СЕКЦІЯ 2
МЕТОДОЛОГІЯ ТА МЕТОДИ СОЦІОЛОГІЧНИХ ДОСЛІДЖЕНЬ

CONVERSATION ANALYSIS: APPLICATIONS, PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

КОНВЕРСАЦІЙНИЙ АНАЛІЗ: СФЕРИ ЗАСТОСУВАННЯ, ПРОБЛЕМИ ТА ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ

Borodenko O.V.
PhD in Philosophy,
Senior Lecturer at the Department
of Sociology
Petro Mohyla Black Sea
National University

The article deals with the current state of conversation analysis (CA) as one of the most promising methods of sociology. Conversation analysis has been comprehended within the framework of ethnomethodological research paradigm, which is aimed at studying objective facts, the constant reproduction of social reality in practice. Scientific sources and ways of method formation in the West (works of H. Sachs, E. Schegloff, G. Jefferson) are highlighted, its relevance and significance are shown. The causes and nature of the methodological crisis that conversation analysis is experiencing today are analyzed. Possible ways to overcome the methodological crisis are proposed, first of all – through the expansion of the problem field of CA, the search for new areas of its application. Some promising areas of application of the method have been considered: a) study of different types of institutional interaction – conversations during court hearings, parliamentary sittings, official or semi-official conversations in administrative institutions, in the army, educational institutions, etc.; b) research interviews (CA method allows to explain the orientation of the interview participants on the normative properties of the exchange of phrases, which occurs in strict sequence); c) analysis of conversations between doctor and patient, which allows to consider both parties as full participants in the interaction; d) study of various forms of conversational communication as a component of political interaction; e) research of the role of the audience in conversational public communication (the audience is evaluated by conversation analysts as a full participant in the dialogue). In addition, the article focuses on the possibilities and prospects of using conversation analysis in the study of common forms of online communication (eg, chat).
Key words: conversation analysis, ethnomethodology, everyday communicative practices, institutional talks, online communication, methodological crisis.

У статті розглядається сучасний стан конверсаційного аналізу (КА) як одного з найбільш перспективних методів соціології. Конверсаційний аналіз осмислюється в рамках етнометодологічної науково-дослідницької парадигми, спрямованої на вивчення об'єктивних фактів, постійного відтворення соціальної реальності на практиці. Висвітлено наукові джерела та шляхи формування методу на Заході (праці Х. Сакса, Е. Щеглоффа, Г. Джефферсон), показано його актуальність і значущість. Аналізуються причини й характер методологічної кризи, яку конверсаційний аналіз переживає в наш час. Пропонуються можливі шляхи подолання методологічної кризи передусім через розширення проблемного поля КА, пошук нових сфер його застосування. Розглядаються окремі перспективні сфери застосування методу: а) вивчення різних видів інституційної взаємодії – розмов під час судових засідань, засідань парламенту, офіційних або напівофіційних розмов в адміністративних установах, в армії, навчальних закладах тощо; б) дослідницькі інтерв'ю (методика КА дає змогу пояснити орієнтації учасників інтерв'ю на нормативні властивості обміну фразами, що відбувається в суворій почерговості); в) аналіз розмов між лікарем і пацієнтом, що дає змогу розглядати обидві сторони як повноправних учасників взаємодії; г) вивчення різних форм розмовної комунікації як складника політичної взаємодії; д) дослідження ролі аудиторії в розмовній публічній комунікації (аудиторія оцінюється конверс-аналітиками як повноправний учасник діалогу). Окрім того, у рамках статті частково приділяється увага можливостям і перспективам використання конверсаційного аналізу під час вивчення поширених форм онлайн-комунікації (наприклад, спілкування в чатах).
Ключові слова: конверсаційний аналіз, етнометодологія, повсякденні комунікативні практики, інституціональні розмови, онлайн-комунікація, методологічна криза.

Formulation of the problem. Conversation analysis (CA) has declared itself as an empirical method of sociological research in the first half of the 70s of the twentieth century. The name of the method was proposed by the American scientist H. Sachs. This method was formed within the framework of an ethnomethodological research paradigm, which is aimed at studying objective facts as a constant recreation of social reality in practice, in the process of everyday communication[1]. The article by H. Sacks, E. Schegloff, G. Jefferson *A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation (1974)* became a programmatic work in this direction [30]. After that, other studies began to appear (mainly in the USA, Canada and Western Europe), in which the CA method is used in various spheres of everyday communication – for example, when analyzing friendly conversations in cafes, telephone conversations of various people, conversations between children and etc. (Sachs, Schegloff, Jefferson, Heritage, Hutchby and Woo t and others). In the 80s, the CA expanded its area of penetration – the so-called "institutional talks" began to be studied (that is, communication in an official or semi-official setting – at court hearings and parliamentary meetings, in interviews, between a doctor and a patient, etc.) (Atkinson, Bull, Drew & Heritage, Clayman, Maynard, Nofsinger, Frankel and others). In the USSR, this method was regarded with suspicion, so until the beginning of the 90s it was practically not used. And only at the beginning of this century serious studies began to appear in the post-Soviet space, mainly of a theoretical nature, in which the principles and methods of the CA are described in detail, and the issue of the areas of practical application of this method is discussed (Isupova, Turchik, Kolyadov, Korbut, Sikorskaya, Ulanovsky). There are very few works on CA in Ukraine. These are studies that have appeared relatively recently (Mramornova 2011; Selivanova 2011, 2013; Slobodyanyuk and Dikan 2013).

Analysis of recent research and publications. At the same time, in recent years, it has become increasingly common to talk about a certain methodological crisis of the CA, about the exhaustion of its themes and possibilities. The main claims of the critics of the method are as follows: a) CA limits the prospects of ethnomethodology, introducing a powerful behavioral influence into it [3, p. 447]; b) within the framework of the CA, the local positions of judgments of the participants in the conversation are unreasonably exaggerated to the detriment of the objective meaning [3, p. 452]; c) CA does not involve consideration of the characteristics of the participants in the interaction [14, p. 761]; it considers social reality as a sequence of current events, as a kind of "existence" that defines a social essence, and not vice versa; d) the participants in the conversation are often perceived as some faceless figures who are devoid of individuality and social attributes [4, p. 547].

We cannot fully agree with such estimates. Nowadays, there are many interesting works in which the CA technique finds new, often unexpected areas of application[2].

Setting objectives. *The relevance of this issue* is due, on the one hand, to the growing interest in CA in Ukraine and in other countries, as well as, the expansion of the scope of this technique, including on online communication; on the other hand, by the methodological crisis that CA is currently experiencing and by the extremely insufficient number of publications on CA in Ukraine. *The purpose of our article* is to investigate the most promising areas of using conversation analysis in sociology at present, as well as possible ways to overcome the crisis that this method has survived.

Presentation of the main research material.

The use of CA in the study of various types of institutional interaction.

Harvey Sachs called for applying the CA method exclusively to ordinary conversations [26; 27; 28; 29]. However, already in the late 1970s, conversation analysis began to be applied to the study of various forms of the so-called "institutional talk". These are discussions in the courtroom, speeches by politicians, parliamentary meetings, a teacher's conversation with a student, wedding ceremonies and the like. The fact is that people communicate both informally and formally; moreover, "institutional talk" is used by people more often. A conversation in an institutional context is characterized by a reduction in many of the rules of communication that are present in everyday conversation. In addition, there are significant restrictions on the set of speech practices [17; 20; 8]. As noted by one of the most respected experts in this matter John Heritage, CA of the 'institutional talk', unlike CA of the 'ordinary conversation' "focused on more restricted

---

[1] *Ethnomethodology* is a direction in twentieth-century sociology that was begun by H. Garfinkel in 1967. It analyzes everyday practices (language use, communication, behavior, customs). The main postulate of ethnomethodology is that any everyday practice is a structure that is able to organize itself, proceeding not from general theoretical prescriptions, but from the characteristics of each specific situation [10].

[2] Conversation analysis of online discourse is one of these promising areas. So, more and more analysts turn to the study of chatting (L. Murphy & P. Collins 1999, H. Park 2002, R. Parrish 2000, P. Ten Have 2002, R. Vallis 2001, T. Yee 2000). As experts notice, "media as a socialization agent, are more similar to peers than other agents such as family, school, or community. Since adolescents choose both their media and their peer group, they have more control over their socialization from these agents compared to their socialization from agents over which they have less control, such as their family or school. Chat, with its amalgam of media and peers, enables researchers to look at this socialization process up close and personal" [31, p. 663].

environments in which (i) the goals of the participants are more limited and institution-specific, (ii) restrictions on the nature of interactional contributions are often in force, and (iii) institution- and activity-specific inferential frameworks are common" [8, p. 5; 17, p. 3].

Research interviews are one of the typical examples of this interaction. Any interview is a "conversation with a specific purpose" [23, p. 179]. The communicative situation, which consists in the interaction between the respondent and the interviewer, is interesting in that it develops not only due to psychological or cognitive factors, but also under the influence of certain "laws of conversation". These laws are in the field of view of the CA. The method of conversation analysis allows not only to find and describe repetitive patterns of this kind of communication, but also to explain the orientation of the interviewees to the normative properties of replica exchanges, which are carried out in a strict order. CA also allows us to outline a special focus on the analysis of interactive activities: the mechanics of the intersubjective work of interview participants, which is expressed in situationally agreed messaging, as well as the role and features of many non-verbal components of speech interaction (pauses, laughter, booing, applause), which do not always fall into field of view of interview researchers [32, p. 124].

An interview as a way of communication is also interesting because it is an institutional form of communication only partially. Indeed, any interview is based on a clear-cut scheme for accepting Q&A. In addition, neither the interviewer, nor the respondent can circumvent the strict rules, without which the interview loses its meaning (for example, the interviewer cannot enter into discussions with the respondent, his goal is to ask questions that are aimed at obtaining the maximum amount of information; any interview should be saturated with facts; the interview has its own strict style, to a large extent formalized; the interviewer is obliged to let his interlocutor speak out; one cannot ask too easy or too complicated questions; one cannot give vent to emotions and so on). At the same time, any interview is a conversation between two people interested in mutual communication. Consequently, an interview is colloquial speech, which is largely spontaneous and situational. "Interaction during the interview is based on mechanisms similar to those used by people in everyday conversation," which "allows us to consider the interview as a certain transformation of the basic and primary model of communication – conversational interaction; < … > this allows you to apply the basic methodological principles of conversation analysis to the study of any type of interview, including research and standardized interviews " [24, p. 2; 32, p. 126].

Conversation analysis of interaction between a doctor and a patient.

The beginning of research of this kind was laid by Frankel [21; 22], Heath [15; 16], and West [33], which appeared in the mid-80s of the twentieth century. These studies developed and deepened the sociological analysis of interactions in the medical field, the normative concept of which back in 1951, Talcott Parsons proposed in line with the ideas of structural functionalism [25]. Nowadays, such studies are very popular. They cover a wide field – surgical operations, medical consultations, primary medical care and so on. If in many other studies of the interaction between the doctor and the patient the leading role is inevitably given to the doctor, then the conversation analysis allows us to consider both sides as equal participants in the interaction. And this approach is very important: "First, interactional practices through which persons conduct themselves elsewhere are not abandoned at the threshold of the medical clinic. <…> Second, practices for effecting particular kinds of actions – describing a problem or trouble or telling bad and good news are also carried across the threshold of the doctor's office and affect how doctors and patients go about addressing particular interactional tasks. Third, <…> CA begins from the presumption that physician and patient, with various levels of mutual understanding, conflict, cooperation, authority, and subordination, jointly construct the medical visit" [19, p. 362].

Conversation analysis in the study of political interaction.

One of the most common types of institutional interaction is political interaction. In the mid-80s, the first significant studies of communication between politicians have been appeared. It was an analysis of communication during the presidential debate, as well as during parliamentary meetings and parliamentary hearings, in which the CA was the main method. As you know, the media play a key role in modern politics. Very often, a mediocre politician gains weight and influence in society, wins elections only because of his image, ability to use the media: "Politicians are not only seen and heard, they are seen and heard in close-up; their appearance, indeed their every action are open to close scrutiny. Thus, what matters is not just what is said but how it is said: demeanour, tone of voice, facial expression and body movement may all affect voters' perceptions of their political representatives" [5, p. 79].

Conversation analysis in its application to political interaction is able to identify primarily three key features of the interaction: a) how, in the course of interaction, politicians build a communication structure, what factors are crucial in building a political dialogue; b) the process of indexing the statements by each of the participants

in the interaction to the context[3]; c) the smallest details of the interaction of politicians, since any, even a short phrase is important for the CA, and without exception, all the features of a live conversation occurring in vivo are updated in each interaction detail.

Studying the role of the audience in the interaction.

At the very beginning of the use of our method, the audience of public speech interactions was not the object of research for conversation analysts. Only in the mid-80s the role of the audience begin to be taken seriously. The audience of any speech event (an audience of a television talk show, hearers of a political speech at a stadium or in a crowded room, an audience of mass entertainment events) is always a very important partner in interaction. Analysts came precisely to this conclusion, although this did not happen right away, but during about two decades of analysis of audience participation.

The most important and crucial work in this direction is the work of the British scientist Max Atkinson [1; 2], as well as a number of his followers, especially C. Goodwin [11; 12; 13], Heritage & Greatbatch [18], P. Bull [5], S. Clyman [6; 7], A. Duranti [9]. Analysts pay special attention to such moments: a) addressing the speaker's statements to the audience (to whom exactly, when and to what extent the statements are directed); b) the role of non-verbal statements (gestures, facial expressions, pauses, etc.) in the interaction "speaker – audience"; c) the response of the audience (approving or disapproving reactions – applause, exclamations, shouts, whistles, etc.).

A very thorough transcription of the conversation, which is always used in the CA, allows you to record every minute, for example, at what point in time and how many times the speaker's speech was interrupted by the audience, when and how the speaker encouraged the audience to his desired reactions, and when, conversely, his speech caused negative or unanticipated reactions of listeners. The results of such an analysis allow us to trace what is good and what is bad in the interaction of a politician, artist or any other public figure with the audience, and also to find out what moods dominate among the masses.

Conclusions. The method of conversation analysis has very broad capabilities. It allows you to capture those details of the interaction that may simply not be noticed when using other methods. The results of using this method in the study of various forms of conversational interaction allows us to argue that at present conversation analysis is one of the most effective methods of sociology. The most promising, in our opinion, directions

of CA we analyzed in the framework of this article: analysis of everyday informal communication of small groups of people; analysis of institutional conversations; study of communication "doctor-patient"; analysis of conversational interaction in politics; analysis of online communication.

REFERENCES:

1. Atkinson J.M. Our Master's Voices: The Language and Body Language of Politics. L. ; Methuen : Psychology Press, 1984. 203 p.

2. Atkinson J.M. Public Speaking and Audience Responses: Some Techniques for Inviting Applause. Atkinson J.M., Heritage J. (eds.). *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis.* Cambridge ; N.Y. : Cambridge University Press, 1984. P. 370–409.

3. Atkinson P. Ethnomethodology: a critical review. *Annual review of sociology.* 1988. Vol. 14. P. 441–465.

4. Billig M. Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in conversation analysis. *Discourse and society.* 1999. Vol. 10. P. 543–558.

5. Bull P. The Microanalysis of Political Discourse. *Philologia Hispalensis*, 2012. P. 79–93.

6. Clayman S.E. Booing: The Anatomy of a Disaffiliative Response. *American Sociological Review*. 1993. Vol. 58. № 1. P. 110–130.

7. Clayman S.E. Caveat Orator: Audience Disaffiliation in the 1988 Presidential Debates. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. 1992. Vol. 78. № 1. P. 33–60.

8. Drew P., Heritage J. Analyzing Talk at Work: An Introduction // *Talk at Work* / ed. by P. Drew, J. Heritage. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1992. P. 3–65.

9. Duranti A., Brenneis D. (eds.). The Audience as Co-author. *Text*. 1986. Vol. 6. № 3. P. 239–347.

10. Garfinkel H. Studies in Ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs ; N.Y. : 1967.

11. Goodwin Ch. Conversational Organization: Interaction between Speakers and Hearers. N.Y. : Academic Press, 1981. 195 p.

12. Goodwin Ch. Co-Operative Action. N.Y. : Cambridge University Press, 2018. 521 p.

13. Goodwin C., Heritage J. Conversation analysis. *Annual review of anthropology.* 1990. Vol. 19. P. 283–307.

14. Hammersley M. Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: methods or paradigms? *Discourse and society*. 2003. Vol. 14. P. 751–781.

15. Heath C. The display of recipiency: an instance of sequential relationship between speech and body movement. *Semiotica*. 1982. Vol. 42. P. 147–167.

16. Heath C. Body Movement and Speech in Medical Interaction. Cambridge, UK : Cambridge Univ. Press, 1986.

17. Heritage J. Conversation Analysis and Institutional Talk: Analyzing Distinctive Turn-Taking Systems. S. Cmejrkova, J. Hoffmannova, O. Müllerova and J. Svetla (1998) (eds.) *Proceedings of the 6th International Congress of IADA (International Association for Dialog Analysis)*, Tubingen : Niemeyer. P. 3–17.

18. Heritage J., Greatbatch D. Generating Applause: A Study of Rhetoric and Response at Party Political Conferences. *American Journal of Sociology.* 1986. Vol. 92. № 1. P. 110–157.

---

[3] According to one of the fundamental principles of conversation analysis, the contribution of each participant in the interaction should be contextually oriented.

19. Heritage J. & Maynard D. W. Problems and Prospects In the Study of Physician-Patient Interaction: 30 Years of Research. *Annual Revue of Sociology.* 2006. Issue 32. P. 351–374.

20. Hutchby I., Wooffitt R. Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practicies and Applications. Cambridge : Polity Press, 2002.

21. Frankel R.M. The laying on of hands: aspects of the organisation of gaze, touch and talk in the medical encounter. *The Social Organization of Doctor-Patient Communication* / ed. S Fisher, AD Todd, pp. 19–54. Washington, DC : Cent. Appl. Linguist, 1983.

22. Frankel R.M. From sentence to sequence: understanding the medical encounter through micro-interactional analysis. *Discourse Process.* 1984. Vol. 7. P. 135–170.

23. Maynard D.W., Schaeffer N.C. Opening and Closing the Gate: The Work of Optimism in Recrouting Survey Respondents. *Standartization and Tacit Knowledge: Interaction and Practice in the Survey Interview* / ed. by D.W. Maynard, H. Houtkoop-Steenstra, N.C. Schaeffer, J. van der Zouwen. New York : John Wiley & Sons, 2002. P. 179–205.

24. Nofsinger R.E. Everyday Conversation. London : Sage, 1991.

25. Parsons T. The Social System. New York : Free Press, 1951.

26. Sacks H. Lectures on Conversation. Oxford : Blackwell Publishing, 1992.

27. Sacks H. An Initial Investigation of the Usability of Conversational Data for Doing Sociology. *Studies in Social Interaction* / Ed. by D. Sudhow. N.Y. : Free Press, 1972.

28. Sacks H. On the Analysability of Stories by Children. In: *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication* / Ed. by J.J. Gumperz, D. Hymes. N.Y. : Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1972.

29. Sacks H., Schegloff E. Opening up Closings. *Semiotica.* 1973. № 7.

30. Sacks H., Schegloff E., Jefferson G. A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language.* 1974. Vol. 50. № 4 (part 1). P. 696–735.

31. Subrahmanyama K., Greenfield P.M., Tynes B. Constructing sexuality and identity in an online teen chat room. *Applied Developmental Psychology.* 2004. Vol. 25. P. 651–665.

32. Turchik A. Konversaczionny`j analiz instituczional`nogo vzaimodejstviya: kommunikativny`e strategii uchastnikov "prervannogo" telefonnogo interv`yu [Conversation analysis of institutional interaction: communication strategies of participants in the "interrupted" telephone interview]. *Socziologiya vlasti.* 2013. № 1–2. P. 122–154 [In Russian].

33. West C. Routine Complications: Troubles with Talk Between Doctors and Patients. Bloomington : Indiana Univ. Press, 1984.