UC Riverside
Issues in Applied Linguistics

Title

Collective Participation as a Resource in Multiparty Multicultural Broadcast Interactions

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2hc108fn

Journal

Issues in Applied Linguistics, 11(2)

ISSN

1050-4273

Authors

Piirainen-Marsh, Arja
Koskela, Heidi

Publication Date

2000-12-30

DOI

10.5070/L4112005036

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

Collective Participation as a Resource in Multiparty Multicultural Broadcast Interactions

Arja Piirainen-Marsh and Heidi Koskela
University of Jyväskylä, Finland

This paper investigates how multiparty multicultural interactions from broadcast settings are organized to provide opportunities for participants to arrange themselves into different kinds of associations for the management of the core activities of the setting. Building on previous work on collective participation and team alignment in conversational and institutional settings, this paper examines how participants in multiperson broadcast interactions invoke and display the relevance of multiperson units in talk. Drawing on data from multiperson multicultural television discussions, we examine the verbal and nonverbal practices used as resources for invoking, establishing, and negotiating the relevance of collective units of participation and investigate how these units become consequential for the organization of talk and activity in the setting. First, we consider how the institutional representatives call upon the relevance of various associations for current talk by addressing questions collectively to participants or subsets of participants. We describe the key resources used and discuss how they establish opportunities for collective participation. Second, we describe how participants display and negotiate the relevance of associations through a variety of resources, in particular by speaking on behalf of a collection of others, engaging in collaborative action, and aligning with prior speakers.

INTRODUCTION

This paper investigates how broadcast interactions involving participants from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds are organized to provide opportunities for collective participation. We focus on the practices used in establishing and maintaining the relevance of these units and investigate how they are treated as consequential for talk and activity in this setting. The data come from multiparty television discussions involving two hosts and 4-5 invited guests from a variety of ethnic, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds. The discussions were conducted in English and organized around pre-established themes such as linguistic, national, and cultural identity; race; and prejudice. In the following pages we investigate how the parties in these discussions organize participation by forming various alignments that are consequential for the talk of the moment and by displaying the relevance of particular groups, alliances, or teams in the course of dealing with these pre-established themes and topics. While our main focus is on the ways in which local alliances are occasioned and formed, we also pay attention to ways in which membership in broader collectivities, for instance, different ethnic, racial, or linguistic groups, is used as a resource in organizing participation.

Issues in Applied Linguistics
ISSN 1050-4273
© 2000, Regents of the University of California
Vol. 11 No. 2, 243-272

By examining the ways in which alignments are invited, formed, and sustained, it is possible to trace the kinds of associations that become relevant units of participation in this setting (see Francis, 1986; Goodwin, C., 1986, 1987; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1990a, 1990b; Lerner, 1992, 1993; Maynard, 1986; Schegloff, 1991, 1995). Through local practices of alignment, participants place themselves in different social positions and relationships. These, in turn, may invoke and make visible particular social, cultural, and occasion-specific identities and units of social organization. Detailed analysis of the practices and resources used in negotiating alignment sheds light on the ways in which such units are treated as relevant and consequential for talk (e.g., see Drew & Heritage, 1992; Goodwin, C., 1987; Schegloff, 1991, 1992). For clarity, we will use the term *collectivity* to refer to sets of social categories and relationships that are invoked locally and used as a resource in situated activities (cf. Hester & Eglin, 1997; Jayuusi, 1984; Sacks, 1992). The terms *alliance* or *association* are used when dealing with situated, locally accomplished units of participation, which may or may not draw upon identifiable collectivities (Lerner, 1993). When participants explicitly act as an association, making their mutual alignment visible both for each other and for those outside the association, they form a specific kind of local alliance referred to as an *interactional team* (Kangasharju, 1998).

SOME FEATURES OF BROADCAST INTERACTION

Broadcast settings are subject to complex institutional constraints which may shape the local management of participation in various ways. First, those who gain access to the *frontstage* of broadcast events are preselected according to *backstage* institutional concerns which vary according to the overall institutional framework and broadcast format (Sarangi & Roberts, 1999; see also Croteau & Hoynes, 1994). Often participants are invited to the public arena not so much as individuals, but rather as members of some external collectivities, for example, representatives of institutions or social or political groups. In this case, it is the participants' membership in such associations that affords them value as sources of information or expertise or figures of interest for the viewing public. Second, as studies of media discourse have shown, the organization and content of talk is shaped by the invisible audience (e.g., see Livingstone & Lunt, 1994; Nuolijärvi & Tiittula, 2000; Scannell, 1991). Participation rights are asymmetrical and tied to the participants' institutional identity: It is the institutional representatives' (e.g., interviewers' or hosts') task to orchestrate talk and activity according to pre-established goals and agendas by making use of techniques of questioning and other institutionally available resources (Heritage, 1985; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991, 1999; Nuolijärvi & Tiittula, 2000). However, as Roth (1998) argues, who or what the participants are "depends as much on processes intrinsic to interaction as it does on processes extrinsic to it" (p. 82). The relevance of the participants' backgrounds and social identities is established in the process of negotiating participation in interaction.

For example, through particular ways of addressing, referring to, and describing participants in the course of the core activities of the setting, speakers invoke, establish, and sustain the relevance of selected aspects of their identity, categorial membership, or personality for the event in progress (Hester & Eglin, 1997; Lerner, 1993; Roth, 1998). This is true as much for the institutional identities of the participants as it is for other aspects of their personality drawn upon in the construction of the broadcast event. In the present data, the possibility of inviting participants to speak as members of an association and of forming alliances or teams to participate in talk (Lerner, 1993, p. 228) is a central resource through which speakers negotiate their identities and mutual relationship, and position themselves in relation to topics and issues in focus.

TEAMS AND COLLECTIVITIES AS UNITS OF PARTICIPATION

The participation arrangements of many institutional settings systematically draw upon the ability of speakers to address recipients as associations and the possibility of recipients to act collectively in response (Clayman, 1993; Kangasharju, 1996, 1998; Lerner, 1993). Participants often form associations that coincide with recognizable social units such as couples or negotiating teams. Collectivities may have ongoing relevance for talk even when only one member is present in the interaction: In broadcast settings, for example, participants are often treated as representatives of different institutional frameworks, such as political or professional groups. But alignments are not dependent on external social ties: Local alignments can arise from the specifics of the situation (e.g., acting as hosts and guests) and from the topics or activities under way (Goodwin, C., 1987; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1990b; Maynard, 1986). Specific kinds of local alliances are created when participants explicitly act together and make this visible to other participants, forming what is called an interactional team (Kangasharju, 1996, p. 292; 1998). As Lerner (1993) has shown, membership in one collectivity does not preclude the formation of other occasion specific associations or alliances. Whether they draw upon social ties or emerge in specific interactional activities, alignments are formed, made visible, and maintained through systematic local practices of interaction which are sensitive to the activity in progress (Lerner, 1993; Schegloff, 1995).

A number of studies have investigated how interactional alliances or teams are created, maintained, and displayed through talk in different environments. Drawing on data from both ordinary conversation and institutional settings, Lerner (1993, pp. 220-222) has shown how participants establish the relevance of associations, for instance, through addressing individuals as an association or by speaking as representatives of an association. Lerner (1993) and Kangasharju (1996, 1998) have described how alliances are formed and displayed through a variety of linguistic and other resources. These include the use of reference forms (e.g., proterms) that enable participants to address or speak for associations of participants and

prior associations. Linguistic alignment devices, such as syntactic continuations or completions, verbal agreements, repetitions, and reformulations, indicate the current speaker's commitment to preceding turns. In addition to verbal devices, participants draw upon voice, prosody, and nonverbal resources. Gaze, gestures, and posture can be crucial in displaying mutual alignment with other copresent participants and distinguishing close alignments, such as interactional teams, from other ways of attending to coparticipants' talk (Kangasharju, 1996, p. 302; see also Goodwin, C., 1987; Goodwin, M. H., 1997).

Previous research also suggests that practices of alignment can take different forms in different activity contexts: Devices used for alignment in collaborative activities may differ from those used in activities involving disagreement or conflict (e.g., Goodwin, M. H., 1980; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1990b; Kangasharju, 1996, 1998; Maynard, 1986). These studies have shown how practices of alignment allow participants to arrange themselves into different participation frameworks and to display their social positions in relation to each other. At the same time, they allow those present to differentiate between different kinds of hearers (e.g., knowing versus unknowing recipients, supporters or opponents of a point of view) and to adjust their positions with respect to the topics and activities in progress (Goodwin, C., 1987, 1996; Maynard, 1986). Through subtle adjustments in the participation arrangements, speakers hence display and negotiate different *footings* with respect to different aspects of talk (Clayman, 1992; Goffman, 1981; Levinson, 1988). While the resources used for both establishing and maintaining the relevance of associations have been examined in different environments, research has only begun to suggest how these devices are shaped by particular settings or activity contexts and how they contribute to the tasks and roles of participants in these environments.

THE DATA AND ITS INSTITUTIONAL ORIENTATION

The data examined here come from multiperson television discussions produced for a four-part series of educational programs on language and culture by the Finnish Broadcasting Company[1]. The discussions, held in English, involved two hosts and 4-5 guests, who were selected on the basis of aspects of their background. The choice of guests reflected the concept of the series as well as the themes of individual programs: The guests were men and women representing different ethnic, cultural, linguistic, or national groups. Both native and nonnative speakers of English were included, with participants from Britain, the United States, Zimbabwe, China, Jamaica, Turkey, Argentina, France, Italy, India, and Finland. The guests were invited to the studio to talk about themes related to cultural diversity and problems of multiculturalism. The preselected themes put the participants' different identities in the foreground. Throughout the discussions the participants' diverse backgrounds were topicalized and used to invite accounts of personal experience and to encourage exchange of views. Topics that draw upon the participants' different identities emerge throughout the discussions, invoking particular

participation frameworks through which expertise and authority are negotiated and providing opportunities for expressing and aligning with different positions on the issues discussed (Goodwin, C., 1986, 1987; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1990a, 1990b; see also Drew, 1991).

The broadcast format can be characterized as a hybrid between an informal discussion or talk show and an interview with a specific educational purpose. While the interactions display features of *question-driven* (Heritage, 1985; Heritage & Roth, 1995) forms of broadcast talk such as interviews, the participants rely on resources of ordinary conversation to participate in talk about various topics. For example, rather than restricting their participation to questioning and related activities, the journalists engage in telling stories and offering and aligning with personal opinions just like their guests. In this sense, the setting clearly differs from some other broadcast formats, such as news interviews, where journalists have been shown to orient to their institutional identity by withholding personal opinions and favoring neutral positions with respect to topics (Clayman, 1988, 1992; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991).

The pre-established aspects of the discussions make relevant various participation options which provide opportunities for collective participation, both for associations tied to enduring social units and for other occasion specific or topically relevant associations. The institutional collectivities of television show hosts and guests can be said to have ongoing relevance for the occasion (Drew & Heritage, 1992, p. 49; Lerner, 1993, p. 228; Sacks, 1992). In addition to the occasion specific identities of *hosts* and *guests*, the participants draw upon their membership in various social categories which are referred to, talked about, or treated as tacitly relevant for much of the talk that takes place. In the following section, we briefly consider how institutional representatives invoke the relevance of particular associations for current talk by addressing questions collectively to all or some participants or subsets of participants.

ADDRESSING QUESTIONS TO PARTICIPANTS AS MEMBERS OF AN ASSOCIATION

Questioning is a key resource for managing the institutional agenda of broadcast talk: through different design features of questions and response invitations, journalists manage transitions from one topic or spate of talk to another, select next speakers, restrict the focus of topics, and set up expectations for appropriate next actions (Heritage, 1999; Heritage & Roth, 1995). In multiperson broadcast settings, the institutional representatives also exploit the resources of question design to establish opportunities for joint participation by multiple participants. Specific features of question design provide for the potential that questions carry for setting particular agendas for subsequent conduct. Through addressing particular participants and inviting particular types of responses, questioners not only design their turns to specific recipients or audiences (see Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991;

Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974), but also propose specific ways of treating recipients as persons or as members of associations. Through different resources of question design, interviewers or hosts can, for example, signal that their questions are addressed to recipients as ensembles or subgroups who share specific types of information or who can be held accountable for particular views or behaviors. By calling forth shared aspects of the participants' identity, questioners invite particular recipients to respond to the action that the question accomplishes, thus shaping the course of subsequent talk.

In these data, most questions are addressed to participants as members of associations made up of copresent or nonpresent members. These questions fall into three groups according to the opportunities they establish for participation in subsequent talk. First, some questions, particularly those which initiate new topics, are *addressed to* all the guests as *a single unit*. Questions of this type serve to guide the overall organization of the discussions by managing the topical agenda and inviting copresent participants to respond as sources of knowledge or experiences relevant to the treatment of the topic. In Example, 1 the host's[2] question marks a shift of topic from racial prejudice in general to specifically raising children to be "free of prejudice." The collective reference form *we*, the formulation of the question as a generic request for a point of view, and the speaker's gaze, which shifts from one participant to another in the course of the question, indicate that the question is not addressed to anyone in particular, but rather provides an opportunity for any guest to self-select and initiate an answer.

(1) [T2 1437] (participants: hosts S and R; guests from China, Jamaica, Turkey, India and Zimbabwe)

1 H (S) =when we think about our children, h:ow should we raise them so that
2 they- they (.) could be free of these hhh uh free of all this prejudice and uh
3 (.) all these funny (0.2) attitudes (0.4) towards other, (.) other nations,
4 .hh is there a (0.3) <u>rule</u>. can we do something about that.

Questions of this type draw upon and reinforce the copresent participants' institutional identities of hosts/interviewers and guests/sources/interviewees in a broadcast event with specific goals and agendas. While these questions propose a participation framework based on shared opportunities to participate (Lerner, 1993, p. 215) so that guests can respond as individuals, they are designed to address the recipients as members of an association who share access to the information or expertise sought, and to invite them to speak on behalf of others in producing a response which provides that information. In this case, the recipient is invited to respond on behalf of the group of guests as sources of expertise on the topic of raising children free of prejudice.

Second, questions may be *addressed to* some *subset of copresent participants* as a unit of participation with access to the information or content sought by the question. Questions of this type may introduce new topics or they may occur as follow-up turns which pursue a previously established topical agenda and invite

more talk either from the same or different participants. In Example 2, a shift of perspective is accomplished through inviting responses from a new set of participants.

(2) [T1 174] (participants: hosts S and R; two bilingual couples)

1	H (R)	how about you two, (0.5) uh
2		you come from France, Caroline and
3		you are a Finnish-speaking Finn
4	JS	mm-hm
5	CG	I think at home uh: basically we speak English,
6		but Jari speaks French nowadays so u::h
7		AND I (.) decided hh .hh finally to learn Finnish so
8		(.) .hh maybe in couple of years I will be fluent

Here the host's question addresses one of two copresent couples after a spate of talk in which the other couple has been actively engaged. In preceding turns the members of one couple have been describing their use of two languages within the family. The host's question maintains this topic, but achieves a shift of perspective by addressing the other copresent couple collectively and describing their national and linguistic backgrounds. Questions such as these invite answers from the recipients as an association and generally receive answers from one participant who responds on behalf of an association, as CG does in the example above (note the use of "we" and references to "Jari," her husband). Responses such as these make relevant alignment by other members of the association and can lead to collaborative action and the formation of an interactional team.

Finally, some questions *invite answers* from individual *participants as representatives of non-present collectivities*. These utterances make relevant participation as individuals, but treat the recipient's membership in some collectivity as relevant to the topic and activity in focus, for instance, through linking membership in the collectivity to expertise or authority in the topical domain. In Example 3, the host's question carries a previously established topic, the role and treatment of women in different cultures, and invites an Indian participant to contribute on the basis of her cultural expertise.

(3) [T2 907] (participants: hosts S and R; guests from China, Jamaica, Turkey, India and Zimbabwe)

1	H (S)	[what about] in India, hh people talk h (.) a lot about Indian women,
2	F	[mm]
3	H (S)	.hh their situation (.) in the society. how do you feel
4		.hh of did you (0.3) notice (.) lot of difference when you came here.

The examples above give an initial demonstration of how questions manage the topical agenda through selecting particular associations of guests as appropriate next speakers and invoking some category bound knowledge or experience as relevant to the topic at hand.

As the main focus of this paper is on the local alignments through which the copresent participants arrange themselves into associations and teams which are treated as consequential to talk in progress, the next sections will investigate how the first two types of question turns make relevant responses from copresent associations of participants. A closer analysis of the turns can shed light on the ways in which these turns propose specific opportunities for participation through employing resources that enable the speaker to establish or sustain the relevance of an association for subsequent talk.

In the following section we examine how references to and descriptions of participants as members of associations combine with other features of question design and provide a key resource for the management of participation and simultaneously display the participants' status as sources of information or experience. In particular, we describe how linguistic practices, such as the selection of proterms, categories, and person descriptions, accompanied with nonverbal devices (e.g., gaze), are used to select multiperson units as addressees and how they contribute to the action that the question accomplishes in its sequential context. Although systematic treatment of nonverbal, embodied, and visual aspects is not always possible due to the restricted focus of the camera during specific moments of talk, features of the speakers' gaze, body posture, and gestures are dealt with alongside the verbal practices where relevant and available for viewing and analysis.

Proterms Combined with Other Available Resources

The use of proterms (e.g., second person reference with *you*) is a device for addressing sequence-initiating actions to selected recipients, individuals, or parties (see Lerner, 1993, 1996a; Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). In multiperson contexts the use of the proterm *you* may become problematic in that recipients have to determine whether its reference is singular or plural and to define its specific meaning in the context. For this reason, other aspects of talk and context are crucial in the process of establishing who is being referred to and addressed (Lerner, 1996a, p. 282). When units consisting of several participants are addressed, they may, for example, be identified by using explicitly plural references (e.g., *you two*, *you all*, *you guys*) or by topicalizing activities or issues which make relevant the recipients' shared membership in a collectivity. Addressing can therefore be accomplished by coupling linguistic devices, such as pronouns, with other resources, such as aspects of the current topic, specifics of the situation, and the sequential context.

One technique through which hosts introduce new topics is to address their questions collectively to all participants. In questions of this type, the second person pronoun is often employed together with other features of turns and utterances to invoke shared aspects of the copresent participants' identities and to establish the scope of address. In the example below, the host initiates a new topic with a question addressed to all copresent participants. The question contains plural reference terms which, together with content features, make relevant an occasion specific association of guests in a multicultural television discussion. Prior to this

question, participants have been talking about problems of communication between people from different cultural backgrounds and the role of shared language in alleviating such problems. The first part of the host's turn below is formulated as an interrogative which introduces a new aspect of the topic as an additional issue to be addressed in subsequent talk ("isn't it also a matter of information, about knowing [0.6] about each other"). The turn thus achieves a shift of focus from the role of language and culture to the role of knowledge in facilitating intercultural communication.

(4) [T2 567] (Participants: hosts S and R, guests from China, Jamaica, Turkey, India and Zimbabwe; M=unidentified male participant)

1	H (S)	[isn't it also: a matter of uh (.) .hh information:
2		about knowing (0.6) about each other.
3		.hh I just uh I was about to ask uh .hh
4		are there things that we here in Europe don´t know about you
5		.hh [would it be easier (.) I mean]
6	M	[.hh (coughs) k- (there are)]

The core part of the turn consists of an interrogative ("are there things that we here in Europe don't know about you") which invites the participants to describe aspects of their background which might be unfamiliar and therefore might cause misunderstandings or trouble. The action that the question accomplishes in part relies on the way in which the guests are treated as sources of information relevant to both to the theme of the discussion, racial and other forms of prejudice, and the broader institutional aims, education through interaction. The way that addressing is achieved is crucial in framing the question to accomplish a request to provide the information sought. The recipients are addressed with the second person reference "you," which is juxtaposed with the speaker's collective reference to herself with the pronoun "we," combined with a place reference "here in Europe." The linguistic context of the interrogative establishes "you" as a plural reference form and gives rise to an inference whereby the recipients are addressed as non-European for the purposes of this activity. This allows the host to disaffiliate with the guests and to affiliate with the audience. At the same time, she is able to display an interactional footing which allows her to avoid taking a personal stance on the issue and thereby display her proper public institutional role (cf. Clayman, 1992).

This example highlights the way that the selection of categories or descriptions is consequential for the treatment of the party that is referred to (see Goodwin, C., 1987). Here, one participant comes from Turkey, which could be considered a European country, and most of the other guests have lived in Europe for some time. Yet all are addressed as non-Europeans and contrasted with the speaker, who is also speaking for the audience. It can therefore be argued the address form also implicitly invokes a collectivity based on race or ethnicity: By juxtaposing the proterm and the inclusive reference linked to a place description "we here in Eu-

rope," the speaker alludes to the guests' membership in ethnic and racial categories which contrast with those of the audience and herself as the mediator between the audience and copresent participants. In brief, the reference forms and content of the question together accomplish collective addressing whereby the guests are invited to respond as comembers of a group of informants representing a collectivity based on their ethnic or racial background.

In questions addressed to a subset of guests, pronouns are often used to identify some participants as the appropriate recipient and next party to talk. In the following example from a discussion with two couples, the act of addressing is accomplished through referring to the recipients with the pronouns *you* and *your*. The pronouns alone, however, do not specify the addressee, and a particular couple is selected as the proper recipient through the way the scope of address is restricted by the sequential context (see Lerner, 1993, p. 225-226).

```
(5)  [T1 1368]  (Participants: hosts S and R; two bilingual couples)
1    AR         =because I [have a] habit of saying no (0.6)
2    PR                    [yeah   ]
3    AR         you know, [no] I´ll do it=
4    RS                   [no-]
5    PR          =yeah=
6    F           =[yes   ]
7    M            [(mm)] aha.
8    AR         [you know and I put it into] the Finnish language >and it comes<
9    PR         [and  she-   yeah          ]
10   AR         completely [wrong ((laughs))
11   PP                    [       ((laughter))=
12→H (S)        what about any cultural (0.4) uh misunderstandings
13               anything, ·hh maybe: at the beginning of your (0.4)
14               relationship, was there anything that you (0.4) ·hh
15               didn´t (0.3) understand each other because of the
16               cultural background.=
17     AR        =yes there was o:ne, I mean (0.9) I- he he he
18               £Pertsa he's very-£    (smiling, gaze at PR)[3]
19               well he wa:s. very quiet and very passive. hh when I came
20               and I´m (.) quite like this [you know and]
```

The question turn here is marked as a follow-up question which invites more talk on the same topic from the same participants. The "what about" question format (Roth & Olsher, 1997) is used to achieve a slight shift of focus: Previous talk has concerned misunderstandings caused by foreign language use, and this question is formed to introduce "cultural misunderstandings" as another issue to be addressed. The next turn shows how the same couple is confirmed as the appropriate party to talk. In line 17, AR responds on behalf of the couple, refers to her husband by name, Pertsa, and formulates a description of him, thereby making him and the relationship the topic of her turn and the next activity, a story. In line 18, she briefly glances at her husband, PR, soliciting his recognition of the story

about to begin and displaying his part in it. Lerner (1993, p. 221) refers to this practice as *conferring* and identifies it as one way in which an association of participants can be made relevant to other participants by one party speaking for the association.

Sometimes when questions are addressed to associations of participants using the second person pronoun, the question itself does not specify which association is addressed, and further talk is required to establish the nature of the association and to select the next speaker. In the following example, the host, H(S), engages in explicit interactional work to identify the type of association addressed.

(6) [T1 213] (participants: hosts S and R; guests: two bilingual couples AR & PR and CG & JS; F=unidentified female participant)

```
1     H (S)    but in an international (0.3) marriage,
2              there is always a situation in which hh (0.4)
3              at least one of the (0.5) two (0.4) people, hh (.)
4              talks in a foreign language (0.7) mainly (0.3)
5              .hh and er, I feel that er (0.4) it is a l- a bit of a
6              sacrifice anyway, because it´s not your own language
7              and you can never hh (0.4) really express yourself (0.4)
8              in the same way in a foreign language
9              as you can in your own language.
10             (0.8)
11    H (S)    and uh (.) I think that language is a very important part
12             of the (.) national identity (0.7) theme so,
13             (1.1)
14 →           how do you feel about this eh eh I mean- hh huhh
               (SS gazes towards JS and CG) x----------x    (x----x = shifts gaze
               towards AR and PR)
15             the party in you who: ee (.) [speaks]
16    AR                                    [a lot- ]
17    H (S)    in the foreign language mainly.
               (gaze towards AR)
18    AR       a lot of the personality of that person goes. (0.5)
                          x--------x--    (x----x= glances at JS and CG)
19             when they can´t speak in in their own <language>.
20             (0.4) [e- for] example, if I speak in English
21    F              [yes  ]
22    AR       my hands are flying: and .hh I have all these
23             expressions and certain things like that
```

The host's first turn (lines 1-9) accomplishes a transition from the previous topic—language of communication in bilingual relationships/families—to a new aspect of the theme by introducing the "sacrifices" that one has to make when speaking a foreign language. The shift of topic makes relevant a change in participation framework. Previous activities have involved two couples, which have taken turns in collaboratively describing the languages used in the family or relation-

ship. The new topic, however, foregrounds other aspects of the coparticipants' identity, specifically their linguistic background and status as native or nonnative speakers. These aspects of identity thereby become available as resources for rearranging the participation framework.

While the host's extended turn makes relevant a shift in participation arrangements, it does not provide enough shared particulars for any subgroup of participants to self-select and begin talking on the topic. After a long pause (line 13), the host begins to formulate a question which invites a subset of participants to respond to her views. During formulation of the question, the speaker's gaze shifts from one couple to the other: Her gaze is down during the first utterance, then shifts first to one couple, JS and CG, during the interrogative, then shifts to the other couple, AR and PR, during "I mean," and finally stays in this position until AR begins to respond. The speaker initiates a self-repair in line 14 (the brief laughter seems to indicate the speaker's recognition of trouble here) and selects those members of the couples who can be referred to as foreign language users as addressees ("the party in you who: ee speaks in the foreign language mainly"). In the complex circumstances of these participants, the reference does not identify the addressee unambiguously: The participants are in a bilingual relationship where one or both of the participants may speak a foreign language most of the time or may change language according to the situation. However, at this point the speaker's gaze is directed towards AR, making relevant a response from her. AR begins to respond in overlap with the host (line 16) and resumes her response after the host completes her utterance (line 18). AR's turn accomplishes speaking for the association by topicalizing the referent of the previous turn ("that person") and selecting a plural pronoun ("they") before shifting footing and initiating a more personal account as an example of the type of problems that using a foreign language can cause.

As these examples have demonstrated, proterms combine with other resources of turn design and sequential development to address participants or subsets of participants as associations and to invoke the relevance of these associations for subsequent talk. Proterms such as *we* and *you*, coupled with other characterizations of participants, allow hosts to call upon those aspects of the recipients' identity and relationships that are relevant to the topic and content of the question and to invite recipients to respond as participants in such social arrangements. These resources provide one element in the patterns of language use that interact in question design and contribute to the action that the question is to accomplish.

Person Descriptions

Roth (1998) has demonstrated how selective, situated descriptions of persons serve as resources for constructing different types of question turns in news interviews and how they are related to the construction of news content. His study shows how person descriptions contribute to actions that the interviewers' questions accomplish and how they can be used by interviewers to establish the

interviewees' expertise, to juxtapose multiple perspectives, and to challenge some aspect of the interviewees' public persona. In the same way as news interviewers selectively describe their sources "newsworthy" personae (Roth, 1998, p. 94), hosts in these data draw upon aspects of their guests' ethnic, social, linguistic, or cultural identity to construct questions which allow them to elicit talk related to the educational agenda of the broadcast by directing talk towards preselected topics and mediating between different perspectives on these topics. The first two examples below demonstrate how person descriptions serve to select particular collectivities, in this case, couples, as addressees, and at the same time restrict the focus of topic, either by establishing a connection between prior talk and talk to follow or by establishing a new aspect of the topic to which the recipients are invited to respond.

(7) [T1 174] (participants: hosts S and R, two bilingual couples AR & PR and CG & JS)

1	H (R)	how about you two, (0.5) uh *(host not in view)*
2 →		you come from France, Caroline and *(host in view: gazing towards JS and CG)*
3 →		you are a Finnish-speaking Finn
		(RS's gaze alternates between JS and CG)
4	JS	mm-hm
5	CG	I think at home uh: basically we speak English,
6		but Jari speaks French nowadays so u::h
7		AND I (.) decided hh .hh finally to learn Finnish so
8		(.) .hh maybe in couple of years I will be fluent
9		ah [ha hh]
10	JS	[but we-] we kind of mix- mix up the languages
11		but uh (.) most of the time we speak English (0.3)
12		together, but we-(.)

Example 7 comes from the introductory phase of a discussion involving two bilingual and bicultural couples. Prior to this exchange, the hosts focused their attention on one of the couples, asking them questions about the languages used for communication within the family. The host's question here shifts the focus of talk to the other co-present couple, JS and CG. The shift of participation framework is achieved through a plural pronominal reference ("you two") embedded in a "how about" interrogative clause. This is followed by two descriptive statements which reintroduce the participants as members of different nationalities. The question thus maintains the topical agenda established in earlier question-answer sequences and invites a different association of participants to contribute to the topic. Connection with prior talk is achieved here through person descriptions, which highlight the addressees' different national and linguistic background, combined with an interrogative which selects the couple as addressee (cf. Roth, 1998, p. 92). In her response, CG speaks for the couple (note reference to "we" and talking about her husband "Jari" and the couple as a unit). Her turn is followed by a response from her husband, JS, with similar markers of co-membership.

In Example 8, persons' descriptions are used to negotiate the addressee's expertise on the topic raised by the question (lines 7 and 8).

```
(8)  [T1 1101] (participants: hosts R and S; two bilingual couples AR & PR, CG & JS)
1    H (S)     =right. I was just to ahh- going to ask how quickly or (0.2)
                                  (gaze not directed at anyone)
2              .hh how slowly (.) does the cultural (.) integration work.
                        (x-------gaze towards CG and JS--------------------
3              I mean for people who live abroad. how quickly do they get adjusted.
               ---x-----(gaze shift towards AR and PR) (------gaze at AR and PR -------------
4              I don´t know [you, (.) have you-]
               x------gaze shifts to CG and JS-------)
                      (gestures toward to CG and JS)
5    CG                       [ a:h I  think-    ]
6              (0.4)
7 → H (S)      you haven´t been married for that long
8 →            but you have (.)tra[vell:ed  ]
9    CG                          [no we´ve] been living together:: (0.3)
10             some years be(h)fo[re(h)    ] hh but uh
11   H (S)                        [mm-hm]
12   CG        I: think you know it depends of every kind of
13             personality I mean, it´s up to you to adapt (.)
14             when you [go to] a foreign country
```

The question is first formulated in general terms, not selecting any participant as addressee (lines 1 and 2). The scope of address is also seen in the way the speaker's gaze shifts between the two couples. However, as the turn progresses, a repair with a person reference ("I mean for people who live abroad") narrows the scope of address to a collectivity which includes two of the copresent participants, the "foreigners," and excludes the other two, the two Finnish partners. This subset of participants is referred to with the third person pronoun *they* in the interrogative component of the turn (line 3). Although each of the syntactic components added to the turn ends in falling intonation and would allow speaker transition, no one self-selects and no response is initiated. Finally, the speaker adds a further turn component, a post-completion stance marker (Schegloff, 1996) expressing uncertainty ("I don't know"), and directs her gaze towards two of the participants, selecting one of them as primary addressee with the second person pronoun *you* accompanied by gaze and gesturing (line 4). She thus gradually shifts from speaking generally to all participants to addressing a subset of the participants—members of couples who live in a foreign country—and finally selects one member of this subset as next speaker by addressing her directly.

The selected recipient seems to recognize the narrowing scope of address just before she is addressed and self-selects as next speaker, initiating her response in overlap with SS's address form (line 5). However, the host continues with a statement describing the addressee in such a way that the addressee's expertise on

the topic is called into question: by referring to the couple's short experience of married life (line 7). This is followed by another description (line 8), which portrays the recipient as an experienced traveller and as someone with expertise on some other relevant aspects of the topic—such as living abroad, cultural adjustment—and therefore as an appropriate next speaker.

In partial overlap with the host, CG responds with a turn (lines 9-10) in which she contests the host's description by formulating an alternative description ("we've been living together") which disagrees with the host's assertion that "you haven't been married for that long." The guest's counterdescription thus seems to claim the type of expertise which the host's description has left in doubt. Unlike her first attempt to respond to the question, this turn is designed to allow her to speak for the couple (note the use of "we" rather than "I"). This footing shift allows her to address the question of topical expertise and then proceed to formulate a response from her individual perspective.

The following example shows how a single person description as the core component in a question can accomplish multiple tasks in an interactional environment where participants are involved in different kinds of alignment. It also highlights the complex ways in which different aspects of participants' identity that are consequential to the activity in progress are used as resources for forming spontaneous local alignments (cf. Goodwin, 1987). The example comes from an exchange in which one participant, JS, describes his own "typically Finnish" behavior in queues, and two other participants, CG (JS's French wife) and AR (an English woman married to another participant), form a local alliance through nonverbal displays of alignment with each other and through engaging in teasing commentary on JS's talk (lines 14 and 16-18). Below, we begin with a few remarks on the way that the first alignment is formed and then focus on the question turn (line 24) which dissolves this alliance by challenging the point of view of one of the participants and which occasions another type of alignment.

```
(9)  [T1 698]  (participants: hosts S and R; two bilingual couples AR & PR, CG & JS)
1    JS            =that (.) everybody has has to (.)
2                 stand in the queue (.) with a:: (0.4)
3                 [>you know< with a- with a good (.) discipline.]
4    CG           [hh he he he he  hhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhh     ]hh (CG looks at AR, raises
                  eyebrows )
5    AR           [hh hh hhhhhhhh   hhhhhhhhhhhhhhhh       ]hh
6    H (S)        mm [(   )
7    PR              [yeah (.) ( )]
8    JS              [and  (.) if  ] somebody´s passing you you feel
9                 furious but you don´t open your mouth because
10                [even that]
11      H (S)     [  mm      ] mm
12      JS        is [ of::   ] of bad habit.
13      H (S)        [eh heh]
```

14	CG	we have [had some argu]ments eh [heh hh hhh h]	*(gaze towards AR)*
15	JS	[if you open] [yeah	
16	AR	[you would not]	
17		survive in E(h)ur(h)ope h ah ha [ha ha hh	*(gaze towards CG)*
18	CG	[yeah that's	*(small nod, gaze at AR)*
19	JS	[>(yeah) in a way-	
20		in a way but< hhhhhhh (.) it´s- it´s quite funny	
21		I can feel that [(.) th]at it´s something (x)=	
22	AR	[mm]	
23	JS	= which is (.) controlling (.) my (.) behavior in- in the queue.	
24 →	H (R)	aren´t the English famous for queueing	
25	AR	oh yes [we queue but] I mean we also <u>jump</u> the queue.	
26	H (R)	[very patiently]	
27	PR	[they have – they [have a temperament	
28	PP	[(several participants laugh)	
29	AR	[I mean Imean if I if I want something	

During JS's talk CG and AR engage in nonverbal activity—mutual gaze, smiling, and shared laughter—which displays the type of close mutual alignment and shared stance that marks the formation of an interactional team. Their closely coordinated turns (lines 14 and 16-17) comment on JS's talk in a manner that seems to amount to a shared activity of teasing (see Drew, 1987). Both comments extend the implications of the category bound behavior described by JS and at the same time display disalignment between JS and the two other speakers. CG's turn both displays her close relationship with JS and distances her from him by referring to the arguments caused by the type of behavior that her husband is describing. Through gazing at AR, CG selects her as the primary recipient of the comment and makes relevant a response from her. The utterance thereby calls upon the relevance of the couple as a unit but also invites alignment from another participant.

AR responds in lines 16-17 by teasingly commenting on JS's behavior as somehow not appropriate for Europe ("you would not survive in Europe"). In his response, JS cautiously accepts the remarks and joins the shared laughter, but also makes a more serious point which brings his description to a close. At this point, the host comes in with a question addressed to AR: "aren't the English famous for queuing?" AR is selected as recipient through gaze and through the use of the national category *English* which calls upon AR's nationality as relevant for the topic and activity in progress. While the question draws on AR's earlier participation in the joint teasing activity with another participant, it also accomplishes a shift of perspective and participation framework by now inviting AR to respond as a member of an external collectivity.

The question projects an affirmative response to a claim about the English as "famous for queuing." This challenges the position that AR has been heard to take through her earlier participation in talk—that queuing is not appropriate for Europe. In describing the English in these terms, the host calls into question the earlier description of queuing as "typically Finnish" behavior and assigns it to an-

other national category of which the recipient is a member. In doing this the utterance contests AR's stance on the topic by pointing to an inconsistency between her talk and what the speaker considers known about English people in general—that they are "famous for queuing." AR's response can be characterized as a qualified description which orients to the inconsistency brought up by the host's turn and reduces this inconsistency[4] through initially accepting one version of the claim ("oh yes we queue") and then juxtaposing it with a statement more in line with her own position on the topic ("we also jump the queue"). The question also occasions the formation of another kind of alliance: In line 27, PR aligns with his wife by continuing and complementing her utterance with a comment about the English ("they have a temperament"). His comment claims shared knowledge of the collectivity topicalized by the question and at the same time displays a shared stance with AR.

So far we have examined how sequence initiating actions are designed to make relevant collective participation either by inviting individuals to respond as representatives of associations or by inviting joint participation by several co-present participants. Hosts incorporate explicit address forms, such as pronouns and person descriptions, in the syntax of questions to manage participation and topical development in a manner which treats associations as relevant for subsequent talk. In addition to allowing the hosts to control the amount and type of talk produced by different parties, questions such as these make it possible to elicit different points of view, challenge previous speakers, and invite other parties to express their positions on the topic.

SOME RESOURCES FOR REINVOKING, SUSTAINING AND NEGOTIATING ALLIANCES

In addition to practices used in sequence initiating actions such as questions, there are a number of other ways in which participants can establish, reinvoke, or sustain the relevance of associations to current topic and activity. As the examples above have already shown, participants frequently accept and sustain the relevance of such units by speaking for or acting as an association. Below, we describe some practices that participants use to sustain or renegotiate membership in the associations invoked in hosts' questions and examine how they invoke and sustain new temporary alliances for managing current topic or activity. Due to limitations of space, we will limit ourselves to two types of practices found in the data: devices through which participants accomplish actions jointly, for instance, by collaborating in producing a response, and devices through which participants display alignment with prior speakers.

Displays of Coparticipation in Responsive Turns

Collaborative responses

In multiparty institutional settings where participants get addressed as groups, they employ a range of contextually available resources for participating as a unit. Audiences in public speeches, for example, act "in concert" by coordinating responses, such as applause, laughter, booing, or speech (Atkinson, 1984; Clayman, 1993; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986) and pupils in a classroom may produce choral responses to teachers' questions (Lerner, 1993; see also McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979). In these data, participants display alignment through coordinating their responses to hosts' utterances, for instance, by engaging in simultaneous recipient activity. The following example shows how a sequence initiating turn addressed to all copresent participants as an association invites joint participation as the guests collaboratively produce a response.

```
(10) [T1 474]  (participants: hosts S and R, two bilingual couples AR & PR, CG & JS)
1     H (S)    =mm, ·hh but er (0.4) so you: don´t feel
2              that erm:: (.) the language part (0.4)
3              in your marriage would be a barrier,
4              in your cas[es ]
5     PR                 [no.] [(not at all)] definitely [not. ]
6     AR                 [no.] [    no.     ]
                              x---------AR shakes her head----------------------x
7     CG                 [no: and I-]          [no and] I think that
8              sometimes you have eh people that speak the same language,
9              and still they don´t understand each other,
10             [  so  ]
11    H (S)    [mm,]
12    AR       [mm ]
13    H (S)    right.
14    PR       right.=
15    CG       =I [don´t know]
16    H (R)       [ especially ] when they´re married yeah=
17    PP       (( laughter by several participants))
18    CG       (yeah)oh whatever=
19    PR       =yeah in- our- our understanding doesn´t end in in
20             langu[age,][  it  e-   ] it en- ends in other thing(h)s
21    JS            [yes ][because-]
22    CG                 [  no      ]
23    PR       hh [ s(h)omet(h)imes]
24    H (S)       [y e a h   s u r e  ]
25    M           [(          )       ]
26    CG          [   y e a h         ]=
```

The host's turn in lines 1-4 formulates a summary of a preceding stretch of talk and presents it for confirmation or denial by the recipients. Such formulations

are frequently used in institutional settings to demonstrate and make explicit particular understandings or versions of the content of prior talk (e.g., see Heritage, 1985; Heritage & Watson, 1979; Walker, 1995). Here, the host's utterance formulates a point of view which is presented as shared and attributed collectively to the two copresent couples (note the use of the pronoun "you" and the plural form of the noun in the phrase "your cases") and seeks the recipients' confirmation for it.

As the turn reaches its completion, three of the participants begin to produce a response: First PR and AR collectively respond with the negative response particle "no" in accordance with the negative form of the prior turn. The response is reinforced by PR's verbal upgrading elements ("not at all, definitely not") and AR's repetition and extended headshaking. In overlap with this, CG also joins in the activity with a similar negative response, followed by an utterance which both confirms and adds a new dimension to the response. Her turn builds on the host's reference to problems of understanding in bilingual relationships and contrasts it with lack of understanding between "people who speak the same language" (lines 7-9). Several participants align with CG's turn with minimal responses ("mm" and "right"). As CG withdraws from talk with a post-completion stance marker "I don't know" (see Schegloff, 1996), the other host intervenes with a humorous comment (line 16) which extends her point and serves as an invitation to laughter (see Glenn, 1989; Haakana, 1999). Several participants respond to the comment with laughter, thereby collectively affiliating with it. The collaborative sequence is brought to a close by PR, who, building on prior turns, further extends the jointly achieved response.

PR's turn in line 19 repeats elements from prior utterances, especially CG's prior turn, and is linguistically marked to incorporate all those involved in the current activity within its scope. Through a first person plural reference ("our understanding") the speaker can be heard as speaking for an association, which in this sequential context seems to include not only the couple of which he is a member but also the other copresent couple and hence all the guests. PR's turn thus seems to confirm the jointly established position that language is not a problem in these participants' relationships. At the same time, it also builds on and extends the host's comment in line 16 ("especially when they're married") by referring to other marital communication problems. The within-turn laugh tokens also display alignment with the humorous mode of talk established in prior turns. The turn is followed by expressions of agreement by several other participants, who thereby display their alignment with the speaker and sustain the alliance. Local devices for alignment are used in this example to build a collaborative response through which the participants construct and make visible a shared stance on the topic under way.

The following example shows how coordinated actions by several guests achieve a disaffiliative response which leads to a reformulation of the initial turn and a shift in participation framework. The host's turn here formulates a metacomment which marks a shift from a previous topic and alerts the participants to a move towards topics directly related to the agenda. The turn is initiated with

an interrogative which secures the recipients' attention ("but do you notice") and continues in declarative form as a general statement which formulates her understanding of "what is going on" in terms of the activity of "defending our national identity" (lines 5-6). Although mitigated by laugh tokens and a soft voice, her statement takes a somewhat categorical form, intensified with phrases like "we all" and "very much." The speaker is therefore proposing a rather strong interpretation of prior talk by her coparticipants. An action such as this makes relevant a response which either accepts or rejects her formulation.

```
(11) [T1 937] (participants: hosts S and R, two bilingual couples AR & PR; CG & JS)
1    H (S)          [y:es  ] >but do you notice(h)< huhh
2                one thing that is going on here (.) in this
3                conversation which I find interesting (0.4) hhh
4    PR          yeah
5    H (S)       is that we are all defending our national identity, hh
6                (.) very much [actually]  (smiling)
7 → PR                         [hah hah ]
8 → AR           oh  [yeah.]   (smiling)
9 → CG              [haha [ha hh]
10→ PR                    [that´s] that´s [how (it goes).] (smiling)
11   H (S)                                [  or  we  are   ] aware of
12               it, [we know that well, you know that]
13   ?              [  (                  )        mm          ]
14   H (S)       you are from Eng[land (you feel)-]  hh and so on.=
15   AR                          [oh definitely  ]
```

The responses by PR, AR, and CG are closely coordinated and display some alignment with the host through laughter and smiling. PR is first to respond with laughter in terminal overlap with H(S)'s turn. His laughter is quickly followed by AR's recognitional "oh yeah," delivered with a smile, and CG's laughter which overlaps with it. In overlap with CG's laughter, PR continues with an assessment ("that's how it goes"). While the responses by different participants take different forms, they share an orientation to the prior turn as projecting more talk, perhaps a shift of topic, and as something to be taken humorously.

Although the responses indicate recognition, even acceptance of the host's point, they do not show explicit agreement nor do they confirm her version of what the preceding talk was about. It may be that the low degree of commitment expressed in the collective response leads to H(S)'s subsequent effort to reformulate her statement. In line 11, she offers a reformulation in a modified form, replacing her reference to "defending" one's national identity with "awareness" of it. She also modifies the participation framework by explicitly addressing her utterance to one of the participants ("you know that you are from England") and inviting participation from her by gazing at her (lines 12, 14). The addressed participant, AR, responds in the following turn, providing an explicit acceptance ("oh definitely"). Thus, although the coordinated responses by recipients here display

orientation to the association invoked by the host's turn, they also seem to mark a brief collective distancing from the position attributed to the participants, which results in a reformulation of the initial statement and a shift in participation framework.

Responding for an association of participants

As shown in the previous sections, guests frequently orient to the relevance of associations invoked in hosts' questions by designing their initial response turns in such a way that they can be understood to speak for the association addressed in the question. Sometimes questions addressed collectively to all or a subset of the participants lead to explicit negotiation of speakership as the members of the association establish who is to act as the principal speaker. The details of such negotiations, as well their results (i.e., who is selected to speak), depend on the nature of the activity and are highly context specific. In the following example, a question addressed to a couple and designed to elicit a story related to the couple's shared experiences—incidents involving misunderstanding—leads to explicit negotiation of who is selected to act as storyteller. The question is followed by an initial response from one of the addressees, AR, which indicates that there is a shared story available for telling but that she is not the most appropriate member of the unit to tell the story. A closer look at the way in which the response unfolds and leads to a story initiation by PR, AR's husband, shows how the participants sustain "the couple" as the relevant social unit and how they negotiate the participation framework for telling a story in response to the question.

```
(12)  [T1 1320] (participants: hosts S and R; two bilingual couples AR & PR; CG & JS)
1     H (S)     have there been any .hh funny incidences, any funny situations hhh
2               uh because you are a ( . ) uh bicultural couple.
3               [have there been any (linguistic)-]
4       AR      [ maybe with the langu]age.
5               when [you st]arted to £learn the [language, £ hh hh
6       H (S)         [yeah]
7       PR                                       [and Angie has-
8       AR      yeah Pertsa you have to [tell this]  (AR touches PR's arm)
9       PR                              [yeah    ]
10      AR      ( ) I can't tell this=
11      PR      =well Angie has a habit when she speaks (0.3)
12              Finnish to put (.) to start [ every    ] sentence with
13      AR                                  [(coughs)]
14      PR      [(.) word        ] ei. (0.3)[no. ]
```

The first part of AR's response gives an affirmative answer to the preceding question and names a topic—the language—for the story (line 4). The second part of this turn reformulates the opening utterance, specifying "learning the language" as the topic. The way this utterance is formed and delivered indicates that AR treats the story as shared but does not consider herself as the appropriate teller of

the story. First, rather than initiating a story about herself from a personal perspective, she uses the impersonal "you" in referring to the subject of the story (line 5). Second, her voice and nonverbal behavior indicate both recognition of a particular story and a particular stance towards it: The utterance is produced with a rather soft voice, within-turn laugh tokens, and a rising intonation contour, projecting continuation and inviting recipients to treat the projected story as funny. By naming a particular topic, indicating whom the story is about, and treating the story as laughable, the speaker provides an opportunity for the other member of the collectivity, her husband PR, to display recognition and shared knowledge—in other words to establish himself as a knowing participant, a story *consociate* (Lerner, 1992).

This prompting results in PR's attempt to initiate the telling in overlap with AR. The attempt is interrupted, however, by AR's utterance which explicitly hands over primary speakership to her husband as the party who has access to relevant knowledge and the right to speak for her. At the same time, AR also makes relevant her association with PR by touching him (line 8). PR then restarts to tell the story.

The story is thus initiated collaboratively in consecutive turns by two members of the same social unit. This unit is made interactionally salient and visible by displaying recognition and shared orientation to what—and whom—the story is about. By engaging in both implicit (through voice and nonverbal activity) and explicit verbal negotiation of who is to act as principal teller, the couple also displays the kind of topic-relevant knowledge required to tell the story. PR's final turn shows that this knowledge includes not only shared knowledge about the events themselves, but also topically relevant knowledge about the language concerned—Finnish—as the use of Finnish is crucial to the story itself (note the use of "ei," the Finnish word for *no*, in line 14).

ALIGNING WITH A PRIOR SPEAKER

Verbal Expressions of Agreement and Commitment

One way in which parties can invoke and sustain the relevance of a particular association is to explicitly align with prior reports, opinions, or other actions offered by members of a team or alliance. This is frequently done through expressing degrees of agreement or commitment to the positions established by prior speakers. In multiperson conversation, expressing an opinion or taking a particular side on an issue or topic makes relevant next actions by which other participants can make their side known by aligning with or dissociating from the first positions (see Lerner, 1992, 1993; Pomerantz, 1984). Hence, when participants speak on behalf of or about an association of participants, it becomes relevant for other members of the association to "speak for themselves." Affiliating or disaffiliating with the prior speakers provides opportunities to create and sustain alignments which have temporal relevance in talk, for instance, alliances specific to the cur-

rent topic or activity. A clear example of this is seen in those turns in which speakers express explicit agreement with prior speakers in adjacent turns, as in the following.

```
(13)    [T1 685] (participants: hosts S and R; two bilingual couples AR & PR; CG & JS)
1       CG    [that´s of course] the (.) the point. hh
2             economic aspect and I find it very strange in Finland
3             that- they are not trying (0.6) even to sell you
4             something. so  [you don´t] have this
5       H (S)                [  m m    ]
6       CG    economic as[pect]
7 →     AR          [I  ] agree with you [ on ] that.
8       JS          [mm]                 [mm]
9 →     AR    absolute[ly. ]
```

In Example 13, CG is providing a summary assessment of an extended turn in which she has expressed her view on a topic through telling a story. AR aligns with her position by offering an explicit and emphatic agreement (lines 7 and 9). Earlier in the course of her story, CG has already engaged in behavior that can be seen as soliciting AR's support by referring to her in the course of formulating her point of view ("and I have a feeling, I don't know about Angela but uh"). This has lead to displays of alignment by AR through a collaborative completion and verbal responses ("yes"). In this excerpt, AR makes her alliance with CG even more visible to other co-participants by explicitly agreeing with her.

The following example shows how a speaker can express commitment to a prior speaker's view in a non-adjacent turn by referring to the prior speaker's words and thereby making explicit her agreement with them.

```
(14) [T1 431-437]  (line 3: a sordino is a mute used to soften or muffle the sound of a
     musical instrument)
1→   AR      it´s like you said Jari sort of (.) sort of moved
                 x-------------------x  (gazing at JS)
2            [place, you know it´s-]
3 →  JS      [  yeah it´s like you-   ] you put a sordino to your
4            feelings °somehow °=
                     x--------------     (JS looks at AR)
5 →  AR      =yes, or a [hood over your head you know (x)]
             ------------------------------------------x
6 →  JS                 [ °yes°  °yes°   °yes°       ]
7    AR      everything goes, I don´t know what it [is.]
```

In Example 14, commitment with a prior speaker's words is expressed through referring to the speaker ("it's like you said Jari," line 1), marking him as the source of the content of utterances that follow. Such *source markers* (Kangasharju, 1996, 1998) can be used to display alignment with the source's views on the topic and

mark team membership. Here the alignment is also displayed through gaze: Eye contact is established at the point where affiliation becomes relevant (cf. Kangasharju, 1998, p. 194). The affiliative action makes visible the alliance of two speakers and leads to collaborative talk: The two parties jointly construct an utterance to produce a shared view. The joint construction of utterances is achieved linguistically by building on the syntax and linguistic resources of the turn-in-progress, in this case through repetition of turn constructional components such as "it's like" and coordination of syntactic components across speakers (lines 3 and 5).

Repeats and Reformulations

In previous examples we have already seen how repetition of elements from prior turns can serve as a display of alignment. Below are two examples where speakers repeat words or utterances to align with a prior speaker in opposition to another speaker, thus forming an alliance in disagreement.

```
(15)  [T3 328]
1     MM      but still you´re not supposed to u:h kiss (0.7) kiss your boyfriend
2             or your (0.3) whatsoever husband, u::m, in the streets
3     R (S)   aren´t  you?
4 →   TS      [that´s changed]
5     S (S)   [why not.       ] (.) [uh huhh huhh
6 →   RR                            [it's changing (    )
7     MM                            [yeah I know [but uh but
8 →   TS                                         [that's changed yeah
9     MM      you: you do it less in Finland than uh=

(16)  [T3 643]
1     RR      =but do you think sauna is erotic (.) [huh heh]
2     H (R)                                         [u::h well] >I don´t know<
3             it´s the only place you see naked people. hh
4             huhh [huhh huhh huhh huhh huhh   huhh
5 →   H (S)        [ (I don't think) it´s supposed to be ero-
6             we don´t find it erotic [at all] hh  huhh  [huhh   hhhh
7     RR                              [ no:. ]           [(    )
8     MM                                                 [(    )
9     RR      [hehehh [he he
10→   PS      [hardly. [ yeah
11    M                [n o
12→   MM      hhhh (hardly) to to feel it erotic, I mean [I- I- ]
13→   H (S)                                              [no i-] it´s not meant to be
14            erotic [(at all)]
15    MM             [no.    ]
```

Both examples are structurally similar to sequences which typically occur in disagreements involving team alignment in multiparty talk (see Kangasharju, 1998):

The sequence begins with a turn expressing opposition to a prior turn and continues with turns in which others speakers align with the speaker of the opposing turn. In Example 15, the host's turn in line 3 challenges the prior speaker's assertion by questioning it and hence can be seen as the first opposing turn. In lines 4 and 5, two other speakers simultaneously align with the opposition, TS with a comment which disagrees with the first speaker's claim and H(S) with a question ("why not"). In line 6 yet another participant, RR, joins the team by repeating in a modified form the comment offered by TS. In line 8, on completion of the repetition by RR, the same comment is again repeated by TS.

Similar teamwork which accomplishes opposition is seen in Example 16. Here, RR's utterance in line 1 is a question serving as the first oppositional turn to a claim by the host. This display of opposition is followed by H(R)'s attempt to modify his earlier claim and by other participants' displays of alignment with the oppositional turn. First, H(S) aligns with RR with a turn which both answers RR's question and disagrees with H(R)'s earlier claim (lines 5-6). The repetition of the keyword "erotic" reinforces the disagreement. Other participants follow with brief utterances which align with the disagreement and repeat key components of the prior turns, specifically the negative response particle "no" and the word "erotic." Finally, H(S) repeats in a modified form her prior turn (the first alignment turn). The modifications serve to upgrade the opposition collectively established in prior turns by replacing prior mitigated versions with a general statement which negates the original claim. This turn thereby confirms the collective opposition and brings the teaming sequence to completion.

CONCLUSION

This paper has examined how the possibility of forming different kinds of alignments is used as a resource for organizing participation in multiperson television discussions involving participants from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. The data come from a setting with a particular institutional organization: The discussions carry an overall institutional agenda of broadcast intercultural education through exchange of views and experiences between participants from diverse backgrounds. In these data, the institutional anchoring of talk and activity is made visible in the way that participation is structured to display the relevance of different types of associations for the organization of interaction. This paper has addressed this feature of talk from two perspectives. First, we examined how the hosts invoke the relevance of multiperson units for subsequent talk by designing their questions so that the participants' membership in different types of associations is brought to bear on the talk of the moment. Second, we investigated how recipients display, sustain, and negotiate the relevance of different kinds of associations in response to such questions and how they form other spontaneous alliances to participate in talk.

Nearly all of the hosts' questions in these data are designed to provide opportunities for recipients to respond as members of different types of associations. We have described how two types of questions, those addressed to the guests as a single unit and those addressed to some subset of copresent guests, establish the relevance of associations and how they invite recipients to respond as members of different kinds of social units and relationships. In addition to establishing opportunities for collective participation, these questions also align participants to topics of talk in particular ways. First, questions that initiate new topics are often designed to address all the guests as a single unit and to invoke those aspects of their identity that are relevant to the new topic and the themes of the show. By addressing the guests collectively as representatives of different cultural groups, for example, and at the same time speaking as a member of a collectivity herself, the host of the show can call upon the occasion-specific associations of hosts and guests in a television show and select and foreground those ties between the participants that are relevant to subsequent talk. Second, questions that are addressed collectively to some subset of copresent participants are recipient designed to invite a response from selected members of the group and to establish their status as the type of recipients to which the question is directed. This allows hosts to manage topical development by proposing particular participation frameworks in accordance with topics and activities under way.

Both types of questions draw upon systematic practices through which they invoke the relevance of associations and invite joint participation by several copresent participants. Through different techniques of addressing, in particular by embedding references and person descriptions in the syntax of questions, hosts select particular associations of participants as appropriate next speakers and invoke different aspects of the recipients' identity as relevant to the action that the question is to accomplish. While this often highlights the diverse backgrounds of the participants and enables the institutional representatives to treat them as representatives of different cultural groups, the same resources also make proposals about common experiences, shared identities, and social relationships. These features of question design reflect the tacit but crucial characteristic of broadcast talk as talk produced for an invisible third party: Questions carry an agenda which allows the treatment of copresent participants as sources of information, experiences, or views relevant to the overall goals and agendas of the occasion. Through selecting particular ways of referring to and describing recipients, hosts establish and negotiate the expertise that the guests have for participating in talk on particular topics (see Roth 1998). Questions which address the recipients as a single unit allow the hosts to establish ongoing relevance for some associations (e.g., their occasion specific, institutional roles) and call upon other kinds of ties (e.g., being "foreign," belonging to specific ethnic, linguistic, or national groups) to invoke specific types of knowledge or perspectives as relevant to the current topic. While this feature of the design of questions reflects the external constraints which shape these events, such as recruitment of participants, it also crucially affects the ways

that participants are represented to the viewers. Participants' membership in different relationships is used as a resource for informing and educating the audience about aspects of the diverse cultures and groups that they represent. Equally importantly, the various relationships between participants serve as a resource for invoking common experiences and inviting affiliation between participants. Questions that initiate alignments hence serve another dimension of the institutional agenda by creating opportunities for displaying a diversity of views and perspectives in a context of solidarity and locally shared identity. This aspect of talk is an important factor in creating the informal and entertaining mode of the show.

The second part of the paper examined some ways in which participants orient to various collective identities made relevant in the hosts' questions and how they form alternative, momentary alliances through their own actions. Participants often make visible their membership in an association through explicit verbal forms (e.g., use of the collective pronoun *we*), through formulating their response in general terms to comply with the expectations established in the question, or by engaging in collective action (e.g., coordinated responses by different participants). They also employ various resources for renegotiating the relevance of particular associations and act together to form topic- and activity-specific alliances or teams. These techniques show how participants sustain and negotiate their participant status and membership in a variety of potentially relevant associations in specific activity contexts.

This paper contributes to previous studies of collective participation and team alignment by examining how resources available for establishing and sustaining associations are fitted to a specific institutional context and how they reflect the asymmetries of knowledge or perspective on the content of talk in this setting. The techniques described provide some insight into the ways in which participants invoke specific aspects of social relationships and treat them as relevant to the organization of topics and activities in broadcast discussions with an agenda of intercultural education. Our findings suggest that techniques of addressing associations of participants contribute to the way that questions in broadcast interaction pursue specific agendas and control participation in multiparty contexts. They also show that features of participants' social/cultural identities are brought to bear on talk and are used as a resource for establishing links and associations in the context of specific topics and activities so that speakers can select and display particular alignments within and across available categorial identities. More detailed analysis is required to establish the full range of ways in which the multiple asymmetries between participants are reflected in the resources for participation in this and other complex multiperson contexts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to thank Leah Wingard and two anonymous reviewers for their thorough and insightful comments on earlier versions of this paper.

NOTES

[1] The data come from a larger corpus of broadcast interactions collected for a research project on interaction and asymmetry in institutional settings funded by the Academy of Finland (1997-2000).
[2] For clarity, we identify the two hosts in these discussions with the institutional abbreviation H and the speaker's initial (S or R).
[3] The symbol £ in the transcript indicates "smile voice."
[4] We are grateful to Paul Drew for this observation.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, J. M. (1984). Public speaking and audience responses: Some techniques for inviting applause. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 370-410). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clayman, S. (1988). Displaying neutrality in television news interviews. *Social Problems, 35*(4), 474-491.

Clayman, S. (1992). Footing in the achievement of neutrality: The case of news interview discourse. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work. Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 163-198). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clayman, S. (1993). Booing: the anatomy of a disaffiliative response. *American Sociological Review, 58*, 110-130.

Croteau, D. & Hoynes, W. (1994). *By invitation only: How the media limit political debate*. Monroe, ME: Common Courage.

Drew, P. (1987). Po-faced receipts of teases. *Linguistics, 25*, 219-253.

Drew, P. (1991). Asymmetries of knowledge in conversational interactions. In I. Markova & K. Foppa (Eds.), *Asymmetries in dialogue* (pp. 21-48). Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (Eds.) (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Francis, D. W. (1986). Some structures of negotiation talk. *Language in Society, 15*, 53-80.

Glenn, P. (1989). Initiating shared laughter in multi-party conversations. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 53*, 127-149.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goodwin, C. (1986). Audience diversity, participation and interpretation. *Text, 6*(3), 283-316.

Goodwin, C. (1987). Forgetfulness as an interactive resource. *Social Psychology Quarterly 50*(2), 115-130.

Goodwin, C. (1996). Transparent vision. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 370-404). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, M. H. (1980). Processes of mutual monitoring implicated in the production of description sequences. *Sociological Inquiry, 50*, 303-317.

Goodwin, M. H. (1997). By-play: Negotiating evaluation in story-telling. In G. R Guy, C. Feagin, D. Schiffrin, & J. Baugh (Eds.), *Towards a social science of language: Papers in honor of William Labov. Vol. 2. Social interaction and discourse structures* (pp. 77-99). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goodwin, C. & Goodwin, M. H. (1990a). Context, activity and participation. In P. Auer & A. di Luzio (Eds.), *The Contextualization of Language* (pp. 77-99). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goodwin, C. & Goodwin, M. H. (1990b). Interstitial argument. In A. D. Grimshaw (Ed.), *Conflict talk* (pp. 85-117). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haakana, M. (1999). *Laughing matters. A conversation analytical study of laughter in doctor–patient interaction.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Helsinki.

Heritage, J. (1985). Analyzing news interviews: Aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis: Vol. 3* (pp. 95-119). London: Academic Press.

Heritage, J. (1999, March). Question design. Paper presented at the Conference on Broadcast Conversations: Interaction in the Media, Roskilde University, Denmark.

Heritage, J. & Greatbatch, D. (1986). Generating applause: A study of rhetoric and response at political conferences. *American Journal of Sociology, 92*(1), 110-157.

Heritage, J. & Greatbatch, D. (1991). On the institutional character of institutional talk: The case of news interviews. In D. Boden & D.H. Zimmermann (Eds.). *Talk and social structure. Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis* (pp. 93-137). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heritage, J. & Roth, A. (1995). Grammar and institution: Questions and questioning in the broadcast news interview. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 28*(1), 1-60.

Heritage, D. & Watson, R. (1979). Formulations as conversational objects. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 123-162). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hester, S. & Eglin, P. (1997). Membership categorization analysis: An introduction. In Hester, S. & Eglin, P. (Eds.), *Culture in action. Studies in membership categorization analysis* (pp. 1-24). International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis and University Press of America.

Jayuusi, L. (1984). *Categorization and the moral order.* London: Routledge.

Kangasharju, H. (1996). Aligning as a team in multiparty conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 26,* 291-319.

Kangasharju, H. (1998). *Alignment in disagreement: Building alliances in multiperson interaction.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Helsinki.

Lerner, G. H. (1992). Assisted storytelling: Deploying shared knowledge as a practical matter. *Qualitative Sociology, 15*(3), 247-271.

Lerner, G. H. (1993). Collectivities in action: Establishing the relevance of conjoined participation in conversation. *Text, 13*(2), 213-245.

Lerner, G. H. (1996a). On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of interaction: 'Second person' reference in multi-party conversation. *Pragmatics, 6*(3), 281-294.

Lerner, G. H. (1996b). "Semi-permeable" character of grammatical units in conversation. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 238-276). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, S. (1988). Putting linguistics on a proper footing: Exploration in Goffman's concepts of participation. In P. Drew & A. Wootton (Eds.), *Erving Goffman: Exploring the interaction order* (pp. 161-227). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Livingstone, S. & Lunt, P. (1994). *Talk on television.* London: Routledge.

McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society, 7,* 183-217.

Maynard, D. W. (1986). Offering and soliciting collaboration in multi-party disputes among children (and other humans). *Human Studies, 9,* 261-285.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nuolijärvi, P. & Tiittula, L. (2000). *Televisiokeskustelun näyttämöllä. Televisio-institutionaalisuus suomalaisessa ja saksalaisessa keskustelukulttuurissa* [Television discussion as a performance. Television institutionality in Finnish and German discourse cultures]. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis.* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge: CUP.

Roth, A. (1998). Who makes the news? Descriptions of television news interviewees' public personae. *Media, Culture and Society, 20,* 79-107.

Roth, A. & Olsher, D. (1997). Some standard uses of "what about"-prefaced questions in the broadcast news interview. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 8,* 3-25.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation.* Ed. by G. Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell.

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

Sarangi, S. & Roberts, C. (Eds.) (1999). *Talk, work and institutional order.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Scannell, P. (Ed.) (1991). *Broadcast Talk.* London: Sage.

Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Reflections on talk and social structure. In D. Boden & D. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis* (pp. 44-70). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992). On talk and its institutional occasion. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work. Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 101-134). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1995). Parties and joint talk: Two ways in which numbers are significant for talk-in-interaction. In P. ten Have & G. Psathas (Eds.), *Situated order. Studies in the social organization of talk and embodied activities* (pp. 31-42). Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Turn-organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and granmar.* (pp. 52-133). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walker, E. (1995). Making a bid for change: Formulations in union/management negotiations. In A. Firth (Ed.), *The discourse of negotiation: Studies of language in the workplace* (pp. 101-149). Oxford: Pergamon Press.