

Est.  
1841

YORK  
ST JOHN  
UNIVERSITY

Dobrzycki, Holly (2021) Pursuing an Answer in University Seminar Discussions. Masters thesis, York St John University.

Downloaded from: <http://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/5424/>

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. [Institutional Repository Policy Statement](#)

# RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at [ray@yorks.ac.uk](mailto:ray@yorks.ac.uk)

Pursuing an Answer in University Seminar Discussions

Holly Dobrzycki

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts by Research

York St John University

School of Education, Language and Psychology

March 2021

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is their own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material. Any reuse must comply with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 and any licence under which the copy is released.

© 2021 York St John University Holly Dobrzycki

## **Acknowledgements**

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisors Helen Sauntson and Bogdana Huma for your continued support throughout my degree. I could not have asked for better supervisors. Your academic guidance has been amazing, but I also really appreciate your emotional support.

I would also like to thank everyone who participated in my research. I (literally) could not have completed my thesis without you.

Next, I would like to thank Brett Heasman for taking the time to read my thesis and organising a mock viva for me. The advice that you gave me was so helpful and greatly appreciated.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for your continued support and especially, my sister, Megan. Megan, you've been my rock and I cannot thank you enough!

## Abstract

Taking a Conversation Analytic approach, this thesis focuses on pursuing an answer (Pomerantz, 1984c) in university seminar discussions in a particular sequential position: when a lecturer has asked a question and the students' answer is noticeably absent (Schegloff, 1972). Three practices have been identified: (1) adding a grammatically fitted increment to continue the question (Schegloff, 1996b); (2) reinitiating the Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) sequence (Zemel and Koschmann, 2011) to produce a subsequent version (Davidson, 1984) of the question; and (3) acknowledging the Face-Threatening Act (FTA) (Brown and Levinson, 1987) to openly declare that the question runs contrary to the negative face-wants of the students (Brown and Levinson, 2006:313).

Ultimately, this thesis will argue that the lecturers orient to deficiencies in their *own* speech, rather than the students' lack of knowledge (Zemel and Koschmann, 2011:476). The lecturers treat their questions as unaccountably unintelligible (Robinson, 2016:3-4) and aim to recover the accountable intelligibility (Drew and Penn, 2016:57). Hence, the lecturers redistribute the accountability – both in terms of the lecturers' accountability to ask the students understandable questions and the students' accountability to answer the lecturers' questions (Robinson, 2016) – to themselves. Thus, recovering the accountable intelligibility is made “the focal action of the turn” (Bolden et al., 2012:138), rather than pursuing an answer.

Such research will have important implications for pedagogy, as interaction is a valuable component of university seminar discussions. However, students are not always forthcoming with their answers. A better understanding of how lecturers overcome this problem of seeking initial interaction, which can be sequentially built upon in further discussion, will provide a potential framework for lecturers to instigate fruitful discourse.

Table of Contents	page
List of Tables and Abbreviations	6
1. Introduction	7
2. Literature Review	11
2.1. Conversation Analysis and Classroom Interaction	11
2.2. Turn-Taking	13
2.2.1. Turn Completion and Turn Continuation	19
2.2.2. Incrementing	21
2.3. Sequence Organization	25
2.3.1. Question-Answer Sequences and Accountability	25
2.3.2. Initiation-Response-Evaluation Sequences	27
2.4. Face	29
2.5. Pivotal Research into Pursuing an Answer	30
2.6. Knowledge	33
3. Data and Method	38
3.1. Data Collection	38
3.2. Ethical Considerations	40
3.3. Data Analysis	43
4. Analysis	47
4.1. Background	47
4.2. Reinitiating the IRE Sequence via <i>Nomination</i> and Adding an Increment	50
4.3. Reinitiating the IRE Sequence via <i>Repair</i>	59
4.4. Reinitiating the IRE Sequence via <i>Example</i>	65
4.5. Reinitiating the IRE Sequence ' <i>Other</i> '	73
4.6. Acknowledging the FTA via <i>Pursuit</i>	79
4.7. Acknowledging the FTA via <i>Termination</i>	85
4.8. Discussion	91
4.8.1. How the three practices are used in conjunction	100
5. Conclusion	106
6. References	111
7. Appendixes	117
7.1. Appendix 1: Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form	117
7.2. Appendix 2: Transcription Conventions	119
7.3. Appendix 3: Adding an Increment Collection	121
7.4. Appendix 4: Reinitiating the IRE Sequence <i>Nomination</i> Collection	137
7.5. Appendix 5: Reinitiating the IRE Sequence <i>Repair</i> Collection	141
7.6. Appendix 6: Reinitiating the IRE Sequence <i>Example</i> Collection	149
7.7. Appendix 7: Acknowledging the FTA <i>Pursuit</i> Collection	166
7.8. Appendix 8: Acknowledging the FTA <i>Termination</i> Collection	175

<b>List of Tables</b>	page
2.1. Dimensions of Knowledge in University Seminar Discussions (adapted from Stivers et al., 2011)	35
3.1. Data Collection	38
4.1. Categorisations of Reinitiating the IRE Sequence	49
4.2. Extract 3 Insertion Sequence	69
4.3. Extract 3 Questions	71
4.4. Acknowledging the FTA to terminate the question-answer sequence	90

### **Abbreviations**

CTRP	Complex Transition Relevance Place
FTA	Face Threatening Act
IRE	Initiation Response Evaluation
TRP	Transition Relevance Place

## 1. Introduction

Taking a Conversation Analytic approach, this thesis investigates how lecturers pursue an answer in undergraduate university seminar discussions. Such research will have important implications for pedagogy, as interaction is a valuable component of university seminar discussions. However, students are not always forthcoming with their answers. A better understanding of *how* lecturers overcome this problem of seeking initial interaction, which can be sequentially built upon in further discussion, will provide a potential framework for lecturers to instigate fruitful discourse. As Sahlström (2009:103) states, “if learning is understood as situated or constituted in interaction, research on interaction will provide for better understanding of learning”. Moreover, as will be discussed, university seminar discussions are a relatively under-researched environment in comparison to their primary school classroom counterpart. As the interaction is inherently different in university seminar discussions, previous theoretical work must be reinvestigated to account for the differences in relation to knowledge and turn-taking, as will be discussed in detail in the Literature Review.

Returning to the statement that this thesis investigates how lecturers overcome the problem of seeking initial interaction, it is important to note that pursuing an answer in university seminar discussions can be split into two overarching types: pursuing an answer when an answer is not immediately forthcoming, and pursuing a ‘reformulated’ answer when an answer has been given, but is in some way problematic. This supports previous research in which conversation analytic papers focusing on pursuing an answer have tended to focus on instances when an answer is noticeably absent (Romaniuk, 2013:147), for example, Jefferson (1981), Pomerantz (1984c), Stivers and Rossano (2010), Bolden et al. (2012) and Peräkylä and Ruusuvuori (2012). This differs greatly from papers which focus on instances when an answer has been given, but the answer is ‘reformulated’, for example, Solem and Skovholt (2019).



Pursuing an answer when an answer is not immediately forthcoming is the focus of this thesis; thus, coinciding with the aim of the research, which is to investigate how lecturers seek initial interaction. More specifically, this thesis investigates how lecturers pursue an answer in a *covert* manner. As Bolden et al., state:

“a response may be pursued more or less overtly: Pursuing a response may or may not be the focal action of the turn, and methods used to pursue a response can either expose or mask the lack of (immediate) response as the problem the speaker sets out to redress.” (Bolden et al., 2012:138)

It will be argued that because *both* actions in a question-answer sequence are accountably implemented (Heritage, 2006a:3) – (1) the questioner, i.e., the lecturer, is accountable to produce a recognisable and understandable question, and (2) the answerer, i.e., the student, is accountable to produce an answer (Robinson, 2016) – when an answer is noticeably absent (Schegloff, 1972), *both* participants are “accountable” for the noticeable absence. Thus, *both* participants may lose face (Goffman, 1967). Hence, it is in all of the participants best interest that the lecturers pursue an answer in a covert manner.

Overall, this thesis focuses on pursuing an answer (Pomerantz, 1984c) in university seminar sessions in a particular sequential position: when a lecturer has asked a question and the students’ answer is noticeably absent (Schegloff, 1972). Three practices have been identified: (1) adding a grammatically fitted increment to continue the question (Schegloff, 1996b); (2) reinitiating the Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) sequence (Zemel and Koschmann, 2011) to produce a subsequent version (Davidson, 1984) of the question; and (3) acknowledging the Face-Threatening Act (FTA) (Brown and Levinson, 1987) to openly declare that the question runs contrary to the negative face-wants of the students (Brown and Levinson, 2006:313). Ultimately, this thesis will argue that the lecturers orient to deficiencies in their *own* speech, rather than the students’ lack of knowledge (Zemel and Koschmann,

2011:476). The lecturers treat their questions as accountably unintelligible (Robinson, 2016:3-4) and aim to “recover” the accountable intelligibility (Drew and Penn, 2016:57). Hence, the lecturers redistribute the accountability – both in terms of the lecturers’ accountability to ask the students understandable questions and the students’ accountability to answer the lecturers’ questions (Robinson, 2016) – to themselves. Thus, recovering the accountable intelligibility is the “the problem the [lecturer] sets out to redress” (Bolden et al., 2012:183), rather than pursuing an answer, which means that pursuing an answer is “not the focal action of the turn” (Bolden et al., 2012:183). This coincides with the second aim of the research, which is to investigate how lecturers pursue an answer in a covert manner.

As previously stated, such research will have important implications for pedagogy, as interaction is a valuable component of university seminar discussions. Firstly, whilst previous research has been undertaken into pursuing an answer in classroom interaction, the majority of this research has tended to focus on primary age classrooms or English as an Additional Language (EAL) classrooms. Duran and Jacknick acknowledge that pursuing an answer is a common feature of classroom interaction; however, they also note that many of the studies from which this conclusion has been drawn focus on language classrooms. They suggest that the linguistic competence of the students may account for some of the examples of absent answers in previous research (Duran and Jacknick, 2020:4), thus supporting the latter half of this claim. Secondly, whilst previous research has been undertaken into improving classroom interaction, much of this research has tended to focus on improving students’ contributions. Therefore, much research focuses on teachers’ follow-up moves, for example, follow-up moves which extend or suppress students’ contributions (Rowe, 1986:44; Nassaji and Wells, 2000:400-1) and follow-up moves which transform students’ contributions (Solem and Stovholt, 2019:73) Thus, initial interaction has already been obtained. As Zemel and Koschmann (2011:475-6) note, the majority of research into Initiation-Response-Evaluation

(IRE) sequences (to be discussed in detail in the Literature Review) focuses on teacher evaluation; thus, supporting this claim. Accordingly, Zemel and Koschmann (2011:476) distinguish between a second-position trouble source, i.e., a “deficiency in the student’s knowledge or understanding” and a first-position trouble source, i.e., a “deficiency in the instructor’s query itself”. However, as they also note, very little research focuses on first-position trouble sources. Given all of the above, this thesis aims to provide for a better understanding of how lecturers overcome the problem of seeking initial interaction by focusing on areas of research that are less investigated than their counterparts. For example, by focusing on university seminar discussions, rather than primary, or EAL classrooms; by focusing on the lecturers’ initiation moves, rather than their evaluative moves; and in extension, by focusing on first-position trouble sources, rather than second-position trouble sources (Zemel and Koschman, 2011). This will have important implications for pedagogy, as such initial interaction can be sequentially built upon in further discussion. This is crucial because, as Hardman et al. (2008:56) state: “managing the quality of classroom interaction is seen as the single most important factor in improving the quality of teaching and learning”.

The themes discussed thus far (for example, pursuing an answer, accountably implemented actions and Initiation-Response-Evaluation sequences) will be discussed in detail in the literature review next. Here, I will critically evaluate previous literature, which is pivotal to the thesis, for example, turn-taking in classroom interaction (McHoul, 1978) and dimensions of knowledge in university seminar discussions (Stivers et al. 2011). Next, I will outline the data and methodology, before proceeding to the data analysis. Finally, I will complete the thesis by providing an overall conclusion.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1. Conversation Analysis and Classroom Interaction

Conversation Analysis, henceforth CA, has become a prominent methodological approach to the study of classroom interaction (Kimura et al., 2018:185). As Kimura et al. state, one reason for the growing prominence of CA is “the empirical need for understanding how participants *do* teaching and learning” (2018:185, original emphasis). The notion that CA can be used to add empirical detail to educational research is a general consensus amongst researchers. For example, Stovholt (2018:232) suggests that CA can benefit both the accuracy of the researcher’s claims and also the further social implications of how such findings help us to understand teaching and learning. By providing a framework for analysing interaction, the researcher can work objectively whilst also adding precision, illustrating specific conversational practices, for example, how participants negotiate meaning. In relation to how participants negotiate meaning and with particular relevance to this study, Stubbs (1981:128) discusses CA and knowledge, demonstrating how analysing conversational sequencing enables researchers to empirically investigate how lecturers orient to knowledge, including what they present and how they break it up.

Crucially, Conversation Analysis can be organised into two types: Basic CA and Institutional CA (Heritage, 2004:105). Basic CA examines recurring conversational patterns which speakers use to accomplish common tasks (Kimura, 2018:188), whereas Institutional CA examines “how institutionality of a given setting is talked into being” (Kimura, 2018:188). The objective of institutional CA is institutional interaction (Drew and Heritage, 1992), which is the kind of talk that is used by lecturers and students to carry out university seminar related activities. Drew and Heritage (1992) outlined three characteristics of institutional interaction,

which provide a basis for how institutional interaction differs from ordinary conversation. They state that in institutional interaction:

- 1) There is an orientation to institution specific goals and identities.

For example, in a university seminar discussion, the participants orient to the institution specific goal of having an academic discussion or completing an academic task, and to the institution specific identities of lecturer and students.

- 2) There are certain constraints on what can be said and done.

For example, in a university seminar discussion, the participants' contributions must be relevant to the current topic. Moreover, constraints include that students generally cannot direct questions to the whole class, or to individual students, in a challenging manner, as the lecturer is able to do. Rather, students are constrained to directing their questions to the lecturer only, and to asking questions for the purpose of learning, for example, to seek clarification. There are even constraints on how the participants must sit, as the students' chairs are typically positioned towards the lecturer.

- 3) There are inferential frameworks specific to certain institutional contexts.

For example, in a university seminar discussion, when lecturers use governing phrases such as "settle down" and "that's all we have time for today", the lecturer is heard as the participant who can carry out these administrative functions (such as beginning or ending a session) *because of* the institutional setting that they are in. It is unlikely that you would hear a participant in ordinary conversation, such as a group of friends talking, say "that's all we have time for today" (Drew and Heritage, 1992:22).

One of the most important, defining characteristics of institutional interaction is that institutional settings involve specialised turn-taking systems. Heritage (2004:111) highlights

the importance of such specialised turn-taking systems in his claim that “insofar as the participants stuck to these distinctive ways of taking turns, they were showing a clear orientation to a specific institutional identity and the tasks and constraints associated with it”. However, it will be argued that the participants in the current research do *not* ‘stick to the distinctive ways of taking turns’ which is typically associated with classroom interaction. Rather, the participants show an orientation to *multiple* turn-taking systems. Accordingly, multiple turn-taking systems will be discussed below, including, ordinary interaction (Sacks et al., 1974:704), ‘generic’ institutional interaction (Heritage, 2004:116) and specific classroom interaction (McHoul, 1978:188).

## 2.2. Turn-Taking

*Turn-taking in ordinary interaction:* Firstly, it is worth considering turn-taking in ordinary conversation, so that a comparison can be made between ordinary conversation and institutional interaction. This will enable a more complete understanding of the constraints associated with institutional turn-taking systems. The following set of rules for turn-taking in ordinary conversation was proposed by Sacks et al. (1974:704):

- 1) At a transitional relevance place:
  - a) If the current speaker selects a recipient to speak next, then the single selected recipient has the right and obligation to speak. No others have such right or obligation.
  - b) If the current speaker does not select a recipient to speak next, then a recipient may self-select to speak.

- c) If the current speaker does not select a recipient to speak next, then the current speaker may continue to speak, unless a recipient self-selects to speak next.
- 2) If neither 1a) or 1b) have occurred, and following 1c) occurring (the current speaker has continued to speak), then rule-set 1a)-1c) reapplies at the next transition relevance place and recursively at each transitional relevance place until transfer is achieved.

*Turn-taking in institutional interaction:* It is next worth considering institutional turn-taking systems generically. It is thought that special turn-taking systems can be categorised into three broad groups: turn-type preallocation, for example, courtrooms and news interviews; mediated turn allocation procedures, for example, business and other forms of chaired meetings; and a combination of both, for example, mediated and some forms of counselling (Heritage, 2004:116). Turn-type preallocation is the most restrictive, as it restricts one participant, or one set of participants (for example, students) to answering questions. Thus, it restricts which participant may speak (i.e., the participant the question is addressed to) and what the participant may say (i.e., the participant may answer the question). Turn-type preallocation typically occurs in institutions whereby there are numerous participants present, such as a university seminar session. Consequently, it restricts one participant, or one set of participants (for example, lecturers) to asking questions and generally, allocating turns (Heritage, 2004:116). Mediated turn allocation is less restrictive, for example, regarding what the participant may say. However, as with turn-type preallocation, it still restricts one participant, or one set of participants, to allocating turns (Heritage, 2004:117). A university seminar session would typically fall into a combination of both. These more generic turn-taking systems are important to consider because, as will be discussed next, classroom interaction is not governed by a single turn-taking system.

*Turn-taking in classroom interaction:* Taking into consideration Sacks et al.'s (1974) rules for turn taking in ordinary conversation, McHoul (1978:188) adapted such rules to account for the organisation of turns at talk in the classroom:

- 1) For the lecturer at a transitional relevance place:
  - a) If the lecturer selects a student to speak, then the single selected student has the right and obligation to speak. No others have such a right or obligation.
  - b) If the lecturer does not select a student to speak, then the lecturer must continue speaking.
- 2) For the student at a transitional relevance place:
  - a) If the student selects the lecturer, or another student to speak, then the lecturer, or single selected student has the right and obligation to speak. However, typically, the student will select the lecturer to speak.
  - b) If the student does not select the lecturer, or another student to speak, then the lecturer or another student may self-select to speak. However, the lecturer will have the primary right to speak.
  - c) If the student does not select the lecturer, or another student to speak, and neither the lecturer nor another student self-selects to speak, then the student must continue speaking.
- 3) For the lecturer, if at a transitional relevance place the lecturer does not select a student to speak, or if the lecturer has continued to speak, then rule-set 1a)-1b) re-applies at the next transition relevance place and recursively at each transitional relevance place until transfer to a student is achieved.
- 4) For the student, if at a transitional relevance place the student does not select the lecturer, or another student to speak and neither the lecturer nor another student self-



selects to speak, or if the student has continued to speak, then rule-set 2a)-2c) re-applies at the next transition relevance place and recursively at each transitional relevance place until transfer to the lecturer is achieved.

It is important to take McHoul's rules into consideration when analysing the current phenomenon of pursuing an answer, as the organisation of turns at talk in the classroom may account for *why* students do not answer lecturer questions. For example, Duran and Jacknick argue that in whole class discussion the students may not answer because there is a lack of designated next speaker (2020:2), there appears to be some vagueness surrounding rule 1b): for the lecturer at a transition relevance place, if the lecturer does not select a student to speak, then the lecturer must continue speaking. However, in the current university seminar data, the lecturers do not typically select a student to speak. Rather, following the lecturers' questions, the students self-select to speak as in ordinary conversation (rule 1b): at a transitional relevance place, if the current speaker does not select a recipient to speak next, then a recipient may self-select to speak). Even more significantly, following the lecturers' assessments, which do not require the students to speak at all, the students self-select to speak. For example:

*Mark\_W4\_A1\_00:19:46\_V1\_00:18:38\_Psychological\_Social\_Problem*

01 L: this >>>(kind of)<<< of prejudice and race hasn't gone anywhere  
02 S:→ cognitively speaking racism hasn't changed but- socially speaking it has

The above extract will be discussed in detail in the analysis, but what is important presently is that when the lecturer reaches a transitional relevance place, i.e., following an assessment, the student immediately self-selects to speak, i.e., to produce a second assessment (Pomerantz, 1984a). This supports the previous statement that the participants in the current research do *not* 'stick to the distinctive ways of taking turns' which is typically associated with classroom

interaction. Rather, the participants show an orientation to *multiple* turn-taking systems. Crucially, the participants do not regard breaches in the turn-allocation system as problematic. Whereas, in primary school classroom interaction, such breaches may be regarded as reproachable. For example, in her work into teachers' reproaches, Margutti stated that reproach activity "focuses on the recipient's conduct as transgression and infringement of social expectations" (2011:310). Thus, as breaches in the turn-allocation system of classroom interaction go against social expectations, they may be regarded as reproachable. Margutti's research also highlights another differences between university seminar interaction and primary classroom interaction. Namely, following educators' unaddressed questions, whereas university students self-select to speak, as just mentioned, primary students may bid to speak, for example, by raising their hands (2006:317). This difference is crucial because whilst gaps are expected in primary classroom interaction – i.e., as a result of turn-taking constraints, such as students bidding to speak – gaps are arguably more noticeable in university seminar interaction because students can skip the bidding (Willemsen, 2018:46).

Considering the above, it is perhaps worth highlighting the date in which McHoul's rules were written, as classroom interaction has evolved since 1978. For example, in their study into turn-taking and wait time in classroom interaction, Ingram and Elliot (2014) stated that whilst turn-taking does still follow the above structure outlined by McHoul overall, there were some notable exceptions, including debate, students asking questions and students initiating repair (2014:19). For example, Ingram and Elliot noted that when students were involved in debate with other students, the turn-taking resembled more closely to the rules for ordinary conversation (2014:21). Moreover, they noted that students self-selected to ask questions and there were instances where repair was initiated by a self-selecting student on a previous student's turn (2014:24). Therefore, taking into account these variations, it no longer seems possible to think of classroom interaction as governed by a single turn-taking system.

This comes as no surprise when one considers the multiple activities that occur within a single educational setting, each with their own prescribed system of turn-taking. Taking a university seminar session as an example, the lecturer will vary their level of involvement across a range of activities throughout the session. They may begin by delivering information via a PowerPoint Presentation, which in parts requires no student participation, thus reflecting the speech style associated with monologues. Within the presentation, they may introduce a series of relatively short questions to the students, thus embodying turn-type preallocation (Heritage, 2004:116). Lecturers may also ask longer questions for the purpose of discussion. If discussion is achieved, the interaction would likely reflect mediated turn allocation (Heritage, 2004:116). Finally, students may engage in individual group discussions, a task which would invite the turn-taking structure of ordinary conversation (Sacks et al., 1974:704).

As well as turn-taking systems differing within an educational setting, they also differ across educational settings. This is extremely significant regarding the current research, as much of the existing literature regarding classroom interaction focuses on the interaction in primary school settings, as previously mentioned. However, the interaction in university settings is inherently different. Whilst many of the specialised turn-taking systems for classroom interaction remain true for university seminar interaction, they are more susceptible to shifting. For example, as previously mentioned, following the lecturers' questions, primary students bid to answer (Margutti, 2006), whereas university students self-select to answer. Next, primary students are reproached (Margutti, 2011) for breaches in turn-taking, whereas university students are not. This means that whilst primary students only speak when selected (McHoul, 1978), university students speak unsolicited at any given point, i.e., not just following the lecturers' questions. This also means that university students interrupt other students and the lecturer. Moreover, whilst both primary classrooms and university seminar sessions comprise sequences involving the following three turns: teacher initiation (I), student

response (R), teacher evaluation (E) (this will be discussed in detail in section 2.3.2.), university seminar sessions frequently involve an additional, fourth turn: student evaluation (E). Moreover still, in primary classrooms, teachers appear to maximise the amount of time between themselves finishing speaking and the students starting speaking (Rowe, 1984), whereas in university seminar sessions, lecturers appear to minimise the amount of time. This will be discussed in detail in section 2.2.2., but what is importantly presently is that lecturers add increments less than one second after finishing speaking. It will be argued that this is because in certain sequential environments the interaction more closely resembles ordinary conversation. Finally, whilst the following are not related to turn-taking, they are related to teachers' reproaches: university students use 'vulgar' language and make negative assessments (for example, *it wasn't the most engaging book to be honest*).

### **2.2.1. Turn Completion and Continuation**

Having focused on overarching turn-taking systems: ordinary interaction (Sacks et al., 1974), generic institutional interaction (Heritage, 2004:116) and classroom interaction (McHoul, 1978), the Literature Review will now focus on turn completion and turn continuation.

Turn completion is important for all three answer pursuing practices, as it affects the overall *recognisability* of the lecturers' questions, and thus, the "account-ability" of the lecturers' questions (Robinson, 2016:4). The "account-ability" of the lecturers' questions will be discussed in detail in section 3.3.1.. However, turn completion is particularly important for incrementing. This is because to categorise a turn continuation as an increment, it needs to be evidenced that the previous turn has reached what could have been a possible completion point, or a transition relevance place.

Ford and Thompson (1996) state that there are three aspects of turn completion: syntactic, intonational and pragmatic. Syntactic completion means that a turn can be interpretable as complete as it contains “a complete clause” (1996:143). Intonational completion means that a turn can be interpretable as complete as it has “clear final intonation, indicated by a period of question mark” (1996:147). Finally, pragmatic completion means that a turn can be interpretable as complete as it contains “a complete conversational action” (1996:150). Furthermore, Ford and Thompson state that if a turn includes all three of these aspects of turn completion, it constitutes a complex transition relevance place (CTRP) (1996:153). This is significant because Ford and Thompson uncovered in their data that speaker change occurred most often at CTRPs (1996:157). Finally, in reference to trail offs, which are evident in the data, Schegloff (1996b:87) states: “The grammatical constitution of possible completion is what is “played with” or flouted by trail offs: in the trail off, just what is needed to arrive at a possible completion point is projected, and then left unarticulated.”. However, as will be discussed in the analysis, leaving a turn unarticulated may be a positive resource in pursuing an answer.

Focusing next on turn *continuation*, Couper-Kuhlen and Ono (2007) state that there are three ways of continuing a turn once a speaker has reached the end of a TCU: firstly, at one end of the spectrum, a speaker can produce a new TCU. A new TCU is independent from the original TCU, as it is syntactically and semantically unrelated, and constitutes a new action (2007:514). Secondly, at the other end of the spectrum, a speaker can produce a TCU continuation. A TCU continuation is dependent on the original TCU, as it is syntactically and semantically related, and continues the prior action (2007:515). Thirdly, in the middle of the spectrum, a speaker can produce a free constituent. A free constituent is not syntactically dependent on the original TCU, but it is semantically and pragmatically dependent. A free constituent often initiates a new action (2007:515).

Incrementing is a type of TCU continuation and thus, will be discussed next. However, it must be noted beforehand that whilst incrementing fits methodically into one category of turn continuation, reinitiating the IRE sequence does not. Some re-initiations presented as new TCUs, whereas others presented as free constituents.

### 2.2.2. Incrementing

Overarchingly, an increment is any non-main-clause continuation by the same speaker on their previous turn when they have reached what could have been a possible completion point, or a transition relevance place. This is based on prosody, syntax and sequential position (Ford et al., 2002:16). More specifically, there are two different types of increments: those that are grammatically fitted and those that are not. The current research focuses on those that are grammatically fitted. This is because, as Mandelbaum states, “increments [can] provide for the additional element to be added to the turn in such a way as to *come off (retroactively) as having been part of the utterance all along*” (2016:133, emphasis added). This is crucial, as the aim is to investigate how lecturers pursue an answer in a *covert* manner. Intrinsically, increments that are grammatically fitted *do* “come of (retroactively) as having been part of the utterance all along”, as they are syntactically connected. For example:

*Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_00:15:19\_V1\_00:14:58\_Conserving*

- 01 L: °it feels like you were: chatting about some of these aspects°  
 02 (2.3)  
 03 L:→ °when you were talking about conserving:°

The above extract will be discussed in detail in the analysis, but what is important presently is that if the gap was removed, the glue-on together with the previous turn would still constitute a well-formed syntactic turn:

- (a) it feels like you were chatting about some of these aspects
- (b) it feels like you were chatting about some of these aspects when you were talking about conserving (Couper-Kuhlen and Ono, 2007:521).

The notion that there are two different types of increments is consistent across previous research (for example, Schegloff, 1996b; Ford, et, al., 2002; Walker, 2004; Couper-Kuhlen and Ono, 2007). However, the terminology differs. For example, Schegloff (1996b:90) and Ford et al. (2002:16) refer to increments that are grammatically fitted as ‘extensions’, whereas Couper-Kuhlen and Ono (2007:15) refer to them as ‘glue-ons’. However, Couper-Kuhlen themselves note that “The glue-on category corresponds to the prototypical ‘increment’ of English studies.” (2007:521).

Couper-Kuhlen and Ono’s (2007) research also differs from Ford et al.’s (2002) regarding the categorisation of free constituents. Couper-Kuhlen and Ono categorise a free constituent as a type of turn continuation in its own right, i.e., as a separate practice from an increment (2007:515-16), whereas Ford et al. categorise a free constituent as a type of increment (2002:16-17). However, what is consistent across both sets of research is that free constituents are not syntactically connected to the previous turn. Thus, they do not “come off (retroactively) as having been part of the utterance all along”. Accordingly, free constituents, will not be categorised as increments in the current research. The current research, therefore, adheres to Couper-Kuhlen and Ono’s (2007) typology. To fully understand the typology, for example, where they place increments relative to similar turn-continuations, a brief summary has been provided below.

First, Couper-Kuhlen and Ono distinguish between two types of turn-continuation: non-add-ons and add-ons. Second, they distinguish between two types of add-ons: replacements and increments. Third, they distinguish between two types of increments: glue-ons and insertables. Non-adds do not follow a prosodic break (although they do follow a strongly marked syntactic closure), whereas add-ons do follow a prosodic break (for example, pitch, loudness, tempo/rhythm, or pause) (2007:515). Replacements change an element, whereas increments add an element (2007:515). Glue-ons add an element that is grammatically fitted, whereas insertables add an element that is not grammatically fitted (2007:15).

To summarise, increments in the current research are: turn-continuations; specifically, they are add-ons, meaning they follow a prosodic break; more specifically still, they are increments ‘proper’, meaning they add an element; finally, they are a glue-ons, meaning they add an element that is grammatically fitted.

However, it is important to note that lecturers’ increments in university seminar interaction will be inherently different from participants’ increments in ordinary conversation. The current research focuses on lecturers’ increments in a particular sequential position: following lecturers’ questions. This is because, as previously mentioned, the lecturers’ speech in part reflects the speech style associated with monologues, and as Schegloff states:

“Talking in turns means talking *in real time, subject to real interactional contingencies*.

Whether articulated fluently or haltingly, what results is produced piece by piece, incrementally, through a series of “turns-so-far.” (1996b:55, original emphasis)

This means that the lecturers are *constantly* adding increments to their turns, and whereas in ordinary conversation, the place just prior to the increment could have been a TRP, in university interaction, this is not necessarily the case. Thus, increments are determined by ‘pause’ (rather than other forms of prosodic break, such as pitch, loudness, tempo/rhythm), as ‘pause’ is a sufficient indicator of awaiting an answer.



Therefore, increments in the current research can be further categorised as post-gap increments (Walker, 2004:6). Whereas Couper-Kuhlen and Ono's (2007) categorisations focused on the types of increments, Walker's (2004) categorisations focus on the positions of increments relative to the previous turn. Briefly, the other positions include: post-other-speaker-talk increments and next-beat increments (2004:6). Importantly, "Post-gap increments are deployed by speakers orienting to a *lack of uptake* to an utterance which they have just brought to a point of transition relevance." (Walker, 2004:20, emphasis added). Again, this is crucial, as the aim is to investigate how lecturers pursue an answer.

Finally, having determined the type of increments (glue-on) and the position of increments (post-gap following lecturers' questions), it is important to determine the duration of the gap to assess whether the students have reasonable time to answer. For example:

*Blair(Att)\_W3\_A2\_01:24:32\_Most\_Valuable*

13 L: are they most valua↑ble↑?  
 14 (0.3)  
 15 L:→ fo:r us

In ordinary conversation, the recipient would have been expected to produce an answer (or a non-answer) in the 0.3 second gap following the speaker's question. However, in university interaction, it is perhaps unrealistic to have expected a student to answer so promptly. Firstly, the students may need time to consider their responses. For example, Rowe (1986:43) stated that if teachers were to increase the wait time between them finishing speaking and a student starting speaking, to three or more seconds, there would be improvements in the students' responses. Secondly, there are constraints associated with institutional turn-taking systems. For example, Duran and Jacknick stated that a lack of designated next speaker may complicate the students' willingness to respond (2020:2). Thus, whilst the lecturer's turn *is* an increment

there are a multitude of extraneous determining factors, one of which is the overall sequential environment in which the increment is produced.

### **2.3. Sequence Organization**

Having focused on overarching turn-taking systems: ‘ordinary’ conversation (Sacks et al., 1974), classroom interaction (McHoul, 1978), and subsequently, individual turns: turn completion (Ford and Thompson, 1996) and turn continuation (Couper-Kuhlen and Ono, 2007), including, and most importantly, adding an increment (Schegloff, 1996b), I will now focus on Sequence Organization. In its most basic form, “‘Sequential’ means roughly that the parts which are occurring one after the other, or are in some before and after relationship, have some organisation between them.” (Sacks, 2006:27). Sequence organization is an inherent part of Conversation Analysis, for example, question-answer sequences (Heritage, 2006a), invitation-accept/reject sequences (Heritage, 2006b) and assessment-assessment sequences (Pomerantz, 1984a).

#### **2.3.1. Question-Answer Sequences and Accountability**

The aforementioned sequences (question-answer, invitation-accept/reject, assessment-assessment, and the like) are all types of adjacency pairs. Adjacency pairs are characterised by the following five features: they consist of (1) two turns, which are (2) adjacently placed, and produced by (3) different speakers; the two turns are differentiated into (4) first pair parts (FPPs) and second pair parts (SPPs), and the FPPs and SPPs are (5) type-related (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973:295-6). Crucially, “the adjacency pair structure is a *normative* framework for

actions which is *accountably* implemented” (Heritage, 2006a:3, original emphasis). This means that:

“the first speaker’s production of a first pair part proposes that a second speaker should relevantly produce a second pair part which is *accountably* ‘due’ immediately on completion of the first” (Heritage, 2006a:3, emphasis added)

Thus, in the current setting, when the lecturers produce a question, the students are *accountable* to produce an answer. In other words, the lecturer’s question imposes conditional relevance (Schegloff, 1968) and when the students do *not* produce an answer, an answer is noticeably absent (Schegloff, 1972).

However, the completion of an adjacency pair, i.e. a second speaker producing a second pair part, relies on a first speaker producing a *recognisable* first pair part (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973:296). Thus, the question, as well as the answer, is accountably implemented. Moreover, alongside producing a recognisable first pair part, a first speaker must produce an understandable first pair part (Robinson, 2016:3). Thus, in the current setting, when the lecturers produce a question, they are *accountable* to produce a recognisable and understandable question.

To summarise the above, a question-answer sequence is accountably implemented: (1) the questioner, i.e., the lecturer, is accountable to produce a recognisable and understandable question, and (2) the answerer, i.e., the student, is accountable to produce an answer. These two type of accountability have been defined by Robinson as: (1) accountability as intelligibility, and (2) accountability as responsibility. To clarify, accountability as intelligibility means producing “account-able” actions (2016:4) and accountability as responsibility means being “accountable” for adhering to relevance rules; including, producing “accounts” for actions which breach relevance rules (2016:13).

Typically, in ‘ordinary’ conversation, both speakers show a clear orientation to the normative accountability of question-answer sequences. For example, a first speaker may repeat his/her question and/or a second speaker may account for his/her absent answer (Heritage, 2006a:8). As Stivers and Robinson state (2006), there are two primary ways for a second speaker to comply with the conditional relevance imposed when a first speaker produces a question: they can produce an answer, or they can produce a non-answer, such as an account. Although, as Stivers and Robinson note, a non-answer only complies with the structural aspect of question-answer sequence, i.e., ensuring that it consists of two turns (2006:369-371). However, typically, in university seminar interaction, the students do *not* account for absent answers. Thus, the responsibility falls solely on the lecturers.

### **2.3.2. Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) Sequences**

An IRE is a three-turn sequence used in classroom interaction and involves a teacher and a student. The term was originally used by Sinclair and Coulthard in 1975 and whilst Sinclair and Coulthard originally labelled the sequence IRF (referring to ‘follow-up’ or ‘feedback’), many subsequent studies have labelled the sequence IRE (referring to ‘evaluation’), for example, Mehan (1979). The sequence has been labelled IRE in the current research in accordance with Zemel and Koschmann (2011). An IRE sequence consists of the following three turns: teacher initiation (I), student response (R), and teacher evaluation (E). However, as Zemel and Koschmann state, much of the previous research into IRE sequences tends to focus on teacher evaluation; specifically, how teachers “assess, repair and/or correct a student’s response when its adequacy is treated as problematic” (2011:475:6). They note that first-position trouble sources are under-researched (2011:476).

IRE sequences are significant in understanding why, when the participants orient to multiple turn-taking systems, including ordinary conversation, the turn-taking system for classroom interaction is still the predominant system in university seminar discussions. As Margutti and Piirainen-Marsh conclude in their introduction to ‘the interactional management of discipline and morality in the classroom’, teachers’ authority predominantly “resides in the unequal distribution of the participants’ speaking rights” (2011:305). IRE sequences are a clear indication of the participants having unequal speaking rights. Thus, whilst university students have increased “rights and obligations to know” (Pomerantz, 1980:187) institutional information (to be discussed in section 2.6.), and whilst university students can breach traditional classroom turn-taking rules, lecturers still have primary speaking rights.

Zemel and Koschmann’s research focuses on pursuing a question by reinitiating the IRE sequence (2011). Specifically, they distinguish between a first-position and a second-position trouble source. They define a first-position trouble source as a “deficiency in the instructor’s query itself” (2011:476) and a second-position trouble source as a “deficiency in the student’s knowledge or understanding” (2011:476). In reinitiating the IRE sequence, the lecturer can create another opportunity for the students to respond, thus pursuing a response. Moreover, whilst pursuing a ‘reformulated’ answer is not the focus of the research, it is interesting to note that in reinitiating the IRE sequence, the lecturer can avoid addressing the correctness (or incorrectness) of the students’ answers and can avoid any potential disagreement by not providing a direct response to what the students have said (Zemel and Koschmann, 2011:476). For example:

*Mark\_W3\_A1\_00:54:46\_V2\_00:10:05\_Rephrase*

01 L: do your thoughts drive your actions  
 02 (1.86)  
 03 L:→ let me rephrase (0.3) do your inner workings (0.3) drive your actions

Having focused on two of the three practices for pursuing an answer identified in the current research: adding an increment (Schegloff, 1996b) and reinitiating the IRE sequence (Zemel and Koschmann, 2011:476), the Literature Review will now focus the third practice: acknowledging the FTA (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

#### **2.4. Face**

Face can be defined as “the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself [sic] by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact” (Goffman, 1967:5). Importantly, it is the group that determines how face is distributed (1967:6). Thus, in a university seminar session, positive social value is likely to be distributed through displays of knowledge. Goffman describes various face-work practices to demonstrate how face can be “lost, maintained, or enhanced” (Brown and Levinson, 2006:311), but underpinning all of the practices is the notion that participants have two points of view, a defensive orientation towards saving your own face and a protective orientation towards saving another’s face (Goffman, 1967:14). However, as Brown and Levinson note, “everyone’s face depends on everyone else’s being maintained” and thus, “it is in general in every participant’s best interest to maintain each other’s face” (2006:311). For example, in the current research, when noticeable absences occur, *both* lecturers’ and students’ face are threatened because *both* questions and answers are accountably implemented, as previously discussed. Specifically, the current research focuses on negative-face, which entails freedom from imposition (2006:312). For example, in the current research, ‘not being put on the spot’, as will be explored in extract 5.

However, some acts intrinsically threaten face; hence, they are called face-threatening acts (FTAs). Specifically, face-threatening acts are “those acts that by their nature run contrary to the face wants of the addressee and/or of the speaker” (Brown and Levinson, 2006:313). So

again, in the current research, ‘putting students on the spot’ would constitute a face-threatening act. When face-threatening acts do occur, speakers can perform redressive actions to attempt to rectify the face damage of the FTA (2006:317). In the current research, it will be argued that the lecturers can pursue an answer by acknowledging the FTA, which means openly declaring that they recognize and respect the students’ negative-face wants. For example:

*Mark\_W3\_A1\_00:18:23\_V1\_00:17:50\_Spot*

01 L: what is his particular understanding of the world that he’s suggesting  
 02 (3.8)  
 03 L:→ %I’M PUTTING YOU ON THE SPOT HERE CAUSE YOU MENTIONED  
 THAT YOU READ MICHAEL BILLIG SO I’M GONNA kind of ...%

Face is important to consider because in his research into participation in master’s thesis seminars, Svinhufvud argued that participation may not take place because of face concerns (2015:69). For example, Benwell and Stokoe (2010:94) demonstrate that students may be reluctant to display academic knowledge in front of their peers. Rather, students may construct a particular type of student identity whereby appearing to work hard is resisted and/or mitigated.

Having focused on the specific practices for pursuing an answer identified in the current research: adding an increment (Schegloff, 1996b), reinitiating the IRE sequence (Zemel and Koschmann, 2011:476), and acknowledging the FTA (Brown and Levinson, 1987), the Literature Review will now focus on universal practices for pursuing an answer.

## **2.5. Pivotal Research into Pursuing an Answer**

Much research into pursuing a response has cited Pomerantz’s (1984c) study as a pivotal text, the findings of which remain pertinent in subsequent research. This is true of the current

research which hinges on many of Pomerantz's original findings. As previously mentioned, if students fail in answering lecturers' questions, their behaviour is accountable. Pomerantz suggest that lecturers may make sense of this in terms of the students having some problem in answering (1984c:152). Pomerantz outlines three potential problems and provides a solution for each.

Firstly, the recipient may have a problem understanding a reference because it is unclear. As a solution, the speaker may offer a more understandable reference (1984c:152). Secondly, the recipient may have a problem understanding a reference because they do not share that knowledge. For example, the speaker may assume that the recipient knows about something when he or she does not. As a solution, the speaker may check what the recipient does (or does not) know (1984c:153). Thirdly, the recipient may have a problem because they do not agree with the speaker. As a solution, the speaker may modify what they have said, for example, if what they have said is inaccurate or overstated (1984c:153). To briefly summarise, offering a more understandable reference (or in other ways *clarifying* what one has said), checking shared knowledge and modifying one's position are all ways that speakers may pursue an answer.

Davidson's (1984) research is another pivotal resource which compliments Pomerantz's research. Her findings on accepting invitations and offers can be extrapolated to other conversational actions, such as question-answer sequences, as is the current focus. If recipients fail to accept/reject speakers' invitations and offers, their behaviour is accountable. As Davidson suggests, the speakers may make sense of this in terms of the recipients having some problem in accepting (1984:105). As a solution, the speakers may produce subsequent versions of the invitations/offers. Such subsequent versions demonstrate that the speakers are "attempting to make it now possible, desirable, or necessary for the recipient[s] to accept" (1984:105). Crucially, subsequent versions of invitations and offers provide a next place for



recipients to do a response (1984:105). Thus, producing a subsequent version is a way that speakers may pursue an answer.

The final pivotal resource is Stivers and Rossano's (2010) research into Mobilizing Response. Stivers and Rossano suggest that alongside the inherent functional properties of actions that mobilize response, for example, as previously discussed, when the lecturers produce a question, the students are accountable to produce an answer, the lecturers can rely on turn-design features which "increase the response relevance of a turn beyond the relevance inherent in the action performed" (2010:4). They discuss four turn-design features: interrogative lexico-morphoyntax, interrogative prosody, recipient-focused epistemicity, and speaker gaze (2010:4). Thus, Stivers and Rossano suggest that lecturers mobilize response by employing numerous resources simultaneously, including, the action itself, i.e., a question, the sequential position, i.e., a sequentially initial question, and the turn-design feature(s), i.e., a recipient-focused, sequentially initial, question (2010:4).

This is crucial in the current research because if lecturers do not include the turn-design features in their original questions, they can incorporate them in their subsequent questions; thus, *relying* on them to pursue an answer. For example, as will become apparent in the analysis, lecturers frequently rely on recipient-focused epistemicity to pursue an answer. Recipient-focused epistemicity refers to states of affairs that are asymmetrically with the students' epistemic domain (2010:8).

Thus, alongside the lecturers being able to redistribute the students' accountability to produce an answer (i.e., to themselves, as previously mentioned), the lecturers are able to *increase* the students' accountability to produce an answer (Stivers and Rossano, 2010).

## 2.6. Knowledge

Previous research into knowledge from a conversation analytic perspective, has tended to focus on “epistemic *positions* taken through language and embodied action” (Stivers et al., 2011:708).

Epistemic status refers to how knowledgeable somebody is regarding a domain of knowledge *relative* to somebody else. Both people may be knowledgeable on the matter, however one may be *more* knowledgeable than the other; thus, they have different positions on an epistemic gradient: more knowledgeable (K+) or less knowledgeable (K-) (Heritage, 2012:32; Heritage, 2013:376). Epistemic stance refers to how speakers position themselves with respect to their epistemic status (Heritage, 2012:33). As Heritage states: “The additional concept of epistemic stance is necessary because epistemic status can be dissembled by persons who deploy epistemic stance to appear more, or less, knowledgeable than they really are.” (2012:33). For example, a person may have high epistemic status regarding a domain of knowledge but may take a low epistemic stance by mitigating their knowledge, for example, by using a prepositioned epistemic hedge like *I don't know* (Weatherall, 2011:317).

Epistemic positions are not fixed. For example, Heritage and Raymond demonstrate how speakers can upgrade or downgrade their epistemic primacy in first and second position assessments (Heritage and Raymond, 2005). Moreover, Beach and Metzger demonstrate how claims of insufficient knowledge, such as *I don't know*, do not necessarily mean that the speaker ‘does not know’ (Beach and Metzger, 1997; see also Sert and Walsh, 2013). This may in part be because, as Pomerantz (1984b:610) states, if speakers make assessments with certainty, they are accountable for the accuracy of their assessments.

Epistemic positions can derive from asymmetries of knowledge. Asymmetries of knowledge occur when somebody lacks knowledge possessed by somebody else (Drew,

1991:25). As Drew states: “the ways knowledge asymmetries are consequential for conversational interaction arise from speakers’ orientations to such asymmetry” (1991:26). More specifically, asymmetries of knowledge can be understood in relation to territories of knowledge (Heritage, 2012:32). Territories of knowledge include, for example, A-events and B-events: A-events are known to A, but not B, and B-events are known to B, but not A (Labov and Fanshel, 1977). Of course, elements of knowledge can fall into both A and B’s territories of knowledge, but it is often to different degrees (Heritage, 2013:376). These differing degrees include, as previously mentioned, more knowledgeable (K+) or less knowledgeable (K-), but also the type of knowable.

Pomerantz distinguishes between two types of knowables. Type 1 knowables are “those that the subject-actors as *subject-actors* have rights and obligations to know”, whereas type 2 knowables are “those that subject-actors are assumed to have access by virtue of the knowings being occasioned” (Pomerantz, 1980:187). An example of type 1 knowledge would be a participant relating academic content to their personal life, as the individual has had direct experience with the information that they are sharing. An example of type 2 knowledge would be a good participant reciting what they have read in a textbook, as this information is derivative. Similarly, Stovholt (2018) distinguishes between mundane and scientific talk. Mundane talk is the “personal knowledge domain, which involves their emotions and subjective opinions”, whereas scientific talk is the “shared scientific epistemic domain, which involves a common pool of technical concepts from the curriculum” (2018:234).

Moreover, referring back to the notion that elements of knowledge can fall into both speakers’ territories of knowledge, but often to different degrees, such different degrees can often be attributed to the inherent nature/institutionality of institutional settings. For example, previous research focusing on knowledge in institutional settings has demonstrated that participants *do* show an orientation to knowledge asymmetries. For example, Gill’s research

into medical interactions showed that: “Patients’ displays of uncertainty are not necessarily evidence that patients lack knowledge about what is wrong. Rather, they can be conversational devices that patients use to display their lack of entitlement to a particular type of knowledge [...]” (Gill, 1998:345) (see also Lee’s research into airline service contexts (Lee, 2016:176)). This can be explained in relation to Lee’s notion of service seekers and service providers: service providers have more institutional knowledge and authority in comparison to service seekers (Lee, 2016:175).

Stivers et al.’s (2011) research provides a summary for much of the above. They highlight the three main dimensions of knowledge: epistemic access, epistemic primacy and epistemic responsibility (2011:9). Table 2.1. summarises Stivers et al.’s (2011) findings and provides an example for each with a particular focus on university seminar discussions.

*Table 2.1. Dimensions of Knowledge in University Seminar Discussions (adapted from Stivers et al., 2011))*

Dimension	Description	Example
Epistemic access	Knowing versus not knowing	<i>The answer is</i> versus <i>I don’t know the answer</i>
	Degree of certainty	<i>The answer is definitely</i> versus <i>I think the answer is</i>
	Knowledge source	<i>I know the answer because</i>
	Directness of knowledge	<i>I know because I was there</i> (direct) versus <i>I know because I was told</i> (indirect)
Epistemic primacy	Relative rights to know	The students have the relative rights to know academic concepts that they have read about, or have been told about. However, the lecturers are likely to have greater relative rights to know such concepts.
	Relative rights to claim	<i>I know because I have read X, Y and Z</i> versus <i>I know because I have read X</i>
	Relative authority of knowledge	The lecturers and students may both have access to an academic concept, but the lecturers are likely to have

		epistemic authority over such concepts.
	Type of knowable (Type 1 versus 2)	<i>I know because I was there</i> (Type 1) versus <i>I know because I was told</i> (Type 2)
Epistemic responsibility	Recipient design of actions	The students are unlikely to request information if they already know the answer.
	Recipient design of turns	The lecturers are likely to draw upon what they know the students know when designing their turns.

As stated in the Introduction, whilst previous research has been undertaken into pursuing an answer in classroom interaction, the majority of this research has tended to focus on primary age classrooms or English as an Additional Language (EAL) classrooms. This is crucial in distinguishing the current institutional setting from other similar institutional settings, regarding knowledge. Regarding *institutional information* (i.e., excluding participants' experiences and opinions), whereas in other institutional settings there is a significant knowledge discrepancy between the participants, in the current institutional setting, the knowledge discrepancy is significantly diminished. This is because whereas in other institutional settings *one* participant has first-hand access to institutional information, for example, teachers in primary classroom interaction, doctors in medical interaction (Gill, 1998), agents in airline service interaction (Lee, 2016) and other providers (rather than seekers) in service interaction (Lee, 2016), in the current institutional setting, *both* participants have first-hand access to institutional information. For example, university students read academic materials first-hand. Thus, university students have increased "rights and obligations to know" (Pomerantz, 1980:187) institutional information. Thus, whilst lecturers possess epistemic status *overall*, epistemic status is liable to shift. For example, university students also have first-hand access to news articles, public figures, television shows, and the like, all of which are frequently discussed in university seminar discussions. When these discussions take place, both participants are knowledgeable (K+). Furthermore, university students have first-hand

access to institutional information that lecturers do not have access to. For example, in one of Blair's linguistic discussions, which focused on Second-Language Learning, whilst Blair had first-hand access to British school curriculums, international university students had first-hand access to international school curriculums. Access that Blair herself did not have. Thus, when these discussions took place, it was international students who were more knowledgeable (K+) and possessed epistemic status.

In their research into medical encounters which featured a team of practitioners, Galatolo and Margutti stated that because the practitioners had the same access to the patients, the knowledge discrepancy related to "*knowing/experiencing differently* [because of the practitioners different professional competences] rather than knowing more or less because of having different access to the same object" (2016:888, original emphasis). Whilst lecturers and students have the same access to academic materials; thus, students have rights and obligations to know institutional information, they will likely know/experience institutional information *differently*. For example, in one of Mark's psychology discussions, which focused on racism, much of the discussion surrounded British politics. Thus, because both Mark and the students have the same access to racism and British politics, both have equal rights and obligations to know. However, when the discussion surrounded racism and psychology (as will be discussed in detail in Extract 3 in the Analysis), Mark had primary rights and obligations to know. Thus, both Mark and the students *know* racism, but they *experience* it differently.

Having critically evaluated previous literature, which is pivotal to the thesis, for example, turn-taking in classroom interaction (McHoul, 1978) and dimensions of knowledge in university seminar discussions (Stivers et al. 2011), I will next outline the data and methodology.

### 3. Data and Method

#### 3.1. Data Collection

The data comprises audio and video recordings of undergraduate university seminar discussions (the subject domains are Linguistics and Social Psychology) held in a UK university. There are 16 discussions and each is one or two hours long, totalling 28 hours of discussion. More specifically, the data comprises recordings of three different lecturers. The first lecturer (who has been given the pseudonym *Blair*) was recorded in October-November 2019. Two of her modules were recorded and for one of these modules, there were two classes. Therefore, whilst the data comprises three lecturers, there are five different groups of students. The second two lecturers (who have been given the pseudonyms *Tessa* and *Mark*) were recorded in February-March 2020. The above has been summarised in Table 3.1. below.

*Table 3.1. Data Collection*

Lecturer	Subject Domain	Number of sessions recorded	Duration of each session (hours)
Blair Module 1 (Att)	Linguistics	5	2
Blair Module 2 Class 1 (ELL1)	Linguistics	2	1
Blair Module 2 Class 2 (ELL2)	Linguistics	2	1
Tessa	Linguistics	4	2
Mark	Social Psychology	3	2

The data collected comes from naturally occurring interaction (Clayman and Gill, 2004:4). I recorded everything that the participating lecturers allowed me to, the only requirements being

that the sessions were seminar sessions (rather than lectures) and that they were undergraduate level. Therefore, there are variations in the data. For example, whilst all the sessions are extremely interactive, for Blair and Tessa's sessions, some of this interaction is in the form of individual group work. However, as my research is primarily focused on the lecturers' speech I will not be analysing individual group work.

The data were collected using two audio recorders and where possible two video recorders (specifically, a camcorder and a GoPro). I used multiple devices for practical purposes, for example, so that I had a backup of the recording in the event of a device stopping working, but also to ensure coverage of the entire classroom. Audio recorders were placed at both ends of the room to account for the lecturer moving around (Kimura et al., 2018:197) and to ensure that all of the students could be heard. Video recorders were also placed at both ends of the room with one directed at the lecturer and the other directed at the students. This was to capture any non-verbal cues. It must be pointed out that once the recordings had begun, the devices were not adjusted at any point throughout the session. This was to minimise the presence of the researcher in the hope that the participants would be less conscious of the fact that they were being recorded. It is not unusual for university seminar discussions to be recorded, as such recordings are often used for academic purposes, thus the risk of the observer's paradox (Labov, 1972) is lessened due to the participants' familiarity with the presence of recording devices. Importantly, as conversation analysis (CA) focuses primarily on the underlying structure of the interaction (CA will be discussed in detail in section 3.3.), the effects of the observer's paradox are again lessened because such effects are often "limited to the surface content of the interaction" (Clayman and Gill, 2004:4), for example, avoiding sensitive subjects. Moreover, where possible I recorded sessions each week (rather than, for example, recording every other week) to again minimise the presence of myself as a researcher.



For example, for one of Blair's modules, I was able to attend six weeks consecutively meaning that the participants were familiar with my being there.

It is important to note that whilst "one can never produce the moment in its entirety no matter how many recording devices are used" (Kimura et al., 2018:197), the data constitutes "a "good enough" record of what happened" (Sacks, 1984:26). As Kimura et al. states, the objective for the analyst is to yield the maximum quantity of useable data with the available resources, not to "produce a complete replica of real-life encounters" (2018:197). Nevertheless, recordings are imperative to CA research, as they enable analysts to uncover precise interactional details that would not be uncoverable in any other way (Pomerantz and Fehr, 1997:70). This is crucial because, as previously stated, there is an "empirical need for understanding how participants *do* teaching and learning" (Kimura et al., 2018:185, original emphasis).

### **3.2. Ethical Considerations**

The study has been ethically designed and approved by the York St John University ethics committee (Ethical Approval Code: RECLL00020).

Following the initial emails sent to lecturers to initiate the data collection process, I received responses confirming their willingness to participate in the study. Of course, such willingness was subject to the condition that the *majority* of the students also consented, thus, the lecturers were acting as 'gatekeepers' to their students. After consent was gained from the gatekeepers, students who did not want to participate were given the opportunity to refuse consent (as will be discussed). In order to address any foreseeable problems regarding students *not* wanting to participate, it was agreed that these students would be edited out using audio and video software to alter images and voice qualities beyond recognition. This was because,

practically, there was no way of making the recordings without them being in it. For example, I could not edit them out in 'real life' by asking them to move out of frame, or to withhold contribution. This would have hindered their learning, in turn preventing me from fulfilling my job as a researcher, which is to be as un-intrusive as possible.

Having reached this conclusion, I was then able to begin the procedure of gaining consent from the students. I undertook this in two steps over a two-week period for each group of students. I first approached the students 'unofficially', meaning I did not provide them with any formal paperwork, rather I spoke to the students to give an initial introduction to myself and my project. The benefit of approaching the students in this way first was that it allowed for time in the upcoming week for them to voice any concerns with their lecturers privately. It must be noted that whilst I did not provide the paperwork myself this session, I did request for the lecturers to post an announcement online, which included such documents. Therefore, students could view these prior to the following week's session. This also meant that any students not in the initial session were given equal opportunity to address any questions or concerns.

In the following week, I provided each participant with the formal paperwork necessary for my study. This consisted of a 'Participant Information Sheet', which I also explained verbally, and a consent form to be signed. The participants were made aware of what the study entailed and what they were required to do. The main intention of the 'Participant Information Sheet' was to relieve any anxieties related to being recorded. It was highlighted that the participants were not being tested and that they had the right to withdraw from the study up to one month after the recordings had taken place without detriment.

However, following the data collection in October 2019, it soon became apparent that providing *each* participant with a consent form was not an effective method for ensuring that I had consent from *all* of the students. This is because, for ethical reasons, I was not able to

access copies of the module registers; therefore, I had no control list to compare the number of consent forms to. Thus, I would have been unable to provide evidence to the Ethics Committee that I had consent from all of the students, which could have in turn affected my ability to use parts of the data despite the overwhelming consensus that all students were happy to participate.

There was substantial evidence to support this consensus, derived mostly from the fact that students were given multiple opportunities to refuse consent. For example, the students could have refused consent following the first ‘unofficial’ talk; after the formal paperwork was given to them; at any point during the recordings taking place; and, finally, at any point up until one month after the recordings had taken place. Not only were there multiple opportunities for the students to refuse consent, it was also made easy for them to do so. For instance, the consent form was online throughout the whole data collection process and they were also given my personal email address. This meant that the students could refuse consent without speaking to me in person, thus removing the element of pressure to consent. The fact that no students contacted me or their lecturer to express concern evidences their willingness to participate. Finally, every student who *had* filled in a consent form, which was the majority, only disregarding students that were absent during the formal paperwork handout, positively consented to participating in the recordings.

Therefore, an addendum was made to the original Ethical Application Form, which was approved by the York St John University Ethics Committee. The addendum stated that, rather than gaining consent from each participant, the lecturer was to sign consent on behalf of the students. The students of course still had the option to refuse consent. They would now do this by *opting out* of the study. In order to do this, the students simply had to sign the original consent form, which was again put online to reduce the risk of researcher pressure. The students that had already been recorded were made aware of this change via an announcement online.

The announcement also stated that if any student had not signed one of the original consent forms, they were now covered by the new form which the lecturer had signed on their behalf. If they did not want to be ‘covered’, they could sign the opt out form. It is worth making a note that no students across the entire data set have signed the opt-out form. Thus, every participant has agreed to participate in the study. This new method had been put in place ready for the data collection in February 2020. A copy of the finalised consent form and the ‘Participant Information Sheet’ can be found in Appendix 7.1..

Following the recordings being made, the data have been stored and managed securely on my YSJU OneDrive account and on an encrypted hard drive, with the raw data being only accessible to the research team (myself and my supervisors). For the recordings that have been analysed, I have anonymised written transcripts by replacing personal information, such as the names of the participants, with pseudonyms. I have also edited this information out of the recordings. As every participant consented to the study, I have not had to alter the images and voice qualities, as was previously mentioned as a measure to protect those who did not consent. The only time that the video has been edited is to cut out personal information in accordance with the written transcripts.

### **3.3. Data Analysis**

Having completed the data collection, I then proceeded to the data analysis. The data has been analysed from a conversation analytic perspective. Conversation analysis is the “empirically based, naturalistic, descriptive study of human conduct” (Pomerantz and Fehr, 1997:68). However, it is interesting to note that some conversation analysts refer rather to *talk-in-interaction*. This is because, as Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998:13) state:

“Although the field has adopted the name ‘conversation analysis’, practitioners do not engage solely in the analysis of everyday conversations. [...] the range of forms of talk-in-interaction that have been subject to study within CA is far larger than the term ‘conversation’ alone would imply.”

Thus, as previously stated, conversation analysis can be organised into two types: Basic CA and Institutional CA (Heritage, 2004:104). Crucially, CA disregards social factors that account for *why* something is said (for example, gender) and instead, focuses on *what* is said and *how* it is said (Clayman and Gill, 2004:10). Next, the data analysis can be split into two stages. The first stage involved *discovering* the practices to pursue an answer and the second stage involved investigating *how* the practices pursue an answer.

Beginning with the former, I followed two “pathways” (Clayman and Gill, 2004:11) into the data. The first ‘pathway’ was to “begin with a vernacular action” (Clayman and Gill, 2004:12). Thus, *all* instances of lecturers ‘requesting information’ across the entire data set were accumulated into an initial collection. This included interrogative formats (such as, *how many of these names are at all familiar*); declarative formats (such as, *tell me which names you know anything about*); and any other indirect requests (such as, *you were chatting about some of these aspects*). This also included lecturers requesting information in *all* sequential positions. As was stated in the Introduction, the current research focuses on pursuing an answer in a particular sequential position: when a lecturer has asked a question and the students’ answer is noticeably absent. However, in the initial collection, both types: pursuing *an* answer and pursuing a *different* answer, were collected. The second ‘pathway’ was to begin with an “unmotivated” observation (Schgelloff, 1996a:172). Thus, anything that could be considered ‘noticeable’ was accumulated into the same initial collection. This included, noticeable aspects of turn-taking (such as interruption) and knowledge (such as students demonstrating type 1 knowledge). Crucially, this also included examples of acknowledging the face-threatening act

(Brown and Levinson, 1987). Finally, influenced by previous research, for example, Zemel and Koschmann (2011), I created the final collection. This included: (1) adding a grammatically fitted increment (Schegloff, 1996b); reinitiating the Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) sequence (Zemel and Koschmann, 2011); and (3) acknowledging the Face-Threatening Act (FTA) (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

Proceeding to the latter, investigating *how* the practices pursue an answer, I first transcribed the recordings into a written format using Jefferson (2004) transcription conventions. Some adaptations have been made, for example, using a percentage sign (%) to indicate ‘putting on a voice’ (Flint, 2016). A copy of the transcription conventions can be found in Appendix 7.2.. Crucially, conversation analysis focuses on the participants’ orientations to the talk. Thus, there are two main analytic resources for CA: the speakers production of the talk, i.e., the lecturers’ production of the practice to pursue an answer, and the recipients response to the talk, i.e., the students’ answer (or lack of answer) to the practice (Clayman and Gill, 2004:13). Briefly, as the following will be discussed in detail in the Analysis, the analysis of the lecturers’ production of the practice included: the frequency of the practice; the overall sequential position of the practice (i.e., relative to the surrounding interaction); the specific sequential position of the practice (i.e., relative to the lecturer’s own turn); and the practice in conjunction with other practices (Clayman and Gill, 2004:16). Importantly, relating to the specific sequential position of the practice, the analysis focused on the timing of the practice to pursue an answer relative to the prior turn: the lecturers’ question (Pomerantz and Fehr, 1997:73). For example, as briefly stated, the analysis focused on turn-completion (Ford and Thompson, 1996:143-150) and turn-continuation (Couper-Kuhlen and Ono, 2007:514-15). Next, the analysis of the students’ answer (or lack of answer) to the practice included whether the students themselves treated the practice “in ways that are in accordance with the analyst’s interpretation” (Peräkylä, 2011:368).

Finally, as Clayman and Gill (2004:3) state, CA is both a qualitative and an informally 'quantitative' method. Focusing on the former, it is a qualitative method because typically, CA research involves the detailed analysis of a single example of the given phenomena. Accordingly, in the current research, a single example of each practice to pursue an answer will be analysed. Next, focusing on the latter, it is an informally 'quantitative' method because typically, CA research involves the accumulation of numerous examples of the given phenomena. Accordingly, in the current research, numerous examples of each practice to pursue an answer will be presented in Appendixes 7.3.-7.8.. Please note that the video data from the Camcorder has been provided for *one* example of each practice to pursue an answer; however, the entire data collection is available upon request.

## 4. Analysis

### 4.1. Background

As previously stated, in order to begin the process of investigating how lecturers pursue an answer in university seminar sessions, *all* instances of lecturers requesting information across the entire data set were accumulated into an initial collection. This included interrogative formats (such as, *how many of these names are at all familiar*); declarative formats (such as, *tell me which names you know anything about*); and any other indirect requests (such as, *you were chatting about some of these aspects*). This also included lecturers requesting information in *all* sequential positions. To reiterate what was stated in the Introduction, it was clear early on in the data analysis process that pursuing an answer in university seminar discussions could be split into two overarching types: pursuing an answer when an answer is not immediately forthcoming, and pursuing a ‘reformulated’ answer when an answer has been given, but it is in some way problematic. This supports previous research in which conversation analytic papers focusing on pursuing an answer have tended to focus on instances when an answer is noticeably absent (Romaniuk, 2013:147), for example, Jefferson (1981), Pomerantz (1984c), Stivers and Rossanno (2010), Bolden et al. (2012), Peräkylä and Ruusuori (2012). Pursuing an answer when an answer is not immediately forthcoming is the focus of this thesis.

Three practices for pursuing an answer when an answer is not immediately forthcoming have been identified: (1) adding a grammatically fitted increment to continue the question (Schegloff, 1996b); (2) reinitiating the Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) sequence (Zemel and Koschmann, 2011), to produce a subsequent version (Davidson, 1984) of the question; and (3) acknowledging the Face-Threatening Act (FTA) (Brown and Levinson, 1987) to openly



declare that the question runs contrary to the negative face-wants of the students (Brown and Levinson, 2006:313).

In total, there are 31 examples of adding a grammatically fitted increment, 54 examples of reinitiating the IRE sequence, and 19 examples of acknowledging the FTA. It is important to note that there are numerous categorisations of reinitiating the IRE sequence. Thus, the overall number of examples of reinitiating the IRE sequence is much higher. However, for the purpose of the current research, three categorisations have been included: *nomination* (8 examples), *repair* (16 examples) and *example* (30 examples). In accordance with Pomerantz, repair refers specifically to offering a more understandable reference (1984c:152).

These three categorisations have been included because they directly address the problems outlined in the Literature Review as to why students may not answer lecturers' questions. For example, *nomination* directly addresses the problem that students may not answer lecturers' questions because there is a lack of designated next speaker (Duran and Jacknick, 2020:2). Next, *repair* directly addresses the problem that students may not answer lecturers' questions because there is an unclear reference in the question (Pomerantz, 1984c:152). Finally, *example* directly addresses the problem that students may not answer lecturers' questions because there is a concern related to knowledge. For example, related to epistemic access, the degree of certainty and the knowledge source, and related to epistemic primacy, the relative rights to know and the type of knowable (Stivers et al., 2011:9). Moreover still, they coincide with the aim of the research, which is to focus on first-position trouble sources (Zemel and Koschmann, 2011:476). In these three categorisations, the first-position trouble sources are accessible to the analyst, as they can be 'pinpointed'. Whereas, in other categorisations, for example, those in which syntactically new IREs are produced, which do not resemble the original IREs, the first-position trouble sources are not always accessible to

the analyst, as they are ambiguous. The remaining categorisations of reinitiating the IRE sequence have been displayed in table 4.1. below.

*Table 4.1. Categorisations of Reinitiating the IRE Sequence*

Categorisation	Example
Nomination	Initial: <i>What might a language offer of value to linguistic science?</i> Reinitiated: <i>It feels like you were chatting about some of these aspects</i>
Repair	Initial: <i>Do your thoughts drive your actions?</i> Reinitiated: <i>Do your inner workings drive your actions?</i>
Example	Initial: <i>Is it a psychological or a social problem?</i> Reinitiated: <i>If I go around saying that people in a particular ethnic group are horrible and inferior to whatever I am would that present a psychological problem or would that present a social problem?</i>
Knowledge Check	Initial: <i>Over time what happens to your first language?</i> Reinitiated: <i>Do you know the formal term for this linguistically?</i>
Repetition	Initial: <i>So 'cup' without the 'c' gives you can anyone tell me?</i> Reinitiated: <i>So if you take the 'c' from 'cup'</i>
Other	Initial: <i>Is one answer more true than the other?</i> Reinitiated: <i>What do you think?</i>

The remaining categorisations would be interesting to investigate in future research. Particularly, it would be interesting to investigate the categorisation labelled *other*. Again, these are examples whereby syntactically new IREs are produced, which do not resemble the original IREs. Thus, they are ambiguous.

Finally, there are also two categorisations of acknowledging the FTA: *pursue* (13 examples) and *terminate* (6 examples).

The analysis will be structured according to the above categorisations, with a separate extract being provided and discussed for each. Though there is some overlap, this will enable the functions of each individual practice to be fully examined, whilst maintaining the space to account for the multitude of smaller factors that work in conjunction with the main practice towards the overall goal of pursuing an answer. Moreover, incorporating different extracts for each practice will be beneficial, as it will allow for a range of environments to be examined, with which the participants' concerns with turn-taking, lecturers' questions, students' knowledge and participants' face will be inherently different according to the context.

Next, by incorporating examples in which the lecturers have used more than one of these practices for pursuing an answer, the analysis will focus on how such practices work in conjunction with one another. More specifically, the analysis will discuss the varying degrees of covertness between the practices and how this interplays with the participants' concern with face.

#### **4.2. Reinitiating the IRE Sequence via *Nomination* and Adding an Increment**

The following extract occurred shortly after the students had been involved in a group task. The students had been discussing various linguistic issues in individual groups. Whilst such discussions were taking place, the lecturer walked about the room, listening to the discussions and often joining in.

Extract 1: Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_00:15:19\_V1\_00:14:58\_Conserving

1 L: er::m: (.) and so::: >yeah< (.) >>it's<< worth capturing some of  
2 >the-< (.) some of these (.) erm:: the notion of: (.) >of a< language

3 offering something very specific to: linguistic science (.) so e-  
 4 what might a language: (.) <offer> of value to:: (.) linguists: (0.3)  
 5 to linguistic science?  
 6 [(3.8) ]  
 7 **[(L gazes to right side and then left side of room)]**  
 8 L: [>mm?< (.) °it feels like you were: (.) chatting about some of these]  
 9 **[(L gazes at and directs left hand towards left front row) ]**  
 10 [aspects° ]  
 11 **[(L gazes at and wiggles fingers towards left front row)]**  
 12 [(2.3) ]  
 13 **[(L gazes at and directs left hand towards left front row)]**  
 14 L: [°when you were talking about conserving:° ]  
 15 **[(L gazes at and directs left hand towards left front row)]**  
 16 (0.5)  
 17 S: oh: is it: (.) >like< (1.3) is it whether: (.) °°°(ah::) ( ) (I forgot  
 18 what we were) >>just talking about<<°°° erm:: (.) >is it a bit ↑like:↑<  
 19 (.) <protected>

The extract begins with the lecturer asking a question on line 4: “what might a language: (.) <offer>? Of value to:: (.) linguistics:”. In regard to accountability, specifically the notion that participants are accountable for making their actions recognisable and understandable (Robinson, 2016:3-4), the lecturer’s question is recognisable as a question. This is clear from the interrogative term “what”. Such a term allows the question to be “project[able] of the unit-type underway, and what, roughly, it will take for an instance of that unit-type to be completed” (Sacks et al., 1974:702). The lecturer’s question can be analysed as having been completed, as it adheres to two out of three of Ford and Thompson’s aspects of turn completion: syntactic and pragmatic completion (1996:143-150).

Following the lecturer’s question, a 0.3 second gap occurs on line 4. Given that the lecturer’s question could be argued to be both recognisable and complete, the gap constitutes an initial transition-relevance place (TRP) (Sacks et al. 1974:703). Certainly in ordinary conversation the gap would be considered a TRP and thus, the lecturer’s turn continuation on line 5: “to linguistic science?” would be considered an add-on in the form of a replacement (Couper-Kuhlen and Ono, 2007:515). This is because the turn is “repair-like” and “replace[s] a part of the host” (2007:515). However, given the constraints associated with turn-

taking in a classroom, it is perhaps unrealistic to have expected a student to have answered so promptly. This demonstrates the complex nature of determining add-ons in a university seminar discussion as whilst conversation analytically the lecturer's turn *is* an add-on – evidenced by aspects of turn completion and turn continuation – in this sequential environment the lecturer's turn continuation is ambivalent.

Nevertheless, in classifying the current turn as a replacement, it is important to note that the lecturer's turn is delivered with rising intonation, the final aspect of Ford and Thompson's turn completion (intonation completion) (1996:147). Therefore, the lecturer's question now constitutes a complex TRP (CTRP), as it includes all three aspects of turn completion (1996:153). Ford and Thompson uncovered in their data that speaker change occurred most often at CTRPs (1996:157). It could be argued that such modification of prosody (i.e. added intonation) is targeted towards “projecting a link”, as was the case in Ford and Thompson's study (1996:167). Therefore, the turn continuation acts to strengthen the relevance for speaker change to occur.

Regarding adjacency pairs, the lecturer has provided a first pair part: a question, which provides for a second pair part: an answer, as the *expected* next turn (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973:295-6). Not only this but the lecturer has made an answer conditionally relevant (Schegloff, 1968). As Robinson states, “relative to some relevance rules, those that impose “conditional relevance” appear to have a high(er) degree (e.g., “strength” or “force”) of implicativeness, or normative expectation” (2016:9). Evidence that the lecturer's question imposes “conditional relevance” and thus, has a high degree of normative expectation comes from the fact that as the action is a question (rather than an assessment, for example), the students will orient to themselves as accountable to provide an answer (Stivers and Rossano, 2010:7). As aforementioned, the lecturer's question constitutes a CTRP which also strengthens the implicativeness.

However, the lecturer does not receive an answer resulting in a 3.8 second silence on line 6. Therefore, the answer is notably absent (Schegloff, 1972). It is important to note that during such 3.8 second silence, the lecturer gazes first to the right side of the room and then to the left (line 7). This gestural cue is important, as it provides evidence to support the statement (which will be discussed momentarily) that the lecturer is addressing the students as a collective group. This is because the lecturer does not direct her gaze at one student in particular.

Consequently, on line 8, the lecturer reinitiates the IRE sequence and in doing so, directly addresses a small group of students using the personal pronoun *you*, which is also emphasised: “>mm?< (.) °it feels like you were: (.) chatting about some of these aspects°”. The lecturer has thus *nominated* a next speaker. However, despite using direct address, which could be potentially face-threatening (Goffman, 1967), as the lecturer must be mindful of the students’ negative face, which entails freedom from imposition (Brown and Levinson, 2006:311), the lecturer’s turn is heavily mitigated. For example, the turn is delayed: “>mm?< (.) °it feels like” and is noticeably quieter than the surrounding talk.

Moreover, whilst reinitiating the IRE, the lecturer gazes at and directs her left hand towards the left front row (lines 9 and 11). Thus, the lecturer has made her facial expression available to the left front row, which in itself serves as a pursuit of response (Peräkylä and Ruusuvuori, 2012:13). Moreover, the lecturer relies on the turn-design resource ‘speaker gaze’ to increase the response relevance beyond the relevance intrinsic in requesting information (Stivers and Rossano, 2010:4).

By reinitiating the IRE sequence in order to nominate a next speaker, it could be argued that the lecturer is attributing the notable absence to the constraints associated with institutional turn-taking systems. More specifically, due to the turn-allocational delivery of the question (Duran and Jacknick, 2020:12), there is a lack of designated next speaker, which may complicate the students’ willingness to answer (2020:2). Evidence to support such a statement

comes from the fact that the lecturer (at this point) has not oriented to any other deficiencies in her question, other than the turn-allocational delivery; for example, she has not self-initiated self-repair (Schegloff et al., 1977:364). This may suggest that the lecturer does not believe there to be an issue of clarity or foreseeable disagreement, as previously outlined by Pomerantz (1984c:152-153), as other possible explanations for why students may not respond to lecturers' questions. Referring to the validation procedure, the fact that the lecturer directly addresses the problem outlined demonstrates that "the interactants themselves treat the utterance in ways that are in accordance with the analyst's interpretation" (Peräkylä, 2011:368).

In regard to accountability, specifically the notion that students are accountable for answering lecturers' questions (Heritage, 2006a:3), it must be noted that when asking questions in whole class discussions, accountability is assigned to the students as a collective group. Thus, it could be argued that accountability is diminished slightly, as where notable absences do occur, no individual student is held accountable. Therefore, no student will lose face (Goffman, 1967). Hence, by reinitiating the IRE by means of nomination, the lecturer localises the accountability to a smaller group of students or, in other cases, an individual student.

Alternatively, by reinitiating the IRE sequence in order to nominate a next speaker, it could be argued that the lecturer is attributing the notable absence to the students' ostensible concerns relating to knowledge. Crucially, the lecturer does not treat the students as lacking knowledge. Rather, the lecturer treats the students' as lacking epistemic access regarding the degree of certainty and epistemic primacy regarding the relative authority of knowledge and the type of knowable (Stivers et al., 2011:9). For example, regarding the latter, the lecturer is a linguistic lecturer requesting information about "linguistic science". This is significant because the lecturer has the relative authority of knowledge (Lee, 2016:175). Such orientations to epistemic primacy may have complicated the students' willingness to answer. Thus, the lecturer relies on the turn-design feature 'recipient focused epistemicity' to increase the

response relevance, as the students' individual group discussion is asymmetrically within the students' epistemic domain (Stivers and Rossano, 2010:8). Moreover, the lecturer transforms her question from one which seeks type 2 knowledge: an answer relating to the course content, to one which seeks type 1 knowledge: an answer relating to the students' individual group discussion (Pomerantz, 1980:187). Again, the students' individual group discussion is asymmetrically within the students' epistemic domain; thus, the lecturer transfers the relative authority of knowledge to the students. This simultaneously increases the students' degree of certainty, which the lecturer treats as a potential problem as to why the students have not answered her question: "*you were chatting about some of these aspects*". In spite of this, the lecturer *still* does not receive an answer resulting in a 2.3 second silence on line 12.

Finally, on line 14, the lecturer adds an increment: "°when you were talking about conserving: °". This is an increment because rather than replacing a part of the host, as in the previous add-on, this add-on furnishes a new element. The increment is added in the form of a glue-on, as it is "grammatically fitted to the end of the host" (Couper-Kuhlen and Ono, 2007:515) and "can be heard as a direct continuation of what has come before" (Ford et al., 2002:16) (*you were chatting about some of these aspects when you were talking about conserving*).

Adding such an increment has many benefits, the following of which, identified by Bolden et al. (2012), can be said of increments in a classroom environment generally. This is not to undermine their effect, but rather to make the point that the advantages mentioned are consistent amongst all of the increments in the data set. Firstly, by adding an increment, the lecturer has masked the lack of response from the students. This is because whereas the previous 3.8 second silence on line 6 formed an inter-TCU gap, here the lecturer has converted what could have been a second inter-TCU gap (which would have been damaging to both the lecturer's and the students' face) into an intra-TCU pause (2012:140). Secondly, the lecturer



has refreshed the relevance of a response (2012:140), therefore attempting to pursue an answer without making pursuing an answer “the overt business of talk” (Bolden et al., 2012:140). This is in keeping with the current study in which the purpose is to investigate how lecturers pursue an answer in a *covert* manner.

Further evidence to highlight the covertness of increments comes from Mandelbaum’s (2016) research into embedded self-correction. Mandelbaum discusses how incrementing is a form of embedded self-correction, as increments can be designed to remove problematic hearings without making the removal “officially available” (2016:121). To quote Mandelbaum, “increments provide for the additional element to be added to the turn in such a way as to come off (retroactively) as having been part of the utterance all along” (2016:133). This is important because, as Jefferson notes, even self-initiated repair may be susceptible to contempt because it focuses the attention on the problematic aspect (2006:269).

By adding an increment, the lecturer has benefited the discussion socially by saving her own and the students’ face (masking the lack of an answer) and structurally by progressing the talk (refreshing the relevance of an answer).

However, increments can also have benefits specific to the example. For example, in extract 1, the lecturer utilises the increment to self-initiate self-repair of the indexical reference “aspects” to “conserving” (repair will be discussed in detail in the Extract 2). This means that the lecturer may have oriented to the indexical reference “aspects” as being somehow problematic (Bolden et al., 2012:14). For example, referring back to Pomerantz, the lecturer is treating the reference as unclear or too broad and consequently, resolves this ostensible problem by providing a more understandable, specific reference (1984c:152). Therefore, it could be argued that “aspects” is a first-position trouble source (Zemel and Koschmann, 2011:476). This can also be thought of in terms of Schegloff’s notion of dispensability (2004), specifically the explication of indexical expressions. The reference “conserving” can be said

to have been explicated, demonstrating that such reference was considered dispensable by the lecturer in the question (replacing it with the broader term “aspects”) (2004:108). With regards to knowledge, the lecturer appears to be orienting to a problem with epistemic access, specifically knowing versus not knowing (Stivers et al., 2011:9). However, this unknowing status is perceived to be a result of a deficiency in her own talk, rather than a deficiency in the students’ ability. More specifically, the lecturer appears to be treating herself as accountable for why the students cannot respond by orienting to this trouble source as hindering their epistemic access: they presumably do not know what she is referring to, hence they are in an unknowing epistemic position, which is preventing them from being able to answer. Nevertheless, regardless of whether the indexical reference is unclear to the students, and regardless of whether the lecturer believes it to be problematic, the lecturer orients to it *as if* it is problematic.

When lecturers ask questions in a university seminar environment, they appear to have the hidden task of assigning the accountability to provide an answer. This is particularly important in cases such as the above where questions do not get responded to the first-time round. For example, if the accountability to provide an answer is assigned solely on the basis of the question being asked, the accountability may not be forceful enough on its own. In these instances, lecturers may be able to employ practices for pursuing an answer which reassign the accountability for providing an answer. However, in doing so, lecturers must also be mindful of the students’ face. Therefore, the accountability to provide an answer may be redistributed multiple times within a questioning sequence.

Take extract one for example, the lecturer asked a question on line 4, which given the nature of questioning, meant that the students were accountable for providing an answer. However, as there were multiple students in the session, the students were accountable for providing an answer *as a collective*, as the question was not directed at one student in particular:

there was a lack of designated next speaker (Duran and Jacknick, 2020:2). Therefore, whilst an answer was noticeably absent (Schegloff, 1972) on line 6, it could be argued that the students did not lose face. Consequently, the lecturer reinitiated the IRE by means of nomination on line 8, which assigned the accountability to provide an answer to a small group of students using the personal pronoun *you*. It could be said that the lecturer, therefore, *redistributed* the accountability to provide an answer from the students as a collective to a more localised group. However, in doing so, the lecturer ‘upped the stakes’ in regard to face. This is because by localising the accountability to provide an answer to a small group of students, the students could now lose face if they did not answer. As shown on line 12, the students did not answer resulting in another noticeable absence. However, rather than allow the students to lose face, the lecturer added an increment on line 14 to repair the indexical reference *aspects*, which redistributed the accountability to herself, as she oriented to her talk as problematic. The lecturer’s question was not understandable and therefore, not accountably intelligible (Robinson, 2016:3-4). Finally, by adding an increment, the lecturer redistributed the accountability to provide an answer back to the students, as she refreshed the relevance for a response (Bolden et al., 2012:140).

To summarise, the accountability to provide an answer to the lecturer’s original question seems to have been redistributed multiple times. Firstly, accountability was assigned to the students as a collective by the very nature of the question being asked. Next, accountability was localised to a small group of students by using the personal pronoun *you* to nominate a next speaker. Thirdly, accountability was attributed to the lecturer by the lecturer adding an increment to suggest that her talk could have been problematic, thus accounting for why the students could not provide an answer. Finally, accountability was assigned back to the small group of students, as the lecturer, by adding the increment, had refreshed the relevance for a response.

### 4.3. Reinitiating the IRE Sequence via *Repair*

Before analysing the data extract, it is important to note that repair is an extremely broad term. It could be argued that *every* example of reinitiating the IRE sequence contains some form of repair. This is because, other than re-initiations which have been identified as repetitions, every example of reinitiating the IRE sequence contains some form of change. As Schegloff et al. state: “In view of the point about repair being initiated with no apparent error, it appears that nothing is, in principle, excludable from the class ‘repairable’.” (1977:363). Thus, to ensure that the examples are consistent, it is crucial to focus on one form of repair. As previously mentioned, in accordance with Pomerantz, repair focuses specifically on offering a more understandable reference (1984c:152). This includes examples whereby one word is replaced with another of the same word class (Schegloff, 1979:263) (for example, *stance* replaced with *subjective position*; *thoughts* replaced with *inner-workings*; *cliff* replaced with *ceiling*) and examples whereby an indexical expression is replaced with a concrete expression (Bolden et al., 2012) (for example, *that* replaced with *borders in central Africa*; *that* replaced with *a really carefully thought through revitalisation process*; *we* replaced with *political slash cognitive psychologist*). However, what is consistent amongst all of the examples is that *one* word or phrase can be pinpointed as an “apparent error” or first-position trouble source (Zemel and Koschmann, 2011:476).

The following extract occurred midway through the seminar session. This particular lecturer’s seminar sessions (pseudo-anonymised Mark) typically resemble a combination of mediated turn allocation (Heritage, 2004:116) and ordinary conversation (Sacks et al., 1974:704). This is because whilst the lecturer does refer to PowerPoint presentations in part, the sessions are mostly discussion-based. Thus, the sessions typically involve debating, which as previously

mentioned, is a notable exception to McHoul's rules for turn-taking in a classroom (1978), as identified by Ingram and Elliot (2014:21).

Extract 2: Mark\_W3\_A1\_00:54:46\_V2\_00:10:05\_Rephrase

1 L: paired with that (0.3) is at least the implicit assumption (.) that  
 2 our thoughts drive our actions (2.7)  
 3 [do you agree with that or disagree with that where do you stand on  
 4 that do your thoughts drive your actions ]  
 5 **[(L leans back in chair and gazes around room)]** ]  
 6 (1.6)  
 7 L: [let me rephrase ] (0.3)  
 8 **[(L circles left hand forwards)]**  
 9 [do your inner workings ] (0.3) drive your actions  
 10 **[(L circles left hand by left ear)]**  
 11 (0.6)  
 12 L: [so it's not just thoughts ]  
 13 **[(L puts left hand out left)]**  
 14 [>but I'm gonna include em-< emotions ] in there as well  
 15 **[(L pulls left hand from left to right)]**  
 16 [(1.3) ]  
 17 **[(L gazes around room)]**  
 18 S1: well >>>( )<<< drives in action °then° (0.7) likely to- >to< an  
 19 extent yes

The extract begins with the lecturer asking a series of questions on line 3, which are, as with extract 1, first pair parts (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973:295-6). Again, given the rule of conditional relevance (Schegloff, 1968), by asking a question, the lecturer has strengthened the degree of normative expectation (Robinson, 2016:9) and provided for a second pair part (an answer), as the expected next turn: “do you agree with that or disagree with that where do you stand on that do your thoughts drive your actions”. It appears that the third question is of particular focus. This is true for these types of questioning sequences in general, as suggested by Sacks (2006), whose research indicates that when multiple questions are asked, recipients are likely to answer the last question first in order to preserve the contiguity of the question and the answer (Sacks, 2006:33). This is further evidenced in the data as the lecturer does not leave a pause for students to respond after the first two questions,

and formulates the third question as a repetition of the prior class content: “paired with that (0.3) is at least the implicit assumption (.) that our thoughts drive our actions” followed by “do your thoughts drive your actions”. Moreover, and of greatest significance to the current research, is that the final question in the sequence is the one that is repaired. Therefore, there is demonstrable evidence that it is the third question that is the ‘real’ focus of the discussion, and thus that the lecturer seeks an answer to. Given the above, in regard to accountability (that lecturers are accountable for making their questions recognisable as questions), it could be argued that the lecturer’s question *is* accountable, as it is recognisable as a question (Robinson, 2016:3-4). However, the lecturer does not receive an answer, resulting in a 1.6 second silence on line 6. Thus, as with extract 1, a noticeable absence has occurred (Schegloff, 1972).

Consequently, on line 7, the lecturer reinitiates the IRE and in doing so, replaces the reference “thoughts” with “inner workings”: “do your inner workings (0.3) drive your actions”. The lecturer has thus *repaired* a potentially problematic reference. Therefore, it could be argued that the lecturer is attributing the noticeable absence to “a breakdown in the accountable intelligibility” of the question (Drew and Penn, 2016:55), specifically that the reference “thoughts” is not *understandable* and thus the question cannot be accountably intelligible (Robinson, 2016:3-4). Evidence to support this claim comes from the lecturer’s explicit orientation to such breakdown: “let me rephrase”. This repair once again adheres to Pomerantz’s notion of offering a more understandable reference as a solution for a lack of response (Pomerantz, 1984c: 152). According to this paradigm, the word “thoughts” is a first position trouble source, indicating a deficiency in the lecturer’s own speech (Zemel and Koschmann, 2011: 476). In this case, the deficiency appears to be that the reference is not broad enough. Evidence for this comes from the fact that, following a 0.6 second silence on line 11, the lecturer employs a second practice for pursuing an answer in the form of an increment, to

further clarify this already repaired term: “so it’s not just thoughts >but I’m gonna include em-< emotions in there as well”. More specifically, this is an increment in the form of a clausal glue-on (Couper-Kuhlen and Ono, 2007:522-3). Here, the lecturer escalates the replacement (“inner workings”) to an explanatory turn (“I’m gonna include [...] emotions”), therefore widening the scope of possible answers from the students. The repair practice thus seems to be designed to “recover” the intelligibility of what the lecturer is asking the students (Drew and Penn, 2016:56).

Referring back to the repair of the problematic reference, as this is the main concern in this example, the lecturer orients to the lack of an answer as a potential problem with epistemic access, specifically relating to knowing versus not knowing (Stivers et al., 2011: 9). Whilst it appears that the lecturer recognises his students as being in an unknowing position (K-) (Heritage, 2012:32), he redistributes the accountability to himself. He does this by explicitly announcing his self-initiated self-repair (Schegloff et al., 1977:364): “let me rephrase”. Such explicit announcement draws attention to his own misdirection: it is not the students’ ability that inhibits them from providing an answer, rather his inability to provide a clear enough reference. Again, the lecturer is treating his question as not being understandable and therefore, as not being accountable (Robinson, 2016:3-4). Hence, by performing the repair, the lecturer reinstates the student’s epistemic access, drawing attention to their knowing (K+) status (Heritage, 2012:32). This can again be thought of in terms of Schegloff’s notion of dispensability (2004), specifically the notion that responses to repair initiators (such as “huh?”) may include the replacement of specialised reference terms with those deemed to be more accessible (2004:97). Whilst the students do not produce any repair initiators per se and thus, the re-initiation is still being categorised as *self*-initiated self-repair, it could be argued that the lecturer is treating the silence as an indicator of trouble (Davidson, 1984:104).

Moreover, it is important to note that such explicit announcement of the self-initiated self-repair, as well as being beneficial in drawing attention to the lecturer's 'misdirection' (and thus, to the accountability of the question), is also beneficial in helping to mask the lack of an answer from the students (Bolden et al., 2012:140). As with extract 1, it will be argued that the re-initiation of the IRE works overall to mask the lack of an answer; however, it could be argued that "let me rephrase" works *in itself* to carry out the same function. This is because, as Hoey demonstrates in his research, "*let me X*" "orients to what the recipient had projected for or expected of the speaker" (2020:10). In this case, the lecturer projected for and thus, expected an answer from the students. However, "let me rephrase" self-authorises the lecturer to *displace* the expected next action, an answer from the students, and forgo it in favour of an unexpected next action, another question from the lecturer (2020:10). This can be thought of in terms of the lecturer attending to the "practical preconditions" for answering (2020:8). The lecturer is treating 'producing an understandable question' as a practical precondition for the students being *able* to answer. As he has not done so (or at least orients to the question *as if* he has not done so), the lecturer works to "recover" the accountable intelligibility of the question (Drew and Penn, 2016:56), as previously mentioned.

Referring back to the notion that lecturers are accountable for making their questions recognisable and understandable (Robinson, 2016:3-4), it was argued previously that the lecturer's question *is* recognisable. However, it may not be understandable. For example, given that it is the third question in the sequence that is of particular focus, the lecturer's preamble of other questions may be complicating the intelligibility of the question overall. The lecturer can be seen to be orienting towards this issue. Again, this can be thought of in terms of Schegloff's notion of dispensability (2004). Specifically, Schegloff states that responses to repair initiators that are designed to do "repeating" typically involve some kind of reduction or addition (2004:99). Repeating can be seen in the current example whereby, excluding the replacement



reference, the lecturer's reinitiated IRE takes the same format as the original: "do your thoughts drive your actions", followed by "do your inner workings (0.3) drive your actions". Schegloff states that such reductions are: "not any reductions [...] but ones that appeared designed to disencumber the trouble-source turn from elements now superfluous" (2004:99). According to this, the lecturer appears to orient towards the preamble of questions as dispensable, subsequently discarding them. This can be seen as an example of what Schegloff defines as simplification, the process of "par[ing] down what was being said to its minimal form, rendering what is eliminated as "dispensable"" (2004:117). Thus, alongside attributing the noticeable absence to the problematic reference, the lecturer also appears to attribute it to the other, dispensable questions that are complicating the question's accountability in regard to how understandable it is.

Given all of the above, as with extract 1, multiple exchanges regarding the accountability to provide an answer can again be traced. To begin with, the lecturer assigned the accountability to the students on the basis of the question being asked. Next, the lecturer redistributed the accountability to himself by orienting to deficiencies in his own speech, which prevented the students from being able to answer: his questions were not understandable and therefore, they were not accountably intelligible (Robinson, 2016:3-4). In order to "recover" the intelligibility of the question(s) (Drew and Penn, 2016:56), the lecturer reinitiated the IRE by means of repair and treated his preamble of questions as dispensable, ultimately disregarding them (Schegloff, 2004:117). Finally, the lecturer *re*assigned the accountability to provide an answer back to the students, as given the reinitiated IRE, a new questioning sequence had been instigated, which refreshed the relevance of a response (Bolden et al., 2012:140).

Ultimately, the repair of the problematic reference, as with incrementing, masks the lack of response and refreshes the relevance for response. This similarity between the two

practices, specifically incrementing and repairing a problematic reference (in her case, focusing on indexical references), was noted by Bolden et al., (2012:140). This is a recurring theme across the three practices and their subcategorisations, as will become apparent in the remaining analysis.

#### 4.4. Reinitiating the IRE Sequence via *Example*

The following extract occurred 20 minutes into the seminar session. Whilst the extract comes from a different session to the one above, it features the same lecturer (Mark) and the same set of students. Therefore, the previous contextual information still applies. To briefly recap, the sessions are predominantly discussion-based and therefore, extremely interactive, including debating.

##### Extract 3: Mark\_W4\_A1\_00:19:46\_V1\_00:18:38\_Psychological\_Social\_Problem

1 L: and that's a question that we'll come into later as well oh there is  
 2 this new old racism distinction >( )< has: (0.7) who this  
 3 >>>(kind of)<<< of prejudice and race hasn't gone anywhere  
 4 S1: cognitively speaking racism hasn't changed but- socially speaking it  
 5 has  
 6 L: mm  
 7 (0.9)  
 8 L: there you go so is racism a social or a psychological problem?  
 9 [(1.2) ]  
 10 **[(L drinks)]**  
 11 S1: mm both  
 12 (.)  
 13 S2: social construct  
 14 (1.4)  
 15 L: .hhh there is >this< element of social construction in there (.) but  
 16 I'm saying like- in kind of loo::se laymen's terms is it a  
 17 psychological problem .hh or a social problem  
 18 [(2.4) ]  
 19 **[(L gazes to left side of room)]**  
 20 L: if I go around saying that people a-er: say all the time that people  
 21 in a particular ethnic group are: horrible and inferior to:::  
 22 whatever I am (0.8) °although if that's ( ) I'll be a bit  
 23 mongrel my↑self↑°  
 24 SA: hh

25 (0.5)  
 26 L: er:m (1.8)  
 27 [would that present:: (0.8) a psychological problem? ]  
 28 **[[((L lifts left hand into a 'thumbs up' and presses lips together))]**  
 29 [(1.0) ]  
 30 **[[((L's left hand remains in a 'thumbs up' and his lips remain**  
 31 **pressed together)) ]**  
 32 [or would that present a social problem ]  
 33 **[[((L extends index finger out from the 'thumbs up'))]**  
 34 (0.5)  
 35 S3: °°°both°°°

The initial discussion in extract 3 above, from lines 1-17, is extremely forthcoming. For example, following an assessment made by the lecturer on line 2: “this >>>(kind of)<<< of prejudice and race hasn't gone anywhere”, student 1 immediately produces a subsequent assessment, on line 4: “cognitively speaking racism hasn't changed but-socially speaking it has”. Moreover, in response to student 1's assessment, the lecturer initiates a questioning sequence on line 8: “there you go so is racism a social or a psychological problem?”, which is responded to without further pursuit. This is an example of a smooth-progress receipt, as it adheres to the following structure: [receipt] + [move to next question], as identified by Antaki (2002:412). After a 1.2 second silence on line 9, student 1 answers on line 11: “mm both”, which is shortly followed by another answer from student 2 on line 13: “social construct”.

It is worth noting briefly that the discussion occurring on lines 2-6 seems to more closely resemble ‘ordinary’ conversation, as was discussed in the Literature Review. The lecturer makes an assessment on line 2 and the student produces a subsequent assessment (Pomerantz, 1984a:62) on line 4. The reason this sequence is significant is as follows: firstly, in ‘ordinary’ conversation, speakers' assessments, specifically those whereby the referent is accessible to the recipient, provide for the relevance of recipients' subsequent assessments (Pomerantz, 1984a:61). However, in educational settings, teachers produce assessments (whereby referents are accessible to students) which do not provide for the relevance of

students' subsequent assessments, for example, when teachers' talk reflects that of monologues. This supports the statement that the participants in the current research do not stick to the distinctive ways of taking turns which is typically associated with classroom interaction, as university students self-select to speak, unsolicited, at any given point, i.e., not just following lecturers' questions. Secondly, as Pomerantz states, assessments are "*products of participation*" (1984a:57), which means that by producing an assessment, the student claims knowledge of that which he is assessing (1984a:57). This is important as it demonstrates that the student is knowledgeable (K+) on the topic under consideration.

However, the discussion becomes less forthcoming from line 18 onwards when a 2.4 second gap emerges following a question initiated by the lecturer: the lecturer orients to student 2's answer ("social construct") as being in some way problematic – a second position trouble source (Zemel and Koschmann, 2011:476) – on line 15: "there is >this< element of social construction in there (.) but". This structure, agreement ("there is >this< element of social construction") followed by disagreement ("but"), is typical of dispreferred turns (Heritage, 2006b:12). Consequently, the lecturer produces a subsequent version (Davison, 1984:103) of the questioning sequence on line 16: "in kind of loo::se laymen's terms is it a psychological problem .hh or a social problem". This is a transforming reformulation, as it aims to adjust student 2's answer, rather than challenge or summarise it (Solem and Skovholt, 2019:73).

However, following such a subsequent version of the question (which is in itself an example of reinitiating the IRE sequence), a 2.4 second gap emerges on line 18 where an answer is noticeably absent (Schegloff, 1972). Thus, the lecturer must now employ practices for pursuing an answer. Consequently, on line 20, the lecturer reinitiates the IRE sequence by providing an *example* of the matter under consideration (in this case, racism): "if I go around saying that people a-er: say all the time that people in a particular ethnic

group are: horrible and inferior to::: whatever I am [...] would that present:: (0.8) a psychological problem? (1.0) or would that present a social problem”. To clarify, it is the anaphoric reference *that* (“would that present::: [...]”) which indicates that the example, in the form of a hypothetical scenario, and the reinitiated IRE are connected.

As in the previous two examples, it would appear that the lecturer is orienting to a deficiency in his own question – a first position trouble source (Zemel and Koschmann, 2011: 476). Specifically, he seems to be orienting to “it” as being problematic. To clarify, “it” refers to “racism” (this is evident from the first question on line 8). However, as within the previous two examples, in which a reference was unclear, here there does not appear to be an issue with clarity. Rather, there appears to be an issue with the broadness and the abstractness of the term. This is because each student will have a different experience in regard to racism – what one finds racist another might not. Therefore, epistemic access with regard to knowing versus not knowing is just one explanation of many for why the students may not have responded in this example. Rather, it may be the case that there is an issue with epistemic access with regard to the students’ degree of certainty and the knowledge source (Stivers et al., 2011:9). This is because there is evidence in the prior interaction to suggest that the students *are* knowledgeable (K+) on the matter. For example, as previously mentioned, student 1 makes an assessment on line 4. Focusing now on the *content* of the student’s assessment, student 1 refers specifically to the business on hand: “cognitively speaking racism hasn’t changed but- socially speaking it has”. By introducing the topic, student 1 is demonstrating his epistemic access regarding knowing versus not knowing. This is verified by the lecturer’s positive affirmation on line 8: “there you go”, which confirms that the student is in a knowledgeable (K+) position. Moreover, student 1 provides an answer on line 11: “mm both”, which is shortly followed by an answer from student 2 on line 13: “social construct”. Whilst the lecturer orients to student 2’s response as being in some way problematic (as previously mentioned),

he does partially agree indicating that the student *is* knowledgeable on the matter – her response just may need some refining. Therefore, by incorporating an example, the lecturer provides epistemic access with regard to the students degree of certainty, by providing a hypothetical scenario. This can be thought of in relation to Antaki’s notion of ‘personalised revision of ‘failed’ questions’ (2002). Antaki suggests that if a question is met with a problematic answer, rather than immediately asking a new question, the questioner can “introduce something that has to be settled first, and that something will form the basis of the new question” (2002:414). Antaki refers to these types of sequences as ‘insertion sequences establishing an alternate basis to the question’ (2002:413). Below displays the insertion sequence in the current example:

*Table 4.2. Extract 3 Insertion Sequence*

Question	“is it a psychological problem .hh or a social problem”
Insertion Sequence	“if I go around saying that people a-er: say all the time that people in a particular ethnic group are: horrible and inferior to::: whatever I am”
New Question	“would that present_:: (0.8) a psychological problem? (1.0) or would that present a <u>social</u> problem”

As Antaki states, “Given that the listener will assume that the inserted sequence is consequential, the new question will be heard as naturally limited to the bounds of the scenario that the inserted sequence establishes. This means that if the scenario is more limited than the original range of the question, then the new question will be more limited too, even if it used the same, or similar wording.” (2002:422). The wording in the current example is similar: “is it a psychological problem .hh or a social problem” **reinitiated** to “would that present\_:: (0.8) a psychological problem? (1.0) or would that present a social problem”. One of the main noticeable exceptions is the anaphoric reference “that”, as

previously mentioned. Such a reference explicitly demonstrates how “the general” has been turned into “the concrete and specific” (2002:422-3). Providing an example is thus, an extremely powerful tool, as despite the lecturer’s original and reinitiated IRE appearing to be extremely similar, the reinitiated IRE has changed significantly in regard to the range of the question. Moreover, the lecturer pursues an answer in a covert manner, as the inserted hypothetical scenario masks the considerable discrepancy between the original and the reinitiated question (Antaki, 2002:426).

Furthermore, another way in which the lecturer increases the students’ degree of certainty is by including extreme case formulations such as “horrible” and “inferior” (Edwards, 2000:347; Norrick, 2004:1727-1729). The lecturer’s example is “designed to be hearably incorrect”, thus constituting an absurd formulation (Amar et al., 2021:2). Its absurdity is brought about through the interactional context (2021:2), as the lecturer has made it abundantly clear throughout the seminar discussion that this is not his ‘real’ viewpoint and that this is a ‘hypothetical’ viewpoint. This is further supported by the lecturer’s absurd formulation (“mongrel”) in reference to himself on line 22: “°although if that’s ( ) I’ll be a bit mongrel my↑self↑°”. The current example differs from Amar et al.’s examples in that the latter focused on examples whereby the teachers produced candidate answers designed to be rejected (2021:5). In the current example, “psychological problem” and “social problem” still remain the candidate answers. However, Amar et al.’s findings are transferable. For example, the lecturer’s absurd formulation allows for “a much-needed injection of levity” (2021:11); thus, alleviating the pressure on the students (2012:24). It allows for the joint understanding of what are not plausible answers; thus, limiting the range of what are plausible answers (2021:11). Finally, it allows for the students to produce *any* answer, including an absurd answer; thus “send[ing] the message that *any answer is preferable to silence*” (2021:24, emphasis added).

Next, it is worth paying some more attention on the questioning part of the re-initiation of the IRE sequence (as oppose to the example, which has been the focus of the current discussion). There are two alternative explanations to the design of this question (“would that present<sub>u</sub>:: (0.8) a psychological problem? (1.0) or would that present a social problem”). Firstly, it could be argued that the lecturer has again employed a second practice for pursuing an answer. This is because if you were to treat “a psychological problem?” as the potential end of a TCU, which is a plausible explanation, as the turn encompasses all three aspects of turn completion, thus resembling a complex TRP (CTRP) (Ford and Thompson, 1996:153), then “or would that present a social problem” would constitute an increment. Specifically, it would be an increment in the form of a glue-on, as it is “grammatically fitted to the host” (Couper-Kuhlen and Ono, 2007:515). This can once again be explained in reference to Schegloff’s notion of dispensability (2004). As displayed below, the lecturer’s question has now been asked three times (lines 8, 16 and 27).

*Table 4.3. Extract 3 Questions*

Question 1	“is racism a social or a psychological problem?”
Question 2	“is it a psychological problem .hh or a social problem”
Question 3	“would that present <sub>u</sub> :: (0.8) a psychological problem? (1.0) or would that present a <u>social</u> problem”

Considering that both question 1 and 2 were framed in the same way, as offering two alternative options, the lecturer may have considered the second option (“social problem”), as being dispensable in question 3. Schegloff states that “Or X” is often omitted in turn-final position (Schegloff, 2004:113). However, following such potential end of the TCU – especially one which imposes conditional relevance (Schgeloff, 1968), which is strengthened by the CTRP (Ford and Thompson, 1996:153) – a 1.0 second gap prevails. Thus, the lecturer restores the



second option by incrementing. This is another example of embedded self-correction in which the alternative “come[s] off (retroactively) as having been part of the utterance all along” (Mandelbaum, 2016:133). Therefore, it could be argued that what the lecturer initially viewed as dispensable, is now being viewed as *indispensable* (Schegloff, 2004:99).

Alternatively, as there is also a 0.8 second pause following “would that present:: (0.8)”, it could be argued that the lecturer’s 1.0 second pause following “a psychological problem? (1.0)” is interactionally relevant. It could be the case the lecturer is purposely slowing down his talk and mimicking the pauses throughout in order to aid the accountable intelligibility of the question. Referring again to the notion that lecturers are accountable for making their questions recognisable and understandable (Robinson, 2016:3-4), each question can be considered recognisable. They all include interrogative terms (such as, “is” and “do”) meaning they are projectable of the unit-type underway (Sacks et al., 1974:702), and they all adhere to Ford and Thompsons aspects of turn completion (specifically, syntactic and pragmatic completion, and in some cases, intonation completion (Ford and Thompson, 1996:1430150)). However, it may be the case that the lecturer’s questions are not understandable; thus, diminishing their accountable intelligibility. This example again demonstrates the complex nature of determining add-ons, such as increments, in a university seminar discussion.

Again, ultimately, as with the previous two types of reinitiating the IRE sequence (nomination and repair), by reinitiating the IRE to provide an example, the lecturer has masked the lack of an answer from the students and has refreshed the relevance for an answer (Bolden et al., 2012:140).

Finally, multiple exchanges regarding the accountability to provide an answer can be traced. First, the lecturer assigned the accountability to provide an answer to the students on the basis of the question being asked. Next, the lecturer redistributed the accountability to

himself by orienting to a deficiency in his own speech, in this example the broadness and abstractness of the original question, which prevented the students from being *able* to answer. To remedy the deficiency, the lecturer reinitiated the IRE by providing an example, which limited the bounds of the original question to a specific scenario (Antaki, 2002:422), thus rendering it more intelligible (Robinson, 2016:3-4). Finally, the lecturer *reassigned* the accountability to provide an answer back to the students, as by reinitiating the IRE, the lecturer refreshed the relevance of an answer (Bolden et al., 2012:140).

#### **4.5. Reinitiating the IRE Sequence ‘Other’**

Referring back to Table 4.1., which displays the remaining categorisations of reinitiating the IRE sequence, there is a categorisation labelled ‘*other*’. These are examples whereby syntactically new IREs are produced, which do not resemble the original IREs. Thus, they are ambiguous. Again, the remaining categorisations would be interesting to investigate in future research. However, the current example of an ‘*other*’ reinitiated IRE sequence warrants further investigation presently, as it provides a comparative example. Whereas in the previous three examples the lecturers orient to deficiencies in their own speech and produce syntactically similar IREs to recover the deficiencies, in the current example, the lecture does not orient to a deficiency in his own speech and produces a syntactically *new* IRE to seek the students’ opinion: “what do you think?”. Thus, it also provides an interesting example whereby the lecturer orients to the ‘preference for agreement’ inherent in yes/no interrogatives (Raymond, 2003:943).

The following extract occurred midway through the seminar session. It again features the same lecturer (Mark) and the same set of students. Thus, the previous contextual information again applies.

Extract 4: Mark\_W7\_A1\_00:57\_44\_V2\_00:12:49\_More\_True

- 1 L: how many of yo:u a::re (.) familiar with Occam's Razor  
2 (3.0)
- 3 L: ((LS)) what can you tell us about (the:se)  
4 (0.4)
- 5 S1: er::m (0.4) °°b-°° we- >usually means that the mos:t< (.) that- if  
6 there's a simple ex- explanation for something then it's (.) that's  
7 likely th- the answer to it
- 8 L: yep  
9 (0.7)
- 10 L: .hhh SO (2.0) the simplest explanation is often the true one (2.8)  
11 so if we can explai::n (.) a certain type of behaviour (0.6) at the  
12 level of: (1.3) [brain chemistry ]  
13 **[(L puts left hand out left]**  
14 [rather than at the level of] [social explanations ]  
15 **[(L brings left hand in) ] [(L puts left hand out left]**  
16 (1.0) [is one (.) answer more true than the other.]  
17 **[(L puts left hand out forward ]**  
18 **((L slaps left hand on left leg and presses lips together))**  
19 [(3.6) ]  
20 **[(L gazes to right side and then left side of room))]**
- 21 L: °°what do you think<°°  
22 [(1.6) ]  
23 **[(L gazes to left side and then right side of room))]**
- 24 S1: if you didn't (think/take) a relative in the (ap-proach) the:n yes  
25 (0.6)
- 26 L: .hhh >>no no<< [I'm asking you what you think ]  
27 **[(L lifts both hands up and smiles))]**  
28 [not what your approach might be ]  
29 **[(L maintains prior gesture and moves right hand towards S1))]**  
30 (.) [what do you: think ]  
31 **[(L puts both hands down and smiles))]**  
32 [(3.3) ]  
33 **[(L gazes to left side and then right side of room))]**
- 34 S1: yeah I think- (0.9) I think there are more right explan- more right  
35 explanations than others
- 36 L: °°mm hm°°  
37 (.)
- 38 S1: otherwise then- (0.6) we live in a whole where fascism could be  
39 justifie(h)d(h)  
40 (0.8)
- 41 L: ok::

The extract begins with the lecturer requesting information regarding the psychological concept “Occam’s Razor”. Importantly, the lecturer requests information regarding the students’ knowledge on line 1: “how many of yo:u a::re (.) familiar with Occam’s Razor”. Then, on line 5, student 1 defines the concept: “if there’s a simple explanation for something then it’s (.) that’s likely th- the answer to it”. The lecturer utilises student 1’s answer to initiate another questioning sequence beginning on line 10. This is clear from the lecturer’s audible inbreath (“.hhh”) and introductory marker (“so”) (Margutti, 2006:332). The lecturer then positively evaluates student 1’s answer through repetition: “the simplest explanation is often the true one”. Drawing on Margutti and Drew’s research, through repetition, the lecturer “confirms [the answers] correctness”, demonstrates that he “already knew the answer” and treats the answer as a “progression towards something more” (Margutti and Drew, 2014:442-3). Following such positive evaluation, the lecturer begins his original IRE sequence: “if we can explai::n (.) a certain type of behaviour (0.6) at the level of: 1.3) brain chemistry rather than at the level of social explanations (1.0) is one (.) answer more true than the other”. Whilst this question, as in all of the previous examples, is recognisable as a question (Robinson, 2016:3-4) and thus, imposes conditional relevance (Schegloff, 1968), the lecturer does not receive an answer resulting in a 3.6 second gap on line 19. Thus an answer is noticeably absent (Schegloff, 1972). It is important to note that in allowing a 3.6 second gap, the lecturer is adhering to Ingram and Elliot’s notion of wait time 1(ii): the silence between the lecturer finishing speaking and the lecturer speaking again (Ingram and Elliot, 2014:14). Thus, the lecturer has waited the appropriate time, as deemed sufficient by research.

Consequently, following the 3.6 second gap, the lecturer reinitiates the IRE sequence on line 21 and in doing so, seeks the students’ *opinion*: “°>what do you think<°”. However, as mentioned previously, unlike in the previous three examples of reinitiating the IRE sequence, the lecturer does not orient to any obvious deficiency in his original question.

Returning back to Zemel and Koshmann's study, they state that reinitiating the IRE occurs due to a first-position trouble source (2011:476). Here, there is no obvious trouble source. Whereas in the previous three examples, a single word could be pinpointed as problematic (*aspects* in extract 1, *thoughts* in extract 2 and *it* in extract 3). Thus, in the previous three examples, it was thought that the students could not provide an answer because the trouble sources were hindering their epistemic access. Consequently, in the previous examples, the reinitiated IREs followed the same (or at least a similar) format to the original IREs (*do your thoughts drive your actions* reinitiated to *do your inner workings drive your actions* in extract 2 and *is it a psychological problem or a social problem* reinitiated to *would that present a psychological problem or would that present a social problem* in extract 3). However, in the current example, the fact that the lecturer does not pinpoint a single word as problematic, which could be hindering their epistemic access, and does not reinitiate the IRE using the same format to the original IRE, but instead produces a syntactically new IRE, suggests that he does not believe there to be an issue with the *wording* of the question. Rather, the lecturer appears to be orienting to an issue with the 'preference for agreement' inherent in yes/no interrogatives (Raymond, 2003:943; Sacks, 2006:30) and consequently, to an issue with the students' epistemic primacy (Stivers et al., 2011:9).

Firstly, the lecturer's original question constitutes a yes/no interrogative ("is one (.) answer more true than the other"). This is particularly significant in reference to preference, as alongside action-preference (i.e., that questions should be answered), yes/no interrogatives typically *prefer* either a 'yes' or 'no' answer (Raymond, 2003:943). As this is teaching environment, 'yes' or 'no' is likely to be synonymous with 'correct' or 'incorrect'. This is crucial because the students orient to this second type of preference even after the pursuit of an answer. For example, student 1 answers "if you [...] then yes" on line 24. Thus, this second type of preference may have complicated the students' willingness to answer.

However, there is evidence in the data to suggest that *neither* answer is preferred. For example, as Raymond demonstrates, speakers can manipulate the design of their yes/no interrogatives to signify which answer is preferred. Raymond uses the examples “can you give me a ride home” versus “you can’t give me a ride home can you”. The former signifies that a “yes” answer is preferred, whereas the latter signifies that a “no” answer is preferred, as the polarity is reversed (2003:943). However, the lecturer’s question has what Quirk et al. (1985) term neutral polarity (Quirk et al., 1985, as cited by Heinman, 2008:61). This is because, in comparing the current example to examples in previous research, Heinman stated that the positive interrogative in her data “have you tried it” signified neutral polarity. Heinman uses the examples “have you tried it” (positive) versus “haven’t you tried it” (negative) (2008:61). Thus, in the current example, “is one answer more true than the other” would constitute a positive interrogative and “isn’t one answer more true than the other” would constitute a negative interrogative. Further evidence to suggest that neither answer is preferred comes from the fact that as previously mentioned, the lecturer produces a syntactically new IRE (“<sup>o</sup>>what do you think<<sup>o</sup>”). If one answer was preferred, he may signify which, for example, in accordance with Raymond’s research, he may reverse the polarity creating the following hypothetical question: “one answer isn’t more true than the other is it”. Finally, evidence to suggest that neither answer is preferred comes from the fact that following student 1’s answer on line 24 (“if you [...] the:n yes”), the lecturer does not treat the student’s “yes” as problematic. Rather, he treats the student’s content as problematic on line 26: “>>no no<< I’m asking you what you think not what your approach might be”. Ultimately, student 1 still provides a “yes” answer on line 34: “yeah I think- (0.9) I think there are more right explan- more right explanations than others” and the lecturer does not treat this a problematic: “ok: :” on line 41. Again, if the student’s “yes” is problematic, the lecturer may signify that a “no” is preferred.

Nevertheless, as the students may orient to this second type of preference, in reinitiating the IRE to seek the students' opinion, the lecturer transforms a "yes" *or* "no" question into a "yes" *and* "no" question. This is because the lecturer's subsequent question allows for mundane talk, which means that the students can talk about their "emotions and subjective opinions" (Stovholt, 2018:234). As the students have the "relative rights to know" their emotions and subjective opinions (Stivers et al., 2011:9), "yes" *and* "no" constitute a 'correct' answer. Whereas in the lecturer's original question, as the lecturer has the "relative rights to know" the academic content, "yes" *or* "no" constitute the 'correct' answer. This can be supported by Willemsen et al. (2018:44) who state that when the students can talk about their emotions and subjective opinions there is objectively *no* 'correct' or 'incorrect' answer. Furthermore, in reinitiating the IRE to seek the students' opinion, the lecturer relies on the turn-design feature 'recipient focused epistemicity' to increase the response relevance, as the students' opinion is asymmetrically within the students' epistemic domain (Stivers and Rossano, 2010:8).

Furthermore, a third type of preference may come into play: a preference for progressivity (Stivers and Robinson, 2006). Stivers and Robinson demonstrate how speakers 'lower their expectations' in regard to preference, for example, they demonstrate how despite non-aligning answers being dispreferred, non-aligning answers are still preferred over non-answers (2006:373), and despite speakers often selecting a next speaker, an answer from any next speaker is preferred to no answer at all (2006:380). Similarly, as Willemsen et al. (2018:48) state: "For holding 'real' discussions with their students, "the more open the invitations, the likelier an actual discussion" seems to be a valid motto.". Thus, alongside "yes" and "no" constituting a 'correct' answer, *any* answer may constitute a 'correct' answer. For example, a non-answer, such as "I don't know", or an elaborate answer, such as "both answers are equally true".

To summarise the above, in the lecturer's original question, *one* answer is preferred. Namely, the students can answer "yes" *or* "no". In the lecturer's subsequent question, *neither* answer is preferred. Namely, the student can answer "yes" *and* "no". Alternatively, in the lecturer's subsequent question, *any* answer is preferred. Namely, the students can answer "yes" and "no", with a non-answer (such as "I don't know"), or with an elaborate answer (such as "both answers are equally true").

Despite this example being 'uncategorisable', as with the previous examples, the following analyses again apply, thus demonstrating their generalisability. By reinitiating the IRE to seek the students' *opinion*, the lecturer has masked the lack of an answer and has refreshed the relevance of an answer (Bolden et al., 2012:140). Moreover, with reference to the accountability to provide an answer, the lecturer assigned the accountability to the students on the basis of the question being asked. In the face of a noticeable absence, the lecturer redistributed the accountability to himself by alleviating the 'preference for agreement' (Raymond, 2003:943; Sacks, 2006:30) and allowing for mundane talk (Stovholt, 2018:234), which the students have the "relative rights to know" (Stivers et al., 2011:9). Finally, the lecturer *reassigned* the accountability back to the students, as by reinitiating the IRE, the lecturer refreshed the relevance for an answer (Bolden et al., 2012:140).

#### **4.6. Acknowledging the FTA via *Pursuit***

Prior to the following extract, the lecturer initiated a new topic by changing the slide on the PowerPoint presentation and asking the question: "why is psychology so individualistic". The students responded to the question without further pursuit. As will be demonstrated in the analysis, student 2 responded to the question by referencing an academic author. This contextual information is thus important, as it demonstrates that the participants were not



previously discussing the author and that student 2 referenced the author on his own accord.

This has many implications regarding knowledge, as will be discussed in detail in the following analysis.

Extract 5: Mark\_W3\_A1\_00:18:23\_V1\_00:17:50\_Spot

1 S2: erm ( ) (0.8) well looking back on papers like (0.3) er: from  
 2 Michael Billig and they (0.9) (dec)ided to throw the who:le concept  
 3 of (.) cognitions into question of whether they- do explain (.) er  
 4 social psychology (.) phenomenon °°an::d°° so that's (0.8) in hence  
 5 (tha-) (0.8) well (1.4) that's the beginning of er discourse analysis  
 6 where they'll just look at it through a: more of a qualitative  
 7 approach where they (0.4) >>which<< which considers the er: social  
 8 environment  
 9 L: yeah  
 10 (0.5)  
 11 S2: >and< (0.4) does high mirror which is (0.3) which has been a-  
 12 analysed and  
 13 (0.5)  
 14 L: y[eah ]  
 15 S2: [just] considering that to- (.) that ideals do change but what  
 16 doesn't change is the fact that er: (3.4) well (0.3) °°erm°° (1.2)  
 17 never mi(h)nd .h h  
 18 L: [well since we're on- on topic of Michael Billig (0.9) you're right  
 19 that he does question: (0.3) not the existence of cognition but the  
 20 po- potentially their >>a-<<< (.) validity as a sole expl- (.)  
 21 explanation of what we do .hhh now >you said that< he:: suggested  
 22 that we look at the qualitative context in that (0.5) instead (0.8)  
 23 is true >>but<< he's suggesting a very particular qualitative context  
 24 and what is that what is his particular understanding of the world  
 25 that he's suggesting ]  
 26 **[(L gazes predominantly at S2, he is seated with his arms crossed)]**  
 27 [(3.8) ]  
 28 **[(L maintains prior gesture)]**  
 29 L: [%I'M PUTTING YOU ON THE SPOT HERE CAUSE YOU MENTIONED THAT YOU READ  
 30 MICHAEL BILLIG SO I'M JUST GONNA kind of ...% ]  
 31 **[(L gazes at S2 and smiles, he is seated with his arms crossed) ]**  
 32 [(0.7) ]  
 33 **[(L maintains prior gesture)]**  
 34 S2: %I've seen assume (0.4) read it [but it's ]%  
 35 L: [huh huh huh] .hhh ]  
 36 **[(L laughs and tilts chin down) ]**  
 37 [%o(h)k [carry on% ] ]  
 38 **[(L smiles, nods and leans forward to pick up drink)]**  
 39 S2: [%>>it wasn't it<<] wasn't the most engaging book to be  
 40 ho(h)nest%  
 41 L: [↑which book was that↑ ]  
 42 **[(L tilts head right and squints eyes)]**  
 43 (0.3)

44 S2: °erm:° (0.5) er: the nintee:::n er: eighty-seven book (0.3)  
 45 [no er:m ]  
 46 L: [Arguing and Th]inking?  
 47 [(2.1) ]  
 48 **[((L tilts head right, squints eyes and puts left hand out forward))]**  
 49 S2: yeah >>I mean<< I'd probably like to read this again though (>>>because  
 50 it seems<<<) quite new (>>of a<<) topic at the time

The extract begins with student 2 responding to the question on line 1: “erm ( ) (0.8) well looking back on papers like (0.3) er: from Michael Billig [...]”. As previously mentioned, the student references an academic author relevant to the topic. Again, it is important to note that the class were not previously discussing the author and that the student referenced the author on his own accord. This is significant because it demonstrates that university students are able to read the academic authors’ papers first-hand. Thus, the student has the same epistemic access in regard to the knowledge source as the lecturer (Stivers et al., 2011:9). Therefore, whilst the lecturer still possesses epistemic primacy, both the lecturer and the student occupy the knowledgeable (K+) end of the epistemic gradient (Heritage, 2012:32). Evidence to support the statement that the lecturer still possesses epistemic primacy comes from the fact that the lecturer positively evaluates the student’s answer on lines 18 (“you’re right”) and 23 (“is true”). Moreover, there is evidence to suggest that the student has read the papers independently, for example, for an assignment, rather than as part of the class curriculum. This is because on line 41 the lecturer produces the question: “↑which book was that↑”. More specifically, the lecturer produces the question with notably higher pitch, tilts his head right and squints his eyes (line 42). This suggests that the lecturer’s question is a ‘genuine’ question. This is significant, as it demonstrates that unlike in other institutional settings, *both* participants have first-hand access to institutional information. Thus, university students have increased “rights and obligations to know” (Pomerantz, 1980:187) institutional information.

The lecturer's positive evaluations, which can be considered explicit meaning they are clear and direct (Margutti and Drew, 2014:439), are perhaps offered in accordance with the students post-positioned self-deprecation (Dobrzycki, 2018) on line 16: "er: (3.4) well (0.3) °°erm°° (1.2) never mi(h)nd .h h". They are themselves face-saving practices, as it is apparent from the long pauses (3.4 and 1.2 seconds), fillers ("well" and "°°erm°°") and self-deprecating remark ("never mi(h)nd") (which is also delivered with audible outbreath, perhaps indicating distress) that the student is losing face.

As Goffman states, "when one finds he is powerless to save his own face, the others seem especially bound to protect him" (1967:28). The student's self-deprecation ("never mi(h)nd") indicates that he is "powerless to save his own face" and thus, the lecturer "protects" him by offering him a "face-saving line of escape" (Brown and Levinson, 2006:317). Namely, the lecturer initiates another questioning sequence on line 23: "he's suggesting a very particular qualitative context and what is that what is his particular understanding of the world that he's suggesting", which gives the student an opportunity to display his knowledgeable (K+) position. The lecturer gazes predominantly at student 2 (lines 26 and 28), which indicates that the question is aimed at him. Thus, the lecturer has made it "possible and even easy" (Goffman, 1967:29) for the student to save his own face.

As with the previous extracts, the lecturer's question is accountable, as it is recognisable (indicated by the interrogative term "what") and understandable (Robinson, 2016:3-4). The lecturer's question is also syntactically and pragmatically complete (Ford and Thompson, 1996:143-150). Thus, the lecturer's question imposes conditional relevance (Schegloff, 1968).

However, the lecturer's face-saving line of escape has the reverse effect, as the lecturer's question is met with a 3.8 second gap on line 27. Thus, not only has a noticeable absence occurred (Schegloff, 1972), but the noticeable absence is attributable to one student in particular. Consequently, student 2 may lose face for a second time. However, rather than allow

the student to lose face, the lecturer treats his question, which could have been face-saving, as face-threatening.

Consequently, on line 29, the lecturer *acknowledges the face-threatening act* by openly declaring that his question runs contrary to the negative-face wants of the student, namely non-imposition (Brown and Levinson, 2006:312-3): “%I’M PUTTING YOU ON THE SPOT HERE CAUSE YOU MENTIONED THAT YOU READ MICHAEL BILLIG SO I’M JUST GONNA kind of ...%”. The act of ‘putting you on the spot’ is paradoxical to ‘freedom from imposition’. Acknowledging the FTA constitutes a redressive actions as it: (1) ‘gives face’ to the student, (2) aims to counteract the potential face damage of the question, and (3) demonstrates that no such face damage was intended, and that the lecturer recognizes the student’s face wants and wants them to be attained (Brown and Levinson, 2006:317). More specifically still, acknowledging the FTA constitutes a negative-politeness strategy (2006:317).

The lecturer’s acknowledgment of the FTA implies that the question is difficult and that the student has not had time to consider the answer. For example, in terms of the difficulty of the question, ‘I’m putting you on the spot’ implies ‘I’m challenging you’, and in terms of the timing of the question, ‘I’m putting you on the spot’, implies ‘I’m rushing you’. Thus, the lecturer ‘gives face’ to the student, as he orients to his own conduct as problematic, rather than to the student’s knowledge as problematic. In regard to epistemic access, the lecturer treats the student as being in a knowing epistemic position regarding ‘the author’s papers’ overall, but as being in an ostensibly unknowing epistemic position regarding ‘the author’s particular understanding of the world’ (Stivers et al., 2011:9). Evidence to support the statement that the lecturer treats the student as being in a knowing epistemic position overall comes from the fact that the lecturer requested information regarding ‘the author’s paper’ even after the student’s post-positioned self-deprecation, and refreshed the response relevance (i.e., by acknowledging the FTA) even after the student’s noticeable absence. Therefore, by openly declaring that ‘I’m

putting you on the spot’, the lecturer aims to counteract the potential face damage of the question, as he gives the student time to consider the answer (resolving the problem of timing) and gives the student the option to produce a non-answer (such as ‘I don’t know’) or an incorrect answer (resolving the problem of difficulty). The student does produce a non-answer on lines 34-40: “%I’ve seen assume (0.4) read it [but it’s ]% [...] [%>>it wasn’t it<<] wasn’t the most engaging book to be ho(h)nest%”, which the lecturer does not treat as problematic; thus, supporting this claim. Rather, the lecturer produces the question on line 41: “↑which book was that↑”, as previously discussed. The fact that the lecturer gives the student the option to produce a non-answer means that he has given him an ‘out’ or again, a “face-saving line of escape” (Brown and Levinson, 2006:317). This can again be thought of in terms of Stiver and Robinson’s preference for progressivity, whereby speakers ‘lower their expectations’ in regard to preference (2006).

Again, as with all the previous examples, the following analyses again apply. Firstly, the lecturer redistributes the accountability to produce an answer to himself by orienting to a deficiency in his *own* speech (Zemel and Koschmann, 2011:476). Namely, the question is difficult and thus, runs contrary to the negative-face wants of the student (Brown and Levinson, 2006:313). Whilst the student is in a knowing epistemic position regarding ‘the author’s papers’, he is in an ostensibly unknowing epistemic position regarding ‘the author’s particular understanding of the world’. Thus, the question is unintelligible (Robinson, 2016:4), as the student does not possess that knowledge. To recover the unintelligibility of the question, the lecturer acknowledges the FTA, which provides for the student to produce a non-answer (such as ‘I don’t know’) as a plausible option. Finally, the accountability to produce an answer is reassigned to the student, as by acknowledging the FTA, the lecturer refreshes the relevance of a response (Bolden et al., 2012:140). The potential face damage to the student is “the problem the [lecturer] sets out to redress” (Bolden et al., 2012:183); thus, pursuing an answer is not “the

focal action of the turn” (Bolden et al., 2012:183). Therefore, acknowledging the FTA aligns with the aim of the current research, which is to investigate how lecturers pursue an answer in a *covert* manner.

However, it must be noted that acknowledging the FTA in itself is not a covert practice. By definition, acknowledging the FTA means *openly declaring* that the question runs contrary to the negative-face wants of the student(s). Thus, it is important to consider why the lecturers employ such practice when there are more covert practices available (such as incrementing or reinitiating the IRE sequence, as previously discussed). One possible explanation is due to the turn-allocational delivery of the question meaning that frequently, when the lecturers acknowledge the FTA, there is a designated next speaker (Duran and Jacknick, 2020:2). Specifically, there are 8 examples of acknowledging the FTA whereby there is a designated next speaker. This can be compared to 2 examples of incrementing and 2 examples of reinitiating the IRE sequence. This is significant because in these examples, *one* student is accountable to produce an answer.

#### **4.7. Acknowledging the FTA via *Termination***

The principal practice in the following extract is acknowledging the FTA to *terminate* the question-answer sequence. Thus, the following extract deviates from the aim of the research, which is to investigate how lecturers pursue an answer. However, the following extract is important for a number of reasons. Firstly, prior to the lecturer acknowledging the FTA, the lecturer employs five practices to pursue an answer. Thus, the extract illustrates that the practices are not always met with success, and that the practices are often used in conjunction. Secondly, the extract illustrates how the lecturers manage instances whereby the practices are not met with success. Thirdly, it has been argued throughout the analysis that the lecturers

orient to the intelligibility of their questions as problematic. However, the current extract illustrates that the lecturers purposely produce unintelligible questions for pedagogical purposes. This will be explained in detail in the following analysis.

The following extract occurred shortly after the students had been involved in a group task. The students had been discussing “what defines a language”. Whilst such discussions were taking place, the lecturer walked about the room, listening to the discussions and often joining in.

Extract 6: Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_00:26:37\_V1\_00:26:16\_Sweedish\_and\_Danish

1 S1: <it's a way of> like- (0.8) just (0.8) logistics way of (1.6)  
 2 communicating slash (1.2) <talking? to people> like that can maybe  
 3 (survive) one- one or two (0.6) so like not just talking to yourself  
 4 like you're talking to other people or communicating: with that side  
 5 language or a (0.4) um the- >kind of< a way a way to express what  
 6 you're thinking  
 7 L: uh huh (0.5)  
 8 [and then how does that <differentiate> itself from another language]  
 9 **[(L gazes around room and moves both hands slowly up and down)]** ]  
 10 [that ] [does the same thing ] (0.4)  
 11 **[(L lifts left hand towards S1)] [(L gazes towards S1)]**  
 12 [but differently (.) possibly using a different grammatical:: ... ]  
 13 **[(L gazes around room and moves both hands slowly up and down)]**  
 14 [(2.5) ]  
 15 **[(L maintains prior gesture)]**  
 16 L: [°°how else°° ]  
 17 **[(L gazes around room and moves both hands slowly up and down)]**  
 18 [(2.2) ]  
 19 **[(L maintain prior gesture)]**  
 20 L: so how do we differentiate for example between  
 21 [(0.8) °er::m ]  
 22 **[(L gazes down)]** mos:: ° (0.5)  
 23 [Swedish:: ]  
 24 **[(L shakes head, smiles and puts both hands out forwards)]** (1.3)  
 25 a:nd (1.5) [Danish:: ] (.)  
 26 **[(L puts left hand out forward)]**  
 27 [Danish and Norwegian is the classic example ]  
 28 **[(L tilts head right, smiles and puts both hands out forwards)]**  
 29 [(1.9) ]  
 30 **[(L maintains prior gesture)]**  
 31 L: [how do we know that one's- (.) they're two languages ]  
 32 **[(L gazes around room and shakes left hand side to side)]**

33 [are they two languages ]  
 34 **[((L nods head and puts left hand out forwards))]**  
 35 (0.5)  
 36 L: [Nor[wegian ] [and Danish ]  
 37 **[[(L lifts left hand up)]] [(L drops left hand down)]]**  
 38 S2: [°yeah° ]  
 39 (.)  
 40 S2: yeah  
 41 S3: pronunciation  
 42 S4: like speech language °°( )°°  
 43 (1.3)  
 44 L: yeah (0.4) speech (stands) important aspect there (.) going back to  
 45 Josie's point about grammar  
 46 (1.6)  
 47 L: [where are we with Norwegian and Danish ]  
 48 **[((L gazes around room and moves both hands slowly up and down))]**  
 49 **[(6.0) ]**  
 50 **[((L gazes around room, moves both hands slowly up and down and**  
 51 **smiles)) ]**  
 52 L: [so it's quite interesting ] .h so (1.1)  
 53 **[((L changes slide on presentation))]**  
 54 [there's a few spanners in the work imme- works immediately when you]  
 55 **[((L gazes around room, moves both hands around and smiles)) ]**  
 56 [start to follow up on some of the:::se these ↑notions↑ ]  
 57 **[((L gazes around room, moves both hands around and smiles))]**

The extract begins with student 1 making a contribution on lines 1-6: “<it's a way of> like- [...]”. The lecturer utilises student 1's contribution to initiate another questioning sequence beginning on line 8: “and then how does that <differentiate> itself from another language that does the same thing (0.4) but differently (.) possibly using a different grammatical:::1 ...”. As with all of the previous examples, the lecturer's question is recognisable as a question (Robinson, 2016:3-4). Moreover, to aid such recognisability, whilst producing her question, the lecturer gazes around the room and moves both hands slowly up and down (lines 9, 11 and 13). Most importantly, the lecturer maintains such gestural cues during the subsequent 2.5 second gap that emerges on line 14. As Peräkylä and Ruusuvuori (2012:12) demonstrate, maintaining facial expression serves as a pursuit of response. The lecturer's facial expression can be described as ‘questioning’, as whilst her mouth is neutral, her eyes are serious and direct. The lecturer's head is tilted down towards the students and she focuses her gaze on one row at a time. Shifting her gaze from one row to the



next also means that the lecturer's facial expression is made available to all of the students (Peräkylä and Ruusuvuori, 2012:13). Moreover, there is the accompanying movement of the lecturer's hands. The movement closely resembles that of 'weighing up the options'. Thus, the movement can be thought of in terms of Drew and Kendrick's notion of searching (2018). Whilst Drew and Kendrick refer to searching in a physical sense, for example, if someone were to extend their hand to reach for something, but stop and remain stationary (2018:6), here the lecturer appears to be searching in an abstract sense.

However, it could be argued that the lecturer's question is not understandable (Robinson, 2016:3-4). Firstly, the overall wording of the question is ambiguous, for example, the antonyms 'same' and 'different' are juxtaposed: "how does that <differentiate> itself from another language" followed by "that does the same thing" and finally "but differently". Secondly, the question is not syntactically or intonationally complete (Ford and Thompson, 1996:143-147), as the lecturer flouts the grammatical constitution of turn completion by producing a trail off (Schegloff, 1996b:87). Therefore, there may be "a breakdown in the accountable intelligibility" of the question (Drew and Penn, 2016:55). Consequently, there is a 2.5 second gap on 14 whereby an answer is noticeably absent (Schegloff, 1972). The lecturer thus, employs practices to pursue an answer.

Firstly, the lecturer reinitiates the IRE sequence on line 16: "°°how else°°". Such re-initiation appears designed to refresh the relevance of an answer (Bolden et al., 2012:14). Secondly, the lecturer reinitiates the IRE sequence again on line 20: "so how do we differentiate for example between (0.8) °er::m moss::° (0.5) Swedish:: (1.3) a:nd (1.5) Danish::". Such re-initiation appears designed to turn "the general" ("another language") into "the concrete and specific" ("Swedish:: (1.3) a:nd (1.5) Danish::") (Antaki, 2002:422-3). Thirdly, the lecturer acknowledges the FTA on line 27: "Danish and Norwegian is the classic example". Such acknowledgment appears designed to openly

declare that the question is difficult (i.e., it is not the straightforward, standard example). Fourthly, the lecturer reinitiates the IRE sequence again on line 31: “how do we know that one’s- (.) they’re two languages ↑are they two languages↑”. Such re-initiation appears designed to change the overall wording of the question(s). Finally, the lecturer produces an add-on on line 36: “Norwegian and Danish” (Couper-Kuhlen and Ono, 2007:515). Such add-on appears designed to replace the indexical reference “they” (“are they two languages”) with “the concrete and specific” reference “Norwegian and Danish”, as previously mentioned. Overall, following the lecturer’s initial question beginning on line 8, four noticeable absences occur (lines 14, 18, 29 and 35) and the lecturer employs five practices to pursue an answer. Finally, student 2 produces an answer on line 38: “°yeah°”, which is shortly followed by two more answers produced by students 3 and 4 on lines 41 and 42: “pronunciation” and “like speech language”.

The above is crucial in explaining why, when the lecturer initiates another questioning sequence on line 47 (“where are we with Norwegian and Danish”), after a fifth noticeable absence occurs on line 49, the lecturer acknowledges the FTA to *terminate* the question-answer sequence beginning on line 52: “so it’s quite interesting .h so (1.1) there’s a few spanners in the works immediately when you start to follow up on some of the::se these ↑notions↑”. As previously stated, because *both* actions in a question-answer sequence are accountably implemented (Heritage, 2006a:3), when noticeable absences occur, *both* participants may lose face (Goffman, 1967). Thus, considering that five noticeable absences have occurred, the lecturer may have terminated the question-answer sequence to avoid any further face damage. Again, as with extract 5, acknowledging the FTA to terminate the question-answer sequence thus, constitutes a redressive action, as it ‘gives face’ to the students, i.e., it is not that the students lack knowledge, it is that “there’s a few spanners in the

work”. More specifically, acknowledging the FTA constitutes a softening mechanism, as it gives the students an ‘out’, or a face-saving line of escape (Brown and Levinson, 2006:317).

Alternatively, the lecturer may have terminated the question-answer sequence because there is no answer, i.e., as previously mentioned, the lecturer may have purposely produced an “illegitimate” question. Evidence to support the claim that the lecturer may have purposely produced an “illegitimate” question comes from the fact that the lecturer self-initiates self-repair (Schegloff et al., 1977:364) on line 31: “how do we know [...] they’re two languages †are they two languages†” and acknowledges the FTA on line 54: “there’s a few spanners in the work”. Crucially, in *all* of the examples of acknowledging the FTA to terminate the question-answer sequence, the lecturers orient to their questions as “illegitimate” questions (i.e., as questions that do *not* have answers). The examples have been displayed in table 4.4. below. However, in all of the examples, prior to acknowledging the FTA, the lecturers treat their questions as legitimate questions (i.e., as questions that *do* have answers). For example, in all of the examples, the lecturers leave a gap for the students to produce an answer.

Table 4.4. Acknowledging the FTA to terminate the question-answer sequence

(1)	<i>there’s a few spanners in the work</i>
(2)	<i>it’s more of a question that doesn’t necessarily have an answer</i>
(3)	<i>I can’t answer that</i>
(4)	<i>I wouldn’t expect a guy to stick their hand up even if they did feel that way</i>
(5)	<i>I don’t think anybody has an answer to that</i>
(6)	<i>I’m doing this deliberately [...] it’s actually a really hard question to answer</i>

However, the lecturers' "illegitimate" questions may be beneficial for pedagogy. As Brown and Levinson (2006:319) state:

"the payoff for the fifth strategic choice, 'Don't do the FTA', is simply that S avoids offending H at all with this particular FTA. Of course S also fails to achieve his desired communication"

For example, in the current example, the lecturer may have purposely produced an "illegitimate" question "to achieve [her] desired communication" of demonstrating that "what defines a language" is a complexed topic requiring further investigation.

Ultimately, as with all of the previous examples, the lecturer redistributes the accountability to produce an answer to herself by orienting to a deficiency in her *own* speech (Zemel and Koschman, 2011:476). Namely, the question is "illegitimate" and therefore, not accountably intelligible (Robinson, 2016:4). The lecturer acknowledges the FTA, which provides the students with a face-saving line of escape (Brown and Levinson, 2006:317).

#### **4.8. Discussion**

The analysis focuses on 'Pursuing an Answer' in a particular sequential position: when a lecturer has asked a question and the students' answer is noticeably absent. Three practices for pursuing an answer have been identified: (1) adding a grammatically fitted increment to continue the question (Schegloff, 1996b); (2) reinitiating the Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) sequence (Zemel and Koschmann, 2011) to produce a subsequent version (Davidson, 1984) of the question; and (3) acknowledging the Face-Threatening Act (FTA) (Brown and Levinson, 1987) to openly declare that the question runs contrary to the negative face-wants of the students (Brown and Levinson, 2006:313). As has become evident in the analysis, there are multiple similarities between the three practices.

Firstly, in all of the examples (apart from extract 4, which was included purposely to provide a comparative example) the lecturers orient to deficiencies in their *own* speech, rather than the students' lack of knowledge (Zemel and Koschman, 2011:476). Thus, in all three practices the lecturers treat their original questions as being accountably unintelligible (Robinson, 2016:3-4) due to a first-position trouble source (Zemel and Koschman, 2011:476). In the first three examples, the first position trouble source can be pinpointed to a single word (*aspects, thoughts, it*). In the subsequent examples the first position trouble source is not so singular; rather, it relates to the lecturers' questions overall (for example, the difficulty and legitimacy of the questions). In treating their original questions as accountably unintelligible, the lecturers employ answer pursuing practices to "recover" the intelligibility of the original question (Drew and Penn, 2016:57): adding an increment (Schegloff, 1996b), reinitiating the IRE sequence (Zemel and Koschmann, 2011), or acknowledging the FTA (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Moreover, in treating their original questions as accountably unintelligible, the lecturers redistribute the accountability – both in terms of the lecturers' accountability to ask the students understandable questions and the students' accountability to answer the lecturers' questions – to themselves. Whilst the term accountability is itself multifaceted, in the following discussion it will be used as an umbrella term to encompass both of the above aspects of accountability in relation to both sets of participants. Thus, in all three practices there is an overarching sequential pattern whereby accountability is redistributed.

Firstly, accountability is assigned to the students on the basis of the question being asked, as the lecturer's question makes the students' answer conditionally relevant. Secondly, accountability is redistributed to the lecturer on the basis of the question containing a first-position trouble source, which makes the question accountably unintelligible. Thus, the lecturer employs an answer pursuing practices to recover the accountable intelligibility of the question. Thirdly, accountability is reassigned to the students on the basis of the answer pursuing practice

refreshing the conditional relevance of the students' answer. What is more, not only do the lecturers redistribute the students' accountability to produce an answer, they also increase the students' accountability to produce an answer. For example, the lecturers consistently relied on the turn-design feature 'recipient-focused epistemicity' to pursue an answer (Stivers and Rossano, 2010:8): "you were chatting about some of these aspects" (extract 1), "what do *you* think" (extract 4), "you mentioned that *you* read Michael Billig" (extract 5), and "how do *we* differentiate" and "how do *we* know" (extract 6). Relying on the turn-design feature 'recipient-focused epistemicity' to pursue an answer is beneficial for two reasons. Firstly, it increases the response relevance beyond the relevance inherent in requesting information. This is because the students' experiences, emotions and subjective opinions are asymmetrically within the students' epistemic domain meaning the students will treat themselves as accountable to produce an answer (Stivers and Rossano, 2010:8-9). Secondly, it makes it easier for the students to produce an answer. This is because the students have the "relative rights to know" (Stivers et al., 2011:9) their experiences, emotions and subjective opinions meaning the students can produce an answer which objectively cannot be 'incorrect' (Willemsen et al., 2018:44), for example, extract 4: "what do *you* think". Moreover, this is because the lecturers can increase the students' degree of certainty (Stivers et al., 2011:9), for example, extract 1: "you were chatting about some of these aspects".

Finally, in all three practices the lecturers mask the lack of an answer and refresh the relevance of an answer (Bolden et al., 2012:140). Most importantly, the lecturers refresh the relevance of an answer without making pursuing an answer "the overt business of talk" (Bolden et al., 2012:140). Rather, recovering the accountable intelligibility is the "the problem the [lecturer] sets out to redress" (Bolden et al., 2012:183). This can be further explained in reference to on record and off record acts (Brown and Levinson, 2006:316). For example, in extract 2 the repair was done on record (*let me rephrase*) meaning that the pursuit was done off

record. Similarly, in extract 5, the acknowledgment of the FTA was done on record (*I'm putting you on the spot*) meaning the pursuit was done off record. Thus, all three practices can be considered *covert* practices for pursuing an answer, which coincides with the aim of the research.

Furthermore, in addressing the deficiencies in their own speech, the lecturers simultaneously address any ostensible issues in the students' knowledge that the deficiencies may have caused.

In extracts 1 and 2 the lecturers orient to the clarity of their questions as being potentially problematic and consequently, change problematic references (*aspects, thoughts, inner workings*) to understandable references (*conserving, inner workings, so it's not just thoughts ...*) (Pomerantz, 1984c:152). Thus, in reference to epistemic access, the lecturers may treat the students as being in unknowing epistemic positions (Stivers et al., 2011:9) *because of* the problematic references.

In extracts 3 and 6 the lecturers orient to the broadness of their questions as being potentially problematic and consequently, change "general" references (*racism, another language*) into "concrete and specific" references (*people in particular ethnic groups are horrible and inferior, Swedish and Danish*) (Antaki, 2002:422-3). Thus, in reference to epistemic access, the lecturers may treat the students as being in uncertain epistemic positions (Stivers et al., 2011:9) *because of* the general references.

In extracts 1, 3 and 4, the lecturers orient to the type of knowable of their questions as being potentially problematic and consequently, change type 2 knowledge references (*what might a language offer of value to linguistic science, is it a psychological or a social problem, is one answer more true than the other*) to type 1 knowledge references (*you were talking about some of these aspects, if I go around saying ..., what do you think*) (Pomerantz, 1980:187).

Thus, in reference to epistemic primacy, the lecturers may treat the students as being in ‘secondary’ epistemic positions (Stivers et al., 2011:9) *because of* the type 2 references.

The above is crucial as whilst the lecturers may treat the students as being in unknowing, uncertain or ‘secondary’ epistemic *positions*, the lecturers do not treat the students as lacking knowledge. In relation to epistemic status, it is important to bear in mind that whilst the students and the lecturers typically occupy different positions on an epistemic gradient, i.e., the students are typically less knowledgeable (K-) than the lecturers, the students *are* knowledgeable (K+) on the subject matters under consideration (Heritage, 2012:32). Aside from the fact that the students are *university* students, the students demonstrate that they are knowledgeable in the data. For example, in extract 3 the lecturer produces an assessment regarding “racism” (*this kind of prejudice and race hasn’t gone anywhere*) and the student immediately produces a subsequent assessment (*cognitively speaking racism hasn’t changed but socially speaking it has*). Similarly, in extract 5, the student produces an assessment regarding the academic author “Michael Billig” (*they decided to throw the whole concept of cognitions into question*). As Pomerantz (1984a:57) states, assessments are “*products of participation*”, which means that by producing assessments, the students claim knowledge of that which they are assessing (1984a:57). Next, in extract 4 the lecturer checks what the students do (or do not) know (Pomerantz, 1984c:153) about the psychological concept “Occam’s Razor” and the students confirm that they *do* know about the concept. The student produces a definition of the concept (*if there’s a simple explanation for something then that’s likely the answer to it*), which the lecturer positively evaluates. More generally, the students’ contributions are typically extensive and supported by evidence and logical argument; thus, demonstrating that they are knowledgeable on the subject matters under consideration. Finally, and of the greatest significance, the students consistently produce answers to the lecturers’ questions *after* the lecturers address the deficiencies in their own speech. This provides



evidence to support the statement that the students *are* knowledgeable on the subject matters under consideration; however, the (ostensible) deficiencies in the lecturer's speech may have also caused deficiencies in the students' knowledge.

Returning to the claim that the lecturers do not treat the students as lacking knowledge, evidence to support this claim derives from considering what practices the lecturers *could* have employed to pursue an answer. For example, if the lecturers *did* treat the students as lacking knowledge, they could have reinitiated the IRE sequence to perform a 'knowledge check'. As Pomerantz (1984c:153) states, the student may have a problem understanding a reference because they do not share that knowledge. For example, the lecturer may assume that the student knows about something when he or she does not. As a solution, the lecturer may check what the student does (or does not) know (1984c:153). For example:

Extract 7: Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_00:51:17\_V2\_00:07:06\_Language\_Attrition

- 1 L: if you don't get to use your (1.3) la:nguage you're first language  
 2 and your (0.3) living your everyday life in a >in a< second or a  
 3 third language: .hh er::m over time what happens to your first  
 4 language  
 5 (5.8)  
 6 L: >>do do<< you know the:: u:m ((LS))(1.4) do you know the formal term  
 7 for this linguistically  
 8 (2.9)  
 9 L: has anyone lo:st their first language?  
 10 (4.4)  
 11 L: °so the term is° language attrition (0.7) °when you:° when you go  
 12 through a process of (1.0) .h r(h)e- %realising you can't speak your  
 13 first language anymore%

Briefly, the lecturer produces a question on line 1: "if you don't get to use your (1.3) la:nguage you're first language [...] over time what happens to your first language"; however, the students do not produce an answer, resulting in a 5.8 second gap on line 5 where by an answer is noticeably absent (Schegloff, 1972). Consequently, the lecturer reinitiates the IRE sequence to perform a knowledge check on line 6: "do you know the

formal term for this linguistically”. Thus, the lecturer checks what the students do (or do not) know about “language attrition” (line 11). However, the students still do not produce an answer resulting in another 2.9 second gap on line 8. Next, the lecturer reinitiates the IRE sequence again on line 9: “has anyone lost their first language?”; however, the students still do not produce an answer resulting in a third noticeable absence on line 10. Consequently, the lecturer does treat the students as lacking knowledge by producing an answer to her own question on line 11: “°so the term is° language attrition”. Crucially, there are only four examples of reinitiating the IRE sequence to perform a knowledge check in the data; thus, supporting the claim that the lecturers do not treat the students as lacking knowledge.

Having focused on the similarities between the three practices, the remaining discussion will focus on the *differences* within and between the practices. Beginning with the former, it is important to focus on the differences *within* the practices for two reasons: first, to disclose the noticeable or anomalous examples in the collection and second, to highlight the examples in the collection which provide for future research.

Focusing first on incrementing, alongside the primary example of incrementing in extract 1 (*when you were talking about conserving*), there was also an example of incrementing in extract 2 (*so it's not just thoughts but I'm gonna include emotion in there as well*). In considering just these two examples, it is already evident that there are differences within the practice. This is because in extract 1 the lecturer added an increment to *replace* the problematic reference (*aspects* replaced with *conserving*), whereas in extract 2 the lecturer added an increment to *clarify* the problematic reference (*thoughts* clarified with *so it's not just thoughts but I'm gonna include emotion in there as well*). Therefore, whilst all the examples in the collection are structurally similar and share the same overall benefits – for example, converting an inter-TCU gap into an intra-TCU pause (Bolden et al., 2012:140) and “com[ing] off

(retroactively) as having been part of the utterance all along” (Mandelbaum, 2016:133) – it could be argued that certain examples also carry unique benefits. For example, whilst there were not enough cases of the following phenomenon to create a subcollection presently, there were three cases whereby the lecturers added an increment to *personalise* the question. For example:

Extract 8: Blair(Att)\_W3\_A2\_01:24:32\_Most\_Valuable

- 1 L: are they the most valuable?  
 2 (0.3)  
 3 L: for us?

Extract 9: Mark\_W7\_A1\_00:17:55\_Discourse\_Analysis1

- 1 L: .hhh so (1.0) what is discourse analysis  
 2 (0.3)  
 3 L: to you

Extract 10: Mark\_W7\_A1\_00:17:55\_Discourse\_Analysis2

- 1 L: why is that important  
 2 (0.6)  
 3 L: for us as psychological researchers

These cases would be interesting to explore in detail in future research; however, what is importantly presently, is that personalising increments, have the unique benefit of converting type 2 knowledge to type 1 knowledge (Pomerantz, 1980:187). Take the first case as an example: “are they the most valuable? (0.3) for us?”. The participants are discussing Second-Language Learning in British schools (specifically, French, German, Spanish and Italian). The lecturer then asks: “are they the most valuable?” (i.e., referring to the aforementioned languages). The lecturer’s question seeks type 2 knowledge, as she is asking about British school pupils as a whole; thus, her question seeks an answer which is objective. However, in adding the increment “for us?” , the lecturer’s question seeks type 1

knowledge, as she is asking about the current class of pupils; thus, her question seeks an answer which is personal. This in turn aids to pursue an answer.

Focusing next on reinitiating the IRE sequence by providing an example, in the extract used in the analysis, the lecturer provides an example by including an insertion sequence (Antaki, 2002:413); however, this is not to say that *all* of the extracts in the same collection include an insertion sequence. However, what the extracts in the collection have in common, is that the lecturers change “the general” into “the concrete and specific” (Antaki, 2002:422-3). Thus, these ‘hypothetical scenarios’ as in extract 3 (*if I go around saying that people in particular ethnic groups are horrible and inferior*) and ‘named places’ as in extract 6 (*Swedish and Danish*), have been coined under the umbrella term *example* despite being structurally different. Furthermore, whilst there were not enough cases of the following phenomenon to create a subcollection presently, there were three cases whereby the lecturers provided an ‘anti’ example designed to be rejected (Amar et al., 2021:5). For example:

#### Extract 11: Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_00:26:37\_Sweedish\_and\_Danish

- 1 L: tell me something about for example the bo::rder betwee:n (.) the  
 2 Netherlands and Germany  
 3 (1.6)  
 4 L: a:re we:: in (1.2) Flemish on one side of the border and German on the  
 5 oth↑er↑

#### Extract 12: Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_00:31:05\_Straight\_Lines

- 1 L: why are borders in: countri- central Africa just: nice: straight  
 2 lines  
 3 (0.4)  
 4 L: is it just because they've got ama::zingly handy mountain ranges?

#### Extract 13: Mark\_W3\_A1\_01:15:17\_Throw\_It\_Out\_The\_Window

- 1 L: what does it mea:n for that research  
 2 (2.7)  
 3 L: do we throw it out the win↑dow↑

These cases would be interesting to explore in detail in future research; however, what is importantly presently, is that the lecturers provide absurd answers which are designed to be rejected (Amar et al., 2021:5). Thus, they allow for the joint understanding of what are not plausible answers; limiting the range of what are plausible answers (Amar et al., 2021:11). This in turn aids to pursue an answer.

#### **4.8.1. How the three practices are used in conjunction**

Having incorporated extracts in which the lecturers use more than one answering pursuing practice (for example, extracts 1, 2 and 6), the discussion will now focus on how the three practices are used in conjunction with one another. As previously stated, there are multiple differences between the three practices, but the most significant difference is the degree of covertness. Again, as this coincides with the main aim of the thesis: pursuing an answer in a *covert* manner, this difference warrants further attention. The three practices have been organised onto a ‘Scale of Covertness’ with incrementing being the most covert, and acknowledging the FTA being the least covert.

Evidence to support the claim that incrementing is the most covert practice comes from the fact that increments are designed to be grammatical extensions of the prior TCU (Schegloff, 1996b:90). Increments are therefore, designed to be *dependent* on the original TCU, meaning that the original TCU remains the primary focus of the talk. On the other hand, reinitiating the IRE would constitute a new TCU. Reinitiated IREs are therefore, designed to be *independent* of the original TCU, meaning the *new* TCU becomes the primary focus of the talk (Couper-Kuhlen and Ono, 2007:153). This would explain why, as Mandelbaum states: “increments provide for the additional element to be added to the turn in such a way as to come off (retroactively) as having been part of the utterance all along” (2016:133). Further evidence to

support the covertness of incrementing comes from the fact that previous literature surrounding incrementing typically focuses on ‘ordinary’ conversation, for example, Schegloff (1996b), Ford et al. (2002), Walker (2004), Couper-Kuhlen and Ono (2007), and Schegloff (2016). Whilst incrementing is mentioned in the literature focusing on classroom interaction, it is not commonly described as a practice in its own right. On the other hand, reinitiating the IRE sequence is inherently a pedagogical practice. This is pivotal in understanding *why*, when more than one practice is employed, incrementing is typically employed *after* reinitiating the IRE sequence, as will be discussed next.

There is some evidence to suggest that when the lecturers use more than one answer pursuing practice, reinitiating the IRE sequence is typically the answer pursuing practice used *first*. For example, there are 11 examples whereby reinitiating the IRE proceeded incrementing and five examples whereby reinitiating the IRE proceeded acknowledging the FTA. This can be compared to three examples whereby incrementing proceeded reinitiating the IRE. Whilst this appears to be strong evidence to support the claim that reinitiating the IRE sequence is typically the answer pursuing practice used *first*, the examples are not always clear cut. For example, in two of the examples whereby reinitiating the IRE proceeded incrementing, the re-initiations were produced as the class were finishing individual group discussions. Thus, the re-initiations may have been produced as devices for ‘getting back on track’, rather than as devices for pursuing an answer. Next, in one of the examples, the re-initiation was produced following a student’s repair initiator “sorry”. Thus, the re-initiation may have been produced because the student(s) did not hear the question. Nevertheless, this is a significant observation which can be investigated in future research in order to confirm (or disconfirm) the claim; however, what can be investigated presently is the benefit of reinitiating the IRE sequence first.

An example whereby reinitiating the IRE sequence proceeds incrementing has already been discussed in detail in extract 1. Thus, to ease the present discussion, the analysis will again focus on this extract.

Extract 1: Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_00:15:19\_V1\_00:14:58\_Conserving

- 1 L: what might a language: (.) <offer> of value to:: (.) linguists: (0.3)  
 2 to linguistic science?  
 3 (3.8)  
 4 L: >mm?< (.) °it feels like you were: (.) chatting about some of these  
 5 aspects°  
 6 (2.3)  
 7 L: °when you were talking about conserving:°

As Brown and Levinson state, “everyone’s face depends on everyone else’s being maintained” and therefore, “it is in general in every participant’s best interest to maintain each other’s face” (2006:311). Thus far, the analysis has focused on the students’ face. Here, the analysis will focus on *both* the lecturers’ and the students’ face. Again, question-answer sequences are accountably implemented: the lecturers are accountable to produce recognisable and understandable questions (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973:296) and the students are accountable to produce answers to the lecturers’ questions (Heritage, 2006a:3).

The lecturer produces a question on line 1 (“what might a language: (.) <offer> of value to:: [...] linguistic science?”); however, the students do not produce an answer on line 3. Rather, an answer is noticeably absent (Schegloff, 1972). Therefore, there could be a “breakdown” in the accountable intelligibility of the question (Drew and Penn, 2016:55). The breakdown that the lecturer orients to is the turn-allocational delivery (Duran and Jacknick, 2020:12) and/or the relative authority of knowledge (i.e., a linguistic lecturer producing a question about “linguistic science”) (Stivers et al., 2011:9). The breakdown could indicate “non-success” in the accountable intelligibility of the question (Drew and Penn, 2016:69). Thus, *both* the lecturer and the students could lose face.

Consequently, the lecturer reinitiates the IRE sequence on line 3 (“°it feels like you were: (.) chatting about some of these aspects°”) to “recover” the accountable intelligibility of the question (Drew and Penn, 2016:57). Specifically, the lecturer nominates a designated next speaker and transfers the relative authority of knowledge to the student(s) (“you”). However, the students still do not produce an answer on line 6. Rather, an answer is noticeably absent (Schegloff, 1972). Again, there could be a “breakdown” in the accountable intelligibility of the question, which could indicate “non-success”. This is significant because, as Jefferson states: “the business of correcting can be a matter of, not merely putting things to rights [...], but of specifically *addressing lapses in competence*” (2006:269, original emphasis). Thus, again, *both* the lecturer and the students could lose face.

However, it is important to bear in mind that noticeably absent answers in university seminar discussions are not entirely unexpected. For example, the students may not produce answers to the lecturers’ questions because they lack certainty (Stivers et al., 2011:9), or because they are reluctant to display knowledge (Benwell and Stokoe, 2010:94), rather than because the lecturers’ questions are accountably unintelligible, or because the students lack knowledge. Thus, the lecturers can employ practices to pursue an answer without damaging face to the same extent as in ‘ordinary’ conversation. Therefore, whilst it is *beneficial* that the lecturers employ covert practices to pursue an answer (as has been evidenced in this thesis), it is not as necessary as in ‘ordinary’ conversation. However, after the lecturers employ practices to pursue an answer, if the practices are not met with success, then it appears imperative that the lecturers’ second practices to pursue an answer are as covert as possible.

Consequently, the lecturer adds a grammatically fitted increment on line 7 (“°when you were talking about conserving:°”) to “recover” the accountable intelligibility of the question (Drew and Penn, 2016:57). Specifically, the lecturer self-initiates self-repair on the indexical reference “aspects” (Bolden et al., 2012).



As previously stated, reinitiating the IRE sequence is inherently a pedagogical practice, whereas incrementing is typically an ‘ordinary’ conversational practice. Thus, after employing a ‘traditional’ pedagogical practice, the lecturers can rely on an ‘ordinary’ conversational practice, which is intrinsically more covert, to pursue an answer. Relying on an ‘ordinary’ conversational practice is beneficial for two reasons. Firstly, the lecturer’s grammatically fitted increment “come[s] off (retroactively) as having been part of the utterance all along” (Mandelbaum, 2016:133). Thus, the lecturer’s second practice to pursue an answer is (ostensibly) undetectable to the students *as* a practice to pursue an answer. Secondly, the lecturer’s grammatically fitted increment converts the inter-TCU gap into an intra-TCU pause (Bolden et al., 2012:140). Thus, not only is the lecturer’s second practice to pursue an answer (ostensibly) undetectable to the students *as* a practice to pursue an answer, but it masks that the lecturer’s first practice to pursue an answer was not met with success. This is because the lecturer’s second practice to pursue an answer masks that an answer is noticeably absent (Bolden et al., 2012:140). This in turn aids to lessen the face damage to *both* the lecturer and the students.

Conclusively, when the lecturers use more than one practice to pursue an answer, reinitiating the IRE sequence is typically the practice used *first*. Reinitiating the IRE sequence is inherently a pedagogical practice, whereas incrementing is typically an ‘ordinary’ conversational practice. Thus, after employing a ‘traditional’ pedagogical practice, the lecturers can rely on an ‘ordinary’ conversational practice, which is intrinsically more covert, to pursue an answer.

To briefly summarise my analysis, three covert practices to pursue a noticeably absent answer have been identified: (1) adding a grammatically fitted increment to continue the question (Schegloff, 1996b); (2) reinitiating the Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) sequence (Zemel

and Koschmann, 2011) to produce a subsequent version (Davidson, 1984) of the question; and (3) acknowledging the Face-Threatening Act (FTA) (Brown and Levinson, 1987) to openly declare that the question runs contrary to the negative face-wants of the students (Brown and Levinson, 2006:313). There is some evidence to suggest that when the lecturers use more than one answer pursuing practice, reinitiating the IRE sequence is typically the answer pursuing practice used first. A more in depth summary will be provided in the Conclusion next.

## 5. Conclusion

Taking a conversation analytic approach, this thesis has focused on pursuing an answer (Pomerantz, 1984c) in university seminar discussions. This thesis has important implications for pedagogy, as previous theoretical work focusing on primary and language classrooms (Duran and Jacknick, 2020:4) has had to be reinvestigated to account for the multitude of differences relating to knowledge (Stivers et al., 2011) and turn-taking (McHoul, 1978) inherent in university seminar discussions. Focusing on knowledge, regarding institutional information (i.e., excluding participants' experiences and opinions), whereas in primary classrooms there is a significant knowledge discrepancy between teachers and students, in university seminars, the knowledge discrepancy is significantly diminished. University students have increased "rights and obligations to know" (Pomerantz, 1980:187) institutional information; thus, whilst lecturers possess epistemic status overall (Heritage, 2012:32), the relative epistemic positions of lecturers and students are often shifting. Focusing on turn-taking, whereas in primary classrooms gaps following teachers' questions are expected as a result of turn-taking constraints (McHoul, 1978), such as students bidding to answer (Margutti, 2006:317), in university seminars gaps following lecturers' questions are arguably more noticeable because students can skip the bidding (Willemsen, 2018:46). This highlights the importance of this research because as Bolden et al. (2012:138) state, practices to pursue an answer "can either expose or mask the lack of (immediate) response as the problem the [lecturer] sets out to redress".

Accordingly, three *covert* practices to pursue an answer have been identified: (1) adding a grammatically fitted increment to continue the question (Schegloff, 1996b); (2) reinitiating the Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) sequence (Zemel and Koschmann, 2011) to produce a subsequent version (Davidson, 1984) of the question; and (3) acknowledging the Face-

Threatening Act (FTA) (Brown and Levinson, 1987) to openly declare that the question runs contrary to the negative-face wants of the students (Brown and Levinson, 2006:313). Ultimately, this thesis has argued that the lecturers orient to deficiencies in their *own* speech, rather than the students' lack of knowledge (Zemel and Koschmann, 2011:476). The lecturers treat their questions as accountably unintelligible (Robinson, 2016:3-4) and aim to "recover" the accountable intelligibility (Drew and Penn, 2016:57). For example, in extract 1 in the Analysis the lecturer oriented to the turn-allocational delivery of the question as problematic (Duran and Jacknick, 2020:12) and consequently, produced a subsequent version of the question to reinitiate the IRE sequence whereby a designated next speaker had been nominated. Next, the lecturer oriented to the indexical reference "aspects" as problematic (Bolden et al., 2012) and consequently, produced a grammatically fitted increment whereby a more understandable reference ("conserving") had been offered (Pomerantz, 1984c:152). Hence, the lecturers redistribute the accountability – both in terms of the lecturers' accountability to ask the students understandable questions and the students' accountability to answer the lecturers' questions (Robinson, 2016) – to themselves. Thus, recovering the accountable intelligibility is the "the problem the [lecturer] sets out to redress" (Bolden et al., 2012:183), rather than pursuing an answer, which means that pursuing an answer is "not the focal action of the turn" (Bolden et al., 2012:183). What is more, not only do the lecturers redistribute the students' accountability to produce an answer, they also increase the students' accountability to produce an answer. For example, the lecturers consistently relied on the turn-design feature recipient-focused epistemicity to pursue an answer (Stivers and Rossano, 2010:8): "*you* were chatting about some of these aspects" (extract 1), "if I go around saying" (extract 3), "what do *you* think" (extract 4), "*you* mentioned that *you* read Michael Billig" (extract 5), and "how do *we* differentiate" and "how do *we* know" (extract 6). This is beneficial for two reasons. Firstly, it increases the response relevance beyond the relevance inherent in requesting information. This

is because the students' experiences, emotions and subjective opinions are asymmetrically within the students' epistemic domain meaning the students will treat themselves as accountable to produce an answer (Stivers and Rossano, 2010:8-9). Secondly, it makes it easier for the students to produce an answer. This is because the students have the "relative rights to know" (Stivers et al., 2011:9) their experiences, emotions and subjective opinions meaning the students can produce an answer which objectively cannot be 'incorrect' (Willemsen et al., 2018:44).

Correspondingly, whilst there were not enough examples of the following phenomena to create a subcollection presently, there were three examples whereby the lecturers added grammatically fitted increments to 'personalise' the questions, for example, "are they the most valuable *for us*" (extract 8). These examples would be interesting to explore in further research. Other examples that would be interesting to explore in further research are examples whereby the lecturers added 'anti' examples to be rejected (Amar et al., 2021:5), for example, "do we throw it out the window" (extract 13). Finally, the remaining categorisations of reinitiating the IRE sequence would be interesting to explore in further research. Particularly, it would be interesting to explore the categorisation labelled '*other*'. These are examples whereby syntactically new IREs are produced, which do not resemble the original IREs. Thus, they are ambiguous.

However, there are limitations to the research. For example, Stivers and Rossano (2010:4) also highlight speaker gaze as a turn-design feature to increase the response relevance. Similarly, Peräkylä and Ruusuvuori (2012:29) highlight facial pursuits of response, such as speakers turning their heads to their recipients. However, this research focuses predominantly on verbal pursuits of response. Thus, to fully understand how lecturers pursue an answer, particularly when there are numerous potential next speakers, further research is required on non-verbal pursuits of response.

Crucially, the three practices have been organised onto a ‘Scale of Covertness’ with incrementing being the most covert practice and acknowledging the FTA being the least covert practice. Incrementing is the most covert because, as Mandelbaum (2016:133) states: “increments provide for the additional element to be added to the turn in such a way as to come off (retroactively) as having been part of the utterance all along”. Alternatively, acknowledging the FTA is the least covert because by definition, acknowledging the FTA means *openly declaring* that the question runs contrary to the negative face-wants of the students. This is pivotal in understanding *why*, when more than one practice is employed, reinitiating the IRE sequence is typically employed first. Reinitiating the IRE sequence is inherently a pedagogical practice, whereas incrementing is typically an ‘ordinary’ conversational practice. Thus, after employing a ‘traditional’ pedagogical practice, the lecturers can rely on an ‘ordinary’ conversational practice, which is intrinsically more covert, to pursue an answer.

Conclusively, as Sahlström’s (2009:103) states: “if learning is understood as situated or constituted in interaction, research on interaction will provide for better understanding of learning”. This thesis has provided for a better understanding of learning by reinvestigating previous theoretical work focusing on primary and language classrooms to account for the differences related to knowledge and turn-taking inherent in university seminar discussions. Next, this thesis has provided for a better understanding of learning by focusing on areas of research that are less investigated than their counterparts, for example, by focusing on lecturers’ initiation moves, rather than evaluative moves, and in extension, by focusing on first-position trouble sources, rather than second position trouble sources (Zemel and Koschmann, 2011). Furthermore, by taking a conversation analytic approach, this thesis has provided for a better understanding of learning by adding empirical detail to educational research. As Kimura et al. state (2018:185, original emphasis), there is an “empirical need for understanding how participants *do* teaching and learning”. Finally, not only has the thesis provided for a better

understanding of learning for analysts, the thesis may provide for a better understanding of learning for lecturers. For example, it has been argued that the participants show a clear orientation to epistemic primacy (Stivers et al., 2011:9), as the lecturers consistently relied on the turn-design feature recipient-focused epistemicity to pursue an answer (Stivers and Rossano, 2010:8). This is crucial as it demonstrates that epistemic primacy is an addressable problem and that the practices to pursue an answer identified in this thesis are implementable practices. Thus, this thesis has practical implications, which may benefit lecturers and other educational providers in ‘the real world’.

## 6. References

Amar, C., Nanbu, Z. and Greer, T. (2021) Proffering absurd candidate formulations in the pursuit of progressivity. *Classroom Discourse*, pp. 1-29.

Antaki, C. (2002) Personalised revision of 'failed' questions. *Discourse Studies*, 4(4), pp. 411-428.

Beach, W. A. and Metzger, T. R. (1997) Claiming insufficient knowledge. *Human communication research*, 23(4), pp. 562-588.

Benwell, B. and Stokoe, E. L. (2010) University Students Resisting Academic Identity. In: Griffiths, P., Merrison, A. J., and Bloomer, A. (2010) *Language in Use: A Reader*. London: Routledge, pp. 82-97.

Bolden, G. B., Mandelbaum, J., and Wilkinson, S. (2012) Pursuing a Response by Repairing an Indexical Reference. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(2), pp. 137-155.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. (1987) *Politeness: Some Universal in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 311-323.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. (2006) Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. In: Coupland, N. and Jaworski, A. (2006) *The Discourse Reader*. London: Routledge, pp. 311-323.

Clayman, S. E. and Gill, V. T. (2004) Conversation Analysis. In: Hardy, M. and Bryman, A. (2004) *Handbook of Data Analysis*. [internet] London: Sage, pp. 1-27. Available from <https://methods-sagepub-com.yorksj.idm.oclc.org/book/handbook-of-data-analysis/n26.xml> [Accessed March 2021]

Couper-Kuhlen, E. and Ono, T. (2007) 'Incrementing' in conversation. A comparison of practices in English, German and Japanese. *Pragmatics*, 17, pp. 513-552.

Davidson, J. (1984) Subsequent versions of invitations, offers, requests, and proposals dealing with potential and actual rejection. In: Atkinson, J. M. and Heritage, J. (1984) *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 346-369.

Dobrzycki, H. (2018) 'Doing being knowledgeable': a conversation analytic account of student self-deprecation.

Drew, P. (1991) Asymmetries of Knowledge in Conversational Interactions. In: Warkova, L. and Foppa, K. *Asymmetries in Dialogue*. UK, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, pp. 21-48.

Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In: Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (Eds.) *Talk at work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3-65.

Drew, P. and Penn, C. (2016) On failure to understand what the other is saying. In: Robinson, J. D. (2016) *Accountability in Social Interaction*. [internet] New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-44. Available from <https://oxford-universitypressscholarship-com.yorksj.idm.oclc.org/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190210557.001.0001/acprof-9780190210557-chapter-2> [Accessed August 2020]



Drew, P. and Kendrick, H. K. (2018) Searching for Trouble: Recruiting Assistance through Embodied Action. *Social Interaction Video-Based Studies of Human Sociality*, pp. 1-15.

Duran, D. and Jacknick, C. M. (2020) Teacher response pursuits in whole class post-task discussion. *Linguistics and Education*, 56, pp. 1-15.

Edwards, D. (2000) Extreme case formulations: softeners, investment, and doing nonliteral. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 33(4), pp.347-373.

Flint, N. (2016) Use of percentage signs as a transcription convention. [Personal communication, 7th October]

Ford, C. and Thompson, S. A. (1996) Interactional units in conversation: syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In: Ochs, E., Schegloff, E. A., and Thompson, S. A. (1996) *Interaction and Grammar*. [internet] Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 134-184. Available from: <https://www-cambridge-org.yorksj.idm.oclc.org/core/books/interaction-and-grammar/1625ABF049DED4FA14E57B59D06BCA36> [Accessed April 2020]

Ford, C. E., Fox, B. A., and Thompson, S. A. (2002) Constituency and the Grammar of Turn Increments. In: Ford, C. E., Fox, B. A., and Thompson, S. A. (2002) *The Language of Turn and Sequence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 14-38.

Galatolo, R. and Margutti, P. (2016) Territories of knowledge, professional identities and patients' participation in specialized visits with a team of practitioners. *Patient Education and Counselling*, 99(6), pp. 888-896.

Gill, V. T. (1998) Doing attributions in medical interactions: Patients explanations for illness and doctors' responses. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 61, pp. 342-360.

Goffman, E. (1967) On Face Work. In: Goffman, E. (1967) *Interaction Ritual*. London: Allen Lane, pp. 5-45.

Hardman, F., and Abd-Kadir, J. and Smith, F. (2008) Pedagogical renewal: Improving the quality of classroom interaction in Nigerian primary schools. *Interactional Journal of Educations Development*, 28, pp. 55-69.

Heinemann, T. (2008) Questions of accountability: yes-no interrogatives that are unanswerable. *Discourse Studies*, 10(1), pp. 55-71.

Heritage, J. (2004) Conversation Analysis and Institutional Talk. In: Sander, R. and Fitch, K. (2004) *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction*. Mahwah NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 103-146.

Heritage, J. and Raymond, G. (2005) The Terms of Agreement: Indexing Epistemic Authority and Subordination in Talk-in-Interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68(1), pp. 15-38.

Heritage, J. (2006a) Conversational Organization: Paired Actions. In: Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (2006) *Conversation Analysis. Volume 2. Sequence Organization*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 1-10.

Heritage, J. (2006b) Preference, Pre-Sequences and the Timing of Social Solidarity. In: Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (2006) *Conversation Analysis. Volume 2. Sequence Organization*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 11-25.

Heritage, J. (2012) The Epistemic Engine: Sequence Organization and Territories of Knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 54(1), pp. 30-52.

- Heritage, J. (2013) Epistemics in conversation. In: Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (Ed.) *Handbook of conversation analysis*. Boston: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 659-673.
- Hoey, E. M. (2020) Self-authorizing action: On *let me X* in English social interaction. *Language in Society*, pp. 1-24.
- Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. (1998) What is Conversation Analysis? In: Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. (1998) *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 13-37.
- Ingram, J. and Elliot, V. (2014) Turn taking and ‘wait time’ in classroom interactions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 62, pp. 1-12.
- Jefferson, G. (1981) The abominable ne? An exploration of post-response pursuit of response. In: Shroder, P. (Ed) *Sprache der Gegenwart*. Germany, Dusseldorf: Paedagogischer Verlag Schwann, pp. 53-88.
- Jefferson, G. (2004) Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In: Lerner, G. H. ed. *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation*. Philadelphia. John Benjamins. pp. 13-23.
- Jefferson, G. (2006) On Exposed and Embedded Correction in Conversation. In: Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (2006) *Conversation Analysis. Volume 1. Turn-Taking and Repair*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 267-281.
- Kimura, D., Malabarba, T., and Hall, J. K. (2018) Data collection considerations for classroom interaction research: a conversation analytic perspective. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(3), pp. 185-204.
- Labov, W. (1972) *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, W., & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse: Psychotherapy as conversation*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Lee, S. (2016) Epistemic Asymmetry and Accountability in Service Interaction. In: Robinson, J. D. (2016) *Accountability in Social Interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 175-206.
- Mandelbaum, J. (2016) Delicate matters. In Robinson, J. D. (2016) *Accountability in Social Interaction*. [internet] New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-44. Available from <https://oxford-universitypressscholarship-com.yorksj.idm.oclc.org/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190210557.001.0001/acprof-9780190210557-chapter-4> [Accessed August 2020]
- Margutti, P. (2006) “Are you human beings?” Order and knowledge construction through questioning in primary classroom interaction. *Linguistics and Education*, 17, pp. 313-346.
- Margutti, P. (2011) Teachers’ reproaches and managing discipline in the classroom: When teachers tell students what they do ‘wrong’. *Linguistics and Education*, 22(4), pp. 310-329.
- Margutti, P. and Piirainen-Marsh. (2011) The interactional management of discipline and morality in the classroom: An introduction. *Linguistics and Education*, 22, pp. 305-309.
- Margutti, P. and Drew, P. (2014) Positive evaluation of student answers in classroom instruction. *Language and Education*, 28(5), pp. 436-458.
- McHoul, A. (1978) The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society*, 72(2), pp. 183-213.

- Mehan, H. (1979) *Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom*. Cambridge: Harvard University.
- Merrison, A.J., Bloomer, A., Griffiths, P., Hall, C.J. (2014) *Language in Use: A Coursebook*. 2nd ed. London, Routledge.
- Nassaji, H. and Wells, G. (2000) What's the use of "triadic dialogue"? An investigation of teacher-student interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(3), pp. 376-406.
- Norricks, N. (2004) Hyperbole, extreme case formulation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, pp.1272-1739.
- Peräkylä, A. (2011). Validity in Research on Naturally Occurring Social Interaction. In: Silverman, D (2011) *Qualitative Research*. London: Sage, pp. 365-382.
- Peräkylä, A. and Ruusuvuori, J. (2012) Facial Expression and Interactional Regulation. In: Peräkylä, A. and Sorjonen, M. J. (2012) *Emotion in Interaction*, [internet] New York: Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-32. Available from <https://oxford-universitypressscholarship-com.yorksj.idm.oclc.org/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199730735.001.0001/acprof-9780199730735-chapter-4> [Accessed January 2021]
- Pomerantz, A. and Fehr, B. J. (1997) Conversation Analysis: An Approach to the Study of Social Action as Sense Making Practices. In: Van Dijk, T. A. (1977) *Discourse Studies: a multidisciplinary perspective*. London: Sage, pp. 64-91.
- Pomerantz, A. (1980) Telling my side: "Limited access" as a "fishing" device. *Sociological Inquiry*, 50, pp. 186-198.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984a) Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In: Atkinson, Maxwell, J. and Heritage, J. (1984) *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 57-101.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984b) Giving a source of basis: The practice in conversation of telling "how I know." *Journal of Pragmatics*, 8, pp. 607-625.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984c) Pursuing a response. In: Atkinson, Maxwell, J. and Heritage, J. (1984) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 152-168.
- Raymond, G. (2003) Grammar and Social Organization: Yes/No Interrogative and the Structure of Responding. *American Sociological Review*, 68(6), pp. 939-967.
- Robinson, J. D. (2016) Accountability in Social Interaction. In: Robinson, J. D. (2016) *Accountability in Social Interaction*. [internet] New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-44. Available from <https://www-oxfordscholarship-com.yorksj.idm.oclc.org/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190210557.001.0001/acprof-9780190210557-chapter-1> [Accessed July 2020]
- Romaniuk, T. (2013) Pursuing Answers to Questions in Broadcast Journalism. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 46(2), pp. 144-164.
- Rowe, M. B. (1986) Wait Time: Slowing Down May Be A Way of Speeding Up! *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(1), pp. 43-50.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., and Jefferson, G. (1974) A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language*, 50(4), pp. 696-735.

Sacks, H. (1984) Notes on methodology. In: Atkinson, Maxwell, J. and Heritage, J. (1984) *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 21-27.

Sacks, H. (2006) On the Preference for Agreement and Continuity in Sequences in Conversation. In: Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (2006) *Conversation Analysis. Volume 2. Sequence Organization*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 27-43.

Sahlström, F. (2009). Conversation analysis as a way of studying learning—An introduction to a special issue of SJER. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 53(2), pp. 103–111.

Schegloff, E. A. (1968) Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist*, 70, pp. 1075-1095.

Schegloff, E. A. (1972) Notes on a Conversational Practice: Formulating Place. In: Sudnow, D. (1972) *Studies in Social Interaction*. New York: Free Press, pp. 75-119.

Schegloff, E. A. and Sacks, H. (1973) Opening up Closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4), pp. 289-327.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., and Sacks, H. (1977) The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53(2), pp. 361-382.

Schegloff, E. A. (1979) The Relevance of Repair to Syntax-for-Conversation. *Discourse and Syntax*, 12, pp. 261-286.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996a) Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *American journal of sociology*, 102(1), pp. 161-216.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996b) Turn organization: one intersection of grammar and interaction. In: Ochs, E., Schegloff, E. A., and Thompson, S. A. (1996) *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 52-122.

Schegloff, E. A. (2004) On Dispensability. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 37(2), pp. 95-149.

Schegloff, E. A. (2016) Increments. In: Robinson, J. D. (2016) *Accountability in Social Interaction*. [internet] New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-44. Available <https://oxford-universitypressscholarship-com.yorksj.idm.oclc.org/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190210557.001.0001/acprof-9780190210557-chapter-8> [Accessed August 2020]

Sert, O. and Walsh, S. (2013) The interactional management of claims of insufficient knowledge in English language classroom. *Language and Education*, 27(6), pp. 542-565.

Sinclair, J. M. and Coulthard, R. M. (1975) *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Solem, M. S. and Skovholt, K. (2019) Teacher Formulations in Classroom Interactions. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 63(1), pp. 69-88.

Stivers, T. and Robinson, J. D. (2006) A preference for progressivity in interaction. *Language in Society*, 35(3), pp. 367-392.

Stivers, T., Mondada, L., and Steensig, J. (2011) Knowledge, morality and affiliation in social interaction. In: Stivers, T., Mondada, L., and Steensig, J. (2011) *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*. [internet] Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3-24. Available from: <https://www-cambridge-org.yorksj.idm.oclc.org/core/books/morality-of->

knowledge-in-conversation/23BD5CF0AA84CF2544E71F4B6EC0CD28 [Accessed November 2019]

Stivers, T. and Rossano, F. (2010) Mobilizing response. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43, pp. 3-31.

Stovholt, K. (2018) Establishing Scientific Discourse in Classroom Interaction Teacher Students' Orientation to Mundane Versus Technical Talk in the School Subject Norwegian. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, pp. 229-244.

Stubbs, M. and Robinson, B. (1981) 'Scratching the surface: linguistic data in educational research'. In: Adelman, C. (Ed.) *Uttering, Muttering: Collecting, Using and Reporting Talk for Social and Educational Research*. London: Grant McIntyre.

Svinhufvud, K. (2015) Participation in the master's thesis seminar. Exploring the lack of discussion. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 5, pp. 66-83.

Walker, G. (2004) On some interactional and phonetic properties of increments to turns in talk-in-interaction. *Cross-linguistic studies in conversation*, 62, pp. 147-169.

Weatherall, A. (2011) I don't know as a Prepositioned Epistemic Hedge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 44(4), pp. 317-337.

Willemsen, A., Gosen, M. N., van Braak, M., Koole, T., and de Glopper, F. (2018) Teachers' open invitations in whole-class discussions. *Linguistics and Education*, 45, pp. 40-49.

Zemel, A. and Koschmann, T. (2011) Pursuing a question: Reinitiating IRE sequence as a method of instruction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(2), pp. 475-488.

## 7. Appendixes

### 7.1. Appendix 1: Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form

#### Participant Information Sheet

I am an MA by Research student in the School of Languages and Linguistics investigating classroom interaction. I am using conversation analytic theories and social theories to investigate this setting with the aim of adding to our understanding of both the structural as well as the moral order of classroom interaction.

I will be video recording an undergraduate class at York St John University in which you will take part. This class has been invited to take part in the study, as I require participants who are in the School of Languages and Linguistics or Psychological and Social Sciences. I must emphasise that I will not be testing your ability to interact in a classroom, rather I will be simply observing 'typical' classroom interaction. Therefore, I do not require you to do anything specific for this study. I would like you to go about your seminar session as you usually would.

This study has been ethically designed and approved by the York St John University ethics committee. The data will be transcribed, stored, and managed securely. Raw data will be accessible only to the research team (myself and my supervisors) while extracts containing anonymised data in which you won't be identified may be used for research or teaching purposes. I will pseudo anonymise written transcripts by replacing personal information, such as the names of the participants, with pseudo anonymised alternatives. I will also edit out this information in the video recordings by using audio/video editing software to alter images and voice qualities beyond recognition.

It is important to note that you are not obligated to take part in this study and therefore, it is your decision to consent to or refuse from participating in the research. Refusing consent will not affect how you are treated throughout the recording process. You may also withdraw from the study within one month of the recording being taken without detriment.

I will next ask you to fill in a consent form to confirm whether you are happy or not to be involved in the project.

Whilst I cannot address the specific feature of classroom interaction that I will be studying, as doing so will hinder the validity of my research, I am happy to answer any general questions regarding my study. I will also explain my study in more depth in a short debriefing session after the recording has been made. Here, you will have the opportunity to ask me any specific questions that you may have.

After reading this participant information sheet, I hope to have relieved any anxieties relating to being recorded. Once again, it is integral to point out that I will not be studying your ability to interact in the classroom.

Thank you for your time.

**Holly Dobrzycki**  
School of Languages and Linguistics  
York St John University  
Lord Mayors Walk  
York  
YO31 7EX  
Email: [holly.dobrzycki@yorks.ac.uk](mailto:holly.dobrzycki@yorks.ac.uk)

Name of school: School of Languages and Linguistics

Name of researcher: Holly Dobrzycki

Title of study: Investigating classroom interaction

---

This form is to be completed by the lecturer on behalf of him/herself and the students.

It is important to note that any students who wish to opt-out of the study have the right to do so and will be given a separate form upon request.

Please read and complete this form carefully. If you are willing to participate in this study, ring the appropriate responses and sign and date the declaration at the end. If you do not understand anything and would like more information, please ask.

- I have had the research satisfactorily explained to me in verbal and written form by the researcher. YES / NO
- I understand that the research will involve: naturally occurring data of classroom interaction, i.e. the data is not prompted and I should go about my seminar session as I usually would. I understand that the session will be both audio and video recorded and will last the duration of the seminar session. YES / NO
- I understand that I may withdraw from this study up to one month after the recording has taken place without having to give an explanation. This will not affect how I am treated throughout the investigation process. Please email [holly.dobrzycki@yorks.ac.uk](mailto:holly.dobrzycki@yorks.ac.uk) to withdraw. YES / NO
- I understand that all information about me will be treated in strict confidence and that I will not be named in any written work arising from this study. Original audio and video recordings will be available only to the research team. Anonymized versions of the recordings and the transcripts will be used in scholarly activities (research and teaching). YES / NO
- I understand that any audio/video-tape material of me will be used solely for research and teaching purposes and will be stored on an encrypted hard drive on completion of your research. YES / NO
- I understand that you will be discussing the progress of your research with your supervisors, Helen Sauntson and Bogdana Huma, at York St John University. YES / NO
- I consent to being a participant in the project. YES / NO

(PRINT NAME)	
Signature of Participant:	Date:

## 7.2. Appendix 2: Transcription Conventions (adapted from Merrison et al., 2014)

### Overlapping Turns

[ ] Talk produced in overlap.

### Pauses

(.) A micro pause of less than 0.2 seconds.

(0.3) A longer pause timed to the nearest tenth of a second.

### Characteristics of Delivery

> < Talk delivered at a faster rate than surrounding talk.

< > Talk delivered at a slower rate than surrounding talk.

- Talk cut off mid-flow.

: Elongation of the preceding sound.

? Gradual rising intonation.

. Gradual falling intonation.

! More animated intonation.

... Talk trails off.

### Abnormal Volume and Pitch

◦ ◦ Talk which is quieter than the surrounding talk.

CAPITALS Talk which is louder than the surrounding talk.

↑ ↑ Notably higher shift in pitch.

% Smile voice or putting on a voice (Flint, 2016)



**Non-verbal Activity**

- (h) Audible outbreath.
- (.h) Audible inbreath.
- (ha)/(heh) Syllable of laughter.
- ((cough)) Representations of non-verbal behaviour.
- ((LS)) Lip Smack.

**Transcription Doubt**

- ( ) Talk that cannot be accurately transcribed indicating a possible hearing.

**Other Conventions**

- Odd Spelling Non-conventional spelling is used to more closely represent the actual pronunciation of words.
- Anonymity Where appropriate, personal details.
- Indicates lines of particular interest.

### 7.3. Appendix 3: Adding an Increment Complete Collection

#### (1) Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_00:15:19\_V1\_00:14:58\_Conserving

- L: er::m: (.) and so::: >yeah< (.) >>it's<< worth capturing some of >the-< (.) some of these (.) erm:: the notion of: (.) >of a< language offering something very specific to: linguistic science (.) so e- what might a language: (.) <offer> of value to:: (.) linguists: (0.3) to linguistic science?  
 [(3.8) ]  
 [(L gazes to right side and then left side of room)]
- L: [>mm?< (.) °it feels like you were: (.) chatting about some of these]  
 [(L gazes at and directs left hand towards left front row) ]  
 [aspects° ]  
 [(L gazes at and wiggles fingers towards left front row)]  
 [(2.3) ]  
 [(L gazes at and directs left hand towards left front row)]
- L:→ [°when you were talking about conserving:° ]  
 [(L gazes at and directs left hand towards left front row)]  
 (0.5)
- S1: oh: is it: (.) >like< (1.3) is it whether: (.) °°°(ah::) ( ) (I forgot what we were) >>just talking about<<°°° erm:: (.) >is it a bit ↑like:↑< (.) <protected> (.) ↑like↑

#### (2) Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_00:43:58\_Language\_Murder

- ((individual group discussion))
- L: oka::y (1.5) SO THERE'S QUITE A LOT OF ER:::M::: (.) %CONCERNED FACES LOOKING AT THIS SLIDE% AN' wondering how to define these terms but actually (.) [so:me some excellent efforts here. ]  
 [(individual group discussion quietens down)]
- L: SO:: ER:: (0.8) tell me (1.8) what language murder (0.4) looks like.  
 (0.7)
- L: °°(on the cr(hh) ( ) .h)°°  
 (0.8)
- L: °how- how.° (.) how is that implemented.  
 (0.9)
- L:→ er in a language  
 (4.1)
- S1: [could it- ]  
 S2: [could you-]  
 (.)
- S2: oop sorry go on  
 (.)
- S1: um. (.) >I was jus' gonna say< something (basic) just like kind of stop- (.) by like (0.6) <no:t by choice> >↑like↑< (0.3) or (0.9) breakin' the choice. (.) like kinda (0.3) weren't able to speak it anymo::re?

## (3) Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_01:15:29\_Minority\_Language

- L: so if by (0.3) FORCING people to CONTINUE speaking their mother tongue and to do all their assessments for their:: (0.4) er:: >school subjects< in a tiny minority language (0.6) how does that set them up for their °°f::°° for their fu↑ture↑  
(2.9)
- L: what's the impact of doing that  
(4.2)
- S1: sorry?
- L: what's the impact. (0.4) of (1.0) a really: (0.5) carefully thought through revitalisation process. on a minority language. that allowed those children to experience mother tongue education (.) which is well known to be very good for your: (.) er:m mental >development< and your curriculum understanding (0.7) a really carefully thought through examinations packa:ge? so that you went through and you- you used your first language in those examinations so it's really important like for examinations °°it's (ex( ))°° ...  
(1.7)
- L: where do the children go from there  
(0.7)
- L:→ in the minority language  
(1.5)
- S1: °°they struggle°°=  
L: =°°they struggl(h)e°°  
(0.8)
- L: they struggle to get jobs in the big cities in the important (1.2) globalised community

## (4) Blair(Att)\_W3\_A2\_00:37:53\_Intrinsic\_Motivation

- L: so: for some it would like really push you >wouldn't it<. you'd go away (.) you know y- you don't wanna fail a single exam in your life kind of thing. (0.3) you're one of those people. (0.5) and you go away and you learn your: your verbs and >blah blah blah< (0.3) but for others you: nee:d an e- intrinsic one. (0.4) otherwise it's not making any sense to you (0.4) you'd nee:d to: an intrinsic motivation would be that you (0.5) well (.) what do you think the best intrinsic motivation is for learning a language.  
(0.6)
- L:→ as proven by research. [and also] all anecdotal knowledge  
S1: [(money) ]  
(1.7)
- S1: like- for a job for money  
L: °°°no(h)°°°  
(.)
- S1: oh (0.6) %that's just me then [I'm just money driven%]  
S2: [( )]  
(1.3)
- S3: °relationship°=  
L: relationship (.) (°°°yeah°°°) (0.5) again ( ) (0.7) fa:ll in love with %somebody who speaks a different language% and your motivation for learning that language goes up ↑quite↑ (.) °quite ↑a lot↑°. .hh

er:m so yeah (0.4) >kind of-< (.)  
 [%NOW PRO:VEN RIGHTFULLY BY RESEARCH TO BE THE BEST INTRINSIC]  
 [((student discussion)) ]  
 [MOTIVATION% ]  
 [((student discussion))]

(5) Blair(Att)\_W3\_A2\_01:04:48\_Thoroughly\_Pulled\_Apart\_Language

L: yeah (.) so some of those aspects are kind of both a bit societal and a bit °individual aren't they° .hh where else did you go  
 (1.0)  
 S1: sorry?  
 L: where- what else did you have on your list  
 (0.6)  
 L:→ %now we've thoroughly pu(h)lled a(h)part [la(h)ngu(h)age .hh h(h)uh%]  
 [((student laughter)) ]  
 (0.8)  
 S2: ( )  
 L: °yeah° (.) the lack of the lack of that

(6) Blair(Att)\_W3\_A2\_01:06:11\_Different\_Experience

L: °°yeah°° so there's something more systemic  
 S1: yea:h [maybe ]  
 L: [an' pro]blematic which we were talking about weren't we in terms of the curriculum (0.5) er:m an' ho:w (0.5) if- how many other people have taken up a language here  
 (1.2)  
 L: er:m so we've got some people who've started learnin' (.) B-S-L::  
 (1.7)  
 L: yea:h. an' have you had a really different experience  
 (1.0)  
 L:→ here in terms of language [( )]  
 SA: [((coughing))]  
 (1.4)  
 L: how- >how has it< how has it been for you °°°(two)°°°  
 (2.8)  
 L: how has it changed for you  
 (2.9)  
 S2: are you talking to us  
 L: %°yea::h°%  
 S2: oh ri(h)ght  
 ((group laughter))  
 [((group laughter))]  
 L: [I'm ( )] behind you °°°you're ( )°°°  
 (1.2)  
 S2: er:m I think it was because we actually chose to do it (0.4) whereas it was f:: forced in school like I was just kind of bombarded with languages in school (0.8) a:nd (0.3) an' I wasn't really given (0.6) a choic:e (.) with it (.) whereas I chose to do this I like enjoy the process of learning it  
 (0.7)  
 L: (°°°yeah°°°) °so that's going back to your (.) your- your (.) very valuable point there° (0.5) er:m but I think the curriculum

( ) can't it from a: (.) from a very kind of  
wo:rk shee:t teaching to the test kind of approach to something that  
 feels much more about communication

### (7) Blair(Att)\_W3\_A2\_01:24:32\_Most\_Valuable

- S1: like- (starting out) linguistically they're the easiest languages  
 fo:r for a native speaker of English to learn. if you'll be at the  
 >Foreign Service Institute of America< they're a:ll listed as  
 category one. which er: basically is- >>(is)<< er:  
 (.)
- L: close connections
- S1: yeah. the (B[BC] )
- L: [they're all] (.) on the ( ) European (0.7)  
 family ↑tree↑
- S1: yeah  
 (0.9)
- L: er::m (0.6) two different branches of that. (0.3) you've got two  
 (romance) languages in there (0.4) and (.) they (teutonically) (0.6)  
 er:m (show them that) (0.6) so the::re (.) >they- there< close  
 proximity linguistically and geographically  
 (1.3)
- L: ( ) good. (.) are they the most valua↑ble↑?  
 (0.3)
- L:→ fo:r us?  
 (1.7)
- L: for our school children  
 (2.7)
- S1: what do you mean by valuable
- L: %we(hh)ll [(0.3)] I(h)'m leaving that one in your ↑pot↑% so exactly.
- SA: [hhh ]  
 what do we mean by valuable  
 (1.9)
- S2: I mean if your only intention with a language is to use it when you  
 travel (0.6) then (0.3) travelling around Europe (.) well before  
 Brexit was (.) [pretty easy ]  
 [((S2 laughter))]  
 [(0.8) ]  
 [((S2 and L quiet laughter))]
- S2: [I'm not sure (.) if that's gonna be the case in a ]  
 [((L quiet laughter)) ]  
 lo[ng time BUT ]
- L: [%literally the firs]t person to: mention the wo:rd% but I feel  
 like it we might be on a ((whooshing noise)) now  
 ((group laughter))

### (8) Blair(Att)\_W3\_A2\_01:56:22\_Too\_Late

- L: it's interesting cuz I wouldn't- I wouldn't necessarily say that the  
education system certainly sees secondary language learning in the  
 same (0.3) in the same light. (0.5) er:m but I find it very  
 interesting that you: (.) >that-< that you do (0.7) er:m IS: learning  
 a language as an adult too- too late?  
 (0.4)

- L: too: late for you care↑er↑?  
(0.8)
- L:→ development for example if it was for ...  
(3.2)
- S1: °>I don't< I don't think so°  
(2.6)
- L: cuz you'd learn it in a different way wouldn't you (0.4) if you were doing it for a particular reason it would be: °you know° throw yourself into that language community °°an' an'°° (0.7) get yourselves a %fluency a lot quicker than you would with four years in a school environment% (°°°yeah°°°) (0.5) °very very interestin'°

### (9) Blair(Att)\_W5\_A1\_00:22:30\_Sit\_With\_You

- L: but if you want any help honing down narrowing down (0.9) finding publicly available discourse on your given topic °er:m just come and have a chat with me° (0.8) °°ok°° (0.9) er:m (0.5) a:ny queries about that.  
(0.3)
- L:→ at the moment  
(0.7)
- L: °°or shall I just let it sit with you°° (°°°for a while°°°)  
(2.8)
- L: again other people get to the narrowing of their topics by: working out as they're doing their online postings .hh which particular postings are the ones that were actually (0.4) °you know° .hh %getting the heated debated going or% (0.4) erm

### (10) Blair(Att)\_W5\_A1\_02:05:04\_Attitudinally

- L: an:d (.) and therefore he sits back on his reputation on his own professional reputation (0.7) er:m (.) a- as: as being an impressionist. and theref: and <there-fore> (0.4) what's the impact of that  
(1.9)
- L:→ attitudinally  
(3.2)
- L: >hh shall I bring you in< huh huh [↑heh↑]
- S1: [°hhh ]h(.h)m°=
- L: =at this point .h you had quite a (viscivorus) reaction to this  
(0.5)
- S1: I just think he was taking <the mick?> a bit like (1.1) of them >that< I think it just- (1.0) um (.) reiterated. (0.8) °°that it was like a°° (0.7) a different (0.4) wrong ( ) thing to do  
(0.4)
- L: °°((LS))°° (0.6) there's an interesting thing about this being the spokesperson isn't there in terms of whether it PERPETUATES (1.0) linguistic attitudes.

### (11) Blair(Att)\_W7\_A1\_00:28:41\_Translanguaging

- L: so. (0.8) this all goes back to cognition (.) and how we think (0.3) of how we store languages in our heads (1.6) so: how- °°°eh°°° how many people here do have more than one language.  
(1.4)

- L:→ erm >a- a- a-< at their disposal  
(1.8)
- L: °°yep°°  
(1.8)
- L: °and how do kind of° (0.6) VISUALISE that in your head  
(0.3)
- L: do you have a separate filing cabinet? for language and another for  
another language?  
(2.8)
- S1: s:ome sometimes but- (0.4) like- (0.4) (when I'm around) different  
people (.) it (0.5) looks (0.3) way different  
(0.7)
- S1: [( )]  
L: [tell me mo]re
- S1: >so ↑like↑< (.) >I don't know< (0.4) u:m (0.9) with my family (0.7)  
like they came to the ( ) and we just ((clicks finger)) went into  
it (0.9) er:m (0.3) so they're just kind of both just kind of  
SWIMMING AROUND I GUESS (0.6) but then ninety-ninety percent of the  
time (0.5) in England (.) it's very much (0.5) in English yeah  
(0.8)
- L: %that's perfect%  
(0.9)
- L: SO (0.6) the swimming around. bit
- S1: >well I cud-< I could have phrased that differently=  
L: =no: I love it (.) no. I don't want you to rephrase that I love it .h  
(0.3) er:m (.) that's translanguaging.

### (12) Blair(Att)\_W8\_A1\_01:36:33\_Reading\_Wise

- L: and we spoke a little bit last week about (.) like- how to: (0.5) how  
to approach reading how to think about maybe not readi(h)ng (both-)  
the entire thing (0.4) er: so today I said nothing. in that regard  
did anybody decide to °°a-°° (.) attack (0.7) thei:r paper (0.5) in a  
particular way or did you all just start (0.8) the abstract an' (0.3)  
°go through to the end° did anyone do anythi:ng in- interesting.  
(0.7)
- L:→ reading wise  
(1.7)
- S1: I tried to get the gist of it (.) and the:n (0.4) went back and  
highlighted (0.3) and the:n used my highlight (.) to make notes.  
(0.3)
- L: right (0.3) that's interesting (0.6) yeah

### (13) Blair(ELL1)\_W5\_A2\_00:21:10\_Problematic

- ((students involved in individual group discussions))  
[((students involved in individual group discussions)) ]
- L: [ok so whe::re were ( ) what- what is it that's not (0.7)]  
[((students involved in individual group discussions))]  
[quite (0.4) ]  
[((individual group discussions dying down))]  
[doing the job here ]  
(0.6)
- L: can you name some aspects of it

(0.5)  
L:→ that're problematic  
(0.3)  
S1: [( )]  
[ ((coughing)) ]  
(0.3)  
L: sorry=  
S1: =°°° ( )°°°  
(0.3)  
L: grammar. >so-< °f-° er: the:  
(0.7)  
S2: can't ca[n't ] (0.3) can't=  
L: [°um°]  
L: yea(h)h (.) [so the]  
S2: [can't ]  
(0.6)  
L: yea:h  
(0.5)  
L: so:: so there's the contraction in itself which: will probably not  
read particularly academically

#### (14) Blair(ELL2)\_W7\_A1\_00:37:30\_Adrenaline

L: AN' IT'S WORTH really focusing in I think on the:: (1.0) thou- the  
two words that (.) are the most prominent there which is: <anxious  
and ne:rvous> (1.5) to actually question (1.6) ho:w negative emotion  
they are or not. (1.4) in::: the context of giving presentations.  
(1.1) er:m (1.3) so quick poll how many: of you >actually vote<  
either anxious or nervous  
(0.8)  
L:→ °°i:n this:°°  
(1.6)  
L: there must have been a fair few of you er:m (1.8) A:RE NERVES a bad  
thing?  
(1.2)  
L: are nerves about a presentation intrinsically a bad thing  
(2.0)  
S1: °°°no°°°=  
S2: =( ) [( )] [ ((S2 laughter)) ]  
L: [yea:h just] [say that an' I was like yeah]  
°>I ge-<° that's what I said [to the last group] .hhh SO there's  
[ ((S2 laughter)) ]  
something abou:t the way I think that we as a society .hh think  
abou:t (0.8) anxiety. is:: (0.8) probably problematic [(0.3) ]  
SA: [ ((coughs)) ]  
but the way that we con-s: <constru:e> something like ne:rves (0.4)  
as a negative emotion is (0.5) <actual↑ly↑ (0.3) quite problematic?>

#### (15) Tessa\_W2\_A2\_01:00:06\_McDonalds

L: SO HERE we've got a child that might know some letters (1.8) ok and  
ma:y (0.3) be able to use this to read wor:ds (0.5) but it might be  
cues like the shape of the word (1.1) SO DO ANY OF YOU: happen to  
know any kind of two years? that can read McDonalds.



- (0.9)  
 L:→ for example  
 (1.6)  
 L: ok (0.9) so: it's- (0.3) basically they see th- the big M (0.9)  
 McDonalds underneath it and they know what it is and they can say  
 >NOW THEY'RE NOT reading that< (0.4) not if they're two (1.2) but  
 they do know what the s- (0.5) the shape of the: arch is (0.5)  
 corresponds to

### (16) Tessa\_W2\_A2\_01:09:33\_Facebook

- L: and though >I- I< just put this in because I thought it was kind of  
 interesting (0.5) er:m (.) <but it- kind of takes us: slightly off on  
 tangent> (0.8) CUZ WHAT WE'RE ULTIMATELY trying to do is a  
 °°°(k- m-)°°° being able to read fluently and automatically. (0.3)  
 .hh and I don't know HOW MANY OF YOU? have had tho- these appear on  
 like Facebook or whatever  
 (0.9)  
 L:→ where people have said like >>basically<< if you can read this you're  
 a genius or you've got a strong mind or: (.) yeah?  
 (0.7)  
 L: yeah=  
 S1: [(especially for)] phonetics actually=  
 [((coughing)) ]  
 L: =pardon?  
 S1: especially for phonetics  
 L: [yeah]  
 S1: [like] if you can read these phonetic (symbo-) symbols you're  
 cleve(h)r  
 L: oh d[ear ]  
 S1: [(yea:h)]  
 (0.5)  
 L: %it's alright I'm not trained in phonetics [so: erm% ] I  
 S1: [((student laughter))]  
 would come (.) I can probably just about read IPA °but er°  
 S1: °°yea:h°°  
 (0.4)  
 L: >JUST TO SAY< I'm psychologist so psychologists are routinely trained  
 in phonetics °°so°°

### (17) Tessa\_W2\_A2\_01:28:54\_Ruin\_Run

- L: it's basically (.) a guess (1.9) which in this >on this< occasion has  
 backfired (0.7) because it is not correct. (0.4) OK WHAT ABOUT <ruin  
 and run.>  
 (4.0)  
 L: °°((LS))°° .hh so: this table over here what did you think.  
 (0.5)  
 L:→ for [this one]  
 S1: [er::m ]  
 (2.0)  
 S1: the: child (.) knows the word run (.) an:d they've just basically  
 kind of taken out the I °because it's so close° (0.3) °so they've  
 gone (.) run°

- (0.9)
- L: yep (.) so it could be again it could be they've (0.7) substituted (>>>a<<<) visually similar word so they know run and they (.) they've looked at it and thought (0.3) that must be run (0.9) that could be (1.3) it also could be a- an omission. (.) so they've just literally missed the I out (0.5) you could class it as that as well

## (18) Tessa\_W3\_A2\_01:04:45\_Pick\_On\_This\_Table

- ((individual group discussion))
- L: [SO HOPEFULLY YOU'LL HAVE A NICE LONG LIST OF INFORMATION THAT (0.6) ]  
 [((individual group discussion)) ]  
 [UM: (.) THAT YOU'RE GONNA NEED TO UNDERSTAND THAT PASSAGE IN FULL]  
 [((individual group discussion)) ]  
 (1.0)
- L: so:: have you got a nice long list of- all the different things that you might need to know?  
 (3.7)
- L: ok:::  
 (1.7)
- L: SO:: .h (0.8) <what do you thi:nk:> (1.4) °right >I'll-< I might pick on this table to start off with° WHAT do you think that- (0.5) he might >ne- what< things might he need to know >can you give me e-< two things that you think we might need to know  
 (0.7)
- L:→ to understand this  
 (3.0)
- S1: °°whose Helen°°  
 (0.8)
- L: >↑pardon↑<  
 S1: °°whose Helen°°  
 (1.6)
- L: OK might need to know who Helen is: (1.0) although I don't know >>>if<<< that's necesari- that's might not be essential depending on what you're reading

## (19)(20) Mark\_W3\_A1\_00:54:46\_V2\_00:10:05\_Rephrase

- L: paired with that (0.3) is at least the implicit assumption (.) that our thoughts drive our actions (2.7)  
 [do you agree with that or disagree with that where do you stand on that do your thoughts drive your actions ]  
 [((L leans back in chair and gazes around room)) ]  
 (1.6)
- L: [let me rephrase ] (0.3)  
 [((L circles left hand forwards))]  
 [do your inner workings ] (0.3) drive your actions  
 [((L circles left hand by left ear))]  
 (0.6)
- L:→ [so it's not just thoughts ]  
 [((L puts left hand out left))]  
 [>but I'm gonna include em-< emotions ] in there as well  
 [((L pulls left hand from left to right))]  
 [(1.3) ]

- [(L gazes around room)]**
- S1: well >>>( )<<< drives in action °then° (0.7) likely to- >to< an extent yes  
(0.8)
- L: ok:  
(2.5)
- L: °anyone else°  
(1.3)
- S2: >>>( )<<< motivated by our:: (0.3) er:: biological impulses?  
(0.8)
- S2: so like the flight er fight or flight response  
(0.4)
- L: °ok°  
(0.9)
- L: .hh so is that more like a knee jerk reaction then  
(0.5)
- S2: yeah >so I don't think< we consciously <think about it> it's the >on-unconscious (0.4) force that's been passed down=  
L: °ok°
- S2: °°through°°°° (.) (>gen-<) °°generations°°
- L: so >>>(there- like)<<< kind of the: evolutionary instincts in there as well yeah ok
- S1: >in the opposite of that< is- is our inhibitions (0.4) from stopping us from doi- stopping us fro:m (.) doing new course of actions
- L: ok? let's go with inhibitions (0.4) are inhibitions psychological  
(1.1)
- L:→ or are they social  
(0.8)
- S1: °bo:th maybe°  
(3.5)
- S1: °°I can't really answer tha(h)t so°°
- L: no I can't answer that either  
(0.5)
- L: .hh I think probably both might be som- (0.3) might be one: way >>of<< looking at it .hh let's say when your parents are teaching you manners when you're a child

**(21)(22) Mark\_W3\_A1\_01:27:38\_Speak\_To\_The\_Victims**

- S1: er::m I: would speak to the victims like people >or like< eth[nic min]orities >>(but) like<< within York (0.4) and their
- L: [mm ]  
opinions and experiences of (0.3) racism  
(0.5)
- L: ((LS)) ok[ay ]
- S1: [maybe] compare it with other cities as well=
- L: .hhh (0.6) .h well let's go with that first part so- (.) talking to the victims (1.7) ((LS)) what kind of understanding of racism would that give to us:.  
(0.4)
- L:→ rather than if we go around asking people are you racist.  
(.)
- S1: .hhh because (1.0) >say like< say if it was me: (0.5) researching it I'm a white female [like] (.) I might not understand what racism is

- L: [mm ]  
in the same way (0.3) that a black man would.  
(.)
- L: mm.=
- S1: =so: it's: understanding it from (.) people that are actually (0.3)  
the victims in the situation >rather than< (1.2) creating a  
definition based on my interpretation of it
- L: [>>>mm hm<<<]  
(0.3)
- L: .hhh ok (.) let's go with that (.) .hh (0.3) so: the way we study  
something (1.4) in this case if we asked the <victim> have you  
experienced racism .hh what does that tell us  
(0.4)
- L:→ about racism  
(0.7)
- S2: >is it like< what groups are (.) targeted.  
(0.4)
- L: .hhh (it'll) tell you what groups are targeted.
- S1: what it is like how it manifests [itself]
- L: [.hhh ] (.) ok. (.) how it  
manifests yeah=
- S3: =>but like< >>couldn't it<< mean different things to: (0.6) different  
people. [>so like<] what one person perceives as being racist or they  
L: [.hh ]  
were [talkin'] to them (.) that they were: >(experience) racism
- L: [mm ]  
might not be the person<

### (23) Mark\_W4\_A1\_00:49:54\_Bad\_News\_Day

- L: what were the kind of strategies that political parties (0.7) in the  
UK >>>(and other white)<<< countries do for example (0.5) you have a  
parting power (0.6) they will release where they'll say oh actually:  
(.) the recent service says that we're not very popular at- at all  
and it's to kind of bake the other party into calling a general  
election (0.5) but actually what they've said is not true at all it  
could be that they actually their ratings are an all time high but  
they'll say the opposites=
- S1: =is that like what the tory party was doing with labour? (.)  
like the 1[( )]
- L: [THEY HAVE HIS]TORICALLY done that with labour a:n' (0.4)  
possible labour have done that with the tories as well I'm not sure?  
(0.4) er::m (I would have to) political strategies. (0.5) er:m have  
you heard of the:: bad news day?  
(0.7)
- L:→ that the government has:  
(0.6)
- L: so once a year I think it's-eh- around December time (0.4) there's  
all sorts of information that (0.6) the government is required by law  
to release such as (.) dickle- declarations of conflicts of interest  
such as chancellor ( ) having dinner with (0.3) some rich  
industrial guy who gives him lots of little gifts (0.4) by law (.) by  
law they have to declare all this kind of tus- stuff. so what they do  
is they release it all in just one day

## (24) Mark\_W4\_A1\_01:38:10\_Nigel\_Farage

- S1: but the people who don't think Nigel Farage is being racist (.) they're racist.  
(0.5)
- L: ((LS)) but is it racist to oppose >>>( )<<< immigration  
(1.4)
- S1: it could be  
(0.8)
- S1: >>(need) t' look at the manifesto<< no  
(0.9)
- L: .hh but >it's it's exact-< it's that ambiguity there that makes it makes it difficult to pin down  
(1.0)
- SA: °°°mm::°°°  
(2.5)
- L: .hhh that said hhh (1.2) cases of unambiguous racism.  
(2.2)
- L:→ [in the last year]
- S3: [Bad Education ] has some
- L: hm?
- S3: the series Bad Education has some.

## (25) Mark\_W4\_A1\_01:52:13\_Old\_New\_Racism

- L: do you remember the video clip that I played at the end of the prejudice lecture (.) last year (0.3) er:m (1.5) where a: white Finish women stops a: (.) Kenyan women and just starts basically sayin' (.) she literally says the words you are not human because you're black. (0.6) though I'm I'm quoting literally (0.4) what she said in that ( ) so there's just (0.3) all sorts of other (.) horrible things that happened
- L: so: (.) how useful is that old new racism distinction  
(1.0)
- L: I mean looking at the picture on- er:: here >I think< (0.4) we have a fair(ly) clear case that that's: might be (0.4) °or we might° that is a case of >the kind of< mo:re (0.3) explicit forms of racism (0.8) but the one on the right the text (0.4) that gets a bit more complex (0.5) I mean I think- (0.5) judging by the: reactions in the room (.) we can a:ll (0.6) quite clearly recognise that as a very racist post  
(1.3)
- L: but is that kind of old new distinction useful in that case  
(1.0)
- L:→ because you have elements of both. (.) °I think°  
(0.8)
- S1: would the distinction <not be> (0.4) explicit an' implicit rather than new and old  
(0.6)
- L: ye[ah ]
- S1: [is that] not a better distinction °to make°
- L: yeah.  
(0.3)

L: >but the fact is that yo-< °°°uh-°°° my point is that you both the explicit and the implicit in that one (.) but I do >I do< agree with you

### (26) Mark\_W7\_A1\_00:10:40\_Unfair

L: so we've broad(ly) got a consensus that even quantitative papers: (0.5) are not neutral (0.6) °ok.° (1.4) .hhh (0.9) they're not neutral so >what is< their stance (2.3)

L: what are they trying to (0.5) what is thei::r (1.0) subjective position. (1.4)

L: %I'M SLIGHTLY UNFAIR% THAT I'M ASKING THIS QUESTION IN A GENERAL SENSE cuz there probably isn't a general answer to it °it might be something a little bit more specific° (1.3)

L:→ °°so feel free to be specific in your answers°° (5.7)

S1: you could argue that they're tryin' to- (.) they're tryin' to pertain to this ↑i-↑ (0.3) °°°(m- t-)°°° to an idea that- (.) will probably get (there) (1.3) to what's: considered desirable in the domain of psychology (°°>>and what<<°°) (.) and what would get that paper published rather than what they °°s::-°° specifically believe in (0.9)

L: yep

### (27) Mark\_W7\_A1\_00:17:55\_Discourse\_Analysis1

L: it's not enough to just describe what's going on you have to explain <why matters> (1.5)

L: d'you see the point that I'm making here? (0.4)

SA: °°°mm hm°°° (5.2)

L: .hhh so (1.0) what is discourse analysis (0.3)

L:→ to you (0.8)

L: .h now I'm talking specifically (of-) about discourse analysis today because: (0.5) it's: (0.3) the qualitative method that tends to have: (1.7) tends to more broadly combine the most critical approaches in psychology so we're talking about different varieties of discourse analysis .hh because thus- ( ) (case) that kind of critical approach in psychology the best (0.9)

L: .hhh so (0.3) with that parenthetical out the way (0.7) what is discourse analysis as far as we're concerned (1.2)

S1: is it where you:: er:m analyse discursive features (0.4) to::: make inferences about (0.4) the: speakers psychology? (.) and thoughts and behaviours (1.1)

L: that's certainly one variant of dis- discourse analysis ↑yep↑

(28) Mark\_W7\_A1\_00:17:55\_Discourse\_Analysis2

S2: °°<I just like>°° mean >take marriage< for example if you say (0.3) saying I do doesn't really give off the same (0.3) social act doesn't come off the same social action in a- any of the environments outside of the (.) °°of that°° ceremony as- (1.9)

L: ye:p? (.) you say an expression might me different things in different contexts (0.3)

S2: °°°mm°°°

L: yep (2.7)

L: °ok° (1.8)

L: .hh so we can demonstrate these kinds of things. why does that matter (1.2)

L: why does it matter that we can show that (0.3) words don't have inherent meanings (7.0)

L: why is that important (0.6)

L:→ for us as psychological researchers

S3: er:m I'm just thinking maybe because it- is: (0.3) it helps: understand (0.5) like so:cial settings more than what quantitative research would .hh [so in] quantitative research you're measuring

L: [ok ]

somethi:ng er:m >like experimental research for instance< you're measuring something in .hh one point in time in that situation in that scenario and then they bas:e .h their analysis (from) that. .hh whereas language and discourse is something that's developed socially a:nd constructed throughout your lifetime so it's more (1.0) it provi:des more of a: (.) analysis of (0.7) the person as a whole but in terms of the like the social setting as well

(29) Mark\_W7\_A1\_01:09:42\_Draw\_the\_Psychological\_Out

L: >wha-about< this bit here [(14.1) ] [(whole class looking at transcript on TV screen)]

L: seems pretty mundane doesn't it (4.8)

L: ↑what↑ is psychologically <relevant> (1.6)

L:→ >in< this: kind of (0.9) mundane description (0.7)

L: how can we draw the psychological out of this (0.4)

S1: °is i-° >is the< key word here protects (1.2)

L: >say (>>>it<<<) again<

S1: is the key word here protects

- (.)
- L: .hhh=  
S1: =°°cuz it's°°  
(0.3)
- L: I'll give you a clue the key word is- there's no single key word in this instance (0.4) but what- what highlights the word protects for you  
(0.5)
- S1: because he's: framing it as: as er: (British) industries being attacked and we have to protect it
- L: .hh mm ↑hm↑  
(3.2)
- S1: so (>kind of<) us versus them mentality  
(0.7)
- L: there's certainly us versus them mentality ↑yeah↑ .hhh that's a good point >that-< that wasn't what I particularly had in mind in there but that is relevant to that area as well

### (30) Mark\_W7\_A1\_00:29:11\_Psychologically\_Relevant\_Language

- L: .hhh how far is that type of analysis critical  
(1.5)
- L: you tell me  
(2.8)
- L: ((LS)) what is the critical thing of what we('ve) just done  
(2.9)
- L: .hhh and this is not so much to do with how you analyse the data but it's how you frame (0.9) your analysis  
(0.8)
- L:→ overall.  
(.)
- L: what marks that kind of work as critical work  
(2.1)
- S1: °the challenging (.) surface level (0.6) discourse° °° (an' like making it) ( )°°  
(0.8)
- L: ((LS)) (1.1) .hhh not necessarily what's underlying it but highlighting it's complexity .h because everything that we've looked at is still readily observable  
(.)
- S1: °°°mm::°°°

### (31) Mark\_W7\_A1\_01:40:13\_Before\_I\_SayAnything\_Else

- L: this is something that (0.5) one of you quite helpfully: mentioned in er:m (1.3) the >mid module feedback< you'd like a little bit mo::re (.) attention given to the assessment so we'll start with this one then (0.9) so: (.) I think I'll gi:ve (.) e- and at least (wanna try) about ten minutes on (.) assessments (1.7) what would you like to know  
(1.8)
- L:→ °before I say anything else°  
(3.4)
- S1: er:m I have no idea where to start [with ] creating



SA: [my (.) essay question] [ (ha(h) ) ]  
[(S1 laughter) ]  
L: ok  
(0.3)  
L: [ ( ) ]  
S2: [(I just-)] I was thinking th(h)at  
S1: h(h)m [.hh ] hh  
L: [yeah]

#### 7.4. Appendix 4: Reinitiating the IRE Sequence via *Nomination Complete Collection*

##### (1) Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_00:13:56\_Don't\_Ask\_Me

- L: er:m othe::r groups:: reflections on this I didn't get to chance (.)  
 chance to chat to that second row very much  
 (1.0)
- L:→ Timothy °what were you° (.) °°what were you guys talking about ...°°(.)  
 huh huh (°°ha ha°°)  
 (1.0)
- L: %don't as:k me%=
- SA: =°huh huh°=
- L: =are you down with this or not=
- SA: =m(h)m h(h)m  
 (2.0)
- S1: >>I I<< ( ) (0.4) ( ) >how how< can you:: (1.2) how can you: (.)  
 define. (.) a language (0.3) that language .hh as in:: (.) for  
 example (.) if a language is dead ( ) (0.7) but >you< (.)  
 >you you< can sti- you're still able to: (0.6) u::se the language (.)  
 to learn the language
- L: mm hm
- S1: and >to be able< to com( ) using that language=
- L: =mm hm=
- S1: ( ) (.) and to learn the language etc so (.) does that make  
 sense? it's not dead=
- L: =it's not dead .h >and that< (.) reflects on some of the things we're  
 saying on the [front row as] well .hh SO WE'RE CLEA::RLY GOING TO=
- S1: [yeah ]
- L: =HAVE TO SPEND SO:ME TIME (0.3) thinking about what we mean by dead  
 as well

##### (2) Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_00:15:19\_V1\_00:14:58\_Conserving

- L: er::m: (.) and so::: >yeah< (.) >>it's<< worth capturing some of  
 >the-< (.) some of these (.) erm:: the notion of: (.) >of a< language  
offering something very specific to: linguistic science (.) so e-  
 what might a language: (.) <offer> of value to:: (.) linguists: (0.3)  
 to linguistic science?  
 [(3.8) ]
- [(L gazes to right side and then left side of room)]**
- L:→ [>mm?< (.) °it feels like you were: (.) chatting about some of these]  
**[(L gazes at and directs left hand towards left front row) ]**  
 [aspects° ]
- [(L gazes at and wiggles fingers towards left front row)]**  
 [(2.3) ]
- [(L gazes at and directs left hand towards left front row)]**
- L: [°when you were talking about conserving:° ]
- [(L gazes at and directs left hand towards left front row)]**  
 (0.5)

S1: oh: is it: (.) >like< (1.3) is it whether: (.) °°°(ah::) ( ) (I forgot what we were) >>just talking about<<°°° erm:: (.) >is it a bit ↑like:↑< (.) <protected> (.) ↑like↑

### (3) Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_00:26:37\_V1\_00:26:16\_Sweedish\_and\_Danish

L: people were talking about issues to do with mutual intelligibility (0.6) er:m so you have to (.) >>>th'as<<< to be a group of people who can all understand each other. (0.6) an' at the point when that breaks do:wn (0.4) theoretically you're into another (0.5) language. (1.0) is that a::lways the case though (3.0)

L: tell me something about for example the bo::rder betwee:n (.) the Netherlands and Germany (1.6)

L: a:re we:: in (1.2) Flemish on one side of the border and German on the oth↑er↑ [(2.3) ]

**[ ((S1 shakes head) ) ]**

L:→ %how do you think it actually shapes out Evie% (0.5)

S1: I remember I- °°th::°° thought that like (.) around the border there's: (.) a mix there's- a language that's a mix of both. (.) until a certain point in Belgium. (.) >OR A< A SORRY in Germany (0.8) an' then it switches to- (0.5) cuz it's predominantly (.) ( ) speakers (0.5) rather th- >an' around< (more areas) >so it's like< (0.7) you don't know wh(h)at what language they're speaking so (.) it's kind of (0.7) one that's a mix of (0.7)

L: °°°yeah°°° .h you get different things happening at different borders. (0.7) er: but what's: what's safe to say (.) is that (.) you:: have mutual intelligibility.

### (4) Blair(Att)\_W3\_A2\_00:19:40\_Manhandling

((students involved in individual group discussion))

L: er:: so (0.3) let's sh:a::re with each other we'll be coming back to the notion of barriers an' thinkin' about (0.3) defining 'em a:n' an' putting them categories shortly (0.3)

((individual group discussion dying down throughout the above))

er:: but- overall (.) overarchingly what's: what- what do you feel the point is of learning languages there have been some interesting reflections °around the room from a couple of groups° °°°( )°°°

(1.1)

L:→ how did you feel at the back i:n (.) i(h)n %in the: group that I facilitated while manhandling a ch(h)air across the ro- .hhh h(h)eh% [(0.8) ]

[((indistinct whispering))]

S1: er:m we felt like it was both. communication because obviously like there's certain languages that a:re (.) kind of business languages as such (0.4) <so:: it eases the way> (.) that we all communicate

( )

(0.8)

L: in different domains so: yeah thinking about business is (>>>a<<<) good example isn't it (0.3) er::m but yeah >sort of< ea:sing communication (0.5) er:m of (course) it's written (0.6) °er:m° (0.9) domains of use.

#### (5) Blair(Att)\_W5\_A1\_01:15:28\_Video

L: erm so (.) these- these discussions are in- incredibl(hh)y (0.4) er:m difficult. (.) er:m a:nd (0.3) and thought provoking. °so yeah (.) thank you for that° .hh erm ANY OTHE:R (.) THOUGHTS ON THIS::: video and how you think that plays out in an UK contex::t (3.6)

L:→ >how-< what were you: were you discussing a different (tact-) (0.5) °than the others° (.)

S1: er::m we were talking about ho:w er at the end the idea of the children who speak Ebonics at home were actually at a disadvantage at schoo:l .hh cuz they were havin' to: be taught and listen to (e-) er:m a variety that wasn't familiar to them .h which kind er one of the: main arguments for teachin' children how to: speak i:n (.) writin' style in English is that (.) .h it's seen as the most accessible (.) er:m (0.4) form so like in the article last week she was sayin' that (0.3) her >because< she uses a Standard English form everyone can understand he:r (.) even though er:m actually general American for second language speakers it's increasingly becoming (.) the option. rather than (any) English. (0.5) bu:t this actually (.) goes against that idea and says that actually (.) >general American might not be as successful as everybody thinks it is< if the children are being raised in a community and a family that are speaking using er:m RP. (0.4)

L: °yea:h very good point°

#### (6) Blair(Att)\_W5\_A1\_02:03:00\_Ella

((students involved in individual group discussion))

L: RIGHT (1.0) SO I'M NOT GONNA COME TO THIS GROUP FIRST BECAUSE (1.6) we were quite clear. (.) ER:M S- HOW DID YOU REACT (.) TO:: THIS:: (0.5) VIDE ↑O↑ (.) how was it- how was it for you ((individual group discussion dying down throughout the above)) (1.6)

L:→ ho:w was this video: fo:r you: what did you make of it Ella (0.3)

S1: I actually was sayin' that I thought it was really interestin' (like) >>(the way that)<< he spoke to his ma:m because like I get like (change) and stuff all the time but I always like compared to like (0.3) maybe like o:ld generations like my nana or whatever like ( )

#### (7) Blair(Att)\_W7\_A1\_01:06:51\_Elite\_Language\_Learning

((students involved in individual group discussion))

L: OK! RIGHT OK LET'S PICK THESE NOTIONS (0.8) WE'LL PICK THESE NOTIONS APA:RT A LITTLE BIT. ERM (0.4) >'specially since we're< heading into that (0.4) mini politic(h)al .hh er chat at the end of the session

- ((individual group discussion dying down throughout the above))  
 I think this is er::: really interesting wa:y erm that  
 ( ) (.) used these terms. (.) which I: feel have erm  
 (1.6) co-opted. (0.9) in a way that's maybe not useful for us (.)  
 gettin' our heads rounds these ideas ↑so↑ .hh erm (.) some thoughts  
 on what elite- bilingualism would like. can you give me some examples  
 of: .hh erm (0.9) language learning that could be classified as  
elite-  
 (1.8)
- L: °°°throw some (forms) at me°°°  
 (2.6)
- L:→ °°Liza did you- I didn't manage to talk you guys what- what's (0.4)  
 did you have some thoughts on ...°°  
 (1.5)
- S1: <er:m well m::y (0.7) cou:sin has> (0.6) er:m an English (0.3) family  
 side and a Greek (0.4) side so she goes to an English school but then  
 she goes she- her parents pay for her to go to a class to learn  
 Greek.  
 (0.7)
- S1: so she's sort of gettin' a mo:re equal (.) Greek (0.5) education this  
 is what she's havin' in English
- L: yea:h .h (s- s:) that's a really interesting example.

#### (8) Tessa\_W2\_A2\_01:28:54\_Ruin\_Run

- L: it's basically (.) a guess (1.9) which in this >on this< occasion has  
 backfired (0.7) because it is not correct. (0.4) OK WHAT ABOUT <ruin  
 and run.>  
 (4.0)
- L:→ °°((LS))°° .hh so: this table over here what did you think.  
 (0.5)
- L: for [this one]
- S1: [er::m ]  
 (2.0)
- S1: the: child (.) knows the word run (.) an:d they've just basically  
 kind of taken out the I °because it's so close° (0.3) °so they've  
 gone (.) run°  
 (0.9)
- L: yep (.) so it could be again it could be they've (0.7) substituted  
 (>>>a<<<) visually similar word so they know run and they (.) they've  
 looked at it and thought (0.3) that must be run (0.9) that could be  
 (1.3) it also could be a- an omission. (.) so they've just literally  
 missed the I out (0.5) you could class it as that as well

## 7.5. Appendix 5: Reinitiating the IRE Sequence via *Repair* Complete Collection

### (1) Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_00:31:05\_Straight\_Lines

- L: what's mo:re  
interes[ting (.) in locations for example in Africa there's um]
- SA: [((coughing)) ]  
there's a continuum known as the full (fulder) (.) continuum which  
you can see labelled on ethnologue as se(h)parate languages(h) but  
again .h if you take this continuum (.) and start at one end and work  
to the other then you can't understand it's different languages (0.3)  
but all the way along you've got mutual intelligibility with the  
varie- >variations around you< (0.5) so they're known as language  
continuums and THE:Y:: hugely problematise the notion of a named  
language for us of course (0.6) u:m: (0.5) and what's interesting  
about those two examples: (.) is that (.) um: (0.6) the (.) the the  
border creations: hhh (if I want) <a better word< are very different  
of course the borders in (>>>the-<<<<) that part of Africa: °>>in in<<  
the West in the Mid-West of Africa° ar[e: ]
- SA: [((coughing))]
- L: %straight lines:% (.) why are they straight lines  
(3.7)
- L:→ why [are (.) why a]re borders in: countri- central Africa just:
- SA: [((coughing)) ]
- L: nice: straight lines  
(0.4)
- L: is it just because they've got ama::zingly handy mountain ranges?  
that jus:t (0.3) form a straight line? down the country  
(2.6)
- S1: colonialism basical[ly ]
- L: [>>th]ank you<< hhh hm yeah so colonialism (0.4)  
<caused> (0.5) Africa °to just be: split up°

### (2) Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_00:43:58\_Language\_Murder

- ((individual group discussion))
- L: oka::y (1.5) SO THERE'S QUITE A LOT OF ER:::M::: (.) %CONCERNED FACES  
LOOKING AT THIS SLIDE% AN' wondering how to define these terms but  
actually (.) [so:me some excellent efforts here. ]  
[((individual group discussion quietens down))]
- L: SO:: ER:: (0.8) tell me (1.8) what language murder (0.4) looks like.  
(0.7)
- L: °°(on the cr(hh)( ) .h)°°  
(0.8)
- L:→ °how- how.° (.) how is that implemented.  
(0.9)
- L: er in a language  
(4.1)
- S1: [could it- ]
- S2: [could you-]  
(.)

- S2: oop sorry go on  
(.)
- S1: um. (.) >I was jus' gonna say< something (basic) just like kind of stop- (.) by like (0.6) <no:t by choice> >↑like↑< (0.3) or (0.9) breakin' the choice. (.) like kinda (0.3) weren't able to speak it anymo::re?

### (3) Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_01:15:29\_Minority\_Language

- L: so if by (0.3) FORCING people to CONTINUE speaking their mother tongue and to do all their assessments for their:: (0.4) er:: >school subjects< in a tiny minority language (0.6) how does that set them up for their °°f::°° for their fu↑ture↑  
(2.9)
- L: what's the impact of doing that  
(4.2)
- S1: sorry?
- L:→ what's the impact. (0.4) of (1.0) a really: (0.5) carefully thought through revitalisation process. on a minority language. that allowed those children to experience mother tongue education (.) which is well known to be very good for your: (.) er:m mental >development< and your curriculum understanding (0.7) a really carefully thought through examinations packa:ge? so that you went through and you- you used your first language in those examinations so it's really important like for examinations °°it's (ex( ))°° ...  
(1.7)
- L: where do the children go from there  
(0.7)
- L: in the minority language  
(1.5)
- S1: °°they struggle°°=  
L: =°°they struggl(h)e°°  
(0.8)
- L: they struggle to get jobs in the big cities in the important (1.2) globalised community

### (4) Blair(Att)\_W3\_A2\_01:04:48\_Thoroughly\_Pulled\_Apart\_Language

- L: yeah (.) so some of those aspects are kind of both a bit societal and a bit °individual aren't they° .hh where else did you go  
(1.0)
- S1: sorry?
- L:→ where- what else did you have on your list  
(0.6)
- L: %now we've thoroughly pu(h)lled a(h)part [la(h)ngu(h)age .hh h(h)uh%]  
[ ((student laughter)) ]  
(0.8)
- S2: ( )
- L: °yeah° (.) the lack of the lack of that

### (5) Blair(Att)\_W3\_A2\_01:06:11\_Different\_Experience

- L: °°yeah°° so there's something more systemic
- S1: yea:h [maybe ]

- L: [an' pro]blematic which we were talking about weren't we in terms of the curriculum (0.5) er:m an' ho:w (0.5) if- how many other people have taken up a language here [(1.2) ] [(gesture)]
- L: er:m so we've got some people who've started learnin' (.) B-S-L:: [(1.7) ] [(gesture)]
- L: yea:h. an' have you had a really different experience (1.0)
- L: here in terms of language [( )]
- SA: [(coughing)] (1.4)
- L: how- >how has it< how has it been for you °°°(two)°°° (2.8)
- L:→ how has it changed for you (2.9)
- S2: are you talking to us
- L: %°yea::h°%
- S2: oh ri(h)ght ((group laughter)) [(group laughter)]
- L: [I'm ( )] behind you °°°you're ( )°°° (1.2)
- S2: er:m I think it was because we actually chose to do it (0.4) whereas it was f:: forced in school like I was just kind of bombarded with languages in school (0.8) a:nd (0.3) an' I wasn't really given (0.6) a choic:e (.) with it (.) whereas I chose to do this I like enjoy the process of learning it (0.7)
- L: (°°°yeah°°°) °so that's going back to your (.) your- your (.) very valuable point there° (0.5) er:m but I think the curriculum ( ) can't it from a: (.) from a very kind of wo:rk shee:t teaching to the test kind of approach to something that feels much more about communication

### (6) Mark\_W3\_A1\_00:30:33\_Scientifically\_Rigorous

- L: there wasn't (thirty-eight) people all at the same time just staring out the window. .h like textbooks might sometimes let you interpret that. (0.3) .hh (2.2) so why are those stories constructed in those ways (3.0)
- L:→ >>in (those)<< ways that emphasis understandi::ng .h psychology as an individualist subject. (0.3)
- L: understanding it as (0.4) a scientifically rigorous: (.) subject. (0.5)
- S1: for effect. (0.3)
- L: .h and what is that effect=
- S1: =li:ke. (2.0) to make it seem better than it is. (0.9)



L: .h ↑I THINK THAT'S:↑ (0.4) IN SO:ME WAYS >I suppose some people would say better than it is< but also: u:m (.) we have to be fair that there is: credit to certain areas as well

(7) Mark\_W3\_A1\_00:54:46\_V2\_00:10:05\_Rephrase

L: paired with that (0.3) is at least the implicit assumption (.) that our thoughts drive our actions (2.7)  
[do you agree with that or disagree with that where do you stand on that do your thoughts drive your actions ]  
[[**(L leans back in chair and gazes around room)** ]  
(1.6)

L:→ [let me rephrase ] (0.3)  
[[**(L circles left hand forwards)**]]  
[do your inner workings ] (0.3) drive your actions  
[[**(L circles left hand by left ear)**]]  
(0.6)

L: [so it's not just thoughts ]  
[[**(L puts left hand out left)**]]  
[>but I'm gonna include em-< emotions ] in there as well  
[[**(L pulls left hand from left to right)**]]  
[(1.3) ]  
[[**(L gazes around room)**]]

S1: well >>>( )<<< drives in action °then° (0.7) likely to- >to< an extent yes  
(0.8)

L: ok:

(8) Mark\_W3\_A1\_01:01:44\_CBT

S1: fewer resources means you don't have the- (0.3) as much time to invest into education since you ( ) (0.3) >probably w-< end up working from an early age.  
(2.6)

L: yep.  
(.)

S1: °like° 1-[

L: [requirements so again .h the overa- (0.6) the demands of work that might even be in education  
(0.8)

L: .hh how could CBT help with that  
(3.6)

L:→ could CBT help with that  
(0.4)

S2: possibly.  
(.)

L: possib↑ly↑  
(0.4)

S3: I think CBT helps <so far> for instance [like] .h it- m-yeah you can  
L: [yeah]

look at things differently an' try to improve .h you:r outlook from outside in. .h but really I think (1.3) it kind of disguises the fact that there's a problem with the system. [an' how] it's workin'. .h

L: [mm:: ]

L: on a micro level rather than jus' within the individu[al ]  
 [°°>yep<°°]

### (9) Mark\_W3\_A1\_01:21:14\_Glass\_Cliff

L: ↑yep↑ (.) and I mean I think that's a very good example >of- of<  
 gendered reactions I mean as much as I: (0.4) generally do not like  
 Tories she was treated in a way that if a male had said the same  
 things >and actually now< you have Boris Johnson saying very similar  
 things .h to what Theresa May said and no one's mocking him  
 (0.7)

L: or he's been mocked for very different rea[sons ] .h but like  
 SA: [°°h(h) h(h)°°]  
 the whole deal that he's putting forward (0.3) is the same deal that  
 Theresa May put forward.

S1: °yeah°  
 (.)

L: but it's not getting the same resistance (0.6) could that be now- now  
 we have (.) a ma:le? puttin' forward the idea?  
 (1.0)

L: ((LS)) have you heard of the glass:: cliff.  
 (1.3)

L:→ >>have you heard of the<< glass ceilin'  
 (0.4)

S2: °>I've heard of<° (0.9) °it's° (0.3) I KNOW- °°(the:)°° sayin' that  
 we shouldn't throw a glass: (0.4) you shouldn't throw stones from a  
 glass hou[se.]

L: [.hh] NO THAT'S >>>THAT'S A<<< SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT THING. (.)  
 but that's a good point to keep in mind .h no the glass ceiling is  
 when you can't achieve because of whatever °you know° gende:r .h your  
 lack of education or: whatever background so there's like a job  
 promotion that you won't get because (0.5) you're a woman for example  
 >or< women don't get paid as much as men

### (10) Mark\_W3\_A1\_01:24:37\_Bog-Standard

L: ok. (0.3) so. (3.0) where do we locate racism.  
 (1.1)

L:→ where does you:r (0.3) standard. (0.6) bog-standard. (.) political  
 slash cognitive psychologist say the problem with racism is.  
 (.)

L: we've talked about this already toda:y  
 (0.8)

S1: history.  
 (3.0)

L: could say histo↑ry↑

### (11) Mark\_W4\_A1\_00:58:40\_Nineties

L: in the early nineties people might be able to say %I'm not racist  
but% (0.6) nowadays people can pick up on that (.) so what else do:  
 (0.5) people now say and do  
 (0.8)

L:→ how do: (1.3) how have racists (.) got more clever with the way that  
 the:y °understand things°

- S1: people talk about like the: erosion approach culture (.) despite the [fact that ] (0.4) our country was built on immigration and=  
 SA: [((sneezes))]  
 S1: =cultural variety (1.0)  
 L: there you go so that's one of them (.) the corrosion SO IT'S NOT (.) %I have a problem with o- others I just wanna preserve my own culture%  
 S1: °°°yeah°°°  
 L: and that I'd say is a very very common trouble in most (0.3) Western or Western (minor) countries they do that a lot

## (12) Mark\_W7\_A1\_00:10:40\_Unfair

- L: .hh well that is certainly common critique yeah (0.5)  
 L: ok. .hh (0.7)  
 L: so we've broad(ly) got a consensus that even quantitative papers: (0.5) are not neutral (0.6) °ok.° (1.4) .hhh (0.9) they're not neutral so >what is< their stance (2.3)  
 L:→ what are they trying to (0.5) what is thei::r (1.0) subjective position. (1.4)  
 L: %I'M SLIGHTLY UNFAIR% THAT I'M ASKING THIS QUESTION IN A GENERAL SENSE cuz there probably isn't a general answer to it °it might be something a little bit more specific° (1.3)  
 L: °°so feel free to be specific in your answers°° (5.7)  
 S1: you could argue that they're tryin' to- (.) they're tryin' to pertain to this ↑i-↑ (0.3) °°°(m- t-)°°° to an idea that- (.) will probably get (there) (1.3) to what's: considered desirable in the domain of psychology (°°>>and what<<°°) (.) and what would get that paper published rather than what they °°s::-°° specifically believe in (0.9)  
 L: yep

## (13)(14)(15) Mark\_W7\_A1\_00:17:55\_Discourse\_Analysis

- L: how people use words to do things (0.3) yep (0.8)  
 L: so what do you do with that type of analysis (1.3)  
 L:→ why would you ↑do↑ that type of analysis (1.6)  
 L: ok? so we know that we can: (0.7) analyse tha- people's communication discourse >whatever< we:: (0.7) want to look at a particular point to see what they do: with their words to understand if there's .hhh something underlying psychological go- going on there (.) fair enough (0.9) what do you do with that type of information (.) what do you do with that type of analysis (0.6)

- S2: it'll just show that er: (0.4) depending on the circumstances of the s- social environment t- the same words w- would always mean the same thing: (.) depending on the conte:xt (0.8)
- L: ok? (0.8)
- S2: m- words and actions too I- I believe (0.7)
- L: ok so you could sho:w that (0.6) words are designed to do things:: (.)
- S2: °°°mm°°°
- L: ok: (1.3)
- S2: °°<I just like>°° mean >take marriage< for example if you say (0.3) saying I do doesn't really give off the same (0.3) social act doesn't come off the same social action in a- any of the environments outside of the (.) °°of that°° ceremony as- (1.9)
- L: ye:p? (.) you say an expression might me different things in different contexts (0.3)
- S2: °°°mm°°°
- L: yep (2.7)
- L: °ok° (1.8)
- L: .hh so we can demonstrate these kinds of things. why does that matter (1.2)
- L:→ why does it matter that we can show that (0.3) words don't have inherent meanings (7.0)
- L:→ why is that important (0.6)
- L: for us as psychological researchers
- S3: er:m I'm just thinking maybe because it- is: (0.3) it helps: understand (0.5) like so:cial settings more than what quantitative research would .hh [so in] quantitative research you're measuring
- L: [ok ]  
somethi:ng er:m >like experimental research for instance< you're measuring something in .hh one point in time in that situation in that scenario and then they bas:e .h their analysis (from) that. .hh whereas language and discourse is something that's developed socially a:nd constructed throughout your lifetime so it's more (1.0) it provi:des more of a: (.) analysis of (0.7) the person as a whole but in terms of the like the social setting as well

#### (16) Mark\_W7\_A1\_01:04:47\_Data\_Session

- L: .hhh example. look at that. more political data. (0.3) .hhh (2.2)  
how do you make sense of something like this: (22.7)
- L: do you want to have little go yourself before I show you? (6.0)
- L: well let's have us a little data session. (.) .hh (0.5)

SA: h(h)uh=

L:→ =HOW DO YOU MAKE SENSE OF THIS: (0.8) HOW DO YOU ANALYSE SOMETHING LIKE THIS: (0.6) IN TERMS O:F (0.3) the psychologically relevant phenomenon in this (0.6) without inferring mental states (0.9)

L: don't tell me what kind of a person (1.0) F-A-R whoever that might be (2.3) don't try an' tell me ↑what↑ (.) kind of a person we're dealing with but- tell me what is a psychologically relevant categories that are going on in there (1.2)

S1: well you- when you cons- consider what er: he's trying to accomplish (°°°>>>I mean<<<°°°) (.) in the political- political goals an' (0.3) °>c-<° can you look at how he- he use- (.) he uses that- his own (.) his own words and lang- and discourse. (0.4) analysis (0.3)

L: ok [.hh ]

## 7.6. Appendix 6: Reinitiating the IRE Sequence via *Example Complete Collection*

(1)(2) Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_00:26:37\_V1\_00:26:16\_Sweedish\_and\_Danish

- S1: <it's a way of> like- (0.8) just (0.8) logistics way of (1.6) communicating slash (1.2) <talking? to people> like that can maybe (survive) one- one or two (0.6) so like not just talking to yourself like you're talking to other people or communicating: with that side language or a (0.4) um the- >kind of< a way a way to express what you're thinking
- L: uh huh (0.5)  
[and then how does that <differentiate> itself from another language]  
[[**(L gazes around room and moves both hands slowly up and down)** ] ]  
[that ] [does the same thing ] (0.4)  
[[**(L lifts left hand towards S1)**]] [[**(L gazes towards S1)**]]  
[but differently (.) possibly using a different grammatical:: ... ]  
[[**(L gazes around room and moves both hands slowly up and down)**]]  
[(2.5) ]  
[[**(L maintains prior gesture)**]]  
L: [°°how else°° ]  
[[**(L gazes around room and moves both hands slowly up and down)**]]  
[(2.2)  
[[**(L maintains prior gesture)**]]  
L:→ so how do we differentiate for example between  
[(0.8) °er::m ]  
[[**(L gazes down)**]] mos::: ° (0.5)  
[Swedish:: ]  
[[**(L shakes head, smiles and puts both hands out forwards)**]] (1.3)  
and (1.5) [Danish:: ] (.)  
[[**(L puts left hand out forward)**]]  
[Danish and Norwegian is the classic example ]  
[[**(L tilts head right, smiles and puts both hands out forwards)**]]  
[(1.9)  
[[**(L maintains prior gesture)**]]  
L: [how do we know that one's- (.) they're two languages ]  
[[**(L gazes around room and shakes left hand side to side)**]]  
[are they two languages ]  
[[**(L nods head and puts left hand out forwards)**]]  
(0.5)  
L: [Norwegian ] [and Danish ]  
[[**(L lifts left hand up)**]] [[**(L drops left hand down)**]]  
S2: [°yeah° ]  
(.)  
S2: yeah  
S3: pronunciation  
S4: like speech language °°( )°°  
(1.3)  
L: yeah (0.4) speech (stands) important aspect there (.) going back to Josie's point about grammar  
(1.6)  
L: [where are we with Norwegian and Danish ]

- [((L gazes around room and moves both hands slowly up and down))]  
 [(6.0) ]  
 [((L gazes around room, moves both hands slowly up and down and smiles)) ]
- L: [so it's quite interesting ] .h so (1.1)
- [((L changes slide on presentation))]  
 [there's a few spanners in the work imme- works immediately when you]  
 [((L gazes around room, moves both hands around and smiles)) ]  
 [start to follow up on some of the::se these ↑notions↑ ]  
 [((L gazes around room, moves both hands around and smiles))]  
 .h erm which is indeed of course why there are <many linguists> (0.7)  
 er: globally who ↑refute↑ the notion of of any named language and  
 problematise it .hh er:m .hhh (1.4) people were talking about issues  
 to do with mutual intellig- intelligibility (0.6) er:m so you have to  
 (.) >>>th'as<<< to be a group of people who can all understand each  
 other. (0.6) an' at the point when that breaks do:wn (0.4)  
 theoretically you're into another (0.5) language. (1.0) is that  
 a::lways the case though  
 (3.0)
- L:→ tell me something about for example the bo::rder betwee:n (.) the  
 Netherlands and Germany  
 (1.6)
- L: a:re we:: in (1.2) Flemish on one side of the border and German on  
 the oth↑er↑  
 [(2.3) ]  
 [((S1 shakes head))]
- L: %how do you think it actually shapes out Evie%  
 (0.5)
- S1: I remember I- °°th::°° thought that like (.) around the border  
 there's: (.) a mix there's- a language that's a mix of both. (.)  
 until a certain point in Belgium. (.) >OR A< A SORRY in Germany  
 (0.8) an' then it switches to- (0.5) cuz it's predominantly (.)  
 ( ) speakers (0.5) rather th- >an' around< (more areas) >so  
 it's like< (0.7) you don't know wh(h)at what language they're  
 speaking so (.) it's kind of (0.7) one that's a mix of (0.7)
- L: °°yeah°° .h you get different things happening at different  
 borders. (0.7) er: but what's: what's safe to say (.) is that (.)  
 you:: have mutual intelligibility.

### (3) Clare(Att)\_W2\_A2\_00:31:05\_Straight\_Lines

- L: what's mo:re  
 interes[ting (.) in locations for example in Africa there's um]
- SA: [(coughing) ]  
 there's a continuum known as the full (fulder) (.) continuum which  
 you can see labelled on ethnologue as se(h)parate languages(h) but  
 again .h if you take this continuum (.) and start at one end and work  
 to the other then you can't understand it's different languages (0.3)  
but all the way along you've got mutual intelligibility with the  
 varie- >variations around you< (0.5) so they're known as language  
 continuums and THE:Y:: hugely problematise the notion of a named  
 language for us of course (0.6) u:m: (0.5) and what's interesting  
 about those two examples: (.) is that (.) um: (0.6) the (.) the the  
 border creations: hhh (if I want) <a better word< are very different

- of course the borders in (>>>the-<<<) that part of Africa: °>>in in<< the West in the Mid-West of Africa° ar[e: ]
- SA: [((coughing))]
- L: %straight lines:% (.) why are they straight lines (3.7)
- L: why [are (.) why a]re borders in: countri- central Africa just:
- SA: [((coughing)) ]
- L: nice: straight lines (0.4)
- L:→ is it just because they've got ama::zingly handy mountain ranges? that jus:t (0.3) form a straight line? down the country (2.6)
- S1: colonialism basical[ly ]
- L: [>>th]ank you<< hhh hm yeah so colonialism (0.4) <caused> (0.5) Africa °to just be: split up°

#### (4) Blair(Att)\_W3\_A2\_01:06:11\_Different\_Experience

- L: let's unpack it (0.3) let's unpack that a bit further cuz .hh it's kind of (1.3) it's kind of key in understanding our <parti::cular> context here in the UK I think (0.8) er:m but- but not to say that it doesn't happen in other countries that have a dominant (0.5) er: language. (.) >but let's think about issues to do with< (.) %dominance% .hh er:m (0.5) ((LS)) and how that factors into the: socio-political (0.4) er:: (0.5) underlying's of intrinsic motivation (0.7) er:m i:n kind of late children an' an' an' grammars. as it were (0.6) er:m so let's let's just d- couple of minutes (0.4) wh:y i:(s) (0.3) intrinsic motivation such an aspect in this (0.4) in this country. why is it such a battle (0.8) what's going on (2.1)
- L:→ why do people just say I'm not very good at language learning. what does that mean (0.5) and why (1.3)
- L: ↑(pe-)↑ er it's:: it('s) really not a usual h(hh)uh .hh feelin'. (0.7) er:m globally. (.) for people to say (.) I'm not very good [at ] learning languages (.) MOST PEOPLE li:ve in a multilingual
- SA: [°>mm<°] Country (0.9) so if- if- if there was such a percentage of people (0.4) as there are in the UK who say they are poor at learning languages. in (En[gland] ) there would be a bunch of people who
- SA: [((coughs))]
- %couldn't get by on a dail(h)y b(h)asis% .hhh (1.2) so there's something that's not right. (0.4) like (0.3)
- S1: I think wh[(at it is)]
- L: [%neuo]rological(h)y% hu(h)h .hh=
- S1: >>>(do you think it'll have)<<< something to do with the wa:y that it's ↑like↑ a language is being taught (0.6) like for my brother he: (0.5) we grew up (.) i:n (.) somewhere where- >>English wasn't really spoken<< (0.3) er:m ((LS)) and so we were both speaking that language since (0.3) he was five and I was seven (0.5) er:m (0.9) <but then> in like >(at our)< schoo:l (0.3) started teaching French. cuz (0.4) you know you had to get a GCSE out of it kind of thing (0.4) er:m (0.5) an' he could speak the other language (0.4) relatively ok (0.4)



- but the- (0.5) he never conne- ↑well↑ (.) he never really connected with the teaching style with French. (.)
- L: °°mm°°=
- S1: =an' so he found it (.) in- (.) credibly difficult to pick it up (0.5) an' when asked why his grades >>(were goin' the way they were for it)<< he was just like I'm just not good at learning it. (0.4) but it was (0.3) I think it was something to do with the style of that. (0.4) an' how he WASN'T surrounded by it every day and it wasn't part of (.) what he needed to be doin' (0.3) it was just part of his school curriculum
- L: °°yeah°° so there's something more systemic
- S1: yea:h [maybe ]
- L: [an' pro]blematic which we were talking about weren't we in terms of the curriculum

### (5) Blair(Att)\_W7\_A1\_00:25:51\_Code\_Switching

- L: an' an' that's one- one keyway of doing it allow for EXPLORATION DISCUSSION .h writing i:n (.) <one code first> an' the:n (.) moving into another↑ (0.3) er:m an' then seeing a- a type (.) that fu:nctional way of using (0.3) translanguaging (0.3) °as a concept°. (0.7) ((LS)) erm (.) D::OES ANYO:NE feel comfortable (0.7) describing what code switching (0.8) is. (0.3) a- a mo:re (.) traditional linguistic (0.4) focus o:n (.) the way that people interact multilingually (1.6)
- L: have you hea:rd people code switching (3.2)
- L:→ you kno:w if you get in a (0.4) taxi (0.3) i::n (1.2) a city like Lee:ds or Leicester (.) or London (0.8) er:m and you hear a- (.) taxi driver (.) <on the ph:one> (0.9) what's: (0.3) would you often hear them doing with thei:r (0.6) linguistic repertoires (10.1)
- L: I've often heard examples o:f (0.5) people mixing (0.7) mixing (0.3) linguistic codes if you will >MIXING< English an' (0.4) Punjabi mixing English and Arabic .hh IN THE SAME SENTENCE (0.7) have you: have you (.) come across that heard (.) heard of that .h SO TRADITIONALLY that's bee:n defined as tran- >er< (as) CODE SWITCHING or code mixing. (1.8) now when you hear something like that (0.8) you can (.) also describe it (0.3) as translanguaging or as translangual practices

### (6) Blair(Att)\_W7\_A1\_00:28:41\_Translanguaging

- L: so. (0.8) this all goes back to cognition (.) and how we think (0.3) of how we store languages in our heads (1.6) so: how- °°°eh°°° how many people here do have more than one language. (1.4)
- L: erm >a- a- a-< at their disposal (1.8)
- L: °°yep°° (1.8)
- L: °and how do kind of° (0.6) VISUALISE that in your head (0.3)

- L:→ do you have a separate filing cabinet? for language and another for another language?  
(2.8)
- S1: s:ome sometimes but- (0.4) like- (0.4) (when I'm around) different people (.) it (0.5) looks (0.3) way different  
(0.7)
- S1: [( )]
- L: [tell me mo]re
- S1: >so ↑like↑< (.) >I don't know< (0.4) u:m (0.9) with my family (0.7) like they came to the ( ) and we just ((clicks finger)) went into it (0.9) er:m (0.3) so they're just kind of both just kind of SWIMMING AROUND I GUESS (0.6) but then ninety-ninety percent of the time (0.5) in England (.) it's very much (0.5) in English yeah  
(0.8)
- L: %that's perfect%  
(0.9)
- L: SO (0.6) the swimming around. bit
- S1: >well I cud-< I could have phrased that differently=  
L: =no: I love it (.) no. I don't want you to rephrase that I love it .h  
(0.3) er:m (.) that's translanguaging.

#### (7) Blair(Att)\_W7\_A1\_01:25:13\_Reading

- L: but s:ome of you will be sittin' there goin' %↑how↑ ((indistinct fast mumbling))% .hhh %↑I (ta-) I don't read like that I'm not very good at gist readin'↑ I kind of need to read everything or I die.% er:m .hh so there are wa:ys that- other people might wanna a- attack (.) there reading in a different ↑way↑ (0.6) how might you do that  
(1.5)
- L:→ if I've asked you: to: for example give a summary to your teammates as it were (0.3) on this topic (.) where might you find that  
(.)
- S1: °°conclusion°°
- L: %h hh at the end hu(h)h .h% ↑SO↑ my suggestion would be that you start reading at the e:nd because the [thing ]
- L: [((claps hands together once))]  
about this is it's <not a novel> (0.5) so you're not gonna ruin the end %o(h)f you(h)r sto:ry% if you start at the end

#### (8) Blair(ELL1)\_W7\_A1\_00:40:46\_Spoonerism

- L: ((LS)) .hh er:m (0.6) things like muddled words I think is a really interesting one though (0.4) er::m (1.2) how much does that matter  
(2.4)
- L:→ if I: (0.6) if I just like °m-m-mm° do a total spoonerism now. get all confused with what I'm sayin' (0.5) how much would you care  
(2.0)
- S1: °it's about how you pick up. really though°  
(1.4)
- L: °yea:h°  
(1.0)
- L: °(it's like)° (0.9) just don't lose your train of thought and crack on

## (9) Blair(ELL2)\_W5\_A2\_00:10:55\_Essay

- L: ((LS)) er:m (.) this essay of course asks you to (0.9) demonstrate your understanding of these very terms (.) language. and communication. (0.7) er:m so you'll need to- (0.3) sit back an' work out (0.6) what your understanding of those terms is (.) based on the lecturers we've ha:d based on your reading. (0.5) er::m you're bein' asked to disCUSS (0.3) similarities and differences between the two: an' think about how those two terms are u:sed (.) specifically within the field of linguistics (0.8) er:m (0.4) so to: (0.9) try not to overly labour the point. .hh what kind of ways of we not wanting you to defi:ne (0.4) language and communication. (1.5)
- L: how am I going to want you to (0.8) tell me what those two terms mea:n. (0.3)
- L: what evidence are you goin' to u:se (10.5)
- L:→ when you try and di- define a te:rm (0.4) er:m where'd you go to for that information (4.5)
- L: (o[kay] ]
- S1: [>dictionary<] (0.3)
- L: to a dictionary. (0.5)
- L: .hh er:m is that what you're goin' to do: for this essay (0.9)
- L: h(h) h(h) h(hhh) thank you for shakin' your head. h(h)uh h(h)uh .hhh

## (10) Blair(ELL2)\_W7\_A1\_00:37:30\_Adrenaline

- L: er:m anxiety is usually for >>a: a<< range of very se(h)ns(h)ible reasons .hhh that people are °°eh°° a- anxious about >various things °in life°< .hh but ne:rves to be associated with that as an intrinsically negative thing (0.5) i:s (0.9) i- is a problematic thing when we think about- (.) presentations. (0.6) so- what can (0.8) what can ne:rves do. (0.7)
- L:→ they can make you work harder. (0.8)
- L: what else can ne:rves about a presentation do. (5.0)
- L: if you feel ne:rvous just before you do something what do you build up in your body (1.4)
- S3: °°adre[naline°°]
- S4: [°adre ]naline°=
- L: =adrenaline. what can you then DO with adrenaline. (1.3)
- S5: °energy° (1.3)
- L: gain energy. (0.4) gain ((clicks fingers)) spa:rk. (0.3) have a buzziness.

## (11) Tessa\_W4\_A1\_00:30:07\_Danny

- L: ok and similarly with ( ) one I think this child has got confused between the W (.) and the- and the Y (1.5) and that's kind of led to them thinking actually no that's Y- that's not the right letter and then put that letter a:n' ...  
(0.7)
- L: (°°°ok°°°)  
(.)
- L: the bottom one  
(2.0)
- L:→ if I told you the child's name was Danny  
(3.4)
- L: °°°h-°°° he went comple:tely off pieced  
(3.4)
- L: .hhh %but that's what you get with reception kids%  
(1.0)
- L: ok they might just fancy writing their name because that's what they fancy ↑doin↑ (0.5) even when you've asked them to write something specific

## (12)(13)(14)(15) Tessa\_W5\_A1\_00:59:44\_T-unit

- L: right where were we (0.3) I've got lost. >AH here we go< (.) right (1.7) ok so the OTHER THINGS to think about (.) with- (.) so we've gone for- we've °(um-)° looked at our sentence structure we've thought about whether they're using simple:: .hh er:m an- >or< complex sentences or simple compound complex if you prefer .hhh THE OTHER THING TO THINK ABOUT is like °>(we would-)° how would you sort of identify what we would °refe-° think about as maturity in writing  
(1.2)
- L:→ °ok° .hhh so:: thinking about a novice writer versus a matu:re writer ↑what↑ (.) what would be the sort of distinguishing (0.9) features in there  
(0.5)
- L: °ok°  
(2.2)
- L:→ so would we >sort of< see maturity reflecting in (.) as a::ge?  
(1.2)
- L:→ could it be: the better they become at differentiating (1.4) what they're writing from their °sp-° their written language from their spoken language?  
(0.8)
- L:→ °ok° .hh it could be this <T:-unit> s: the i- ideas: length of idea units: we can measure (.) the complexity of the writing by looking at numbers of >something< called T-units  
(1.1)
- L: °>ok<° have you come across T-units befo:re? (.) °is something that you did in:° (.) °no ok° .hhh MM OR are we thinking about the complexity of the syntax that they're using so bringing in (0.3) adjectives adverbs how they construct the sentences .hhh is that what we sort of think about as: maturity in writing yeah=  
S1: =°°what was the difference between the mean length of sentence.°°  
(0.5)

L: .hh the T-units:::=  
 S1: =°°°yeah°°°  
 L: .hh er:m ((LS)) T-units tend to refer to a- an idea unit rather than  
 (.) °°sorry°° (0.4) °°°( )°°° (0.7) .hhh (1.7) °oh no° h(h).h could  
 I just stop for a minute and talk this call it's my son's school

## (16)(17) Mark\_W3\_A1\_00:10:10\_Not\_Saying

L: >>and all<< those are good examples (0.6) can I have another ↑one↑  
 (3.4)  
 L: jus' to be a little bit selfish what's the area of research that I'm  
 quite interested in (0.3) that's not to do with the European Union  
 (1.7)  
 L: that I get quite preach about when I lecturer to you in social  
 psychology about it  
 (1.0)  
 S1: °was it American politics or some-°  
 (0.8)  
 L: °no° >it's it's< a bit more a classical topic in social psychology  
 (7.8)  
 L:→ °I'll say it° prejudice and racis↑m↑  
 (1.0)  
 S1: °oh yeah°  
 (2.5)  
 L: so how might that be looked at. (.) >or how is it< looked at and how  
 could it be looked at differently  
 (6.3)  
 S1: cultural differences. perhaps  
 (1.0)  
 S1: ((LS)) and how's racism (1.6) I mean °uh- m-° as with the differences  
 between the modern and er: (0.8) an' racism from the past so (0.4)  
 (I) mean the way (0.9) >>so they have to be mo-<< (.) if- people want  
 to be racist they have to be more subtle about it these days=  
 L: =mm  
 (0.3)  
 L: yeah (0.5) expressions of racism are different. .hhh <so:> let's go  
 with that then so people can't just go around saying (that) all: (.)  
 people of that o:r (.) this or that ethnic group a:re infer to us  
 because they're members of that ethnic group .hhh er::m >as (you'll  
 see) in one of my extracts< where I have a white woman saying to a  
 black woman you're not human because your black (0.8) .hhh so (0.3)  
 those kinds of expressions a::re (0.3) very r:are (1.8) we can't  
 quite say that they're absent (0.6) there's all evidence to the  
 contrary. .hhh (0.9) but the fact that they're not so prevalent (0.8)  
 what does that say  
 (0.8)  
 L:→ does that say that people are somehow racist in a different way  
 inside their heads  
 (0.6)  
 S2: is there social pressure and group norms  
 (1.0)  
 L: oka:y  
 S2: so one issue might be with (.) studying racism (.) is that it looks  
 at the individual and their (0.7) personal (0.8)

- L: m[m ]  
 S2: [ra]ce re- er racist tendencies >>>(when it)<<< doesn't take into account like group effects (0.7)  
 L: exactly. <so: (.) racism is:> (1.0) more of a social problem that it is (er it's er) a cognitive problem.

### (18) Mark\_W3\_A1\_00:33:28\_Psychology\_Degrees

- S1: I haven't actually done A-Levels but I did study psychology in high school .h and what I feel is (0.3) when I did it in high school it all felt so much more concrete and structured .h wherea[s]  
 L: [O]K!=  
 S1: immediately when I came (h-) when I came to university here .h everything was:: so much more open to interpretation and nothing was really that cle:ar (1.3)  
 L: yeah. so:: you get told that psychology's kind of a singular thi:ng before you come into university so .hh this is what social psychology is this is biological >>(psychology) is this is what cognitive (psychology) is<< .hhh and then when you come in actually there's ten different types of psychology there's: (0.6) social psychology °I don't know<° (0.5) you get nut jobs like me and then you get (evolutionary) social phycologists like Michael an' >>very very<< different ways of understanding things within the same fie- sphere .hhh (2.0) so why does it start of so colourful and kind of:: glitzy (0.5) and then suddenly it turns into this: (1.5) mass confusion of: (0.3) dry: sciencey approaches (1.3)  
 L:→ could it be that it's to: (.) try and get people to sign up to psychology degrees. for the money that they bring [in ]  
 S2: [(to)] like dra:ws people in. so like you draw somebody in and they- get to a point where they're so like (0.5) into it that they continue it. and then [they realise] that (0.5) >>that's the same<< with everything though  
 L: [mm hm ]  
 S2: once you get ( ) you realise that things aren't always (0.3)  
 L: yep  
 S2: how they were (.) as you first saw them. (.) and that there's more to it then  
 L: yep

### (19) Mark\_W3\_A1\_01:15:17\_Throw\_It\_Out\_The\_Window

- L: so we've talked about some of the- <issues of> (0.8) individualism and research. (0.9) now let's loo- think about the body of research that's come (0.5) since (0.5) the death of ( ) (0.5) all that ( ) bystander research that ( ) and (Dallas) started and that's kind of continued to this day .hhh (1.4) what does it mea:n for that research (2.7)  
 L:→ do we throw it out the win↓dow↑ (1.2)  
 S1: no. °°°(there's a lot)°°°

- L: 'k why not  
(2.3)
- S1: well >>>I think<<< it gives us a foundation of where to- >>whether<< to jump off from >f- for< new theories I think an' what (0.7) >>>I mean jus' because<<< a- a theory isn't (.) invalid doesn't mean it should be: (.) (s- it's-) it's proven an' doesn't mean it should be jus' (0.5) thrown (.) thrown into the bin never to be read again um (1.1) there's a lot we can learn from other theories an' (.)
- L: yeah=
- S1: >even (if that)< no matter how (old) they are  
(0.4)
- L: ((LS)) .hhh (0.3) I think so I think actually in terms of this week's readings to be fair to the authors they didn't say that the theory was wrong

## (20) Mark\_W3\_A1\_01:27:38\_Speak\_To\_The\_Victims

- S2: >is it like< what groups are (.) targeted.  
(0.4)
- L: .hhh (it'll) tell you what groups are targeted.
- S1: what it is like how it manifests [itself]
- L: [.hhh ] (.) ok. (.) how it manifests yeah=
- S3: =>but like< >>couldn't it<< mean different things to: (0.6) different people. [>so like<] what one person perceives as being racist or they
- L: [.hh ]  
were [talkin'] to them (.) that they were: >(experience) racism
- L: [mm ]  
might not be the person<  
(.)
- L: yeah. .hh so let's put those two together. .hh so then does that tell us: where the problem of racism is?  
(1.4)
- L:→ <what (Marxist)> (.) so if we try and understand (.) racism in York. (.) to continue the hypothetical example (1.0) now we'd want to talk to the victims of it but we'd also start to realise that some people may experience something as racist and some people might not experience som- the same thing as racist (0.6) ((LS)) .hhh (0.4) what does that tell us about racism. (0.5) tha::t (1.3) going around asking people are you racist would not tell us  
(0.4)
- S2: it's not like a: (0.5) clear cut (1.2) that's racist that's [not ]
- L: [yeah]
- (.)
- L: .hhh (0.3) it's not clear cu[t: ]
- S1: [>where it<] where it comes from  
(0.3)
- L: where it comes [from ]
- S1: [>and what k]ind-< the kind of people it comes from or the institu[tio:n]s: fo:r systems and the (state) it comes fro[m ]
- L: [mm hm] [yep.]

L: .hhh (0.4) above all (.) and (that) all of these points a:re (.) perfectly valid .hh above all it tells us (0.8) that the experience of racism has nothing to do with the cognitions of who we perceive to be the perpetrators of racism.

### (21) Mark\_W4\_A1\_00:11:16\_Old\_Slash\_Modern\_Racism

L: .hhh hhh °r(h)ight° (2.7) ((LS)) so (2.9) .hhh <kee:ping> recent things in mind both media over the last week and generally in politics from the last (0.5) five- (.) years? (1.8) can we sustain that old new distinction (7.0)

L:→ should we have a thing called old slash modern racism (1.6)

S1: °racism is racism though° (1.7)

S2: °°m-°°° (1.2)

S2: given the whole ( ) (what racism is) (.) an' you can still see can (0.7) °°t-°° (.) new racism then I'd argue (.) I would argue no=

L: =°°°ok°°° (0.8)

S2: [racism ] it's just racism

L: [( )] (1.0)

L: yeah. and I mean a lot a lot of the academic community tends to agree that actually this old new distinction is very very unhelpful

### (22) Mark\_W4\_A1\_01:21:52\_Donald\_Trump

L: I mean I grew up with the jokes there's a Finnish man a Swedish man a Norwegian man. °that kind of stuff° (0.7) I mean (0.3) ironically in Finland it was always the Finnish man was the butt of the joke but even so there's (0.3) cultural distinctions in jokes (.)

SA: °°mm:::°° (0.4)

L: what abou:t- (0.4) stand-up comedians a:nd (0.5) humour on TV. (2.3)

L:→ say someone is: ripping lo- Donald Trump to absolutely shreds yeah?=  
S1: =this is what I'm doing my dissertation on >so anything anyone says< will be framea↑ble↑ .hhh er::m but I'm reading a lot of er::m Jost >at the minute.< (.)

L: o[h yeah]

S1: [an' a ] lot of stuff (.) like that (uh:) er::m people like Young and stuff is looking at (1.1) the way that's perceived as mo::re (0.3) acceptable. an' a lot of those papers make the argument that (0.3) a lot of: more conservative viewers (aren't) (0.5) cognitive (enough) (0.6) could be [cuz a lot of] its satire? (.) and they're

L: [( )] sayin' they don't have a lot of the cognitive- processors? (0.6) necessarily to understand satire and that's why (0.6) late night



satire is considered a (little bit) more of a left (0.4) and a more acceptable thing

(0.3)

L: ((LS)) oka:y

(1.9)

L: we'll come back to that point later=

S1: =ok. hhh

(.)

L: but that- that's a really interesting one (0.3) I've read some of Jost's work but I've not come across that

(23) Mark\_W4\_A1\_00:19:46\_V1\_00:18:38\_Psychological\_Social\_Problem

L: and that's a question that we'll come into later as well oh there is this new old racism distinction >( )< has: (0.7) who this >>>(kind of)<<< of prejudice and race hasn't gone anywhere

S1: cognitively speaking racism hasn't changed but- socially speaking it has

L: mm

(0.9)

L: there you go so is racism a social or a psychological problem?

[(1.2) ]

**[(L drinks)]**

S1: mm both

(.)

S2: social construct

(1.4)

L: .hhh there is >this< element of social construction in there (.) but I'm saying like- in kind of loo::se laymen's terms is it a psychological problem .hh or a social problem

[(2.4) ]

**[(L gazes to left side of room)]**

L:→ if I go around saying that people a-er: say all the time that people in a particular ethnic group are: horrible and inferior to::: whatever I am (0.8) °although if that's ( ) I'll be a bit mongrel my↑self↑°

SA: hh

(0.5)

L: er:m (1.8)

[would that present:: (0.8) a psychological problem? ]

**[(L lifts left hand into a 'thumbs up' and presses lips together)]**

[(1.0) ]

**[(L's left hand remains in a 'thumbs up' and his lips remain pressed together)]** ]

[or would that present a social problem ]

**[(L extends index finger out from the 'thumbs up')]**

(0.5)

S3: °°°both°°°

(0.3)

SA: ((cough))

L: >ok can you elaborate on that<

(0.3)

S3: °well- surely:: erm° (1.3) I think sometimes (0.3) er- >sort of< racist hues: can be a >lil< bit (1.1) °(stu:pid at sense)° (.) like

- you're >COMING at it< from a: (1.3) ( ) (.) feels that way >abou-< a certain race:
- L: mm
- S3: like so- >they-< they're less (than other) (.) or less ( ) >but they are<
- L: mm  
(0.6)
- S3: <erm surely> they'll see that there's: evidence of this that that's not the case (0.5) >be like< but (0.4) so you'd say that ( ) >>people can-<< (0.4) <act like> (0.7) be racist and not have any: (0.8) way of not being >>>( ) if you know what I mean like<<< because it says (0.8)
- L: m[m]
- S3: [b]iological thing

#### (24) Mark\_W4\_A1\_01:52:13\_Old\_New\_Racism

- L: do you remember the video clip that I played at the end of the prejudice lecture (.) last year (0.3) er:m (1.5) where a: white Finish women stops a: (.) Kenyan women and just starts basically sayin' (.) she literally says the words you are not human because you're black. (0.6) though I'm I'm quoting literally (0.4) what she said in that ( ) so there's just (0.3) all sorts of other (.) horrible things that happened  
(2.1)
- L: so: (.) how useful is that old new racism distinction  
(1.0)
- L:→ I mean looking at the picture on- er:: here >I think< (0.4) we have a fair(ly) clear case that that's: might be (0.4) °or we might° that is a case of >the kind of< mo:re (0.3) explicit forms of racism (0.8) but the one on the right the text (0.4) that gets a bit more complex (0.5) I mean I think- (0.5) judging by the: reactions in the room (.) we can a:ll (0.6) quite clearly recognise that as a very racist post  
(1.3)
- L: but is that kind of old new distinction useful in that case  
(1.0)
- L: because you have elements of both. (.) °I think°  
(0.8)
- S1: would the distinction <not be> (0.4) explicit an' implicit rather than new and old  
(0.6)
- L: ye[ah ]
- S1: [is that] not a better distinction °to make°
- L: yeah.  
(0.3)
- L: >but the fact is that yo-< °°uh-°° my point is that you both the explicit and the implicit in that one (.) but I do >I do< agree with you

#### (25) Mark\_W7\_A1\_00:17:55\_Discourse\_Analysis

- L: so what do you do with that type of analysis  
(1.3)
- L: why would you ↑do↑ that type of analysis

- (1.6)
- L:→ ok? so we know that we can: (0.7) analyse tha- people's communication discourse >whatever< we:: (0.7) want to look at a particular point to see what they do: with their words to understand if there's .hhh something underlying psychological go- going on there (.) fair enough (0.9) what do you do with that type of information (.) what do you do with that type of analysis (0.6)
- S2: it'll just show that er: (0.4) depending on the circumstances of the s- social environment t- the same words w- would always mean the same thing: (.) depending on the conte:xt (0.8)
- L: ok? (0.8)
- S2: m- words and actions too I- I believe (0.7)
- L: ok so you could sho:w that (0.6) words are designed to do things:: (.)
- S2: °°°mm°°°
- L: ok: (1.3)
- S2: °°<I just like>°° mean >take marriage< for example if you say (0.3) saying I do doesn't really give off the same (0.3) social act doesn't come off the same social action in a- any of the environments outside of the (.) °°of that°° ceremony as-

#### (26) Mark\_W7\_A1\_01:08:36\_Story

- L: >so it's not< exaggerating is: >>>probably<<< (.) takin' an implicit stance in the analysis but there is something >>that that<< tells you >it's exaggerating it's that< catastrophising language .h wil- things will never be the same again (0.8) ok (4.4)
- L: >what about< calling something a story (2.0)
- L:→ ((LS)) .hh now what we don't know what <kind of> (0.9) you say that Farage is constructing his reality I'd say he's arguing for something .h cuz reality construction is something >a lil bit more< specific within arguing something .hhh (0.5) <but> (0.8) there's an implicit reality construction by calling something a story (0.7) what is that (1.4)
- S1: calling it a story implies that it's erm (0.3) perhaps (.) made up (.) (more) (0.3)
- L: made up yeah (0.6)
- L: .hhh (0.4) good (1.6)
- L: it's somehow sayin' that this isn't >>(real)<< it's just a story it's fiction

## (27) Mark\_W7\_A1\_01:12:00\_Quoting

- L: the fact that he's: (.) quoting someone (0.5) what does that say (1.6)
- S1: he's not using his- (0.4) it's pertaining to the fact that- telling everyone that he's not (er:) (0.3) this isn't his own personal belief th- >rather than< it's just <a fact> (1.6)
- S1: a fact he's just trying to pertain (0.3) doing (I) mean >it-< it just so happens t- (0.6) [I've not] described it very we(h)ll .h=
- L: [.hhh ]
- L: =not quite but something very very close I mean there is that footing that is unquoting someone rather than speaking out of own my own mouth which is kind of a way of presenting something as factual going %I'm not saying this someone else said it% (1.0) but what else is relevant about quoting .hhh how'd you quote someone (1.8)
- L:→ when you tell your friends %oh I heard (0.6) that person say that horrible thing% (1.0) >>>what are y-<<< what else are you also telling your friend (0.3)
- L: other than what this other person said (0.6)
- L: you're telling them something else as well (0.4)
- S1: °°m-°° if I'm wrong >>I'm not res-<< I'm not responsible (1.1)
- L: .hh the flip side why is it right why you quoted them (1.8)
- L: by quoting something what are you telling them (1.1)
- S2: what- who you are and what you- are as a person (1.3)
- S2: because if <you: are:> quoting them: in a way that you disagree with them (0.7) your- proving who you are? (0.8)
- L: .hh ok the way you're quoting someone yeah you're right that does tell you about what you personally (0.4) or what you treat as:: something (>>> <<<) >>but that's not quite what I'm saying<< .hh but in order to quote something to say %this person said that% .h you're also telling (that) other person that [%I was there% ]
- L: [((lecturer knocks on table three times))] (0.7)
- L: %I'm not making this stuff up I was there and I heard this person say something%

## (28) Mark\_W7\_A1\_00:15:48\_Anti-British

- L: .hhh hh anti-British (retric) and venom (1.4) again it's perceived by that >kind of< extreme language FULL OF (2.5) the French president was full of anti-British (retric) and venom (0.5) maybe he's tryna tell us that he had an axe to grind? (5.0)

- L: you're quoting something (.) where you hear a friend of yours (1.6) talk about how someone's behaving (.) they say %a::h but- he always says this quite of stuff he's (>>>th-<<<) so anti-British% (1.3) what are you sayin' about the person's argument. >or< their behaviour (0.9)
- L:→ %a::h this person ha:tes tea that's cuz >they' (re) always sayin'< all that anti-British stuff.% (0.8)
- S1: that they're biased against Britain. (0.5)
- L: exactly
- S1: and there's the comparison between (.) his rational speech earlier (0.4)
- L: mm [hm ]
- S1: [(an')]Britain's stance. versus the irrational stance that the °(French) ( )°
- L: yeah!

### (29) Mark\_W7\_A1\_00:29:11\_Psychologically\_Relevant\_Language

- L: what marks that kind of work as critical work (2.1)
- S1: °the challenging (.) surface level (0.6) discourse° °° (an' like making it) ( )°° (0.8)
- L: ((LS)) (1.1) .hhh not necessarily what's underlying it but highlighting it's complexity .h because everything that we've looked at is still readily observable (.)
- S1: °°°mm::°°° (.)
- L: but it's the kind of thing that we might gloss over if we don't stop to really look at it in detail (1.8)
- L: ok what else (4.2)
- L:→ ((LS)) I'd be highlight- (.) I'd be suggesting that you: look at the: (1.4) psychologically relevant language i:n (0.3) >that-< (.) those extracts (0.6) why (10.7)
- L: how might that (1.4) help us understand that work is critical (1.8)
- S2: because you understand the language as er: like a practical function rather than just (1.7)
- L: °°°mm°°°=
- S2: =a (middle states) it's something that has: (.) an effect on behaviour (0.3)
- L: yeah (1.0)
- L: yeah (.) so we understand behaviour or explanations of behaviour based on social context (0.6) rather than (.) tryin' to infer mental states that drive action (.)

S2: mm hm

(30) Mark\_W7\_A1\_00:34:15\_Something\_Else

S1: erm I mean you could look at it like er:m (0.4) which other disciplines probably already do which they do .h it's like er::m (.) like body language:: and how that (0.4) is: (0.4) represented in with like (1.6) er:: like certain (.) psychological states as well? (0.4) or how li:ke er:m .h facial expressions like certain things tha- can go unsaid but two people can communicate without speaking (0.8) and I think that could like set a psychological state as well (1.4) and you could infer behaviour from that as well I think (0.8)

L: you can certainly infer behaviour from that .hh I probably will slightly tweak that >rather than< set psychological (tastes) we're embodying psychological states (1.0)

S1: [mm ]

L: [can you give me an] example of that (1.6)

L:→ how do you embody a psychological state with your body language or facial expressions=

S1: =.h I mea:n so: for instance if: someone's annoying ya >the- you-< you're with your friend or something and somebody's done something you can kind of just give someone a look (.) [A ]ND THAT LOOK that

L: [mm]

S1: facial expression that (1.2) understanding could like (0.9) you both know what you mean if that makes sense

L: yeah

S1: you both >you both< can look at each other and be like %that's annoying% (0.9)

S1: or that's frustr[at]ing] or I can't be bothered with that

L: [yeah ] (0.5)

S1: [>but that's] like< communicating without actually speaking

L: [yeah ]

L: yep yep (1.0)

L: frowning when someone say's [something]

S1: [mm hm ] (1.4)

L: ok:

## 7.7. Appendix 7: Acknowledging the FTA via *Pursuit Complete Collection*

### (1) Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_00:13:56\_Don't\_Ask\_Me

- L: er:m othe::r groups:: reflections on this I didn't get to chance (.)  
 chance to chat to that second row very much  
 (1.0)
- L: Timothy °what were you° (.) °°what were you guys talking about ...°°(.)  
 huh huh (°°ha ha°°)  
 (1.0)
- L:→ %don't as:k me%=  
 SA: =°huh huh°=  
 L: =are you down with this or not=  
 SA: =m(h)m h(h)m  
 (2.0)
- S1: >>I I<< ( ) (0.4) ( ) >how how< can you:: (1.2) how can you: (.)  
 define. (.) a language (0.3) that language .hh as in:: (.) for  
 example (.) if a language is dead ( ) (0.7) but >you< (.)  
 >you you< can sti- you're still able to: (0.6) u::se the language (.)  
 to learn the language
- L: mm hm  
 S1: and >to be able< to com( ) using that language=  
 L: =mm hm=  
 S1: ( ) (.) and to learn the language etc so (.) does that make  
 sense? it's not dead=  
 L: =it's not dead .h >and that< (.) reflects on some of the things we're  
 saying on the [front row as] well .hh SO WE'RE CLEA::RLY GOING TO=  
 S1: [yeah ]  
 L: =HAVE TO SPEND SO:ME TIME (0.3) thinking about what we mean by dead  
 as well

### (2) Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_00:26:37\_V1\_00:26:16\_Sweedish\_and\_Danish1

- S1: <it's a wa:y of> like- (0.8) just (0.8) logistics way of (1.6)  
 communicating slash (1.2) <talking? to people> like that can maybe  
 (survive) one- one or two (0.6) so like not just talking to yourself  
 like you're talking to other people or communicating: with that side  
 language or a (0.4) um the- >kind of< a way a way to express what  
 you're thinking
- L: uh huh (0.5)  
 [and then how does that <differentiate> itself from another language]  
 [((L gazes around room and moves both hands slowly up and down)) ]  
 [that ] [does the same thing ] (0.4)  
 [((L lifts left hand towards S1))] [((L gazes towards S1))]  
 [but differently (.) possibly using a different grammatical:: ... ]  
 [((L gazes around room and moves both hands slowly up and down))]  
 [(2.5) ]  
 [((L maintains prior gesture))]  
 L: [°°how else°° ]  
 [((L gazes around room and moves both hands slowly up and down))]  
 [(2.2)]

- [(L maintains prior gesture)]**
- L: so how do we differentiate for example between  
 [(0.8) °er::m ]  
**[(L gazes down)]** mos:: ° (0.5)  
 [Swedish:: ]  
 [(L shakes head, smiles and puts both hands out forwards)] (1.3)  
 a:nd (1.5) [Danish:: ] (.)  
**[(L puts left hand out forward)]**
- [Danish and Norwegian is the classic example ]  
**[(L tilts head right, smiles and puts both hands out forwards)]**  
 [(1.9)  
**[(L maintains prior gesture)]**
- L: [how do we know that one's- (.) they're two languages ]  
**[(L gazes around room and shakes left hand side to side)]**  
 [are they two languages ]  
**[(L nods head and puts left hand out forwards)]**  
 (0.5)
- L: [Norwegian ] [and Danish ]  
**[[L lifts left hand up]] [(L drops left hand down)]**
- S2: [°yeah° ]  
 (.)
- S2: yeah
- S3: pronunciation
- S4: like speech language °°( )°°  
 (1.3)
- L: yeah (0.4) speech (stands) important aspect there (.) going back to  
 Josie's point about grammar

### (3) Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_01:13:01\_Bold\_Question

- L: a language is (0.4) >t- a-< considered to have di:ed (.) when the (.)  
 the <pe:nultimate> (0.3) %sp(h)eaker dies% (0.5) because that means  
 that that final person there (.) has no one to talk to (.) i:n the  
 language. .h ((LS)) UM: SO YEAH if you were to find out tomorrow that  
 the penultimate speaker of some random little tiny language in  
 Tasman↑ia↑ (.) obviously very tiny .hh er: had died. <who: here would  
ca:re.>  
 (3.4)
- L:→ I know bold question  
 (1.2)
- S1: °°to what extent do you mean°°  
 (0.3)
- S1: [°°like°°]
- L: [°°ye ]a::h°°  
 (0.5)
- L: °°>t(h)- t(h)- t(h)-<°° to an extent.

### (4) Blair(ELL1)\_W7\_A1\_00:11:17\_Sapir-Whorf

- L: >any other< names feel familiar  
 (1.0)
- S1: Sapir Who:rf  
 (.)
- L: Sapir Who:rf. >tell me a little bit more.<



- (1.7)  
 L:→ we have[n't covered Sapir Whorf this year]  
 S1: [°°°( )°°°] (.) English Language (0.5)  
 A-Level.=  
 L: =mm:[:: ]  
 S1: [an'] I remember it having to do with (0.5) <child? language acquisition> or something like that

(5) Mark\_W3\_A1\_00:18:23\_V1\_00:17:50\_Spot

**((L changes slide of presentation))**

- L: so (2.5) why is psychology so individualist (.) <individualistic> (2.4)  
 S1: it is possible that it's shaped by ou:r <culture?> (0.5) in the West we're erm: individualistic anyway (0.3) erm- psychology kind'a (1.0) but- (.) but it's (mum's) psychology that's ( ) (0.3) West Europe maybe? (0.8)  
 L: ok yeah >>>no I would say that's<<< [( ) ]  
 S1: [>>most research<<] papers nowadays are (.) sort of (.) from a Western perspective (0.4)  
 L: yep (0.6)  
 L: no I mean psychology is predominantly developed in- >>in-<<< within a Western mindset (0.5) yep (1.2)  
 S2: erm ( ) (0.8) well looking back on papers like (0.3) er: from Michael Billig and they (0.9) (dec)ided to throw the who:le concept of (.) cognitions into question of whether they- do explain (.) er social psychology (.) phenomenon °°an::d°° so that's (0.8) in hence (tha-) (0.8) well (1.4) that's the beginning of er discourse analysis where they'll just look at it through a: more of a qualitative approach where they (0.4) >>which<< which considers the er: social environment  
 L: yeah (0.5)  
 S2: >and< (0.4) does high mirror which is (0.3) which has been a-analysed and (0.5)  
 L: y[eah ]  
 S2: [just] considering that to- (.) that ideals do change but what doesn't change is the fact that er: (3.4) well (0.3) °°erm°° (1.2) never mi(h)nd .h h  
 L: [well since we're on- on topic of Michael Billig (0.9) you're right that he does question: (0.3) not the existence of cognition but the po- potentially their >>a-<<< (.) validity as a sole expl- (.) explanation of what we do .hhh now >you said that< he:: suggested that we look at the qualitative context in that (0.5) instead (0.8) is true >>but<< he's suggesting a very particular qualitative context and what is that what is his particular understanding of the world that he's suggesting ]  
**[[L gazes predominantly at S2, he is seated with his arms crossed)]**  
 [(3.8) ]

- [(L maintains prior gesture)]**  
 L:→ [%I'M PUTTING YOU ON THE SPOT HERE CAUSE YOU MENTIONED THAT YOU READ  
 MICHAEL BILLIG SO I'M JUST GONNA kind of ...% ]  
**[(L gazes at S2 and smiles, he is seated with his arms crossed)]** ]  
 [(0.7) ]  
**[(L maintains prior gesture)]**  
 S2: %I've seen assume (0.4) read it [but it's ]%  
 L: [huh huh huh] .hhh ]  
**[(L laughs and tilts chin down)]** ]  
 [%o(h)k [carry on% ] ]  
**[(L smiles, nods and leans forward to pick up drink)]**  
 S2: [%>>it wasn't it<<] wasn't the most engaging book to be  
 ho(h)nest%  
 L: [↑which book was that↑ ]  
**[(L tilts head right and squints eyes)]**  
 (0.3)  
 S2: °erm:° (0.5) er: the nintee:::n er: eighty-seven book (0.3)  
 [no er:m ]  
 L: [Arguing and Th]inking?  
 [(2.1) ]  
**[(L tilts head right, squints eyes and puts left hand out forward)]**  
 S2: yeah >>I mean<< I'd probably like to read this again though  
 (>>>because it seems<<<) quite new (>>of a<<) topic at the time  
 (0.9)  
 L: %can't believe you said this I'm engaged [(now) ]%  
 S2: [%we(hh) ]ll)%=  
 L: =%huh I [feel a bit upset ] by tha(h)t%=  
 S2: [>>>I di(h)dn't<<<]  
 S2: =oh  
 (0.3)  
 L: .hh  
 S2: %it's my fault [huh huh I'm ] >>I didn't understand=  
 L: [%>>>no no no no<<< don't%]  
 S2: =it<< very well%  
 L: °no don't worry about it °°°(it's fine)°°° >>it's it's<<...°  
**[(L smiles throughout the above, lines 70-80)]**  
 (0.7)  
 L: you need to understand what's wrong with social psychology before  
 that book has any meaning really (0.6) but the thing that he says  
 that we could look at instead is for example the argumentative  
 dimensions which looks at the ideological climate of the ti:mes and  
 just generally (0.5) he pushes beyond (0.4)social psychology so he  
would consider things like what you said (0.4) a:nd the cultural  
 context (1.0) er:m

### (6)(7) Mark\_W3\_A1\_00:24:27\_Devil's\_Advocate

- S1: <be[cau:::se] li:::ke> we focus on individualistic cultures like the  
 L: [mm ]  
 Western °cultures° rather than a capitalist culture  
 (0.8)  
 L: it could very well be the case .hhh what about the very  
 conceptualisation of >cultures< >>>that<<< are individualistic and  
 collectivist (.) does that work or help us °in any shape or form°

- (1.4)
- S2: yes >>cause it<< says how much individuals are motivated by their culture  
(1.4)
- L: ok .hhh now that's a good point but does that mean that even collectivists cultures are understood from an individualist perspective then  
(1.4)
- L:→ [>I mean< ] >>>I'm-<<< I'm playing the devil's advo[cate ]  
S2: [(°°°so°°°)] [>>so wh]at do you mean<< huh hh
- L: well in the sense that if say that (.) cultural distinctions are >understood< in terms of individualist or (.) collectivists (.) .hh so does that mean that collectivist culture is determined by how the individual responds to a group  
(0.8)
- L: so does that mean that the way we understand the distinction is still rooted in individualism  
(1.5)
- S3: ((LS))  
(0.5)
- S3: p(hhh)°°>that's a tough question<°°  
(0.8)
- L:→ I MEAN >>>I- I<<< genuinely don't know the answer because I'm not a cultural psychologist but >it's it's< just kind of  
(0.7)
- S2: I think I think in collectivists cultures people will forgo their own: (0.4) values and ideas (0.7) <i:n> place of the groups values and ideas .h so:
- L: mm
- S2: they kind of put their own individual psychology aside
- L: ye[ah ]
- S2: [(in-)] in the group psychology  
[(2.2) ]
- SA: [((coughing))]
- L: has >>if we're<< only speaking of correct I'm going to throw a wrench in the works there (0.3) that distinctions not necessarily that simple because you will find .hh highly individualist cultures such as the UK whe:re you still find individuals <putting their personal> (0.5) whatever aside >it-< it for someone else  
(0.4)
- S2: it's quite a general framework (.) bu:[t ( )]=
- L: [it is a bit >>>yeah yeah<<<]
- S2: °°°tend to er:m°°°
- L: it is a general framework <but> >>>the-<<< the point when I highlighted that for example (0.6) even (0.8) >>>( )<<< this happens >kind of< at the ideological level let alone the practical level .h (0.4) is you have this systems of: (less called neoliberal) ideology of the West that we have at the moment that's kind of pro-capitalist pro-individual .hh

## (8) Mark\_W3\_A1\_01:03:32\_Already\_Answered

- L: and if it's outside the individual due to lower socioeconomic status due to univer(h)sity(h) >if we're gonna go with that example< .hh so what else might be we interested in then  
(0.3)
- L: other than (0.8) assuming that something is lies within the individual  
(0.8)
- L: what else could we look at  
(1.0)
- L:→ and you've already kind of <answered that question> but spill it out a bit more  
(0.8)
- S1: social norms? social pressures
- L: social norms social pressures yep  
(.)
- S2: the individual themselves  
(0.8)
- L: yep (.) [so-] can you elaborate on that=  
SA: [( )]
- S2: =so li:ke (0.9) every individual has their ow:n <problem>
- L: mm
- S2: and (they're) like (0.8) if someone's stressed in like a social situation

## (9) Mark\_W4\_A1\_00:37:17\_Entitled\_To\_Ask

- L: how many in this room are not from the UK  
(2.6)
- L: so what's your experience in terms of more nuance forms=>NOT NECESSARILY< THAT PEOPLE HAVE CONSCIOUSLY DONE ANYTHING but have you felt like an outsider in some ways  
(1.8)
- L:→ >and I consider myself< entitled to ask that question because I'm not from the UK as[we::ll so °°(it's ...)°° ]  
[(multiple student laughter)]  
(1.1)
- S1: I mean- (.) for myself I don't really feel like I °°c-°° can comment because I've lived here all my life.  
(.)
- S1: so.  
(.)
- L: you what  
(.)
- S1: I don't feel like I can comment on that because I've lived here all my life.  
(.)
- L: ok fair enough

## (10) Mark\_W7\_A1\_00:10:40\_Unfair

- L: .hh well that is certainly common critique yeah  
(0.5)
- L: ok. .hh

- (0.7)
- L: so we've broad(ly) got a consensus that even quantitative papers:  
(0.5) are not neutral (0.6) °ok.° (1.4) .hhh (0.9) they're not  
neutral so >what is< their stance  
(2.3)
- L: what are they trying to (0.5) what is thei::r (1.0) subjective  
position.  
(1.4)
- L:→ %I'M SLIGHTLY UNFAIR% THAT I'M ASKING THIS QUESTION IN A GENERAL  
SENSE cuz there probably isn't a general answer to it °it might be  
something a little bit more specific°  
(1.3)
- L: °°so feel free to be specific in your answers°°  
(5.7)
- S: you could argue that they're tryin' to- (.) they're tryin' to pertain  
to this ↑i-↑ (0.3) °°(m- t-)°° to an idea that- (.) will probably  
get (there) (1.3) to what's: considered desirable in the domain of  
psychology (°°>>and what<<°°) (.) and what would get that paper  
published rather than what they °°s::-°° specifically believe in  
(0.9)
- L: yep

#### (11) Mark\_W7\_A1\_00:34:15\_Something\_Else

- L: in the case of the critical stuff that we've been talking about  
today (0.5) the critical (outlook) comes from .h refusing to take  
for granted that language (0.5) °drives thought°  
(1.9)
- L: is that enough  
(.)
- SA: [( )]  
[(0.5)]  
(1.1)
- L: could we be doing something (e-) else instead (.) you know to:  
advance critical psychology  
(3.9)
- L:→ >>again<< I have no answer to this >this is just< a general question  
to you  
(1.5)
- L: what do you think  
(4.6)
- S1: erm I mean you could look at it like er:m (0.4) which other  
disciplines probably already do which they do .h it's like er::m (.)  
like body language:: and how that (0.4) is: (0.4) represented in with  
like (1.6) er:: like certain (.) psychological states as well? (0.4)  
or how li:ke er:m .h facial expressions like certain things tha- can  
go unsaid but two people can communicate without speaking (0.8) and I  
think that could like set a psychological state as well (1.4) and you  
could infer behaviour from that as well I think  
(0.8)
- L: you can certainly infer behaviour from that .hh I probably will  
slightly tweak that >rather than< set psychological (tastes) we're  
embodying psychological states

## (12) Tessa\_W2\_A2\_00:07:02\_Mean

- ((individual group discussion))
- L: .hh ok (.) we'll [(1.2) ] d'you- (.) everybody:
- SA: [((background discussion))]
- L: (0.3) seems to have gone quiet so I'm thinking >>that<< that might mean we're at a- natural end so .hhh I'm gonna ask each table to come up with one [(1.3) <ke:y:] point> about spoken versus written=
- SA: [((coughing))]
- L: =language >I'm going to< start over here what mm ((sniff))=
- S1: =mm we said spoken language is usually [more sp ]ontaneous:
- SA: [((coughing))]
- S1: °°than written language°°=
- S1: =not always though (0.3) °but usually°  
[(11.9) ]  
[((lecturer writing on board))]
- L: o:kay so: next table over here °what have we° ...  
(1.2)
- S2: e:rm written language is more formal? (0.3) than spoken language  
(0.9)
- L: ye::p  
(0.9)
- L: can you elaborate a little bit  
(1.0)
- S2: hmm:::  
(0.6)
- L:→ or is that mean putting you on the spot  
(0.3)
- SA: hhh  
(0.6)
- S2: that has to be a certain formality when you write something in general (0.4) wherea:s in spoken language it's very more >it's much more< context( ) (.)depends who you're speaking to and how formal you are  
(0.4)
- L: yeah (0.7) good

## (13) Tessa\_W2\_A2\_01:15:36\_Dreadful\_Example

- L: °°ok<° so these errors tell us a lot about what's going on so if you've got a child for example who makes (0.3) loa:ds of <substitution> errors (0.9) ok so think o- they're saying things like bucket instead of biscuit or they're saying er:m (0.6) I don't know:w (1.7) er:::m (1.0) ok it's gone (0.8) .hh >I don't know< does instead of: (1.2) dress or something like that .h (1.3) if they're making substitution errors a lot (0.3) what that might: what what >do< you think that could tell us something? what do you think that °could tell us°  
(2.1)
- L:→ I've just given you a dreadful example °°of (it)°° (0.4) °because it's gone out of my head but° (0.7) er:m  
(5.7)

L: so what it might tell us is that they're struggling to decode (.)  
°ok° .h so if you're struggling to decode a really really intelligent  
strategy is to guess (1.0)

## 7.8. Appendix 8: Acknowledging the FTA via *Termination Complete Collection*

### (1) Blair(Att)\_W2\_A2\_00:26:37\_V1\_00:26:16\_Sweedish\_and\_Danish2

- L: [how do we know that one's- (.) they're two languages ]  
 [((L gazes around room and shakes left hand side to side))]  
 [are they two languages ]  
 [((L nods head and puts left hand out forwards))]  
 (0.5)
- L: [Norwegian ] [and Danish ]  
 [((L lifts left hand up))] [((L drops left hand down))]
- S2: [°yeah° ]  
 (.)
- S2: yeah
- S3: pronunciation
- S4: like speech language °°( )°°  
 (1.3)
- L: yeah (0.4) speech (stands) important aspect there (.) going back to  
 Josie's point about grammar  
 (1.6)
- L: [where are we with Norwegian and Danish ]  
 [((L gazes around room and moves both hands slowly up and down))]  
 [(6.0) ]  
 [((L gazes around room, moves both hands slowly up and down and  
 smiles)) ]
- L:→ [so it's quite interesting ] .h so (1.1)  
 [((L changes slide on presentation))]  
 [there's a few spanners in the work immediate- works immediately when you]  
 [((L gazes around room, moves both hands around and smiles)) ]  
 [start to follow up on some of the::se these ↑notions↑ ]  
 [((L gazes around room, moves both hands around and smiles))]  
 .h erm which is indeed of course why there are <many linguists> (0.7)  
 er: globally who ↑refute↑ the notion of any named language and  
 problematise it .hh er:m .hhh

### (2) Mark\_W3\_A1\_00:10:10\_Not\_Saying

- L: .hh (1.5) so (2.0) can you think of other cases (.) in social  
 psychology whe:re something might be looked at through (1.0) the  
 lense of an- >>other<< understanding individual (0.6) <whe:re  
 actually> you could look at it (.) from a different perspective (.)  
 and still find (0.5) that it's equally:: (0.7) valid >>>( )<<< in  
 your research and is still just as psychologically relevant  
 (2.2)
- S1: °well it was° Milgram's experiment (0.5) Mil- Milgram was the  
 Stanford (.) <prison experiments>  
 (0.8)
- L: ok so Milgram's (experiments) started with prison experiments .hhh so  
 how are they all >>>(gonna be)<<< concerned with the individual  
 (1.5)



- S1: well >>s- ins<< ins: (.) >ins ins< Zimbardo's case er:m (0.6) they'll just (0.5) (throw us more on the hat) when peoples (1.0) how people were affected by power and or (0.5)
- L: um=
- S1: =or a lack of power s- and (1.5) and how that's (sometime-) (1.6) >>s-<<< (.) we(h)ll helps them to: (.) make them lose their identity within that so: (0.8) without °something° but in that environment (0.7)
- L: ok (0.3) .hhh so what's missing from that (1.4)  
 [(1.0) ]  
 [°°°( )°°°]  
 (3.5)
- L:→ >I'm not saying you had to have an answer to that< it's more of a question .h that doesn't have necessarily have an answer but then that would be the thing .h if we're concerned with how individual lose their identities .h then the next question is >well< what are we missing from that kind of picture

### (3) Mark\_W3\_A1\_00:54:46\_V2\_00:10:05\_Rephrase

- S1: >in the opposite of that< is- is our inhibitions (0.4) from stopping us from doi- stopping us fro:m (.) doing new course of actions
- L: ok? let's go with inhibitions (0.4) are inhibitions psychological (1.1)
- L: or are they social (0.8)
- S1: °bo:th maybe° (3.5)
- S1: °°I can't really answer tha(h)t so°°
- L:→ no I can't answer that either (0.5)
- L: .hh I think probably both might be som- (0.3) might be one: way >>of<< looking at it .hh let's say when your parents are teaching you manners when you're a child

### (4) Mark\_W4\_A1\_00:32:30\_Prejudice

- S1: but >they don-< yeah they chose to do- they chose to be in this it's a choi:ce
- S2: yeah (0.6)
- L: ok so this brings us to another [type of prejudice th]en
- S1: [huh huh huh huh huh ] (0.7)
- L: show of ha::nds: (1.8) who: (1.5) has felt disadvantaged because you're a woman (0.4) at some point [(4.9) ]  
 [((whispering in background))]
- L: right so question to the guys have you felt disadvantaged because you're a guy? (2.7)
- L:→ now there >>is a bit of a<< controversial point that I wouldn't expect a guy to stick their hand up even if they did feel that way

.hh but there is: <also> like we talked (a bit) before we're kind of we're going off on a tangent but we'll follow that a little bit

(5) Mark\_W4\_A1\_00:46:48\_Hovering

- S2: yea:h this this er:m this that this er:m ((LS)) (.) god I can't get my words out today it's Friday afternoon. °I can't ever really°=  
 L: =(I) me [neither]  
 S2: [UM ] QUESTION TIME. (.) [it was about] the points  
 L: [°°mm yeah°° ]  
 systems that's what [that-] (.) that- (.) question time was about .hh  
 L: [mm: ]  
 (.) and this lady %tell me would you close the borders%. (.) just close the borders. (.) stop people coming in. (.) why can't we just do that. (0.5) best thing to do. (0.3) this- this is .hh (.) so it is: (0.8) it is the::re YOU SEE ('EM) YOU SEE IT ON FACEBOOK. you see 'em (.) you see people with views (0.3)  
 L: °ye::[p°]  
 S2: [if] you look at the comments sometimes you think (0.6) oh my god (0.6) and this is two thousand and twenty and people are (0.4)  
 L: °yeah.°  
 (.)  
 L: ((LS)) .hh I THINK THE [INTERNET ]  
 S2: [AN' SOME OF] THESE PEOPLE tra:vel some of these people go on holiday and experience different cultures.  
 (.)  
 S3: mm:.  
 (0.3)  
 L: .hh[h  
 S2: [but they still have the sa:me (1.3) embedded (.) viewpoint.  
 (0.9)  
 L: .hhh which brings us to a very serious psychological issue is:: (0.6) does an attitude cha:nge (.) well first of can you change attitudes and if you can will that change behaviours  
 (1.4)  
 L:→ but (.) we'll (.) kind of leave that hovering in the air cuz:: I don't think anybody has the answer to that .hhh but going back the <points system>.

(6) Tessa\_W5\_A1\_00:41:59\_Deliberately

- L: any other (1.0) thoughts on (0.4) >wha' a-< what a sentence is.  
 (20.4)  
 L: °any thoughts?°  
 (3.8)  
 S1: is it where li:ke (0.3) not necessarily a rule but it- like it's a (advised that-) (.) they always contain at least ( )  
 (0.3)  
 L: ye:↑p↑  
 (2.2)  
 L: °°°s:°°° °so°  
 (3.4)  
 L:→ %ok I'm doing this deliberately ok because you're all looking like °°uh(h)hh°°% (.) ok .hh it's actually a really hard question to

answer. (0.7) a::nd (.) therefore it's actually (.) to try and get that concept over to a child (0.4) as to: what it is that we're expecting them to do and how we're expecting them to do it (.) is not easy