1
The History and Landscape of Conversation and Discourse Analysis

Jessica Nina Lester and Michelle O'Reilly

Introduction

Mental distress has typically been examined from a biomedical or biopsychosocial perspective with quantitative evidence (especially, randomised controlled trials) being favoured. Over the last few decades there has been a growth and greater acceptance of qualitative methods and an increasing emphasis on applied qualitative research, which has been useful in the field of mental health. However, qualitative evidence has been typically, and arguably inappropriately, placed at the bottom level of evidence in the field of health and medicine (Lester & O'Reilly, 2015). Nonetheless, there is a growing acceptance that qualitative approaches offer a great deal for understanding the complexities of mental distress. More specifically, qualitative methodologies, such as conversation and discourse analysis (henceforth DA), have the added benefit of involving a close examination of the realities of individuals diagnosed with mental health conditions and the many interactions that surround their everyday lives.

This Handbook includes the work of scholars engaging with the methodologies of conversation and/or DA in a range of areas of mental distress. The purpose of this chapter is to provide a background, as this is particularly important for those who are relatively new to conversation and DA approaches. Thus, in this chapter, we provide an overview of different types of DA that may be employed by the authors included in this Handbook, as well as an overview of conversation analysis (henceforth CA). We offer a general description of CA, a brief history of the development of the approach, and some guidance regarding how CA is conducted. Additionally, we introduce some of the different types of DA to illustrate the variation in approaches, with some overview of how DA is carried out in practice. While reference is made to the field of mental distress, this is only done in passing, as the substantive emphasis of the Handbook is

not our main focus here, rather we focus on the methodological approaches that are used by the authors in writing their chapters.

An introduction to conversation analysis

Underpinned by a micro-social constructionist position, CA is a qualitative approach that focuses on the study of interaction. With a variety of influences in the background – including ethnomethodology, Goffmanian sociology, linguistic philosophy, ethnography, and others (Maynard, 2013) – it is an emic and inductive methodology, which prioritises empirical evidence that involves the participants' orientations (Bolden & Robinson, 2011). That is, conversational materials are assumed to exhibit orderliness for the participants and is made visible through the ways in which they assemble actions together (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff & Sacks, 1978). In other words, CA aims to 'describe, analyze and understand talk as a basic and constitutive feature of human social life' (Sidnell, 2010, p. 1). Those using CA attempt to explore what kinds of social organisations are used as resources in interaction (Mazeland, 2006), with a focus on how participants within an interaction negotiate meanings between them on a turn-by-turn basis (Hutchby & Wooffit, 2008; McCabe, 2006).

The history and development of conversation analysis

CA was pioneered by Harvey Sacks who originally trained in Law and began to develop this approach, in part through the influence of Harold Garfinkel (Maynard, 2013; Schegloff, 1992) during his investigations at the 'Center for the Scientific Study of Suicide' in the 1960s (Drew, 2015). His early work focused on telephone calls to a suicide prevention center, and he explored how the callers' accounts of troubles were produced through the interaction with call-takers (Drew, Heritage, Lerner, & Pomerantz, 2015; Silverman, 1998). Through this, he began to investigate the generic practices of interaction, and the general elements of what CA is began to develop (Drew, 2015). Notably, the work on suicide prevention calls did not have an analytic interest primarily on suicide, or even on troubles-talk, but rather was focused on the organisation of talk-in-interaction (Drew et al., 2015). Also, Sacks (1984, p. 26) did not begin working with recordings because of 'any large interest in language or from some theoretical formulation of what should be studied', but because the tapes could be replayed and others also could review the data and Sacks' analyses to see or hear how well analytic assertions would hold up.

   Despite the popularity of CA today, at the time of his premature death in 1975 (from a car accident), his papers had tended to be published in relatively obscure outlets (Silverman, 1998); yet, over time the value of CA began to be

recognised. In part, this recognition was due to the fact that during his time 'inventing' CA (Silverman, 1998), Sacks worked alongside Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson in developing the approach and making observations regarding the nature of interaction. It was through his work with Schegloff and Jefferson that Sacks began to view talk as an object of study in its own right (Drew, 2015), with the continued work resulting in CA becoming a readily acknowledged qualitative approach.

Sacks et al. were influenced by ethnomethodology, with the origins of CA being traced back to the work of Goffman and Garfinkel[1] (Schegloff, 2003). Thus, CA is grounded in ethnomethodology, which is a 'bottom-up' approach that views social organisation as an 'emergent achievement' resulting from the efforts of social members who act within a local situation (Maynard & Clayman, 2003). Ethnomethodology explores the principles upon which individuals base their social actions (Seedhouse, 2004). Hence, ethnomethodology is a label used to capture a range of phenomena linked to the knowledge and reasoning techniques of ordinary people (Heritage, 1984). Indeed, it was described by Heritage (1984) as the study of particular subject matter; that is,

> the body of common-sense knowledge and the range of procedures and considerations by means of which the ordinary members of society make sense of, find their way about in, and act on the circumstances in which they find themselves. (p. 4)

For CA, claims are made in the observable orientations that participants display to one another. CA has a distinctive interest in how orderly characteristics of talk are accountably produced on a turn-by-turn basis (Maynard & Clayman, 2003). Therefore, CA reflects a fusion of Goffman's and Garfinkel's approaches through the creation of an empirical method in order to explore how people produce social order (McCabe, 2006). Because of the focus on interaction and the sequential organisation of talk, CA has been described as focusing on 'talk-in-interaction' (Drew & Heritage, 1992), with this understood to entail focusing on what talk is *doing* rather than what talk is *about* (Schegloff, 1999).

Conversation analysis and interactional linguistics

Recently, interactional linguistics has become a prominent part of CA for many scholars. This is because contemporary anthropologists, conversation analysts, and linguists have realised the value of coming together to combine their respective disciplinary strengths with the focus on language (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2001). Interactional linguistics (different from interactional sociolinguistics, discussed later in the chapter) is an interdisciplinary approach to interaction and grammar in linguistics, anthropology, and the sociology of language. Scholars using this approach utilise CA, functional linguistics,

and linguistic anthropology in order to describe the ways in which language features in normative interactions (Ochs, Schegloff, & Thompson, 1996). This is a perspective on language structure that goes beyond grammar and prosody to examine all aspects of language structure, phonology, phonetics, syntax, lexis, morphology, pragmatics, and semantics, as well as language acquisition, language variation, loss, and disorder (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2001).

An important step in the development of interactional linguistics was the seminal work of CA, and the analytic tools of CA were instrumental to this development. Thus, interactional linguistics combines the approach of CA with linguistics and contextualisation theory and forms an interface between linguistic analysis and the study of social interaction (Kern & Selting, 2012).

Interactional linguists see linguistic forms as affected by interaction in speech and language, unlike dominant approaches to linguistics which traditionally focused on the form of language or the user's language competencies (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2001). In other words, interactional linguistics is founded on the premise that language ought not to be studied in terms of context-free linguistic structures, but instead should be examined as a 'resource' for accomplishing social actions (Kern & Selting, 2012).

Conversation analysis and data

Those who utilise CA favour naturally occurring data. That is, conversation analysts have a preference for data that have not been deliberately generated by the researcher for the purposes of research. Rather, they record (in some format) interactions that occur in the 'real-world' as they would happen naturally, without the researcher intervening. In other words, naturally occurring data would still occur if the researcher had not been born (Potter, 2004) or if the researcher was unable to collect it (Potter, 1996). Conversation analysts favour naturally occurring data because it captures actual interactions while retaining the situated nature of the conversations. Thus, it is presumed to illustrate how participants orient to their setting without the abstraction of the researcher's agenda (Potter, 2004).

When analysing this naturally occurring data, researchers either develop a large corpus of conversational data, choose to share analysis from a single case or document practices of social action based on a collection of cases (Schegloff, 1987). Analysis of a single episode brings findings from the body of CA work to bear on the case; analysis of collections has the purpose of explicating a single phenomenon (Mazeland, 2006). That is, the analysis of collections draws upon a large corpus of data and aims to explicate or account for something specific within the data.

Ordinary talk, institutional interaction, and applied conversation analysis

In contemporary literature, there has been a distinction made between ordinary and institutional CA. Ordinary CA refers to the analysis of commonplace conversations, and institutional CA refers to investigations of legal, medical, and other professional settings (McCabe, 2006). Ordinary CA is epitomised by the work of Sacks and his colleagues. This form of CA investigates conversation as a domain in its own right and specifies the normative structuring and logics of particular courses of social action and their organisation into systems (Heritage, 2005). Second, as noted by Heritage (2005), institutional CA builds on the findings of basic CA in order to examine the operation of talk in social arenas that sociologists have called 'formal organisations'. Institutional CA requires a shift in perspective, as talk and discourse in institutional settings may be historically contingent and subject to the processes of social change under the impact of power, culture, social ideology, economic forces, and intellectual innovation. Still another form of CA fits the category of 'applied' analysis. Applied CA has different meanings, which are described in Table 1.1, as they were outlined by Antaki (2011).

It is essential to have an understanding of the basic principles that underlie ordinary conversation in order to analyse talk within institutional settings (Seedhouse, 2004). There are several distinctions between institutional talk and ordinary conversation, as outlined by Heritage (2005):

1. First, the turn-taking organisation of the interaction is often quite different. Although some types of institutional settings use the same turn-taking procedures as mundane conversations, many institutional settings involve very specific and systematic transformations of interactional procedures.
2. Second, the overall structural organisation is often quite distinct. It is typical for interaction to have some overall structural features. In ordinary conversations, these structural features include specifically located activities, but the complex structural organisation of talk is not found in all forms of institutional talk.
3. Third, the sequence organisation is often unique. This is particularly pertinent, as conversation analysts argue that it is through sequence organisation that the tasks central to interaction are managed. For example, in institutional talk there is often a range of question–answer sequences, which are less commonly found in mundane talk.

CA has investigated institutional interactions from its inception, but it was not until the 1970s with the work of Don Zimmerman and his students at

Table 1.1 Meanings of applied conversation analysis

Type of applied CA	Description
Foundational applied CA	This form of applied CA helps to re-specify an understanding of any given discipline to provide a different framework for understanding core concepts. See, for example, Edwards and Potter (1992) and their work on discursive psychology.
Social-problem-oriented applied CA	This form of applied CA is designed to help us better understand social problems. CA offers an alternative way of looking at social organisation and social problems such as conflict, power, and so on. Although what constitutes a social problem varies, CA does recognise macro issues, while focusing mostly on the micro-concerns. See, for example, Kitzinger's (2005) work on heteronormativity.
Communication applied CA	This form of applied CA has focused on 'disordered' talk to understand the features of such talk and in some cases to challenge the picture of disorder and deficiency. CA has strength in being able to look at the interactions of these groups and to see how they actually engage with the world. See, for example, Ray Wilkinson's (2015) work on aphasia and Stribling, Rae, and Dickerson's (2009) work on autism.
Diagnostic applied CA	This form of applied CA is one of the more contentious applications of CA, as this has attempted to correlate features of the organisation of a person's speech with some underpinning psychological or organic disorder. Theoretically, this form has the potential to correlate speech features to medical diagnosis, which may be attractive to those working in medicine. See, for example, Schwabe, Howell, and Reuber's (2007) work on diagnosing epilepsy.
Institutional applied CA	The application of CA to institutional talk is not usually related to solving an institution's problems, rather it looks at how institutions manage to carry out their institutional work successfully. Thus CA illuminates the routine work of the institution. See, for example, O'Reilly, Karim, Stafford, and Hutchby's (2015) work on child mental health assessments and also consider how members resolve problems and/or conflicts. See, for example, Stiver's (2002) work on paediatrics.
Interventionist applied CA	This form of applied CA has a number of core characteristics, including that it is applied to an interactional problem that existed before the arrival of the analyst. It assumes that a solution will be identified through the analysis of the sequential organisation of talk. See, for example, Heritage's work on problem solicitation in medical encounters (Heritage & Robinson, 2006). Also see Maynard's (2003) study of delivering bad and good news; a coda in that book, mostly directed at clinicians, specifies the 'how to' for such tasks.

Source: Antaki (2011).

the University of California, Santa Barbara (Maynard, Clayman, Halkowski, & Kidwell, 2010), and of Atkinson and Drew on courtroom interactions that researchers began to examine institutional interactions as having distinctive features (Heritage, 2005). Importantly, the application of CA to institutional settings explores how institutions manage to carry out their institutional work successfully (Antaki, 2011).

How to carry out conversation analysis

The main aim of CA is to identify the ways in which talk is organised and to appreciate how interlocutors make sense of the unfolding interaction. Patterns in the talk are identified through an analysis of the sequential patterns that occur with respect to turn-taking, repair, and turn design (McCabe, 2006). The structure of a turn is built around 'turn construction units' (TCUs), with a turn being incomplete until the speaker has finished speaking (Sacks et al., 1974). While undertaking CA can be a complex task, and one that requires training to perform effectively, there are some practical steps offered for examining the sequential turn-taking interactions that unfold. Seedhouse (2004) outlined five practical stages:

1. The 'unmotivated looking' on the part of the analyst. Unmotivated looking means that the analyst is open to the discovery of patterns or phenomena without having preconceptions that guide their 'looking'.
2. Once the analyst has identified a candidate phenomenon, it is usual to engage in an inductive search through the data corpus to establish a collection of the phenomena.
3. This stage requires the establishment of the patterns in relation to the occurrences of the phenomenon, and also illustrates how these are methodically produced and oriented to by the participants.
4. Detailed analyses of single instances of the phenomenon are produced, with attention given to deviant cases.
5. A generalised account is produced in terms of how the phenomenon relates to the broad matrix of interaction; thus, a social action is identified.

The practical implementation of CA can be quite a complicated process, and there are a series of steps that the analyst should undertake, from the inception of the analysis to writing it up. Drew (2015) outlined these in detail, and these are summarised in Table 1.2.

The Jefferson convention of transcription

Since its beginning, extensive attention has been given to transcription in CA, with the Jefferson system designed specifically to reflect the analytic stance of

Table 1.2 Practical steps of CA

Step	Description
First stage	The useful starting point for any analyst is to consider the ways in which the interlocutors are not just 'talking' but are actually engaged in their social activity. Thus the analyst should ask 'what they are doing'. The first step therefore is to explore what activity or activities the speakers are engaging in: for example, inviting, excusing, justifying, accounting, questioning, and so on.
Second stage	The analyst should now pay attention to the sequence of turn that preceded the initiated action so that they can investigate how the identified activity has arisen from that sequence.
Third stage	At this point, the analyst should examine the detail in the design of the turn whereby the action was initiated in the talk.
Fourth stage	The analyst should examine how the recipient responded to the prior turn of the initial speaker. In other words, the researcher can analyse what each of the participants in the interaction are making of each other's talk and conduct.
Fifth stage	To this point, the analyst has explored the ways in which, through a series of turns at talk, those in the interaction have managed their activities, with a focus on social conduct. The point of this is to explore how conduct is constructed through what participants are saying and the design of their talk.
Sixth stage	This is a more implicit stage. That is the observation of the construction of the turns at talk, and the understanding or response to them, are not idiosyncratic to those speakers. Thus while every interaction is unique, there are systematic properties of talk-in-interaction and as such the common or shared forms of language can be identified.
Seventh stage	Once the phenomenon has been identified it is time to explore the sequential pattern. At this point, the analyst collects several cases of the phenomenon, and begins to explore the features that the cases have in common.
Eighth stage	The final stage of analysis is to provide an account for the pattern. This stage thus requires the analyst to determine whether the collection has any features in common, and where and how the object or pattern in question arose.
	Once the analysis is completed, it should be written up. It is important that the steps taken for accounting for the phenomenon are clear, and relevant literature should be discussed. It will be necessary to identify which data examples will be used and to decide how many are needed to establish the analytic point for transparency.

Source: Drew (2015).

the approach (Jefferson, 2004). The key conventions were designed to build on familiar forms of literary notation. The symbols were designed to illustrate how words and phrases sound, while making no correction for grammar or pronunciation (Hepburn & Bolden, 2013). Many of the authors in this Handbook utilise the Jefferson system of transcription, and we illustrate the most common of these symbols in Table 1.3.

For those practising CA, the process of transcription is viewed as a core analytical activity and the first step in developing a deeper understanding of the communicative process (Roberts & Robinson, 2004). The transcription process is considered an integral part of CA and is argued to be part of the analytical endeavour (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984). However, those practising CA are also aware that the transcription process is time consuming. Estimates vary from it taking approximately one hour to transcribe 1 minute of talk (Roberts &

Table 1.3   Jefferson transcription symbols

Symbol	Explanation
(.)	A full stop inside brackets denotes a micro-pause, a notable pause but of no significant length.
(0.2)	A number inside brackets denotes a timed pause. This is a pause long enough to time and subsequently show in transcription.
[ ]	Square brackets denote a point where overlapping speech occurs.
> <	Arrows surrounding talk like these show that the pace of the speech has quickened.
< >	Arrows in this direction show that the pace of the speech has slowed down.
( )	Where there is space between brackets denotes that the words spoken here were too unclear to transcribe.
(( ))	Where double brackets with a description inserted denote some contextual information where no symbol of representation was available.
Under	When a word or part of a word is underlined, it denotes a raise in volume or emphasis.
↑	When an upward arrow appears, it means there is a rise in intonation.
↓	When a downward arrow appears, it means there is a drop in intonation.
→	An arrow like this denotes a particular sentence of interest to the analyst.
CAPITALS	Where capital letters appear, it denotes that something was said loudly or even shouted.
Hum(h)our	When a bracketed 'h' appears, it means that there was laughter within the talk.
=	The equal sign represents latched speech, a continuation of talk.
:::	Colons represent elongated speech, a stretched sound.

Robinson, 2004) to 1 hour of talk taking approximately 30 hours to transcribe (McCabe, 2006). In reality, the time taken is likely to be influenced by the quality of the sound, whether the data is in the form of video or audio, whether paralinguistic features are captured, the transcriptionist's level of experience, the number of members in the interaction, the frequency of overlapping talk, and the level of detail used in the transcription.

Introduction to discourse analysis

'Discourse analysis' is an umbrella term (Harper, 2006) that refers to qualitatively oriented methodologies that can be broadly characterised as attending to talk and text in social practice (Potter, 2004). Generally, the basic assumption of DA approaches is that through language people accomplish things. For instance, through language an individual might offer a complaint, give advice, build a case for a particular position, classify someone as 'abnormal', and so on. Language, then, is presumed to be the vehicle by which social life is ordered and sustained.

More specifically, some forms of DA look primarily at the content of the language used, or the issues being discussed within a given conversation. On the other hand, other approaches to DA attend to the structure of language and how this structure functions to create particular understandings or perspectives about a phenomenon of focus. There are also some approaches to DA that are more descriptive, arguing that the goal is to describe how language works or functions. Other approaches to DA are fundamentally critical, meaning that their primary goal is not just to describe how language works but to consider and intervene in social and political issues (Gee, 2011). The diversity of DA approaches is due to the simultaneous focus on discourse in varying disciplines, and thus the term 'discourse analysis' can be thought of as a generic term (Potter & Wetherell, 1987) and different approaches to DA will utilise different methods of data collection (see e.g. Hepworth & McVittie, Chapter 3, this volume). Relatedly, it is difficult to offer a single description of the 'steps' or procedures for carrying out a DA study; rather, it is perhaps most useful to consider analysis as being informed by the particular assumptions of the approach to DA being employed, while also centred on common principles related to the study of social action in talk and text (O'Reilly, Dixon-Woods, Angell, Ashcroft, & Bryman, 2009).

While it is difficult to provide a single definition of DA, it can be broadly characterised as a commitment to studying discourse as talk and text in social practice. As noted, it is generally considered an umbrella term that encompasses a number of techniques for analysing discourse in practice. Across DA perspectives, there are three shared features or perspectives: (1) a focus on language, (2) an acknowledgement of the variability in how people go about

accounting for things; and (3) a focus on the broad ways in which accounts are constructed.

Indeed, there are many approaches to DA, with each underpinned by different theoretical assumptions and therefore serves to answer unique research questions. However, common across many DA traditions is an alignment with a social constructionist epistemological perspective. While there is no single definition of social constructionism, across perspectives there is an explicit recognition that knowledge is historically, socially, and culturally contingent. Thus, across DA perspectives, there is an assumption that knowledge is produced and sustained through social processes.

While there are similarities between CA and DA, with some approaches to DA explicitly drawing upon principles of CA (see, for instance, discursive psychology), there are some key differences. One of the primary differences is that CA examines how participants manage interaction as it unfolds in relation to the sequential structures through which activities are accomplished. CA, then, gives particular attention to the micro-details of an interaction. On the other hand, many approaches to DA emphasise the action orientation of language at a much broader level, with the analysis of the sequential organisation of talk focused on how these structures function in relation to the broader social structures.

A brief history of discourse analysis

While discourse-oriented research can be traced back to writings in the early 1900s (for a further discussion of this, see Lester, 2011), it was not until the 1980s that many of the most dominant discourse research traditions began to develop. The view of language as constitutive rather than merely reflective of inner thought is not new, as linguistic philosophers, such as Wittgenstein (1958), Winch (1967), and even the writing of Berger and Luckmann (1967), discussed it at length. With the linguistic turn, however, there was an even greater shift in how language was understood and eventually studied, with Rorty (1989) and others claiming that language was 'a useful tactic in predicting and controlling . . . behavior' (p. 15) and constitutive of meaning and practice. As researchers began to negotiate a crisis of representation across many research traditions (Clifford & Marcus, 1986; Geertz, 1988; Marcus & Fischer, 1986), they avoided the notion that language corresponds with a given reality. Rather, reality is a feature or outcome of the assumptions to which participants in social life orient and the practices they enact. This shift in perspective shaped how a variety of DA perspectives were developed and applied across disciplines.

In the 1990s, discourse research became more specialised. For instance, analysts drawing upon discursive psychology (discussed below) began to examine how mental states were worked up in language, with a gradual and growing

focus on CA as well. Those analysts using critical DA (discussed below) began to attend to broader political and social structures. More traditional approaches to DA focused on analysing discursive resources by which the truth of a claim could be considered. Thus, post-1990, there were very explicit ways in which the varying approaches to DA began to develop and focus their analytical orientation.

Different approaches to discourse analysis

While a variety of traditions and approaches to DA have been developed, we highlight seven distinguishable approaches to DA, including: (1) discourse analysis model, (2) traditional discourse analysis, (3) discursive psychology, (4) critical discourse analysis (CDA), (5) Foucauldian discourse analysis, (6) interactional sociolinguistics, and (7) Bakhtian discourse analysis. Across the approaches, there is some degree of overlap, with some approaches informing others.

Sinclair and Coulthard's Discourse Analysis Model

In the 1970s, a group of scholars developed an analytical model for the study of spoken discourse referred to as the Discourse Analysis Model, which is also referred to as the Birmingham model. Initially, this model was informed by Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975, 1992) work around classroom discourse, wherein they noted that classroom discourse follows a specific and somewhat rigid structure. They referred to this as the initiation-response-evaluation (IRE) structure, with a particular focus on the interaction between the student and teacher. The IRE structure was described as involving a teacher initiating a turn (e.g. posing a question), a student responding (e.g. a student offers an answer to the question posed), and a teacher evaluating the student response (e.g. a teacher evaluates the accuracy of the student's response). Sinclair and Coulthard (1992) described their model of DA as a tool for the study of classroom talk, but It has since been expanded and applied to the study of less structured talk (see e.g. Coulthard & Montgomery, 1981; Sinclair & Brazil, 1982).

The Discourse Analysis Model uses a rank scale to describe the nature of the structure of the discourse, with no rank given priority over another (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1992). The five ranks initially used to describe discourse were lesson, transaction, exchange, move, and act. Within this rank scale 'lesson' was conceived of being the 'top' rank, which is reflective of the uniqueness of the nature of classroom discourse. Sinclair and Coulthard (1992) claimed that the lower four ranks would likely be found in other types of discourse, not simply classroom interactions. This particular model is grounded in Halliday's work around categories of grammar.

Table 1.4   The three core concepts of traditional discourse analysis

Concept	Description
Interpretative repertoires	Interpretative repertoires are the common sense (but contradictory) ways that people talk about the social world. They are common knowledge, the cultural ideas, and explanations that everyone knows. Interpretative repertoires are used to build explanations, accounts, and arguments (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). A 'repertoire' is a more or less coherent way of describing something. It can be a set of words and expressions, perhaps with associated images, and so on.
Subject positions	This is the discursive process of locating the identity of others and oneself. In conversation, we position others using adjectives or categories and position them in a certain way. We may position someone as a 'bad mother', which constructs the identity of that person in a particular way. This can then be accepted or rejected by others including the talked about person. We can position ourselves in the same way. Discourse analysts views identity as fluid and produced through discourse. Subject positions are culturally available categories that define a person and their identity.
Ideological dilemmas	The concept of an ideological dilemma was developed by Billig et al. (1988) as a concept relating to the fragmented and contradictory nature of everyday common sense. Ideological dilemmas relate to common knowledge and cultural wisdom as being full of contradiction, and many beliefs and expressed values are not fixed, rather they are lived ideologies. In other words, they are ways of explaining and interpreting flexible rhetorical resources. For example, a modern father may have the ideological dilemma in a research interview of showing the interviewer that he is a good father who spends time with his children while managing the contradiction that he works 60 hours per week.

Traditional discourse analysis

A more traditional form of DA is grounded in ethnomethodology and draws upon a social constructionist framework (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Such a form of DA uses three core concepts, as outlined in Table 1.4.

Discursive psychology

Discursive psychology reflects the key concerns of ethnomethodology and Wittgenstein's theory of language use, and is increasingly influenced by CA.

This form of DA is concerned with how people report their mental states and suggests that mental state reports are social actions (Edwards & Potter, 1992). As such, discursive psychology provides a general critique of cognitive theory and criticises the traditional methods used to study mental states. This is a particularly useful orientation to DA for mental health research, as this analytic approach argues that adult's mental health problems are constituted in and reflected by language, rather than being fixed biological states.

Discursive psychology grew from discourse analytic work that was focused on the ways in which speakers draw on cognitive concepts such as memory, cognition, and attention and make them relevant as a way of constructing facts (Wooffitt, 2005). A DP perspective to DA challenges how analysts orient to phenomena like identity and memory (see e.g. Lester, 2014), asserting that these are not entities in themselves but are constituted in and through language. Discursive psychology, then, considers how psychological matters, such as identity and memory, 'are produced, dealt with and made relevant by participants in and through interaction' (Hepburn & Wiggins, 2005, p. 595). Specifically, discursive psychology draws upon both the principles of discourse and CA. The key scholars working in this area include Derek Edwards, Alexa Hepburn, Elizabeth Stokoe, and Jonathan Potter.

Critical discourse analysis

Critical discourse analysis grew out of linguistics, semiotics, and other traditional forms of DA. This approach to DA is mostly focused on theorising and researching about social processes and social change, with a particular focus on political and social issues. With roots in linguistics, critical discourse analysis has a primary focus on the role of discourse in the production of power within social structures. As such, analysts using critical discourse analysis attend to how language functions to sustain and legitimise social inequality (Wooffitt, 2005). Specifically, critical discourse analysis emerged in relation to other approaches to DA and CA, but offers a more critical orientation, with an explicit commitment to demystifying dominant ideologies. Further, the purpose of critical discourse analysis is typically conceived as involving some kind of positive political social change (Morgan, 2010).

Some critical discourse analysts, such as Norman Fairclough, aim to identify how conflicts and/or inequality arise from capitalist modes of discursive production. Others, such as Teun van Dijk, have considered the role of social representation and social cognition in understanding inequalities that inform specific discursive acts. Critical discourse analysts, such as Wodak, have argued for a broader contextual base of discourse, wherein analysts consider the operation of dominance and power across (1) the actual use of language or text, (2) the relationship between utterances and genres, (3) the impact of sociopolitical elements, and (4) the place and role of the historical context. In the

case of adult mental health, a critical discourse analyst may be interested in examining power differences between clients and therapists or between those with mental distress and those without and would thus examine how the subordinate position of 'client' or 'mentally distressed' was produced, sustained, and legitimised through language. Central scholars who have greatly contributed to the development of critical discourse analysis include Teun van Dijk, Norman Fairclough, and Ruth Wodak.

Foucauldian discourse analysis

Foucauldian discourse analysis analyses how discourse informs and shapes one's understanding of the world, particularly an understanding of political and social relationships. While critical discourse analysis emerged in relation to issues surrounding social and political inequality, Foucauldian discourse analysis developed in relation to critical perspectives in psychology and clinical practice. Drawing from philosophers such as Foucault and Derrida, Foucauldian discourse analysis focused on the historically based ideological underpinnings of the dominant discourses in society to identify the vocabularies which shape the ways in which we think about the world (Wooffitt, 2005).

Foucauldian discourse analysis tends to focus extensively on how people are positioned and how such positioning is taken up, with a very explicit focus on subject positions. Further, such an approach to DA typically focuses on historical analyses of how particular discourses are developed across time and space. For instance, there may be an explicit focus on a historical analysis of the development and legitimation of mental health discourses. Another critical concept in Foucauldian discourse analysis is deconstruction, which was shaped by Derrida's work and aims to elucidate taken-for-granted assumptions within a text. For instance, Derrida (1981) noted the structuralist idea that meanings are always constructed in and through a system of signs resulting in each meaning being constructed in relation to something else. In other words, every word, idea, or concept brings with it all other words, ideas, or concepts that are different from it. However, Derrida, like other post-structuralist went beyond such structuralist ideas, and suggested that in order to reify a particular meaning, positioning it as a superior representation of reality, all of the words, ideas, or concepts that shape its meaning are subordinate (Hepburn, 1999). In the context of mental health or the notion of 'abnormal' mental health, the idea of 'health' or 'wellness' does not even make sense without the concept of 'unwell' or 'mental distress', with its very meaning differing from and being evaluated against, while still incorporating, its opposite, in situated and contextually specific ways.

Foucault's work and conceptualisation of discourse has deeply informed this approach to DA, wherein he asserted that nothing exists outside of discourse (for a fuller discussion of how the concept of 'discourse' is conceived

in Foucauldian discourse analysis, see Foucault, 1972). Key scholars in Foucauldian discourse analysis, apart from Foucault and Derrida, are Erica Burman, Ian Parker, and Wendy Hollway.

Interactional sociolinguistics

Interactional sociolinguistics (which is different from interactional linguistics, a more CA-related enterprise, see earlier in the chapter) entails an analysis of power within linguistic practices. More particularly, this form of analysis considers the ways in which certain linguistic features are produced for a specific context, recognising that common grammatical knowledge can be mobilised by different social or ethnic groups. Interactional sociolinguistics attends to patterns of language as a system and thus shares some similarities with CA. However, different from CA, interactional sociolinguists argue that member's interpretations of language form methods of dominance, rather than the words themselves achieving this dominance. In this way, a focus on power is far more emphasised than one would see in a pure CA study. Key scholars working in the area of interactional sociolinguistics include Deborah Tannen and Sydney Gumpertz.

Bakhtian discourse analysis

Bakhtian discourse analysis is grounded in the work of Bakhtin (1981) who conceptualised language as dialogic; that is, he argued that utterances serve to contribute to meaning making in a fluid way. In this way, language is conceived as fluid, with a response to an utterance viewed as a response to other utterances. Maybin (2003) suggested that Bakhtin viewed language as always pointing to a particular position, as it is never neutral. In fact, Bakhtin oriented to language as a site for ongoing struggle around issues of power and ideology. Further, Bakhtin suggested that reported speech can be linear (i.e. reported verbatim) or that speech can be pictorial (i.e. infiltrated with the voice of the speaker).

Within this form of DA, there is an explicit focus on social conflict and ideology, with these constructs being believed to be evidenced in evaluative judgements conveyed through language (Morgan, 2010). In addition, Bakhtian discourse analysis views every-day speech as being patterned into speech genres or themes. Evidently, the key scholar within this particular approach to DA is Mikhail Bakhtin.

Using conversation and discourse analytic research as evidence in the field of mental health

In practice, it is in the interaction between the clinician and patient that the signs and symptoms of mental illness are manifested, identified and treated.

Moreover, studying interaction directly has distinct advantages in identifying how a particular skill, as operationalised and tested in experimental situations, can be generalised to everyday reasoning and interaction.

(McCabe, 2006, p. 42)

The scope of CA and DA for addressing research problems in the field of mental health and mental illness is vast, and there are many different types of questions that CA and DA can answer. Indeed, Sacks' own work started in the context of a suicide prevention center. Both CA and DA are well suited to any research question that asks how people do things in a natural context and the role of language in this process, as opposed to experimental contexts (McCabe, 2006). Specifically, CA is a useful method to explore the language of mental distress and related interactions in this field, as psychiatric categories are produced through and within language (Harper, 1995). The notions of sanity and insanity, normality and abnormality, health and illness are typifications that begin with interaction and observation (Roca-Cuberes, 2008). Importantly, the work from CA has helped to reframe conceptualisations of mental illness and the way in which it is managed by changing the emphasis from biomedical to interpersonal and socio-cultural (Georgaca, 2012). However, there are only a few studies that have applied CA to the study of mental distress and mental health services, and yet CA has great potential to make a significant contribution to the supervision and training of mental health professionals in communication skills (McCabe, 2006).

DA is also an important approach for mental health research and could be used more than it is currently used (Harper, 2006). While DA is becoming more accepted in mental health research, there remains a need to explore how findings from DA studies might impact policymakers, as well as clinicians, particularly those who may be less familiar with or open to questions framed within social constructionist perspectives.

Indeed, both CA and DA have much to offer research in relation to mental health services and treatments (see e.g. Gergen & Ness, Chapter 25, this volume; Kiyimba & O'Reilly, Chapter 26, this volume). This type of research has already examined how clinical processes are interactionally constituted in the course of therapy and has explored the role of the therapist in shaping the interaction (Georgaca, 2012). Furthermore, there is increasing recognition that conversational evidence can be useful as a resource for enhancing practice, with the recordings of actual practices offering rich opportunities to see how outcomes are shaped by therapeutic dialogue (Strong, Busch, & Couture, 2008) and for offering practical recommendations for professionals (Parker & O'Reilly, 2012).

Of course, those practising CA and DA still have to compete on the evidence-based stage for recognition as part of the qualitative evidence set. This is a stage that has relegated qualitative evidence generally to the bottom of the pyramid

(Lester & O'Reilly, 2015). However, CA and DA are considered to be robust methodological approaches and, in some ways, scientific methods. Thus, these approaches may be able to play a part in the rhetoric of evidence. After all, the notion of evidence relates to how we substantiate propositions and raises questions of reliability and validity of findings (McCabe, 2006). CA and DA espouse both reliability and validity in that sense (although we are not fully subscribing to the notions of reliability and validity as suitable terms for quality in qualitative research; see O'Reilly & Kiyimba, 2015, for a full discussion). Thus, for CA and DA reliability is addressed through the selection of recordings and the adequacy of the transcripts and texts, and validity is addressed through transparency of the analytic claims and validation through 'next-turn' and deviant case analysis (Peräkylä, 2004).

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Doug Maynard for offering comments on an earlier draft of this chapter.

Note

1. For example, Goffman (1955) argued that conversational interaction represents an institutional order, and within this there were interactional obligations and rights, which are linked to personal face and identity. Furthermore, Garfinkel (1967) recognised that analysing conversation in terms of practices and rules imposed moral obligation, which needed to be supplemented by recognising the importance of shared understandings.

References

Antaki, C. (2011). Six kinds of applied conversation analysis. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Applied conversation analysis: Intervention and change in institutional talk* (pp. 1–14). Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.

Atkinson, P., & Heritage, J. (Eds.) (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). Discourse in the novel. In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by Baktin, M.* (trans. Emerson, C. & Holquist, M.) (pp. 259–422) Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise on the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, D., Gane, M., Middleton, D., & Radley, A. R. (1988). *Ideological dilemmas*. London: Sage.

Bolden, G., & Robinson, J. (2011). Soliciting accounts with *why*-interrogatives in conversation. *Journal of Communication, 61*(1), 94–119.

Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. E. (Eds.) (1986). *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Coulthard, M., & Montgomery, M. (Eds.) (1981). *Studies in discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.

Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Selting, M. (2001). Introducing interactional linguistics. In M. Selting & E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.), *Studies in interactional linguistics* (pp. 1–22). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Derrida, J. (1981). *Positions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Drew, P. (2015). Conversation analysis. In J. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative psychology* (pp 108–142). London: Sage.

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

Drew, P., Heritage, J., Lerner, G., & Pomerantz, A. (2015). Introduction. In G. Jefferson (Ed.), *Talking about troubles in conversation* (pp. 1–26). New York: Oxford University Press.

Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology*. London: Sage.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language* (trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith). New York: Pantheon.

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

Gee, J. P. (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (3rd edition). New York: Routledge.

Geertz, C. (1988). *Works and lives: The anthropologist as author*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Georgaca, E. (2012). Discourse analytic research on mental distress: A critical overview. *Journal of Mental Health, 23*(2), 55–61. doi: 10.3109/09638237.2012.734648.

Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements of social interaction. *Psychiatry, 18*(3), 213–231.

Harper, D. (1995). Discourse analysis and 'mental health'. *Journal of Mental Health, 4*(4), 347–357.

——. (2006). Discourse analysis. In M. Slade & S. Priebe (Eds.), *Choosing methods in mental health research: Mental health research from theory to practice* (pp. 47–67). Hove: Routledge.

Hepburn, A. (1999). Derrida and psychology: Deconstruction and its abuses in critical and discursive psychologies. *Theory Psychology, 9*(5), 639–665.

Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. (2013). The conversation analytic approach to transcription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 57–76). Oxford: Blackwell.

Hepburn, A., & Wiggins, S. (2005). Developments in discursive psychology. *Discourse & Society, 16*(5), 595–601.

Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

——. (2005). Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In K. Fitch & R. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 103–149). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum.

Heritage, J., & Robinson, J. D. (2006). Accounting for the visit: Giving reasons for seeking medical care. In J. Heritage & D. Maynard (Eds.), *Communication in medical care: Interaction between primary care physicians and patients* (pp. 48–85). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis* (2nd edition). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Kern, F., & Selting, M. (2012). Conversation analysis and interactional linguistics. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Wiley Online Library.

Kitzinger, C. (2005). Heteronormativity in action: Reproducing the heterosexual nuclear family in after-hours medical calls. *Social Problems, 52*(4), 477–498.

Lester, J. N. (2011). Exploring the borders of cognitive and discursive psychology: A methodological reconceptualization of cognition. *Journal of Cognitive Education and Psychology, 10*(3), 280–293.

——. (2014). Discursive psychology: Methodology and applications. *Qualitative Psychology, 1*(2), 141–143.

Lester, J. N., & O'Reilly, M. (2015). Is evidence-based practice a threat to the progress of the qualitative community? *Qualitative Inquiry, 21*(7), 628–632.

Marcus, G. E., & Fischer, M. M. J. (1986). *Anthropology as cultural critique: An experimental moment in the human sciences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Maybin, J. (2003). Voices, interextuality and induction into schooling. In S. Goomdman, L. Thersa, J. Maybin, & N. Mercer (Eds.), *Language, literacy and education: A reader* (pp. 159–170). Staffordshire: Trentham Books Ltd.

Maynard, D. W. (2003). Bad news, good news: conversational order in everyday talk and clinical settings. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Maynard, D. (2013). Everyone and no one to turn to: Intellectual roots and contexts for conversation analysis. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 11–31). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Maynard, D., & Clayman, S. (2003). Ethnomethodology and conversation analysis. In L. Reynolds & N. Herman-Kinney (Eds.), *Handbook of symbolic interactionism* (pp. 173–202). Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Maynard, D., Clayman, S., Halkowski, T., & Kidwell, M. (2010). Toward an interdisciplinary field: Language and social interaction research at the University of California, Santa Barbara. In W. Leeds-Hurwitz (Ed.), *The social history of language and social interaction research* (pp. 313–333). Cresskill, NJ: Humana Press.

Mazeland, H. (2006). Conversation analysis. In *Encyclopaedia of language and linguistics* (2nd edition, Vol. 3) (pp. 153–162). Oxford: Elsevier Science.

McCabe, R. (2006). Conversation analysis. In M. Slade & S. Priebe (Eds.), *Choosing methods in mental health research: Mental health research from theory to practice* (pp. 24–46). Hove: Routledge.

Morgan, A. (2010). Discourse analysis: An overview for the neophyte researcher. *Journal of Health and Social Care Improvement*, May, 1–7.

Ochs, E., Schegloff, E., & Thompson, S. (1996). *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Reilly, M., Dixon-Woods, M., Angell, E., Ashcroft, R., & Bryman, A. (2009). Doing accountability: A discourse analysis of research ethics committee letters. *Sociology of Health & Illness, 31*(2), 246–291.

O'Reilly, M., Karim, K., Stafford, V., & Hutchby, V. (2015). Identifying the interactional processes in the first assessments in child mental health. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health, 20*(4), 195–201.

O'Reilly, M., & Kiyimba, N. (2015). *Advanced qualitative research: A guide to contemporary theoretical debates*. London: Sage.

Parker, N., & O'Reilly, M. (2012). 'Gossiping' as a social action in family therapy: The pseudo-absence and pseudo-presence of children. *Discourse Studies, 14*(4), 1–19.

Peräkylä, A. (2004). Reliability and validity in research based on naturally occurring social Interaction. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (2nd edition) (pp. 283–304). London: Sage.

Potter, J. (1996). *Representing reality: Discourse, rhetoric, and social construction*. London: Sage.

——. (2004). Discourse analysis as a way of analysing naturally occurring talk. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (2nd edition) (pp. 200–221). London: Sage.

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology*. London: Sage.

Roberts, F., & Robinson, J. (2004). Interobserver agreement on first-stage conversation analytic transcription. *Health Communication Research, 30*(3), 376–410.

Roca-Cuberes, C. (2008). Membership categorisation and professional insanity ascription. *Discourse Studies, 10*(4), 543–570.

Rorty, R. (1989). *Contingency, irony, and solidarity*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematic for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*, 696–735,

Sacks, H. (1984) 'Notes on methodology', in J.M. Atkinson and J.C. Heritage (Eds), *Structures in Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 21–27). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. (1987). Analyzing single episodes of interaction: An exercise in conversation analysis. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 50*(2), 101–114.

——. (1999). Discourse, pragmatics, conversation, analysis. *Discourse Studies, 1*(4), 405–435.

——. (2003). On conversation analysis: An interview with Emanuel A. Schegloff. In S. Cmejrkova & C. Prevignano (Eds.), *Discussing conversation analysis: The work of Emanuel Schegloff* (pp. 11–55). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1992). Introduction. In G. Jefferson, with an Introduction by E. A. Schegloff (Eds.), *Harvey sacks: Lectures on conversation* (Vol. 1) (pp. ix–xii). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1978). Opening up closings. *Semiotica, 8*(4), 289–327.

Schwabe, M., Howell, S., & Reuber, M. (2007). Differential diagnosis of seizure disorders: A conversation analytic approach. *Social Science and Medicine, 65*(4), 712–724.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). Conversation analysis methodology. *Language Learning, 54*(s1), 1–54.

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Silverman, D. (1998). *Harvey Sacks: Social science and conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Sinclair, J., & Brazil, D. (1982). *Teacher talk*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

——. (1992). Towards an analysis of discourse. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in spoken discourse analysis* (pp. 1–34). London: Routledge.

Stivers, T. (2002). Presenting the problem in pediatric encounters: 'Symptoms only' versus 'candidate diagnosis' presentations. *Health Communication, 14*(3), 299–338.

Stribling, P., Rae, J., & Dickerson, P. (2009). Using conversation analysis to explore the recurrence of a topic in the talk of a boy with an autism spectrum disorder. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics, 23*(8), 555–582.

Strong, T., Busch, R., & Couture, S. (2008). Conversational evidence in therapeutic dialogue. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 34*(3), 388–405.

Wilkinson, R. (2015). Conversation and aphasia: Advances in analysis and intervention. *Aphasiology, 29*(3), 257–268.

Winch, P. (1967). *The idea of a social science and its relation to philosophy*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Wittgenstein, L. (1958). *Philosophical investigations* (2nd edition) (trans. G. E. M. Anscombe). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Wooffitt, R. (2005). *Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: A comparative and critical introduction*. London: Sage.

Recommended reading

- Antaki, C. (2011). Six kinds of applied conversation analysis. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Applied conversation analysis: Intervention and change in institutional* talk (pp. 1–14). Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Heritage, J. (2005). Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In K. Fitch & R. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 103–149). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum.
- Lester, J., & O'Reilly, M. (2015). Is evidence-based practice a threat to the progress of the qualitative community? Arguments from the bottom of the pyramid. *Qualitative Inquiry, 21*(7), 628–632.
- O'Reilly, M., & Kiyimba, N. (2015). *Advanced qualitative research: A guide to contemporary theoretical debates*. London: Sage.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematic for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*, 696–735.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). Conversation analysis methodology. *Language Learning, 54*(s1), 1–54.