for Emergency Assistance', in P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds) *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*, pp. 418–69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX: TRANSCRIPTION KEY FOR DATA EXTRACTS

Aspects of the Relative Timing of Utterances:

[]	square brackets	overlapping talk
=	equals sign	no discernible interval between turns (also used to show that the same person continues speaking across an intervening line displaying overlapping talk)
<	'greater than' sign	'jump started' talk with loud onset
(0.5)	time in parentheses	intervals within or between talk (measured in tenths of a second)
(.)	period in parentheses	discernable pause or gap, too short to measure

Characteristics of Speech Delivery:

.	period	closing intonation
,	comma	slightly upward 'continuing' intonation
?	question mark	rising intonation question
¿	inverted question mark	rising intonation weaker than that indicated by a question mark
!	exclamation mark	animated tone
-	hyphen/dash	abrupt cut off of sound
:	colon	extension of preceding sound – the more colons the greater the extension
↑↓	up or down arrow	marked rise or fall in intonation immediately following the arrow
<u>here</u>	underlining	emphasized relative to surrounding talk
HERE	upper case	louder relative to surrounding talk
°here°	degree signs	softer relative to surrounding talk
>this<		Speeding up or compressed relative to surrounding talk
<this>		slower or elongated relative to surrounding talk
hhh		audible outbreath (no. of 'h's indicates length)
.hhh		audible inbreath (no. of 'h's indicates length)
(h)		audible aspirations in speech (e.g. laughter particles)
hah/heh/hih		all variants of laughter
/hoh/huh		
#	hatch sign	'creaky' voice
()	empty single parentheses	transcriber unable to hear words
(bring)	word(s) in single parentheses	transcriber uncertain of hearing
((coughs))	word(s) in double parentheses	transcriber's comments on or description of sound; other audible sounds are represented as closely as possible in standard orthography, e.g. 'tcht' for tongue click; 'mcht' for a lip parting sound

Celia KITZINGER is Professor of Conversation Analysis, Gender and Sexuality in the Department of Sociology, University of York, UK. She has published nine books and more than 140 articles on issues relevant to language, genders and sexualities.

ADDRESS: Department of Sociology, University of York, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD, UK.

[email: cck1@york.ac.uk]