会話分析と社会的・連鎖的な
コンテクストに関する論争

Jeffrie Butterfield

要　約

　会話分析は人々がいかにして社会的相互作用を行い、その相互行為内でどのように社会的秩序を維持するか、ということを探求する研究分野である。会話分析ではコンテクストとは連鎖的コンテクストという相互行為内での発話連鎖環境のことである。会話分析においては相互行為内の目に見えること、また、聞こえることが分析対象となるが、近年、社会的コンテクストの要素という目には見えないが人の話し方や行動に影響を与えること（文化、状況、共通知識など）を分析に含めるか否かということが論争されてきた。本研究の目的は社会的コンテクストや連鎖的コンテクストを説明した上で、会話分析の創業者の一人 Emmanuel Schegloff と批判的談話分析の分野で有名な Michael Billig のやりとりに焦点をあてることにより、なぜ会話分析の分野でコンテクストが論争的な要点になっているのか、を明らかにすることである。

Conversation Analysis and the Debate on Social and Sequential Context

<div align="right">Jeffrie Butterfield</div>

Introduction

Conversation Analysis (CA), a methodology for analyzing and understanding human interaction, is informed by a wide range of disciplines. It is the description of social action, more specifically, of how participants in conversations maintain an interactional social order (ten Have, 2007). CA, also referred to as the study of talk-in-interaction (Schegloff, 1987), is concerned with the organization of conversations and how participants perform various actions in interaction. Interaction is the medium through which cultures are transmitted and humans are socialized (Clayman & Gill, 2012), and according to Schegloff (1986), interaction is the "primordial site of sociality" (p. 112).

CA views talk as an interactional accomplishment by interlocutors collaborating to achieve orderly communication (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). The focus of CA is on how people communicate and maintain intersubjectivity, and despite the fact that language is the means through which people communicate and that it has never been at the center of sociological research, CA's roots do lie in sociology. Emmanuel Schegloff and Harvey Sacks, two of the founders of CA, were interested in finding new ways of doing sociological research. As a fellow at the Center for the Scientific Study of Suicides, Sacks found some records of phone calls to the Suicide Prevention Center. The approach now known as CA is what resulted from his analyses of these conversations (ten Have, 2007).

CA is similar to mainstream sociology in that they both aim to describe human behavior, with CA's focus being on interaction. They differ in the

fact that in CA the analyst does not formulate an a priori hypothesis to prove or disprove, and CA aims to focus on the demonstrable features of the interaction, whereas mainstream sociology looks at how factors external to the individual like culture and environment affect human behavior. The conversation analytic approach to analyzing data is what is called "unmotivated looking," meaning that analysts do not go into the data looking to find a particular phenomenon. Conversation analysts allow the focus of their research to emerge from the data. Analyses are empirically grounded and analysts refrain from discussing factors that may affect participants' actions that are not visible in the data. CA research avoids imposing elements of social context on the analysis.

Dimulescu (2009) points out that CA practitioners "are not concerned with the underlying social, cultural, and psychological messages that are rendered through talk, but with describing the ways in which speakers coordinate their talk to produce meaningful actions" (p. 184). Whether the non-visible contextual elements of conversations should or should not be incorporated into analyses has been a topic of debate around CA. These non-visible elements are often referred to as social structure or social context. In CA, context usually means sequential structure, also referred to as sequential context. CA looks at turns in pairs or sequences and it is concerned with examining sequences of actions, also known as sequence organization (Schegloff, 2007). In order to avoid confusion, in this paper I will be using the terms social context and sequential context. For a long time, the topic of context in CA went largely ignored. Schegloff (1992) points out that the object being put in context is often the focus of research, but the meaning of context and its implications for research rarely are. He describes social context as "external" and "distal" and sequential context as "intra-interactional," "discourse," and "proximate" (p. 195). The goals of this paper are to define what is meant by the expressions social context and sequential context and to identify the reasons why the concept of context has become such a contentious point of debate surrounding CA. In the following two sections I will explain social and sequential context and then in the subsequent section I will discuss the major points of the debate surrounding them.

Social Context

Researchers concerned with social context often do not define exactly what social context includes. According to van Dijk（2007）, in the social sciences context is a vague concept used to describe the "situational, historical, geographical, social, or cultural environment of a phenomenon being studied"（p. 285）. In the debate surrounding the use of social context in CA, context often refers to elements that could influence participants' actions such as location, political orientation, identity, culture, position, status, age, gender, and so on.

From a CA perspective, context is not objective; it is a subjective personal construct（van Dijk, 2007）that participants orient to as relevant in interaction. CA does not make a priori assumptions that there is an inherent connection between social context and language. Any claims that state the relevance of sociolinguistic variables to the participants must be empirically grounded in the data（Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008）. Schegloff （1991）states that there is a "paradox of proximateness"（p. 64）, by which he means that analysts need to show how elements of the external environment are relevant to the interlocutors and how they demonstrate this relevancy through their actions. Potter（1998）remarks that Schegloff's view of context "starts to dissolve the traditional micro-macro distinction"（p. 31）. Some researchers（e. g., Maynard, 2006）argue that exogenous features of social context such as narratives about daily life, help us understand participants' experiences and how they relate to their behavior.

Sequential Context

CA is both context-shaped and context-renewing. By context-shaped it is meant that participants' actions can be understood as responses to the preceding actions. Context-renewing refers to the present action being the context for the next action, and how the context is constantly being renewed by the present action（Heritage, 1984）. Context, as it is used in the

field of CA, often refers to sequential context, which is the sequential environment of utterances produced by interlocutors.

Interlocutors display through their conduct which aspects of context they are making relevant at that moment and the relevant contexts should have some connection to the talk or action performed in the interaction (Schegloff, 1987). According to Kasper (2009), "context and social action reflexively shape each other through in situ categorization and the sequential organization of interaction" (p. 11). Conversation analysts view actions as locally occasioned and they are therefore unaffected by the wider social context (Maynard, 2006).

The Debate

According to Markee (2007), the highly debated issue surrounding context in CA research concerns "the extent to which CA's understanding of context as the immediate co-text of talk is a source of methodological rigor or whether it is a needless limitation on our ability to understand what members are doing" (pp. 1022–1023).

CA practitioners who do not include ethnographic information in their research are sometimes said to practice the "purist tradition of CA" (Markee, 2000, p. 27). Other CA practitioners, such as Moerman (1988), incorporate ethnography into their analyses as they believe that it adds to a more thorough understanding of what is occurring in the interaction and why. Maynard (2006) also uses ethnography to complement CA and regarding their combined use he states that "ethnography is an ineluctable resource for analysis, using it in a relationship with CA that is one of limited affinity" (p. 59). Ethnography and CA are similar in the sense that they both approach phenomena from an emic perspective, the perspective of the participants (Markee, 2000). They both also aim to provide in-depth descriptions of everyday practices. They differ, however, in the way that they view social context and the way in which researchers access the participants' perspectives. Ethnographic interviews, which are one element of ethnography, allow researchers to look at participants from their own perspectives and may help to shed light on how and why things are done.

From a CA perspective, one problem with relying on interviews is that participants' subjective views of a phenomenon may be different from reality, which may be revealed through an objective analysis. CA is sometimes criticized by ethnographers because it outright neglects the use of social context. Some CA practitioners question the possibility of connecting features of social context to talk systematically (Maynard, 2006). Markee (2007) points out that is it possible to combine CA, a sequential analysis of how participants talk, and ethnography, a much wider form of analysis, which looks at why participants talk in certain ways, but he also mentions that it is difficult to do both analyses well.

Researchers in the fields of discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis conduct analyses from both emic, participants' perspectives, and etic, researchers' perspectives. CA is more rigid in its methodological approach to analyzing data (Wooffitt, 2005), whereas in discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis studies, which do incorporate elements of social context, the methodology and scope can vary greatly.

Schegloff (1987) argues that some researchers in the social sciences are not satisfied unless the social structural circumstances which allow for an in depth analysis are included in the description of various phenomena. He maintains that to some researchers generalizable patterns of interaction are obvious and not interesting and the features of conversation that differ by "class, ethnicity, culture, gender, institutional setting, organizational setting, and so on" (pp. 228–229) are what are interesting for them. He believes that researchers trying to combine macro-level elements of social context into micro-level analyses of social action run the risk of inadequately explaining the micro-level processes.

Bourdieu (1977) claims that "the truth of interaction is never entirely contained in the interaction" and that this is an important point that "social psychology and interactionism and ethnomethodology forget" (p. 81). He insists that people's positions in society are a result of where they have been and where they are, and they are with them at all times. This suggests that what occurs in interaction is not just a response to what was said in the previous utterance, rather, it is a consequence of a multitude of external factors that have shaped individuals and affect how they speak.

In the late nineties a well-known debate began between Emmanuel Schegloff, as mentioned above, one of the founders of CA and opponent of the use of social context in CA research, and Michael Billig, an influential social psychologist in the field of critical discourse analysis (CDA) and proponent of utilizing social context, regarding the use of social context. Although many researchers participated in this discussion, the main points of contention can be revealed through an analysis of their exchange. In his article titled "Whose Text? Whose Context?" Schegloff (1997) argues that analyses should be empirically grounded and conducted based on how participants orient and respond to relevant elements of interaction. In his paper he criticizes CDA for not anchoring descriptions of participants' interactions in the data and for not showing how the interaction occurring reflects participants' understandings of the interaction. He censures CDA for its lack of a systematic approach, detailed analyses of interaction, and for not analyzing interaction in the way that participants understand it. He asserts that CDA would benefit from examining how participants orient to certain social categories in the interaction. According to Schegloff (1997),

> In our times, the relativization and perspectivization of cultural analysis threaten the virtual disintegration of stable meaning and import into determinacy, and nowhere more than in discourse analysis. By analogy to physical entropy, there is a kind of interpretive entropism. Discourse is often made subservient to contexts not of its participants' making, but of its analysts' insistence. Relevance flies in all directions; the text's center cannot hold in the face of the diverse theoretical prisms through which it is refracted. (p. 183)

In response to Schegloff's claim that participants should be studied on their own terms, Billig (1999a) argues that the terms used in CA are not the terms of the participants, rather, they are the specialized terms of the analyst and that there are inherent problems moving from the language of the participants to the technical language of CA. He contends that conversation analysts do have presuppositions, which he postulates are necessary, but points out that this is not problematic. Billig (1999b) states that the "epistemological and methodological naivety that Schegloff recommends is neither desirable nor in an absolute sense realisable" (p.

573). In order to support his claim that CA terms carry "theoretical baggage" (p. 574), he points out that terms such as participants and co-participants are a reflection of how the analyst understands interaction and that this understanding is a prerequisite for analysis.

Billig (1999a) insists that because traditional CA does not focus on content, it is insufficient to deal with a variety of topics and he questions the lack of methodological consistency among conversation analytic research and how it attends to some things sometimes and disattends to some things sometimes. He argues that CDA draws insights from other disciplines, whereas CA's limited analytical scope is the reason for its minimal range of references.

Schegloff (1999b) responded to Billig by stating that his analytic approach is far from naive, rather it is disciplined, and that the analytic approach that Billig describes is self-indulgent. By this he means that analysts who neither examine participants' actions on their own terms nor analyze how participants make various elements of the interaction relevant through their orientations to them are forcing their own ideas of what they think is relevant to the participants on the analysis. Having discipline entails performing empirically grounded analyses and not relying on the incorporation of elements of social context in the analysis to explain participants' behavior. Behavior is analyzed based on participants' visible orientations to various features of the interaction. In CDA research, according to Schegloff (1997),

> there is a kind of theoretical imperialism involved here, a kind of hegemony of the intellectuals, of the literati, of the academics, of the critics whose theoretical apparatus gets to stipulate the terms by reference to which the world is to be understood. (p. 167)

Billig (1999a) refutes the claim that CA is ideologically neutral and states that "CA contains its own sociological and ideological assumptions" and that "CA is always more than conversation analysis, and, by implication, it is not so different from the sort of critical analyses, that Schegloff takes to task" (p. 544). This implies that contrary to Schegloff's claims that CA research is empirically grounded and analyzed in the participants' own terms, analysts do bring their own presuppositions and

knowledge of the social situation and participants to the analysis. Billig (1999a) points out that using participants' names or letters to indicate participants in CA transcripts is problematic because it assumes that the environment in which the conversation takes place is socially neutral, when in reality it is actually the opposite. He insists that theoretically neutral terms like names or letters are actually quite loaded because they presuppose equality in all situations. Schegloff (1999a) states that CA assumes that all participants in conversations are equal, which is why the term participant is used in analyses. He points out, however, that in institutional talk turns are sometimes pre-allocated such as in courtrooms. In institutional talk who speaks when and who selects the next speaker is often decided by institutional identities which are revealed and made relevant through interaction. He asserts that he has used category terms, especially in reference to institutional roles, as well as for discourse identities such as caller and answerer, because they are related to the interaction at hand.

Conclusion

The contentious debate surrounding the use of social and sequential context to analyze discourse which attracted a lot of attention in the late nineties has dissipated significantly. Practitioners in each field of research, whether it be discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis, or conversation analysis, each have a rationale for their preferred method of research. The main points surrounding the debate regarding context can be seen in the exchange between Schegloff and Billig. The debate between Schegloff and Billig reveals the main methodological differences between CA and CDA as well as the possible strengths and limitations of each discipline.

Conversation analysts who practice traditional CA generally do not condone the invocation of elements of social context in analyses and argue for approaching analyses from an emic perspective. This involves looking at interaction in the interlocutors own terms, which is done by examining the sequential context in which utterances occur. For conversation analysts it is imperative that any elements of social context mentioned in

analyses be grounded in the data. Schegloff argues that CDA lacks a systematic approach and a detailed description of interaction, and that the analyst often imposes their ideologies on the analysis.

Many proponents of discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis believe that CA is unnecessarily limited in analytical scope and that a deeper understanding of what is occurring in interaction could be achieved by considering the non-visible elements of interaction that are sometimes hiding below the surface and not necessarily visible to the interactants themselves. Billig asserts that CA is not as naive as Schegloff claims and that labeling participants in theoretically neutral ways actually involves the analyst presupposing that the participants are equal, which is not always the case. For Billig, CA is ill-equipped to deal with certain topics because of its focus on the visible elements of interaction and not the non-visible elements that also affect the participants' behavior.

Although Schegloff and Billig may never see eye to eye regarding an ideal methodology for analysis, each has a suggestion for how the other discipline could benefit from change. Schegloff (1999b) proposes that CDA be grounded in the formal analysis done in CA and Billig (1999a) suggests that CA abandon its goal of sociological neutrality and take a more critical stance towards the analysis of data. Although the debate surrounding the use of social context in CA has dissipated significantly, in more recent years there are some researchers who still continue the debate. For example, Raclaw (2009) argues that there is not one way to approach context in CA or do CA, rather there are a various branches of CA and a variety of approaches to context throughout the different branches.

References

Billig, M. (1999a). Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in conversation analysis. *Discourse & Society*, *10* (4), 543–558.

Billig, M. (1999b). Conversation analysis and the claims of naivety. *Discourse & Society*, *10* (4), 572–576.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clayman, S. E., & Gill, V. T. (2004). Conversation analysis. In A. Bryman & M. Hardy (Eds.), *Handbook of data analysis* (pp. 589–606). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Dimulescu, C. (2009). A *CA* versus *CDA* approach to cross-gender talk-in-interaction. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov*, *2* (51), 183–188.

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

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

Kasper, G. (2009). Categories, context, and comparison in conversation analysis. In H. thi Nguyen & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Markee, N. (2007). Conversation analysis: Issues and problems. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of language teaching* (pp. 1017–1032). New York: Springer.

Maynard, D. W. (2006). Ethnography and conversation analysis: What is the context of an utterance? In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Emergent methods in social research* (pp. 55–94). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Moerman, M. (1988). *Talking culture: Ethnography and conversation analysis*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Potter, J. (1998). Cognition as context (whose cognition?). *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *31* (1), 29–44.

Raclaw, J. (2012). Approaches to "context" within conversation analysis. *Colorado Research in Linguistics*, *23* (1), 58–79.

Schegloff, E. A. (1986). The routine as achievement. *Human Studies*, *9*, 111–151

Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Between macro and mico: Contexts and other connections. In J. C. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Munch, & N. J. Smelser (Eds.), *The macro-micro link* (pp. 207–234). Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

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

Schegloff, E. A. (1992). In another context. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon* (pp. 191–227). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse & Society, 8* (2), 165–187.

Schegloff, E. A. (1999a). 'Schegloff's texts' as 'Billig's data: A critical reply. *Discourse & Society*, *10* (4), 558–572.

Schegloff, E. A. (1999b). Naivete vs sophistication or discipline vs self-indulgence: A rejoinder to Billig. *Discourse & Society*, *10* (4), 577–582.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis*. London: Sage.

van Dijk, T. A. (2007). Comments on context and conversation. In N. Fairclough, G. Cortese, & P. Ardizzone (Eds.), *Discourse and contemporary social change* (pp. 281–316). Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.

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