Overview and abstracts of accepted panels (July 2018)

(Click on panel title to jump to the abstract)

Practices of talking about languages and language use

Wolfgang Imo[1], Evelyn Ziegler[2]
[1]University of Hamburg, Germany; [2]University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany

Talking about languages, language users and language use is common both in everyday contexts as well as in certain institutional settings, e.g. in narrative interviews dealing with questions of identity, migration, language biographies, dialects or regional languages (e.g. Deppermann et al. 2015; König 2014; Liebscher/Dailey-O'Cain 2009; Tophinke/Ziegler 2006, 2014). The metacommunicative practices that are used to talk about topics related to languages (e.g. evaluations of languages as 'beautiful', 'complicated', 'elegant', "prestigious" etc.), language use (e.g. 'good' or 'bad' style, correct or incorrect usage, including or excluding usage) and language users (e.g. normative expectations and linguistic behavior; language related stereotypes or category bound activities) will be focused upon in this panel. An example for a typical practice of talking about languages and language users, for example, has been described by Imo/Ziegler (2018): Interactants routinely try to position themselves not individually but as part of a larger group when it comes to questions of language use. They do this by employing a range of verbal patterns (constructions) ranged around the indefinite pronoun *man*, resulting in a practice of 're-responsibilization' regarding their own language use. Both the theoretical and methodological aspects named in the conference's call will be addressed in the panel: It will be asked what exactly is meant by 'practices' of talking about language and language use/rs (a recent publication contrasting different concepts has been edited by Deppermann et al. 2016), how practices, actions and verbal patterns hang together in sequences of talking about language (use/rs) and how these practices are enacted prosodically and multimodally.

References

Deppermann, Arnulf, Helmuth Feilke & Angelika Linke (2016): Sprachliche und kommunikative Praktiken. Berlin.

Deppermann, Arnulf, Ralf Knöbl & Alexander Koplenig (2015): Metalinguistic Awareness of Standard vs Standard Usage: the Case of Determiners in Spoken German. In: Davies, Winifred V. & Evelyn Ziegler (Hg.): Language Planning and Microlinguistics. Basingstoke, 165-185.

Imo, Wolfgang und Evelyn Ziegler (2018): Situierte Konstruktionen: das Indefinitpronomen man im Kontext der Aushandlung von Einstellungen zu migrationsbedingter Mehrsprachigkeit. In: de Knop, Sabine und Jürgen Erfurt (Hg.): Konstruktionsgrammatik und Mehrsprachigkeit. Duisburg.

König, Katharina (2014): Spracheinstellungen und Identitätskonstruktion. Eine gesprächsanalytische Untersuchung sprachbiografischer Interviews mit Deutsch-Vietnamesen. Berlin.

Liebscher, Grit und Jennifer Dailey-O'Cain (2009): Language attitudes in interaction. In: Journal of Sociolinguistics 13 (2), 195-222.

Tophinke, Doris & Evelyn Ziegler (2006): ‚Aber bitte im Kontext': Neue Perspektiven in der dialektologischen Einstellungsforschung. In: Voeste, Anja & Joachim Gessinger (Hg.): Dialekt im Wandel. Duisburg, 203-222.

Tophinke, Doris & Evelyn Ziegler (2014): Spontane Dialektthematisierung in der Weblogkommunikation. In: Cuonz, Christina & Rebekka Studler (Hg.): Sprechen über Sprache. Tübingen, 205-242.

Longitudinal CA: documenting change in interactional practices over time

Arnulf Deppermann[1], Simona Pekarek Doehler[2]
[1]IDS, Germany; [2]Université de Neuchâtel, Switzerland

Change over time is a basic condition of human life. As we act in any social situation, we deploy practices in locally contingent manners. Yet, how we design our actions also rests on our cumulative experience of previous situations – an experience that entails continuous adaptations of our practices for action to new situations and their precise contingencies. Therefore, analyzing change in practices over time is key to an EMCA-understanding of learning, the acquisition of communicative competence, language socialization and the emergence of common ground in social interaction and its effects on, e.g., lexical choice, turn-design and action formation. However, despite of Zimmermann's 1999 call for more horizontal (across time) comparative CA, change over time has so far remained largely unexplored in CA research (but see the classical studies by Wootton 1997, Clayman & Heritage's, e.g. 2013 and recently Pekarek Doehler, Wagner & González-Matínez 2018).

In this panel, we scrutinize the methodological challenges of longitudinal research on social interaction, and discuss implications for our understanding of members' local conduct. Investigating change over time requires specific ways of sampling and analyzing data. For instance, longitudinal studies need to order their data chronologically, contrasting instances, typically produced by the same (category of) participants, occurring at different moments in time. They require what Koschman (2013 :1039) refers to as "same-but-different" analysis, which presupposes showing that the actions or practices occurring over time are similar enough to be considered tokens of the same type, i.e. accomplishments of the same action or practice, yet different enough so as to evidence change. Longitudinal analysis from an EMCA-perspective is faced with the key challenge of how to maintain an emic perspective whilst participants typically do not display in situ orientation to how they accomplished a given action in past situations.

In this panel we adress these methodological challenges through longitudinal investigations of change in interactional practices over time in a variety of social situations and across a range of languages. The terrains addressed range from driving lessons in German, through theatre rehearsals in Finnish and German, to second language conversations in French. We discuss how the different studies presented in the panel tackle the above challenges, and we reflect on implications of their findings on understanding local conduct and its historicity.

Heritage, J., and Clayman, S., 2013. The changing tenor of questioning over time: tracking a question form across us presidential news conferences, 1953-2000. *Journalism Practice*, 7(4), 481-501.

Koschmann, T., 2013. Conversation analysis and learning in interaction. In: C. A. Chapelle, ed. *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics.* Oxford, 1038-1043.

Pekarek Doehler, Simona, González-Martínez, Esther & Wagner, Johannes (eds.) (2018): *Longitudinal Studies on the Organization of Social Interaction.* Basingstoke.

Zimmerman, D. H., 1999. Horizontal and vertical comparative research in language and social interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 32(1-2), 195-203.

Wootton, A.J., 1997. *Interaction and the development of mind.* Cambridge.

On Sacks

Robin Smith[2], William Housley[2], Richard Fitzgerald[1]
[1]University of Macau, Macau S.A.R. (China); [2]Cardiff University

The work of Harvey Sacks has had both a widespread and enduring influence across and beyond the social sciences. His ground breaking studies of the organisation of talk-in-interaction influenced the development of ethnomethodology, as well as founding conversation analysis and, later, membership categorisation analysis and discursive psychology. Sacks' work has also been at the heart of a number of recent developments in diverse fields such as human geography, socio-linguistics, computational sociology, and human computer interaction. At the same time, however, much of the truly original methodological insights generated in his work remain underexplored. While his work and research is mostly seen as being about the study of interaction this panel broadens this towards treating Sacks as primarily a sociologist and as an innovative methodologist; as a technician and a craftsman, working with whatever materials and data that enabled a 'good enough' grasp on a given social phenomena. The panel invites contributions that reflect on Sacks' original works in context as well as how his work informs contemporary studies of society. This may include examining his methodological approach, how he built up his analysis or how his work informs contemporary studies of society. The overall aim of the panel, then, is a focus on both the way he worked and with the 'what more' that remains in the rich seam of Sacks' pioneering work. Through this the outcome of the panel is to emphasise Sacks' contribution to social sciences through engaging with the methodology, materials, and inspirations offered through his works.

Knowledge and expertise in interaction

Ilkka AT Arminen, Mika Simonen

University of Helsinki, Finland

In recent years, epistemics has grown into a focal and also disputed area of conversation analysis (CA) (Heritage 2012; 2013; Lynch & Macbeth 2016; Lindwall et al. 2016; Drew 2018). The area concerns how parties in interaction adjust and reshape their actions and understandings according to their sense of what they know and assume other participants to know. In this panel, we propose to open a related area, expertise in interaction, for scrutiny. Participants may not only orient to their knowledges but also to their expertise. Expertise in interaction has been continuously a topic of ethnomethodological (EM) and CA studies. There has been a numerous studies on professional practices, where parties also orient to their expertise in interaction (e.g., Heath 2012; Mondada 2003; Maynard 2003; not to forget a related tradition of institutional interaction Drew & Heritage 1992; Arminen 2016).

There has not yet been a systematic discussion of the relationship between knowledge and expertise in interaction. One might assume that knowledge and expertise are just different aspects of the same domain, but on a closer look their relationship may appear to be more complicated. Expertise may take a form of a professional vision that may also be used for challenging lay observations (Goodwin 1990). In apprenticeship, the trainer may teach trainees how to "see", thereby making evident that primary observations are not given, but you may need to be trained to observe what the profession requires (Hindmarsh et al. 2011; Koskela & Arminen 2012). Expertise in interaction is also open for evaluations; the professionality of action in interaction can be assessed (Rasmussen et al. 2012). Expertise may also be required for gaining deontic authority in interaction; mere knowledge may not yet guarantee access to deontic authority (Stevanovic & Peräkylä 2012). Direct observations and expertise may end up in a conflict so that, for instance, a professional sports(wo)man may dispute lay person's observation of the rule violation. More generally observational and conceptual structures may result in a contradiction, a black taxi may be a yellow cab (Arminen & Poikus 2009).

In this panel, we are interested in studies on parties in interaction adjusting and reshaping their actions and understandings according to their sense of what their expertise and orientation to other participants' expertise. On particular, we are keen on cases where the orientation to knowledge and expertise can be distinguished, or where there is a conflict between lay observations and professional visions. We are interested to learn more how participants orient to expertise in interaction, and how they differentiate directly observable knowledges from expertise based visions.

References included in the longer version of the CfP.

Points of no return: Endogenous assessments of critical tasks in surgical procedures.

Jonas Ivarsson[1], Jeff Bezemer[2], Mike Huiskes[3]
[1]Faculty of Education, University of Gothenburg; [2]UCL Institute of Education, London; [3]Center for Language and Cognition Groningen, University of Groningen

Koschmann, LeBaron, Goodwin and Feltovich (2011) pointed out that social scientists have long held a fascination for work in operating rooms, with reference to such works as Hirschauer (1991), Mondada (2003), Prentice (2007) and Sanches Svensson, Heath and Luff (2007). Here we could also mention the additional works of Hindmarsh and Pilnick (2007) and Bezemer, Murtagh, Cope and Kneebone (2016).

Across this body of work there are a number of commonalities. First, by and large, they ground their analyses in video recordings of in situ clinical practice. Second, there is a theoretical and methodological commitment to ethnomethodology and conversation analysis. And thirdly, the studies build on longstanding cooperative endeavours with practitioners in the medical settings, i.e. they constitute examples of "hybrid studies of work" (Garfinkel, 2002). The panel will advance this work by exploring consequentiality in surgical practice in Sweden, the Netherlands, and the UK.

Surgical practices contain a multitude of different tasks. Some tasks are done routinely and some are more occasional. Their frequency aside, there is another dimension—pertaining to consequentiality—which can be explored in its own right. So, rather than approaching surgical work broadly, the shared aim of the set of contributions is to focus on what we may call "critical tasks". With this notion we refer to the class of *consequential actions*: actions which may be irrevocable, or costly in terms of time or patient wellbeing, if carried out incorrectly. When the stakes are raised, the interaction within the surgical team often changes character and work becomes more assiduous and cautious. We investigate how these moments become marked occasions in the interactive organisation of the surgery and how endogenously identified ambiguities and uncertainties are resolved.

Bezemer, J., Murtagh, G., Cope, A., & Kneebone, R. (2016). Surgical decision making in a teaching hospital: a linguistic analysis. *ANZ journal of surgery, 86*(10), 751-755.

Garfinkel, H. (2002). *Ethnomethodology's program: working out Durkheim's aphorism.* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Hindmarsh, J., & Pilnick, A. (2007). Knowing bodies at work. Embodiment and ephemeral teamwork in anastehesia. *Organization Studies, 28*(9), 1395-1416.

Hirschauer, S. (1991). The manufacture of bodies in surgery. *Social studies of science, 21*, 279-319.

Koschmann, T., LeBaron, C., Goodwin, C., & Feltovich, P. (2011). 'can you see the cystic artery yet?' A simple matter of trust. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(2), 521-541.

Mondada, L. (2003). Working with video: how surgeons produce video records of their actions. *Visual Studies, 18*(1), 58-73.

Prentice, R. (2007). Drilling surgeons: the social lessons of embodied surgical training. *Science, Technology & Human Values, 32*(5), 534–553.

Sanchez Svensson, M., Heath, C., & Luff, P. (2007). Instrumental action: the timely exchange of implements during surgical operations. In L. J. Bannon, I. Wagner, C. Gutwin, R. H. R. Harper, & K. Schmidt (Eds.), *ECSCW 2007*(pp. 41-60). London: Springer.

The multimodal constitution of learning space

Maxi Kupetz[1], Julia Sacher[2]
[1]Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, Germany; [2]University of Cologne, Germany

The overall goal of preschools, schools, universities and other educational institutions is to enable people to learn. Classrooms are constituted as such in and through interaction (Mehan 1979). Conversation analytic work place studies have shown that "*it is within […] local sequences of talk, and only there, that […] institutions are ultimately and accountably talked into being*" (e.g. Heritage 1984: 290; Heritage/Clayman 2010). However, it is not only talk, but also context-sensitive bodily behavior that contributes to the constitution of institutions and social roles (Paul 2007; Mondada 2011; Heller 2016; Kern 2018).

In the panel, we want to explore which practices are used to construct, maintain and negotiate educational environments as learning space. Working with naturally occurring data, we aim at developing a multimodal concept of learning space that takes into account the holistic gestalt of teaching and learning in interaction. This line of work shall contribute to a more in-depth understanding of (embodied) practices in instructional interaction. We aim at addressing the following questions:

- How do participants constitute learning space? Which resources do they make use of and how?
- How can educational interaction be established outside of traditional educational settings?
- How does the participants' deployment of embodied resources contribute to doing teaching and doing learning? Which kind of multimodal practices can be systematically described and differentiated? How are interactional roles then constructed and negotiated?
- How are learning and understanding fostered through the deployment of multiple semiotic resources?
- How do different methodological approaches contribute to the analysis and conceptualization of learning space (Breidenstein 2004; Pitsch/Ayaß 2008; Hausendorf 2012)?
- Which implications does a multimodal, practice-based approach to learning and teaching have for practitioners?

Contributions from various disciplines and backgrounds are welcome.

References:

Breidenstein, Georg (2004): KlassenRäume – eine Analyse räumlicher Bedingungen und Effekte des Schülerhandelns. In: ZBBS 5(1), 87-107.

Hausendorf, Heiko (2012): Der Hörsaal als Interaktionsraum […]. In: Bulletin Suisse de Linguistique Appliquée (Vals-Asla) 96, 43-68.

Heller, Vivien (2016): Meanings at hand […]. In: Classroom Discourse 7(3), 253-275.

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

Heritage, John; Steven Clayman (2010): Talk in action […]. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Kern, Friederike (2018): Clapping hands with the teacher […]. In: Journal of Pragmatics 125, 28-42.

Mehan, Hugh (1979): Learning Lessons […]. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mondada, Lorenza (2011): Understanding as an embodied, situated and sequential achievement in interaction. In: Journal of Pragmatics 43(2), 542–552.

Paul, Ingwer (2007): Intra- und interpersonelle Koordinierung am Unterrichtsanfang. In: Schmitt, Reinhold (ed.), Koordination […]. Tübingen: Narr, 195-224.

Pitsch, Karola; Ruth Ayaß (2008): Gespräche in der Schule – Interaktion im Unterricht als multimodaler Prozess. In: Willems, Herbert (ed.), Lehr(er)buch Soziologie […], Band 2. Wiesbaden: VS, 959-982.

Practices of relationship building in helping professional interactions

Eva-Maria Graf[1], Claudio Scarvaglieri[2], Thomas Spranz-Fogasy[3]
[1]Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt, Austria; [2]Universität Basel, Schweiz; [3]Institut für Deutsche Sprache, Deutschland

The relationship between helping professionals and their clients is vital for the interactive construction of the helping process and for obtaining the institutional goal(s). As "working alliance" this relationship is an established success factor in therapeutic interactions as well as other helping formats: „The quality of the client–therapist alliance is a reliable predictor of positive clinical outcome independent of the variety of psychotherapy approaches and outcome measures" (Ardito & Rabellino 2011: 1, for coaching see Behrendt 2011).

Despite its centrality for helping professional interactions (Graf & Spranz-Fogasy i.pr.), linguistic research on practices of relationship building is still relatively scarce. As argued by Scarvaglieri (2013), in psychotherapy the relationship between client and therapist is managed on different verbal and non-verbal levels of interaction (e.g. turn-taking, sequentiality, spatial positioning, initiation and treatment of topics, pauses and intonation) to thoroughly involve and activate the client. This "hearer-centeredness" (Scarvaglieri 2017) contributes to building and managing the therapeutic relationship and forms a vital condition for change. Graf (in press) defines "Building a Relationship" as one of the four basic activities of coaching. It builds on various communicative tasks such as 'Establishing the roles and identities 'coach' and 'client'' or 'Negotiating hierarchy in an asymmetrical relationship' and serves as the matrix against which all other activities of coaching transpire. In this realm, Spranz-Fogasy (1992) classifies relationship building as a "permanent task" in doctor-patient interaction. On the interactional micro-level, research by Muntigl, Horvath and others (e.g. Muntigl & Horvath 2014) addresses practices of affiliation and dis-affiliation in therapeutic relationship as sequential achievements.

The panel brings together research on practices of relationship building across various types of helping professions such as (psycho-)therapy, coaching, doctor-patient interaction and physiotherapy. Questions to be addressed in this panel include the following:

- What are interaction-type specific and unspecific practices of relationship building across the discussed helping professions?

- How do practices of relationship building develop and change across supra-sessions of action?

- How do verbal and bodily practices of relationship building contribute to the overall regulation of a professional relationship?

- How do practices of relationship building contribute to the local effectiveness of the professional interaction?

References:

Ardito, R. B. & D. Rabellino (2011). Therapeutic alliance and outcome of psychotherapy.

Behrendt, P. (2012). Freiburger Erfolgsfaktoren-Coaching.

Graf, E.-M. (in press). The Pragmatics of Coaching.

Graf, E.-M. & T. Spranz-Fogasy (i.pr.) Helfende Berufe – helfende Interaktionen.

Muntigl, P. & A. Horvath (2014). The therapeutic relationship in action.

Scarvaglieri, C. (2013): ›Nichts anderes als ein Austausch von Worten‹.

Scarvaglieri, C. (2017): Beraten und Psychotherapie

Spranz-Fogasy, T. (1992). Ärztliche Gesprächsführung.

Practices of interpreting a prior speaker's talk

Jörg Zinken, Henrike Helmer
IDS Mannheim, Germany

Persons in interaction sometimes offer an interpretation of another person's prior talk. Initiating repair by offering a candidate understanding, or formulating the gist or upshot of prior talk are examples of moves that involve such interpretations, and that have been widely researched across languages and settings since their first conversation-analytic description in the 1970s (Heritage & Watson, 1979; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). The panel considers these phenomena together, as examples of more generic practices of "interpretation". This allows us to explore the continuities between the domains of repair and formulations, and to shed new light on what participants do by offering interpretations of another person's talk. In everyday informal interaction, there are other, less recognized actions drawing on practices of interpretation. Here is an example. Lydia is talking about how she has recently started liking tomatoes, whereas her parents only started eating them when they were "well into adulthood" (lines 14-15), that is, much older.

Example

15 Lydia: weil die beide ham des dann erst
because they both started
14 gegessen wo se dann so richtig (0.3) schon im
eating that when they had properly (0.3) already

15 erwachsenenalter quasi drin warn
reached adulthood

16 (2.0)

17->Cosima: (bis) du bisten bisschen frühreif
you are a bit precocious
18 (0.3)

19 Lydia: ja(h)a genau
ye(h)s exactly

Cosima's interpretation at line 17 has similarities to what is known as "formulations", but it does not provide either the gist or the upshot of Lydia's talk. The characterization of Lydia that it offers seems to deal with needs of everyday sociality, such as sharing humour, and maybe accomplishing an affiliational story uptake that is "late" (see line 16). Contributions to the panel examine practices of interpretation across settings and languages, addressing questions such as the following:

- Are interpretations a generic practice in interaction, occurring in specifiable contexts and having specifiable consequences?

- How do sequential environments, elements of turn construction, and multimodal aspects of conduct make recognizable the action launched with an interpretation?

- What methods do participants use to index the connection of a turn to a prior, thus making their move recognizable as an interpretation?

- How are interpretations adapted in particular contexts to do the work of a particular (e.g., institutional) setting?

Finally, the study of interpretations in interaction can be an occasion to revisit and discuss our (meta-)theoretical commitments concerning the study of "mental" phenomena, such as meaning, understanding, or inference.

References

Heritage, J., & Watson, R. D. (1979). Formulations as Conversational Objects. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnometodology* (pp. 123–162). New York, N.Y.: Irvington.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation. *Language*, *53*(2), 361. https://doi.org/10.2307/413107

Divergent units and fuzzy boundaries – what do they tell us about practices in action?

Dagmar Barth-Weingarten
University of Potsdam, Germany

Notions like TCU, turn, action, activity, project, and practice, are basic terms in Conversation Analysis, Interactional Linguistics, and Ethnomethodology. While analytically highly valuable, such concepts may also be taken to suggest that participants interact by using clearly identifiable building blocks. Moreover, they are often considered *Gestalt*-based chunks, with converging unit boundaries in various linguistic dimensions (e.g., Sacks et al. 1974, Ford/Thompson 1996, Szczepek Reed 2010).

However, research has pointed out that everyday talk is difficult to segment exhaustively (e.g., Auer 2010, Deppermann/Proske 2015). Plus, work on talk-in-interaction has highlighted a number of cases where unit ends diverge, not only regarding kinetics (e.g., Li 2014), but also with respect to the dimensions relevant for determining TCUs – syntax, prosody, and action (see, e.g., Couper-Kuhlen/Ono 2007 for non-add-ons, Pekarek Doehler et al. 2015 for right dislocations, Walker 2007 for pivots). Moreover, there may be fuzzy boundaries on the prosodic dimension (cf. Barth-Weingarten's 2016 cesura approach).

Assuming that such non-convergences may be interactionally functional (cf. Ford 2004: 31, Clayman 2013: 158), this panel would like to discuss the following issues:

- In which way do different multimodal resources contribute to the formation of practices, actions, and activities?
- Does the divergence of unit endings have repercussions for action ascription?
- Would a cesura approach also be useful for discussing practices?

And, more generally:

- What challenges do such phenomena pose for transcription and annotation?
- Do they speak for more flexibility in interaction than we were aware of so far?

References

Auer, P. (2010): Zum Segmentierungsproblem in der gesprochenen Sprache. In: InLiSt 49.

Barth-Weingarten, D. (2016): Intonation units revisited – Cesuring in talk-in-interaction. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Clayman, St.E.: (2013): Turn-Constructional Units and the Transition Relevance Place. In: Sidnell, J./T. Stivers (eds.) (2013): The Handbook of Conversation Analysis. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 150-166.

Couper-Kuhlen, E./T. Ono (2007): Incrementing in conversation. A comparison of methods in English, German and Japanese. In: Pragmatics 17: 505-512.

Deppermann, A./N. Proske (2015): Grundeinheiten der Sprache und des Sprechens. In: Dürscheid, C./J.G. Schneider (eds.): Handbuch 'Satz, Schema, Äußerung'. Berlin: de Gruyter, 17-47.

Ford, C.E. (2004): Contingency and units in interaction. In: Discourse Studies 6: 27-52.

---/ S.A. Thompson (1996): Interactional units in conversation: syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In: Ochs, E./E.A. Schegloff/S.A. Thompson (eds.): Interaction and grammar. Cambridge: CUP, 134-184.

Li, X. (2014): Multimodality, Interaction and Turn-taking in Mandarin Conversation. Benjamins: Amsterdam.

Pekarek Doehler, S. et al. (eds.) (2015): Time and emergence in grammar. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Sacks, H/E.A. Schegloff/G. Jefferson (1974): A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. In: Language 50: 696-735.

Szczepek Reed, B. (2010): Intonation phrases in natural conversation: A participants' category? In: Barth-Weingarten, D./E. Reber/M. Selting (eds.): Prosody in interaction. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 191-212.

Walker, G. (2007): On the design and uses of pivots in everyday English conversation. In: JoP 39: 2217-2243.

EMCA studies of work and practice in experimental psychology

David Matthew Edmonds

The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong S.A.R. (China)

Ethnomethodology and conversation analysis (EMCA) sit in a curious relationship with psychology; with their agnostic stance regarding inner cognitive states and a preference for studying human behaviour through the examination of naturally occurring social interaction rather than laboratory experimentation (de Ruiter & Albert, 2017). In contrast, recent years have seen the emergence of many psychological studies providing experimental validation and support for some of the core tenets and findings of CA (Kendrick, 2017). This panel proposes a twist on this; through EMCA studies of psychological methods, work and practice- a relatively neglected area of investigation.

Existing EMCA studies of work and practice in experimental psychology focus on two main aspects. First, a focus on the "handling" and "interpretation" of data. For example, the multimodal practices involved in the collaborative organisation of interpreting brain scans (Alač, 2011). Another group of studies focuses on the "production" of data, by focusing on what happens during psychology experiments. These studies explore various aspects of researcher-participant interaction including, how subjects resist experimenters' authority (Hollander, 2015); how subjects come to an understanding of what the experiment involves (Kobayashi Hillman et al., 2017), and the in situ accomplishment of methodological concerns such as demand characteristics (Wooffitt, 2007).

Despite focusing on a range of different types of experimental psychology, all these studies reflect a common theme- a re-specification of method as an interactive and practical accomplishment. They focus on the social organization and situated nature of psychological research. This panel welcomes contributions of empirical EMCA studies of psychological practice and work. The panel will focus on a range of different psychological disciplines, such as cognitive neuroscience, developmental and social psychology. The panel will explore the interactive, situated and social underpinnings of psychological knowledge production.

References

Alač, M. (2011). Handling digital brains: A laboratory study of multimodal semiotic interaction in the age of computers. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

de Ruiter, J.P., & Albert, S. (2017). An appeal for a methodological fusion of conversation analysis and experimental psychology. Research on Language and Social Interaction, 50, 90-107.

Hollander, M. (2015). The repertoire of resistance: Non-compliance with directives in Milgram's 'obedience' experiments. British Journal of Social Psychology, 54, 425-444.

Kendrick, K. (2017). Using conversation analysis in the lab. Research on Language and Social Interaction, 50, 1-11.

Kobayashi Hillman, K., Ross, S., & Kasper, G. (2017). Achieving epistemic alignment in a psycholinguistic experiment. Applied Linguistics Review. Advance online publication.

Wooffitt, R. (2007). Communication and laboratory performance in parapsychology experiments: Demand characteristics and the social organization of interaction. British Journal of Social Psychology, 46, 477-498.

Talking about and interpreting complex visuals in interaction

Tessa van Charldorp[1], Mike Huiskes[2]
[1]Utrecht University, Netherlands, The; [2]University of Groningen, Netherlands, The

Visuals, such as photographs, data visualizations, MRI-scans, animations and video are playing an ever-increasing role in modern society, including institutions. Doctors explain complex medical treatment plans by using visual aids, mortgage advisors inform customers on the monthly mortgage rates through graphs and charts, and public prosecutors persuade a jury by talking through a reconstruction of events in animation format. Even though the use of visuals is becoming a standard in many work domains, research on the use and effects of visualizations in such institutional settings is still far behind when compared to societal developments.

That is, although the cognitive effects of these types of visuals has received a lot of attention in the fields of psychology and communication over the past couple of decades, the role of the interaction that precedes, guides or follows the presentation of the visual remains largely unexplored. From an ethnomethodological and conversation analytic perspective it is not only interesting to look at how the visuals shape the interaction as an embodied phenomenon (Streeck, Goodwin & LeBaron, 2011), but the interaction also assigns meaning to the visual and participants negotiate the interactional meaning of these visuals (see for example Goodwin's "professional vision" analysis of the video recording shown at the Rodney King trial, 1994).

Therefore, interaction between conversational partners shapes how visuals are processed and interpreted. Doctors do not merely show a visual aid and let the patient interpret it, but she explains what she sees and guides the patient in how to interpret the visual. The mortgage advisor similarly points to particular areas of interests in the graph to help the customer make well-advised decisions. And the public prosecutor chooses which aspects to highlight in the animation to convince the jury. In other words, the interplay between the visual and its users in their institutional context defines how meaning is assigned to the visual.

In this panel we invite submissions of studies concerning the ways in which all sorts of (complex) visuals - that are present in the interaction - are talked about in interaction. We would like to explore this "practice" from a multimodal perspective. We would like to know what types of multimodal resources contribute to what types of social action, how we can best transcribe talk about complex visuals, and what talk-extrinsic information analysts need (if any), about the complex visuals, to be able to analyze the talk about the visual. Furthermore, we would like to explore how the analysis of talk about the visual can help us understand how visuals are processed and interpreted.

The multimodal turn in CA-SLA: Theoretical and methodological consequences

Ali Reza Majlesi[1], Søren W. Eskildsen[2]
[1]Stockholm University, Sweden; [2]The University of Southern Denmark, Denmark

Since Firth & Wagner's (1997) call for attending to social interaction on its own terms in second language acquisition (SLA) research, conversation analytic SLA (CA-SLA) has established itself as a solid branch of research. Taking a participant-relevant perspective CA-SLA attends to social practices *in situ* and *in vivo* and traces L2 development as emergent linguistic resources or methods to accomplish social actions (e.g. Eskildsen & Kasper, in press). Moreover, with the recent interests in video-data, bodily conduct and artifacts are increasingly attended to in language learning/teaching research (e.g. Käänta, 2014).

This panel brings together scholars investigating the social occasioning and interactional procedures of language learning as an embodied activity. The panel furthers the need for reconceptualizing core SLA concepts in social terms (Eskildsen & Majlesi, 2018) as it spearheads a new development in CA–SLA that may be labelled "the multimodal turn", in which not only embodied conduct but also artifacts and physical spaces are part of the object of study with implications for learning procedures (cf. 'visual turn' or 'video turn' in Mondada, 2016).

"The multimodal turn" also requires adopting multimodal analysis of video data based on multimodal transcription (Majlesi & Markee, 2018). Accordingly, the panel presents studies that tackle the issue of multimodal analysis in SLA and will discuss the theoretical and methodological consequences of the multimodal turn for CA–SLA. Although studies in the EMCA literature more broadly has already shown how members choreograph embodiment and artifacts with talk-in-interaction (Goodwin, 2018), the discussion of the theoretical implications of these issues is less mature in the CA-SLA literature. The discussion of "the multimodal turn in SLA" may plausibly lead to further respecifications of the CA–SLA branch that would likely bring it into closer alignment with the ethnomethodological aspirations of the EMCA research agenda.

References:

Eskildsen, S. W. & Kasper, G. (in press). Interactional usage-based L2 pragmatics: From form-meaning pairings to construction-action relations. In N. Taguchi (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of SLA and Pragmatics*. New York: Routledge.

Eskildsen, S. W. & Majlesi A R. (2018). Learnables and teachables in second language talk: Advancing a social reconceptualization of central SLA tenets. Introduction to the special issue. *MLJ, 102*: 3–10.

Firth, A. & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *MLJ, 81:* 285–300.

Goodwin, C. (2018). *Co-operative action*. Cambridge: CUP.

Käänta, L. (2014). From noticing to initiating correction: Students' epistemic displays in instructional interaction. *JoP, 66:* 86–105.

Majlesi, A R. & Markee, N. (2018) Multimodality in second language talk: The impact of video analysis on SLA research. In Favareau, D. (Ed.), *Co-operative engagements in intertwined semiosis. Essays in honour of Charles Goodwin.* Tartu: University of Tartu Press.

Mondada, L. (2016). Challenges of multimodality: Language and the body in social interaction. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 20:* 2–32.

Embodied practices in sports and performing arts

Gabriele Kasper[1], Johannes Wagner[2]
[1]University of Hawai'i at Manoa, USA; [2]University of Southern Denmark, Denmark

One of the key achievements of conversation-analytic research on institutional interaction is the demonstration that institutions are "talked into being" (Heritage 1984) through setting-specific configurations of generic methods and resources of talk. Drew & Heritage's volume 'Talk at work' (1992) has helped shaping a highly productive research focus in CA, concerned with the orderly accomplished micro-details in workplace settings where talk is the paramount resource for organizing human (inter)action in all types of work situations.

While the analytical interest in work settings has persisted, the understanding of the primacy of talk has weakened in the multimodal or embodied turn in CA (Nevile 2015). Early research has shown the fine-grained coordination of talk with embodied resources, whereas more recent praxeological studies scrutinize embodied resources in the physical surround where social practices are located. The growing understanding of the role of physical (tangible) objects for the local design of practices (Haddington et al. 2014) and the role of motion and mobility (Haddington, Mondada & Nevile 2013) indicate that talk is part of many practices, but many practices are not or only partly dependent on talk.

At the same time, research on work settings is increasingly complemented by studies of recreational activities, including the performing arts and sports. In ethnomethodological perspective, "all activities, even 'play', involve 'work' – they are all effortful accomplishments" (Rouncefield & Tolmie 2013, p. 2). Taking the view of sport and leisure activities as *instructed activities*, our panel seeks to specify "the praxeological validity of instructed action" (Garfinkel 2002, p. 186) in a range of settings.

The contributions will expand upon recent studies in EM and CA (Tolmie & Rouncefield 2013) which have shown the orderliness of embodied creative and sporting activities, including violin playing (Nishizaka 2006), orchestra rehearsal (Weeks 1996), different types of sport (Meyer & Wedelstaedt 2016), basketball (Macbeth 2012), correction in basketball & powerlifting (Evans & Reynolds 2016), dance correction (Keevallik 2010), boxing (Coates 1999, Okada 2013), rock climbing (Jenkings 2013), surfing (Liberman 2016), and pool skating (Ivarsson & Greifenhagen 2015).

Specifically the panel will shed light on such questions as

- how the instruction is delivered and understood in situ through sequentially organized embodied practices;
- how the practitioners relate the instructions to the specific details of the local environment in which they enact the activity;

"All vision is perspectival" - Accomplishing visibility and establishing reference as professional practices

Elwys De Stefani[1], Ana Cristina Ostermann[2]
[1]KU Leuven, Belgium; [2]UNISINOS, Brazil

The constitution of publicly visible referents is a recurrent accomplishment in various professional settings, ranging from recreational activities (e.g. guided tours) to intimate and sensitive interactions in medical environments (e.g. analyzing ultrasound imaging). Indebted to Chuck Goodwin's work on professional vision, pointing and co-operative action, the contributors to this panel set out to explore how the visibility of a referent is established in ways that are recipient-designed for the audience addressed. Previous research has shown, on the one hand, that professional competence plays a crucial role in constructing the visibility of a referent (Goodwin 1994). On the other hand, participants may categorize (i.e. 'see') pointed at phenomena in many different ways, in accordance, among other things, with their own expertise and experience (Goodwin & Goodwin 1996, Nishizaka 2000, 2011, Nevile 2013). Constructing a visible referent is an interactional achievement relying on the embodied organization of joint attention (Mondada 2014) around a "focal event" (Goodwin & Duranti 1992). Such referents, or "instructed objects" (Koschmann & Zemel 2014), not only have to be seen collectively (Stukenbrock 2015), they are also categorized in a way that is relevant for the (professional) interaction at hand (De Stefani 2014).

This panel brings together researchers working from an EMCA perspective and addressing the following questions, among others:

- Which linguistic and embodied practices are observable in establishing the construction and visibility of a referent?
- How do referential practices relate to the establishment of a joint focus of attention?
- How do referential practices relate to the material environment in which the interaction takes place and which artifacts are used?
- How do participants accomplish referencing when involved in settings of multiactivity?
- How are objects oriented to and categorized in a recipient-designed way and for the interactional purposes at hand?
- What roles do epistemic and deontic orientations and membership categorization play?
- How is a joint focus of attention created in two-party vs. multi-party interaction?
- Do participants – and should we as analysts – differentiate between linguistic practices, embodied practices and "multimodal packages", "multimodal gestalts", etc.?
- How should visually emerging objects be rendered in transcriptions?

The overarching aim of this panel is to show how the analysis of video data is not only necessary for the phenomena under examination, but also consequential for the ways in which we conceive of interactional practices, including the notions and methods we handle.

When Practices become Form: Hybrid Studies and Contemporary Arts in the Making

Yaël Kreplak, Philippe Sormani
EHESS, France

Taking its cue from the title of a seminal exhibition (Szeemann 1969), this panel brings together hybrid studies of contemporary arts in the making. In so doing, the panel brings to bear ethnomethodology's program (Garfinkel 2002) on the description of current practices in visual and performing arts. In particular, the panel's contributions shall explicate, enact, and/or reflect upon the "requirement of mutual tutorial adequacy" (ibid., p. 145), thus inviting a two-way conversation: what can ethnomethodology (EM) learn from artistic practices and, vice-versa, what might be its take-away lessons for art? By instigating this two-way conversation, the panel pursues three key aims: detailed investigation, re-specification and reflection.

Firstly, the panel is intended as a presentation of detailed investigations into a variety of artistic practices (visual art, drawing, music, dance, performance, and so forth), discussing the adequacy of "hybrid studies" to account for those practices – both as a follow-up and renewal of earlier initiatives, such as Sudnow's *Ways of the Hands* (1978).

Secondly, the panel aims at re-specifying the currently fashionable debate on "artistic research," a debate that was recently introduced in art schools as part of artistic training and its institutional legitimation. Whereas this debate is often pitched at a generic conceptual level (Borgdorff 2012), the panel proposes to home in on artistic practices *in situ*.

Thirdly, the panel opens up reflection on how EM's own practices become form (in autodidactic, analytic, or hybrid terms), a reflection that might challenge the "art/science binary" (Jones & Galison 1998) and benefit from conceptual discussions in and around, if not beyond contemporary art (on "experimenting," "performing," "framing," etc.).

The panel invites presentations that contribute to the pursuit of (at least) one of the listed key aims and related research questions. The studious use of the plural in the panel title, alluding to hybrid studies andcontemporary arts, marks both an acknowledgement of and a plea for EM's multiple heuristics, whilst hinting at the current multiplicity of artistic practices, forms, and interventions (Adamson & Bryan-Wilson 2016; Sormani et al. 2018). This shared condition of multiplicity finds also its technical expression, as both EM's studies and contemporary arts engage in audio and video recording, drawing and transcribing, breaching and observing, enacting and reenacting. Working out in perspicuous detail where the commonalities, contrasts, and critical issues lie constitutes the crux of the outlined panel.

References

Adamson, G., Bryan-Wilson, J., 2016, *Art in the Making. Artists and their Materials from the Studio to Crowdsourcing*. London, Thames & Hudson.

Borgdorff, H., 2012, *The Conflict of Faculties. Perspectives on Artistic Research and Academia*, Leiden, Leiden University Press.

Garfinkel, H., 2002, *Ethnomethodology's Program. Working out Durkheim's aphorism*, Lanham, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Jones, C.A. & Galison, P. 1998, "Introduction", *Picturing Science, Producing Art*. London and New York, Routledge, 1–26.

Sormani, Ph., Carbone, G. & Gisler, P., Eds., 2018, *Practicing Art/Science: Experiments in an Emerging Field.* London & New York, Routledge.

Sudnow, D., 1978, *Ways of the Hand. The Organization of Improvised Conduct.* Cambridge, MA, & London, MIT Press.

Szeemann, H., 1969, *When Attitudes become Form*, Bern, Kunsthalle.

Ethnomethodology and Ethnography II

Alex Dennis[1], Yaël Kreplak[2]
[1]University of Sheffield; [2]EHESS

In this second panel on the topic we will elaborate on some more specific empirical and conceptual investigations of how fieldwork and ethnomethodology have informed, and can inform, one another in practice. The panel's main objective is to discuss the particular stance of ethnomethodological research on the observability and accountability of social activities.

We take as starting points Garfinkel's maxim that the accomplished sense of settings consists of 'members doing, recognising, and using ethnographies' (Garfinkel 1967: 10) and Sacks's observation that '[i]nstead of pushing aside the older ethnographic work in sociology, I would treat it as the only work worth criticizing in sociology' (Sacks 1992: 27). *Somehow*, parties to a setting deploy and recognize something like ethnographic techniques to make and display sense; and, again, somehow, analysts use something like ethnographic techniques to make and display the sense *they* make of settings. By considering both sides of this matter we aim to interrogate 'ethnography' not just as a research method but also as an integral part of ethnomethodology's conceptual framework *tout court*.

These concerns manifest themselves more broadly in two areas. Firstly, ethnomethodology is claimed to be a way of practicing ethnography, as illustrated by the chapters on ethnomethodological 'techniques' in the numerous handbooks dedicated to qualitative research (e.g., Atkinson et al. 2007). Secondly, it has been argued that fieldwork is now neglected relative to, for instance, video analysis in ethnomethodology itself (Anderson and Sharrock 2017). Both these tendencies seem to us to be unnecessary: the first reduces ethnomethodology to a 'framework' for ethnography, and the second subverts ethnomethodology's suspicion of there being any 'correct' method for studying different phenomena.

Our panel will therefore divide into two halves. The first will consider Garfinkel's maxim, and elaborate on the ways in which members use and exhibit their lay fieldwork expertise to make and display sense in practical settings. The second will present ethnomethodological ethnographic work as a candidate solution to Sacks's 'criticism': to show how this approach to study does not stand outside the more conventional ethnomethodological framework but, rather, is both essential to it and – indeed – an integral part of any ethnomethodological description.

To address those issues, we call for contributions that may question and revisit the conception of fieldwork and its core connected concepts in ethnomethodology (members' perspective, unique adequacy requirement of methods, ethnomethodological indifference…), so as to provide with examples of how fieldwork is diversely practiced, conceptualized and discussed within the contemporary EM/CA community.

References

Anderson, R. J., and W. W. Sharrock. 2017. 'Has Ethnomethodology Run Its Course?' http://www.sharrockandanderson.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Run-its-Course-VII.pdf.

Atkinson, Paul, Amanda Coffey, Sara Delamont, John Lofland and Lyn Lofland, eds. 2007. *Handbook of Ethnography*. London: Sage.

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

Sacks, Harvey. 1992. *Lectures on Conversation*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Oxford: Blackwell.

Doing Choice and Decision in Shopping and Sales Interactions

Antonia L. Krummheuer[1], Karola Pitsch[2], Marius Meinhof[3]

[1]Aalborg University, Denmark; [2]University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany; [3]Bielefeld University, Germany

Shopping as mundane activity of everyday-live provides several selections and decision making processes shoppers accomplish in collaboration with co-shoppers or salesmen's with the aim to get certain objects in their possession. This includes finding and choosing goods in a semiotically rich environment of for example markets, stores or online-shops, the negotiation of the objects status as a "potentially buyable" (De Stefani 2013) and its appropriateness to be bought in regard to its quality, price and future use. Within consumer studies, decision making and consumer choice are of central relevance. A wide variety of works have attempted to model decision making processes, depicting them mainly as psychological, intra-subjective processes. However, shopping is often a socially situated activity that is accomplished in the co-presence of others. As such, these studies lack to understand and explain how choice and decision are made relevant and are accounted for within ongoing interactions. Only few ethnomethodological and conversation analytical (EMCA) studies focus on choice and decision making in shopping interactions highlighting the interactional construction of both the shopping activity, the participants and the potentially buyable (e.g. Clark & Pinch 1994, 2010, De Stefani 2013, 2014, Heath & Luff 2007, Llewellyn & Hindmarsh 2013, Meinhof 2018, Stokoe et al 2017, vom Lehn 2014).

Therefore, the panel presents EMCA studies which analyse consumer choice as an interactive, situated activity in a material world. The discussion will be based on preferably video-recordings that highlight the situated and multimodal interplay of these interactions in a semiotically rich environment with a special focus on choice and decision making processes. Topics to discuss will be

- The interactional construction of potentially buyables

- The interactional negotiations on objects quality, future use or price

- Constructions of member's identities, autonomous choice and/or consumer subjectivity

- Practices of choice and decision making in assisted shopping (e.g. with people with cognitive, physical or communication disabilities or children)

- If and how global and local contexts (e.g. markets) are constructed and/or show procedural consequentiality in situated decision making processes of shopping activities

- ....

References: (will be provided on request)

Third party positions in interactions

Sarah Hitzler, Ruth Ayaß
Uni Bielefeld, Germany

As sociology has known since Simmel (1908) and Goffman (1981), social interaction is fundamentally altered when a social dyad is transformed into a triad. Conversation analysis has shown that third parties can have a large variety of positions in interaction – they may serve as audiences, as arbiters, as facilitators, as bystanders or animators, or as advocates. CA has known for a long time that third parties play an important role in a range of institutional as well as mundane settings. Interactive positions may be explicitly assigned, such as a mediator's (Garcia 1991, Greatbatch & Dingwall 1989) or interpreter's role (Ticca & Traverso 2017), or adopted spontaneously, such as being a witness to complaints (Laforest 2009), or a lateral addressee to mockery (Günthner 1996). Absent third parties may fuel interactions by allowing for gossip (Bergmann 1993), as may present non- or half-members such as pets and babies, who may be talked about without repression (Bergmann 1988). Media interactions are always geared towards an absent public (the "overhearing audience") that is nonetheless reflected in utterance design (Heritage 1985).

While the precise influence of third party positions may differ greatly between interactions, introducing a third party will always have an impact on the bearings between two people, on the one hand adding stability to their interaction by being witness to it, and on the other hand adding to its dynamic by increasing the interactive options of each of the participants. The third party position of course is not inevitably tied to one individual or role within the course of an interaction; it emerges from the social actions of all parties, and potentially has to be managed by all participants throughout their encounter.

While a great number of studies have come across phenomena related to third party positions, consideration of such dynamics has not yet systematically been undertaken. In the proposed panel, we want to bring together scholars who have worked on different interactions involving third parties. We aim to spark a discussion about how third party positions are adopted, managed or rejected, which practices are tied to such positions, and what their impact can be on social interaction. The intended outcome of the panel is a better understanding of triadic dynamics in social interactions. We hope to spark further work in which these dynamics are systematically explored and discussed, rather than perceived as mere local peculiarities of singular situations.

The changing shape of media dialogical networks

Jiri Nekvapil[1], Ivan Leudar[2]
[1]Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic; [2]University of Manchester, UK

The concept of the dialogical network (DN) has been designed to study complex communications that typically occur in mass and social media (see Leudar and Nekvapil 2004 for a summary). Their most important characteristic is their spatially and temporally distributed character – the participants do not all meet face-to-face. For instance: somebody makes a claim at a press conference on Wednesday and then somebody else disagrees with this claim elsewhere, e.g. on TV, on Thursday. These claims and counterclaims may initiate further 'branches' of a DN if reported in several newspapers together with comments by journalists and other actors recruited by journalists. The media are networked in that newspapers report what has been said, say, at a briefing or on TV, and people 'on the air' refer to newspaper reports. The second important characteristic of a DN is that many contributions are duplicated – several actors may make the same point but formulate it somewhat differently, and certainly do so in different contexts. This has consequences. One is that, being duplicated, comments, agreements, challenges made in the media become more likely to be noted, acquire gravitas and be responded to. Another is that one claim will become connected to a variety of contexts and thus become more and more meaningful.

The concept of the DN was developed in the framework of empirical studies of media in the 1990s. Since then, however, the technological properties of media have changed dramatically and this has affected the shape of DNs accordingly. For example, in the 1990s, not very much happened during the very first day of the existence of a DN, and one week seemed to be an appropriate analytical unit for both experts and members (see e.g. Leudar and Nekvapil 2008). In contrast, current DNs may take a distinct contour even over the course of a single day (see Leudar, Kaderka and Nekvapil 2018). New technological possibilities of extensive duplication might also contribute to the rise of 'emergent properties' in DNs, which have been added to the main characteristics of DNs quite recently (ibid.).

The aim of this panel is to address DNs as a changing phenomenon depending on the state of technologies enabling new communication practices. The contributors to this panel will deal with DNs from various fields of practice, such as politics and finance, and in countries such as the UK, Czech Republic, Belarus or the former Czechoslovakia.

References

Leudar, I., Kaderka, P., Nekvapil, J. (2018, in prep.) A day in the life of a dialogic network: The case of Czech currency devaluation.

Leudar, I., Nekvapil, J. (2008) La guerre contre la terreur. Une semaine dans la vie d'un réseau dialogique. In Dupret, B. & J.-N. Ferrié (eds.), *Médias, guerres et identités. Les pratiques communicationnelles de l'appartenance politique, ethnique et religieuse*. Paris: Éditions des archives contemporaines, 88–113.

Leudar, I., Nekvapil, J. (2004) Media dialogical networks and political argumentation. *Journal of Language and Politics* 3 (2), 247-266.

Resistance in talk-in-interaction

Jack Joyce, Bogdana Huma, Claire Feeney
Loughborough University, United Kingdom

This panel brings together scholars investigating resistance in-talk-in-interaction. It assembles interactional studies which address: (1) how we understand resistance (2) the scope, sequential organisation, and trajectory of resistance, and (3) members' orientations to resistance as an achievement to be done in and through talk-in-interaction.

Alongside persuasion, resistance is a cornerstone social scientific topic. So far, it has been conceptualised mainly in psychological terms as a response to persuasion (Knowles and Linn, 2006). The focus of this research has been on the cognitive mechanisms that presumably underpin resistance; thus, little attention has been paid to the communicative practices through which resistance is accountably accomplished. By contrast, interactional studies have respecified resistance as an embodied form of non-compliance to directives (Kent, 2012). Further work has broadened this understanding of resistance to encompass a wider variety of dispreferred responses (Muntigl, 2013) that disrupt conversational progressivity, lead to escalated disaffiliation, or challenge assumptions embedded in initiating actions. Resistance has been also examined as a practice for establishing and pursuing one's own agenda or categorisation (Fitzgerald & Austin, 2008; Widdicombe, 2017). Commonly occurring markers of resistance include (but are not limited to): 'oh' (Heritage, 1998), address terms (Rendle-Short, 2007), and transformative answers (Stivers & Hayashi, 2010).

This panel coalesces papers from our biannual seminar series and invites other scholars examining resistance in and as part of actions, sequences, and interactional activities in a variety of mundane and institutional settings. Invited papers explore resistance in doctor-patient interactions, conflict talk, pitches, and service encounters. The panellists are also encouraged to reflect on the conceptualisation of resistance as an empirically-grounded interactional phenomenon. Thus, the intended outcome of the panel is to put forward an overarching conceptual framework for resistance-in-interaction, that will enable EM/CA to engage in a dialogue with other disciplines studying resistance and inspire further empirical work on this topic.

References

Clayman, S. E. (2013). Agency in response: The role of prefatory address terms. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 57, pp. 290-302.

Fitzgerald, R. & Austin, H. (2008). Accusation, mitigation, and resisting guilt in talk. *The Open Communication Journal*. 2, pp. 93-99.

Heritage, J. (1998). Oh-prefaced responses to inquiry. *Language in Society.* 27(3), pp. 291-334.

Kent, A. (2012). Compliance, resistance and incipient compliance when responding to directives. Discourse Studies. 14(6), pp. 711-730.

Knowles, E. S., & Linn, J. A. (Eds.). (2004). *Resistance and persuasion.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Muntigl, P. (2013). Resistance in couples counselling: requences of talk that disrupt progressivity and promote disaffiliation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 49(1), 18–37.

Rendle-Short, J. (2007). Neutralism and adversarial challenges in the political news interview. *Discourse & Communication*. 1(4), pp. 387-406.

Stivers, T. & Hayashi, M. (2010). Transformative answers: One way to resist a questions constraints. Language in Society. 39(1), pp. 1-25.

Widdicombe, S. (2017). The delicate business of identity. *Discourse Studies*. 19(4), pp. 460 - 478.

Culture as Method and Practice: Culture in EMCA Studies

Michael Mair[1], Patrick Watson[2]

[1]University of Liverpool, United Kingdom; [2]Wilfrid Laurier University, Canada

Over the past 30 years, studies of culture have become increasingly prominent – some would say dominant (see, e.g., Alexander, Jacobs & Smith 2015) – within and across social science and arts and humanities disciplines in Europe and North America. Although largely unacknowledged, work in EMCA prefigured, acted as a driver for and continues to offer unique insights into culture-in-action, part of this resurgent field's central concerns. If one of the foundational insights guiding contemporary studies of culture is Clifford Geertz's dictum that humans are animals suspended in webs of meaning they themselves have spun (ibid.), EMCA could be viewed as an attempt to look in detail at how the work of spinning is actually accomplished – a domain of methodic practices, "practices that display culture-in-action" (Housley & Fitzgerald 2009: 346), the new studies of culture continue to overlook. Making that domain of practices a topic of inquiry represents one of the enduring contributions of EMCA to understandings of culture "from within" (Garfinkel 1967: 76-77; Sacks 1992: I 21, 26). Nonetheless, while EMCA is interested in "culture as method" (Eglin 1980), that interest is not monolithic. Culture as method and practice was a focus in the work of Garfinkel, Sacks and their collaborators but in importantly different ways. Subsequent waves of researchers have taken up, pursued and built on but also modified the insights of Garfinkel, Sacks and others in light of *their* studies, taking the study of culture in EMCA in new directions as a result. Studies of culture-in-action in EMCA have thus developed distinctive strands and this panel reflects on the diversity of that work, the contributions made across it and what it might offer to researchers beyond EMCA. Bringing together researchers from different areas, it explores culture as method and practice as variously taken up in EMCA, what we learn from this family of studies and how the study of culture-in-action might develop in EMCA from here. The first session provides an overview of culture-*in*-action/culture-*as*-action in EMCA, examining culture in the work of Garfinkel and Sacks, the everyday logic of cultural practices and the relevance of contemporary EMCA work on culture to studies of language, practice and organisation today, (re)opening dialogues with, *inter alia*, philosophy, anthropology, sociology and cultural studies in the process. The second session examines specific cultures-*of*-action and what we learn from them, demonstrating the richness of contemporary EMCA studies through analyses of cultures of gameplay, air travel and practical computer work as well as what might be termed procedural cultures.

References

Alexander, J.C., Jacobs, R.N. & Smith, P. (2015) 'Introduction: Cultural Sociology Today', in Alexander, J.C., Jacobs, R.N. & Smith, P. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Cultural Sociology,* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Eglin, P. (1980) 'Culture as Method: Location as an Interactional Device', *Journal of Pragmatics* 4(2): 121-135

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

Housley, W. and Fitzgerald, R. (2009) 'Membership Categorization, Culture and Norms in Action', *Discourse & Society*, 20(3): 345-362

Sacks, H. (1992) *Lectures on Conversation: Volumes 1 & 2*. Oxford: Blackwell

Ethnomethodology and Ethnography I

Christian Meier zu Verl, Clemens Eisenmann

University of Konstanz, Germany

In this first panel on "ethnomethodology and ethnography" we aim to discuss the relations and differences between these approaches on a general level. In a first attempt at a broad characterization, ethnomethodology can be seen primarily as a theoretical perspective to focus on "organized artful practices of everyday life." (Garfinkel 1967: 11) Ethnography, in turn, seems to denote a general methodological approach, which can be theoretically framed in many different ways (for a different understanding of ethnomethodology and ethnography, see Pollner/Emerson 2001). For example, Clifford Geertz' semiotic ethnography and its method of "thick description" is theoretically influenced by Parsons' structural functionalism (cf. Geertz 1973), while Erving Goffmans corporal ethnography is theoretically influenced by symbolic interactionism and, therefore, focuses primarily on bodily co-presence (cf. Goffman 1989). At the beginning of ethnomethodology, Harold Garfinkel and his colleagues primarily conducted "ethnomethodological ethnographies," such as Zimmerman's "Paper work and people work" (1966), Sudnow's "Passing On" (1967), Cicourel's "The Social Organization of Juvenile Justice" (1968). These ethnographies are ethnomethodologically framed empirical investigations challenging both social theory and methodology. However, "ethnomethodological ethnography" was never canonized in handbooks or proposed as a general approach. Instead, "the unique adequacy requirement of methods" (Garfinkel/Wieder 1992) was formulated as a methodological principle, implying – among other things – participant observation and emphasizing the consideration and implementation of the specific methods of a particular research case (cf. also Garfinkel 2002: 100-1). However, this notion of ethnomethodological ethnography often leads to adverse juxtapositions, blurred boundaries, and misunderstandings. Therefore, the purpose of this panel is: (1) to uncover further as yet unconsidered epistemological relations between ethnomethodology and ethnography; (2) to discuss early methodological forms of "ethnomethodological ethnographies" beginning, e.g., with Garfinkel's "Color Trouble" (1940); (3) to discuss different epistemological styles of ethnomethodology and/or ethnography which feature similar but also different approaches, methods, and the rest. We invite papers which address one or more of these topics.

References

Cicourel, A. V., 1968: The Social Organization of Juvenile Justice. Wiley: New York.

Garfinkel, H., 1940: Color Trouble. Opportunity 18(5).

Garfinkel, H. & D. L. Wieder, 1992: Two Incommensurable, Asymmetrically Alternate Technologies of Social Analysis. S. 175-206 in: G. Watson & R. Seiler (eds.), Text in Context. New York: Sage.

Garfinkel, H. 1967: Studies in Ethnomethodology. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs.

Garfinkel, H. 2002: Ethnomethodology's Program. Working out Durkheim's Aphorism. (Ed. Anne W. Rawls) Lanham.

Geertz, C., 1973: The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic Books.

Goffman, E., 1989: On Fieldwork. Journal of Contemporary Ethnography 18: 123-132.

Pollner, M. & R. M. Emerson, 2001: Ethnomethodology and Ethnography. S. 118-135 in: P. Atkinson, et al. (eds.), Handbook of Ethnography. London: Sage.

Sudnow, D., 1967: Passing On. The Social Organization of Dying. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Zimmerman, D. H., 1966: Paper work and people work. A study of a public assistance agency (Ph.D.-Thesis). University of California, Los Angeles.

Kids in Interaction: EMCA Studies of Children

Yumei Gan[1], Christian Greiffenhagen[2]
[1]The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong S.A.R. (China); [2]The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong S.A.R. (China)

Kids are different. Adults often treat them differently (e.g. adult may speak on behalf of child in certain situations), and researchers often treat them as a special group (e.g. ethics applications often require additional review when children are involved, see also, Danby & Farrell, 2004). The unpublished paper by Garfinkel et al. (1982) has described a kids' culture, focusing on the one hand on kids' competences when interacting amongst kids (cf. Butler, 2008), and on the other hand including an argument about kids' particular position in society – respectively about how adults/parents treat them as not-yet-competent participants (cf. Forrester, 2013). Furthermore, studies have demonstrated that in various ways interaction may be different when children are involved. For example, adult-child interaction is explicitly mentioned as an apparent exception to the preference for self-repair (Schegloff et al., 1977: 380-381, but also see Corrin, 2010; Forrester, 2008 on parents and children's interactive organisation of repair-sequences).

A range of EMCA studies has shown that children are competent in a variety of ways (cf. Bateman, 2015, Filipi, 2009). This has been demonstrated from institutional settings (e.g. medical encounters, school, nursery) to everyday interaction (e.g. family meals, family everyday interaction). By focussing on what children actually *do* in interaction, those studies provide insightful views on children's interactive competencies in interacting with other people (e.g. Cekaite, 2010; Church, 2009; Fasulo et al., 2007; Gardner & Forrester, 2010; Goodwin, 2006; Keel, 2016; Kidwell, 2012; Sterponi, 2009).

Given the methodological and conceptual challenges to studying children, this panel focusses on kids in interaction. The aim of the panel is to bring together various EMCA-driven investigations of children to discuss the following two key issues:

(1) How can we (as researchers) avoid an adult-centred analysis but develop analysis from the children's perspective (by looking at how children orient to actions)?

(2) How can we understand children's participation and contribution to social interactions (by exploring what children actually *do* in interactions)?

We welcome interactions involving children in any kind of interactional environment, and welcome contributions that seek to answer these questions and propose novel directions of enquiry.

Interactional practices and complexity in diverse settings: Findings, methods and implications

Pentti Haddington, Anna Vatanen, Laura Kohonen-Aho, Antti Kamunen, Tiina Eilittä, Iira Rautiainen
University of Oulu, Finland

In ethnomethodology and conversation analysis (EMCA) 'complexity' has been used to characterise social actions or tasks (Mondada 2011), the interactants' embodied conduct (Haddington et al. 2014; Mondada 2011), the packaging of interactional resources into complex 'multimodal gestalts' (Mondada 2014, 2018), or the analysed data (Nevile 2009). Additionally, multiparty interactions, situations with intricate participation frameworks, or multiple and intersecting activities have been shown to contribute to interactional complexity (e.g., Mondada 2011; Nevile 2009; Haddington et al. 2014). Furthermore, various sites of interaction – e.g., technological, computerised or work-place settings – can be referred to as 'complex' (Mondada 2011; Nevile 2009). In the recent years, EMCA has taken important steps in broadening the understanding of the intricate and complex features of everyday interaction in diverse settings. The proposed panel brings together scholars to address and discuss 'complexity' – analytically, conceptually and methodologically – and tie it with the conference's focus on 'practice' through the following key points:

1. Complexity and interactional practices: How do social interactants orient to complexity? What practices – or 'ethnomethods' – do participants rely on to manage complexity (e.g., multiple activities, distributed ecologies, and remote participation frameworks)? When, where, how and why do activities or situations become complex for the participants themselves, and how can this be observed and analysed? What implications does all this have for understanding the basic interactional structures, such as the sequentiality and temporality of action (Levinson 2013)?

2. Methodological practices and solutions for studying complexity: How do new video-recording technologies (e.g., multiple cameras, 360° cameras, virtual reality, ambisonic audio) facilitate the capturing and analysis of interactions in complex settings (see McIlvenny & Davidsen 2017)? What practical solutions do tools for capturing real-time and real-life (inter)action offer for EMCA? What consequences do these tools have for how audio and video are transcribed and analysed in EMCA?

3. Practices for returning the findings to the researched communities: How can the EMCA community return and communicate the research findings on 'complexity' to the communities they study; what good practices are there?

Knowledge, Body, Society – comparing EMCA and Practice Theory

Hannes Krämer[1], Dominik Gerst[2]
[1]Universität Duisburg-Essen, Germany; [2]Europa-Universität Viadrina, Germany

Our panel aims at the relationship between EMCA and practice theory. On one side, EMCA has always been promoting a self-understanding in critical distance to "conventional social sciences". On the other, authors interested in praxeological questions systematically misrepresented EMCA as just another micro-sociology. Instead of tracing the history of mutual reception, we seek to inquire the conceptual congruencies as well as differences between EMCA and practice theory. A re-reading of EMCA-analysis' shows that many praxeological questions have been already discussed within ethnomethodology. To scrutinise such "family resemblances" we turn to three levels of comparison – marking the central points of practice theories:

Firstly, practice theory puts the "know-how dependent […] behavioural routines" (Reckwitz) center stage. How is such a routine of activities conceptualized within EMCA and what kind of knowledge does it refer to? Within EMCA an understanding of knowledge as both everyday common sense knowledge and as practical skill is central. Knowledge is analysed as methodically implemented in recurring, situationally modifiable as well as adaptive actions by competent members – as "knowledge in action" (Housley/Fitzgerald). What are differences to (other) praxeological approaches – e.g. Pierre Bourdieus, Anthony Giddens, or Erving Goffmans? How does, for instance, EMCA grasp the tension between repetition and new creation of knowledge? How does a view on the accomplishment of social facts differ from more (post-)structuralistic views?

The second focus is on the dimension of materiality, which is central to practice theory. In what way are bodies and objects discussed in EMCA? On closer inspection, it becomes clear that bodies are a recurring topic (e.g. in Harold Garfinkel's Agnes chapter). When it comes to objects and artefacts, EMCA-Scholars continuously investigate the ethnomethods of acting in technological and workplace environments. But how does such a perspective on objects in action differ from more object-oriented approaches like ANT or new-materialism, where objects stabilize the social?

Finally, a third question is directed towards the relation to society. In what way do "social-theoretical" or macro-analytical references occur in EMCA? How are topics beyond mere micro-interactions taken into consideration? Practice theory is dedicated to dealing with social issues, albeit beyond a micro-macro dualism. It is from this perspective, that differences between ethnomethodology and practice theory are most likely to be suspected, even though EMCA implicitly refers to the members' rootedness in common grounds (e.g. Sacks).

Our panel does not aim to play one theoretical concept off against the other, but rather encourages a problem-related comparison of what the two perspectives offer. It invites theoretical as well as methodological and empirical papers on the above mentioned questions. In this respect, the panel seeks to contribute to the ongoing debate of whether EMCA still offers a radical alternative to existing social theories or how it should be placed within this field.

Ethnomethodology of creative work

Johannes Kuhnert[1], Ronja Trischler[2], Hannes Krämer[3]
[1]Europa-Universität Viadrina Frankfurt (Oder); [2]Universität Siegen; [3]Universität Duisburg-Essen

While studies of work and workplace studies have produced extensive insights into the methodic practices of laboratories, courtroom sessions, bureaucracies, businesses, human-machine interactions and many more professional sites in the legal, scientific and technical realm, we know little about the working environments of web developers, graphic designers, architects, film, music or (video-)game producers, product designers, or content managers. Considering the growth of the creative industries since the 1960s – the decade of ethnomethodology's inception – and especially over the last two decades, we see this as an academic shortcoming in view of social developments. In this panel, we hope to address this research gap through these leading questions:

· How do Garfinkel's methodological propositions stand up in light of creative work? Which ethnomethodological "classics" can we mobilise to help our understanding of work in the creative industries?

· What ethnomethodologically informed attempts are currently being made to think about problems in design and creative work? How to describe the "haeccity" of creative work (Garfinkel 1991)? Can we delineate and circumscribe this field of research more clearly? To what extent can we bring together and compare workplaces in different parts of the creative industries?

· How to deal with the role of conversation in creative workplaces? How does it relate to other mediated forms of workplace interaction? Which current developments in conversation analytical research are helpful in understanding creative work and to what extent?

· How does ethnomethodological research relate to other approaches which pay close attention to the practices of creative work, for example actor-network-theory (Yaneva 2013, Hennion/Méadel 1993, Farías/Wilkie 2015, see also Krämer 2014, Reckwitz 2017)?

- How does the ethnomethodological perspective relate to art and design research? Can a focus on (creative) practices re-shape the role of ethnomethodology within academia – particularly with respect to a renegotiation of the relations between researchers and practitioners in the creative industries?

In addressing these questions, the panel will particularly seek to combine more general conceptual and methodological questions with empirical case studies.

Farías, I., Wilkie, A. (2015). *Studio studies: notes for a research program*. London; New York: Routledge.

Garfinkel, H. (1991). 'Respecification: Evidence for Locally Produced, Naturally Accountable Phenomena of Order, Logic, Reason, Meaning, Method, Etc. in and as of the Essential Haecceity of Immortal Ordinary Society (I)—an Announcement of Studies'. *Ethnomethodology and the Human Sciences*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 10–19.

Hennion, A., Méadel, C. (1993). In the laboratories of desire. Advertising as an intermediary between products and consumers. *Reseaux* 1(2), 169–192.

Krämer, H. (2014). *Die Praxis Der Kreativität: Eine Ethnografie kreativer Arbeit*. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag.

Reckwitz, A. (2017): *The Invention of Creativity: Modern Society and the Culture of the New*. Malden, MA: Polity.

Yaneva, A. (2013). *Made by the Office for Metropolitan Architecture: An Ethnography of Design*. Rotterdam: 010 Uitgeverij

"Promising practices" - promises and (re)assurances in social interaction

Ann Merrit Rikke Nielsen[1], Mie Femø Nielsen[1], Sabine Jørgensen[2]
[1]University of Copenhagen, Denmark; [2]University College Copenhagen

Call for panel papers

Promises are recurrent activities in social interaction and serve as important resources for the negotiation of interactional relationships and identities and for dealing with future commitment. In early speech act theory promises served as the main type of speech act to illustrate the notion of performative utterances, and claims were made based primarily on constructed/anecdotal evidence (Austin 1962; Searle 1969). The social action of promising has however not been extensively explored within an EMCA frame. In this panel we propose to explore promises as simultaneously context shaping and context renewing social actions (Heritage 1984) and delve into how promises and related activities such as (re)assurances, threats, guaranties etc. are constructed and construed in naturally occurring conversational interaction. The focus is not "what counts" as a promise by reference to felicity conditions, but how conversational activities are treated by participants as doing promising and (re)assuring. We seek to explore the conversational/sequential environment in which such practices occur/are occasioned and what they accomplish in interaction. We are particularly interested in exploring how promises and (re)assurances are involved in practices that deal with issues related to trust (cf. Garfinkel 1963; Koschmann et al. 2011, Jørgensen 2017) and distrust between the participants.

For this panel we invite papers that explore, discuss and/or exemplify conversational activities that deal with commitments to some future course of action such as promises, threats, accounts and (re)assurancesor relationships/boundaries between these. Papers should be based on naturally occurring interaction (video or audio) but could focus on a variety of topics related to the overall theme such as sequential position, turn design, embodiment, identity construction and affiliation. We welcome contributions with data from across different institutional settings as well as everyday interaction.

Literature:

Austin, J.L. (1962) *How to Do Things with Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*(eds. J. O. Urmson and Marina Sbisà) Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Garfinkel, H. (1963). A conception of, and experiments with 'Trust' as a condition of stable concerted actions. In: Harvey, O.J. (Ed.), *Motivation and Social Interaction*. Ronald Press, New York, pp. 187–238.

Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Polity Press.

Koschmann, T., LeBaron, C., Goodwin, C., & Feltovich, P. (2011) "Can you see the cystic artery yet?" A simple matter of trust. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 521-541.

Searle, J. R. (1969) *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge University Press

Intersubjectivity and Diagnosis Delivery in Medical Interaction

Rose McCabe

University of Exeter, United Kingdom

The delivery of the diagnosis is a central activity in medical interaction. It is a critical phase of the medical visit following from the problem presentation and leading to the treatment recommendation. While the doctor has epistemic authority in formulating the diagnosis, patients also bring their own understandings and explanations of their problems to bear on the interaction. The patient's response to the diagnosis, whether it is acceptance or resistance, has important consequences for acceptance of the treatment recommendation and future engagement in treatment. This practice has been studied using conversation analytic and ethnomethodological approaches by e.g., Heath (1990), Perakyla (1998), Maynard and Turowetz (2017), Dooley et al. (2018) with Maynard (2003) and others also focusing specifically on bad news deliveries.

This panel will explore recent work on the delivery of a diagnosis in e.g. autism, depression and dementia with a particular focus on intersubjective orientation to the diagnosis. In particular, it will address how diagnosis is intersubjectively realised and the impact this has on patient resistance to or engagement in the diagnosis. We will discuss how clinicians present evidence for a diagnosis, use different diagnostic practices and the degree to which they engage the patient and family members in the discussion of problematic behaviours that are relevant for the diagnosis. Intersubjective orientation to the diagnosis appears to be particularly salient when the evidence for a diagnosis relates to behaviour (compared to physical signs and symptoms), which calls the patient's face and positive social value into question (Goffman, 1967). We will explore how different diagnostic practices are relationally situated and how preserving more of the coherence and value of the patient has different consequences for intersubjectivity, i.e., mutual understanding and acceptance of the diagnosis.

Rhythm research via interaction analysis

Ulrich v. Wedelstaedt

University of Konstanz, Germany

Being a feature in many classical theories of sociology (e.g. Durkheim 1912; for an overview see: Hassard 1990), there are some recent approaches into rhythm research in sociology, looking into the possibility of collective cohesion through rhythm (e.g.: Collins 2005; King/de Rond 2011). They perceive rhythm as connecting or intermediating link between bodies and/or other social entities, social situations, or macro phenomena, operating with rhythm as an interpersonal, outer body element. However, their descriptions often become vague when describing the concept's key element: the quality of the rhythm itself. Pointing to interaction or cooperation when describing the character of cohesion forces, they remain indistinct about what rhythm itself actually is. Some of them rely on methods borrowed from natural science's procedures or findings, e.g. using pulse as a primordial heuristic category. Others leave rhythm itself untouched, making it the quintessence of their concept, without thoroughly establishing rhythm as a category itself. As a corollary rhythm is a blank spot for sociological description either left with vague reference to sociological terms, intra-bodily occurrences, or remains entirely undefined. Although rhythm is a key instance for the coordination of bodies in sociality and interaction, it is at the same time unexplored.

This panel's idea is that sociology does not need to borrow concepts of intrapersonal exploration, but has the methods at hand to trace social instances of coordination via rhythm. The papers in this panel want to fill the desideratum left by rhythm research using the methods of 'interactional analysis' (vom Lehn 2018). They trace the establishment, maintenance, and losses of rhythms in interaction. They seek to follow and reconstruct the coordination via rhythms produced by any form of bodily contact, be it via language or any other proximity. They explore how people engage into rhythms, solving problems that occur in everyday life. In this perspective ethnomethodology and conversation analysis become a powerful tool for rhythm research.

References

Collins, R., 2005: Interaction ritual chains. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP.

Durkheim, É., 1912: Die elementaren Formen des religiösen Lebens. Berlin: Verlag der Weltreligionen.

Hassard, J., 1990: Introduction: The Sociological Study of Time. S. 1–20 in: J. Hassard (eds.), The Sociology of time. New York: St. Martin's Press.

King, A./M. de Rond, 2011: Boat race: rhythm and the possibility of collective performance. The British Journal of Sociology 62: 565–585.

vom Lehn, D., 2018: Ethnomethodologische Interaktionsanalyse. S. 183–196 in: C. Moritz & M. Corsten (eds.), Handbuch Qualitative Videoanalyse. Wiesbaden: Springer.

"The daemon is in the details: Detail in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis"

Michael Lynch[1], Douglas Macbeth[2]
[1]Cornell University, United States of America; [2]Ohio State University, United States of America

Ethnomethodologists and conversation analysts of all stripes differ from most other sociologists in their conceptualization of and interest in details that make up the production of social actions and interactions. In line with the phenomenological legacy of ethnomethodology, EMCA treats the 'surface' details of social actions as constitutive features of the ordinary intelligibility and analyzability of actions in–their–production, rather than as data for methods of controlled observation, experimentation, and analysis. A further point, often emphasized by Garfinkel, is that ethnomethodology's interest in detail is not a matter of "detailing generalities" (illustrating and applying conceptual frameworks devised by professional analysts), but of explicating how the production of actions becomes intelligible and analyzable for cultural members, and *then* for professional analysts, through the recognizability of local contextures of scenic and sequential details.

The title of this session recalls the vernacular idiom that 'the devil is in the details,' but uses the archaic term "daemon", in ancient use referring to a spiritual intermediary that inspires mundane human action. "Daemon" also is a term used in computer science for an operating system that runs in the background of a user's evident engagement with an interface. Rather than positing a daemon that stands behind, beneath, or above worldly actions, the papers in this session show that its relevance is immanent to the production of detailed action and interaction. The explication of such detail in ethnomethodology and CA is thus not a matter of pursuing smaller and smaller particles and relating them back to the larger orders they compose or the abstractions they index. Matters of detail and granularity are commensurable with what counts as the local-contextual relevance of constitutive detail on any given occasion. Analytically posited detail may or may not be commensurable with details relevant to the endogenous production of laic orders that our materials routinely exhibit.

The panel's papers will address this order of detail and its granularity in laic analyses of practical sociological action, and what is incommensurate about this regard for detail in EMCA analyses *vis a vis* more familiar professional and disciplinary academic treatments of coding, indexing and quantifying. These topics capture a good deal of what is distinctive about the radical initiatives of Garfinkel, Sacks, Schegloff et al. and the sociology that EMCA proposes.

Understanding Hybrid interactions

Marc Relieu[1], Julia Velkovska[2]
[1]Telecom Paristech, France; [2]Orange Labs

Hybrid interactions merging artificial agents and human participants into various types of language exchanges have left the labs and the experimental settings to join everyday life. Textual chatbots are used in various Instant messaging exchanges in order, for example, to book a travel or to order food; vocal conversational agents embedded in smart speakers and mobile phones treat various requests or information queries (Porcheron& al. 2018; Velkovska & Zouinar 2018); different types of conversational agents could be also embedded into robots (Pitsch, K. 2015). Consequently, studies of hybrid interactions constitute a stimulating emergent field, raising questions about the organization of social practices with and through these systems, often based on AI (Moore & alii, 2017), but also about the place and the role of these technologies in society. The objective of this panel is to explore the various theoretical, analytical and empirical challenges that emerge from the study of naturally occurring hybrid interactions, for example:

- Are there specific practices that users of conversational agents develop so as to make this interaction intelligible and to achieve understanding (asymmetry, etc.) ?

- How the visibility or the invisibility of the "botness" of one participant becomes relevant for the organization of the interaction?

- How participants deal with the various breakdowns which emerge during the interactions (repair organization, etc.) ?

We welcome papers on practical activities and different social practices with, through and around various types of artificial conversational agents (chatbots, personal and home voice assistants, robots…) in various social settings, lay or professional.

References

Button G. (1990) "Going up a blind alley. Conflating conversation analysis and computational modelling". In: Luff P, Frohlich D, Gilbert N (eds) Computers and conversation. Academic Press, London, pp 67–90

Pitsch, K. (2015). "Limits and opportunities for mathematizing communicational conduct for social robotics in the real-world? Toward enabling a robot to make use of the human's competences". In: AI & Society. Special Issue ‚Going beyond the laboratory – reconsidering the ELS implications of autonomous robots, 1-7.

Nomikou, Iris and Pitsch, Karola and Rohlfing, Katharina J. (2013). "Asymmetry and adaptation in social interaction: A micro-analytic perspective". In Interaction Studies, 14, vii-xii

Moore, R. J. , Raphael Arar, Ren,G.-J.. Szymanski M. H. (2017). "Conversational UX Design". CHI'17 Extended Abstracts, Denver, CO, May.

Porcheron, M., Fischer, J. E. , Reeves, S. , and Sharples, S., (2018)" Voice Interfaces in Everyday Life " CHI'18, Montréal, Canada, http://www.cs.nott.ac.uk/~pszsr/files/porcheron-2018-voice-interfaces-in-everyday-life.pdf

Suchman, L.(1987) Plans and situated actions. The problem of human machine communication. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Velkovska, J. & Zouinar, M. (2018) « The illusion of natural conversation: interacting with smart assistants in home settings », CHI'18, Montréal, Canada, https://voiceux.files.wordpress.com/2018/03/velkovska.pdf

Children and social competence: talking about sensitive topics with children in different institutional settings

Joyce Lamerichs[1], Amanda Bateman[2]

[1]VU Amsterdam, Netherlands, The; [2]Swansea University, Wales, UK

This panel highlights young peoples' interactional competence in a range of institutional settings when they experience different types of crises. These might be everyday crises or crises that occur as a result of particular traumatic events. In all instances, the child's mental health might be at stake. We present naturally occurring institutional talk from different countries in which young people talk to professionals and disclose particular mental health concerns and ways of coping. Using video and audio recorded conversations of the interactions, the presentations further the empirical evidence that shows how young people employ discursive strategies to demonstrate their interactional competence (Bateman & Danby, 2013; Bateman, Danby & Howard, 2013; Theobald, 2016) and resist or protect claims that they lack interactional competence, especially in contexts where they might be seen as seeking support, or when their (dis)abilities, particular experiences or mental health are explicitly up for discussion (Jol & Stommel, 2016; Lamerichs, Alisic & Schasfoort, 2018; O'Reilly, 2008).

All presentations draw on insights from ethnomethodology, conversation analysis and discursive psychology. They take as a starting point ideas put forward in childhood sociology and sociolinguistics that propose that children possess interactional competencies that can be located as in situ achievements in talk and how this is talked into being in (institutionally) specific ways (Danby, 2002; Moran-Ellis, 2010).

As an increased understanding of children's interactional competencies can inform practice, panel presentations will also report on detailed reflections on their empirical work that were offered by professionals in the respective fields. Last but not least, all contributions will address relevant methodological issues, point to implications that cut across institutions and to areas where future research is needed.

References

Bateman, A., & Danby, S. (2013). Recovering from the earthquake: Early childhood teachers and children collaboratively telling stories about their experiences. *Disaster Prevention and Management, 22* (5): 467-479.

Bateman, A., Danby S., & Howard, J. (2013). Everyday preschool talk about Christchurch earthquakes. *Australian Journal of Communication, 40* (1): 103-121.

Danby, Susan J. (2002) The communicative competence of young children. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, *27* (3): 25-30.

Jol, G., and Stommel, W. (2016). Resisting the legitimacy of the question: self-evident answers to questions about sources of knowledge in police interviews with child witnesses. *International Journal of Legal Discourse, 1*(2), 345-374.

Lamerichs, J., Alisic, E., & Schasfoort, M. (2018). Accounts and their epistemic implications. An investigation of how '*I don't know'* answers by children are received in trauma recovery talk. *Children and Social Interaction, 2* (1):25-48.

Moran-Ellis, J. (2010). Reflections on the sociology of childhood in the UK. *Current Sociology, 58* (2): 186-205.

O'Reilly, M. (2008). What value is there in children's talk? Investigating family therapist's interruptions of parents and children during the therapeutic process. *Journal of Pragmatics, 40* (3): 507-524.

Theobald, M. (2016) Achieving competence: The interactional features of children's storytelling. *Childhood*, *23* (1): 87-104.

Treatment Recommendation as a situated practice: a comparison of ways to recommend treatment in different specialty settings and contexts

Marilena Fatigante, Francesca Alby

Sapienza University of Rome, Italy

Treatment recommendation (TR) is a central practice and aim of the medical visit (Costello, Roberts 2001, Collins et al . 2005, Koenig 2011, Stivers et al 2017). During treatment recommendation sequences, doctors' medical authority can be in tension with patients' preferences and values as well as patients' authority to participate in medical decision-making (Chappel et al. 2018). Doctors can make treatment recommendations via different types of social actions, wherein they exercise different amounts of deontic authority (Stivers et al. 2017) and express varying degrees of certainty in regard to treatment efficacy, life-threatening risks for the patient, and risk-benefit balance (Hudak, Clark, Raymond 2011, Alby et al. 2017). As a recent collection of papers (Stivers et al, 2017) has shown, systematic and comparative investigation of the different ways in which physicians recommend treatment in different countries and in different medical contexts reveals participants' orientation to broader structural forces that are specific to health settings in different social and organizational contexts. Following that line of research, the panel we propose gathers contributions from audio- and video-based, conversation-analytic research of treatment recommendation sequences in medical interaction observed in different specialty fields and in general medicine. Also, languages other than English are included. Our aim is to stimulate a discussion about how participants build their actions, examined in their sequential, temporal and embodied organization, in ways that are specific to, and simultaneously constitutive of, the medical contexts under examination. The panel will explore commonalities and differences in practices of recommending a treatment and engaging patients (sometimes together with their companions if present) in medical decision, in different contexts, also highlighting how different practices may shape in different ways the respective identities of the doctor and the patient. Analyses will show the complexity of different practices done, calling in to question the notion of "patient-centered" vs. "physician-centered" communication. To this aim, the panelists will examine practices of treatment recommendation in several specialty fields in medicine including oncology (examined in two different cultural settings, USA and Italy), neurology, hearing aid rehabilitation setting (examined in Finnish context) and different primary care settings, also including rural, non-western contexts (indigenous Mexican communities), less examined within ethnomethodological and CA literature on medical interaction.

Refs (selection)

Stivers T, et al. (2017) Treatment Recommendations as Actions. Health Communication

Chappel P, Toerien M, Jackson C, Reuber M (2018) Following the patient's orders? Recommending vs. offering choice in neurology outpatient consultations. Social Science and Medicine, 8-16

Alby, F., et al. (2017) Managing risk and patient involvement in choosing treatment for cancer: an analysis of two communication practices. Sociology of Health and Illness.

Koenig, C. J. (2011). Patient resistance as agency in treatment decisions. Social Science and Medicine, 72.